

**ICV Administrative Review - Summary of responses from ICVs and Panel Secretaries**

**NB: A folder containing all responses received has been placed in the Members room**

- 32 responses to the consultation have been received from 19 Panels.
- This represents a 59.38% response rate from Panels.
- Although Consultative groups were not specifically invited to take part in the consultation, they were informed of the proposals and 4 have responded. Their comments have been included as part of the consultation.
- Of the total responses received, 2 agreed with the proposal, 32 disagreed with the proposal and 2 can see benefits in both the MPA Proposal and maintaining the current system.
- Of the 32 ICVP responses received by the MPA, 19 were from individuals. This is a 3.95% representation of the (approximately) 480 ICVs and Panel Secretaries London-wide.
- Seven of the Panels (5 Panel and 2 Individual responses) replied using a template letter – a copy of this has been attached below for reference
- Eight of the Panels responded with an individual letter on behalf of their whole Panel
- Six Panels were represented by individual ICVs or Administrators, responding themselves, rather than on behalf of their Panel.

Main themes

Independence

- 20 respondents have concerns about a loss of independence and/or concerns over a loss of local connections and knowledge. *'With a centralised administration service, the ICVs immediately lose their independence'* and *'Our Independence is being stripped away bit by bit.'* and *'If Panels are to be administered at a day-to-day level by an MPA staff member who is therefore involved in the discussions among Panel members and every detail of what is said at meetings, it would be unlikely that Panels and individual ICVs could do their work with this kind of functional independence.'*
- Five respondents have commented that members may leave, or that members have threatened to leave their Panel, should this proposal be agreed.

Quality and Control

- Nine comments focus on past efforts of the MPA to be more involved in ICV Panels, the failings of these efforts and a general lack of confidence in the MPA to manage the Scheme. *'During the pilots*

*papers went missing, minutes weren't written. The Administrator was not always available when a member had a question about a local issue.'*

- Seven respondents commented that *'No thought has been given to how the MPA can quality control the ICV service other than through direct employment of administrative staff.'* With a further two also questioning the MPAs quality control methods.

#### Funding and Staffing Issues

- Eighteen respondents agree that the MPA needs to make some changes to address funding inequalities and/or to meet its statutory responsibilities
- Thirteen respondents commented that the *'proposed administrative resources to support the Panels are inadequate.'*
- Twelve respondents made a specific point about how they respect and value their current Panel secretaries and think that the MPA's proposals have ignored their real worth, knowledge and experience.
- Five respondents noted the shared administrative support to both ICVPs and CPCGs, and that a defunding of local administrative support to ICVPs would have an adverse knock on effect on the MPA's funding of CPCGs.
- Ten respondents express confidence that their Panel is progressing well and working in a positive manner and so do not want welcome direct involvement by the MPA in the running of the Panel.
- Five respondents were concerned that new arrangements would mean extra work for volunteers.

#### Some Positives

- Twelve responses acknowledge that Panels across London work very differently from one another, and that some Panels are struggling more than others.
- One response noted that *'with adequate funding and good management a centralised administration would work.'*
- Some Panels acknowledge they need administrative and managerial support, and one responded that they don't want to continually *'clash'* with the MPA.
- One response states *'a centralised system could work if the right people are employed,' 'particularly if incumbents fill the posts'* and that the proposal offered in option 4 *'will offer the most benefits going forward.'* One person comments that the *'proposal provides a sound foundation for the future.'*

Example of template letter received from several Panels

Dear Mr Duval

Proposed New Arrangements for Independent Custody Visiting

I am writing to you on behalf of the Hillingdon Independent Custody Visiting Panel, one of 32 across London.

The members of our Panel are concerned that whilst there may be a need for changes in the administrative arrangements for a minority of panels, particularly in relation to funding, we have serious concerns about the current proposals, in brief as follows:

- The proposed administrative resources to support the panels are inadequate and our work on costings has been ignored
- Although London policing is borough based the proposals will not allow this to continue for custody visiting on resource grounds alone.
- No thought has been given as to how the MPA can quality control the ICV service other than through direct employment of administrative staff. We believe and have suggested other models but there has been no discussion of these.
- We are told that a decision will be made by the Policing and Strategy Committee in July giving less than six weeks for consultation. As the MPA has had responsibility for custody visiting for almost six years we find a consultation period of only six weeks on proposals that will have a profound influence on the future of our work unacceptable.

Of even more concern is the allegation by our MPA member, John Roberts, and some MPA staff that our elected Programme Board Representatives do not have our support. No evidence of this has been provided. At our meeting on 16 May attended by representatives from 20 panels a secret ballot produced a unanimous vote endorsing them as our representatives. We are extremely concerned at what appears to be attempts to undermine our elected representatives who have worked extremely hard to co-ordinate and present our views.

We understand that our representatives are due to meet with you on 26 May. We urge you to listen to their views and changes to the current MPA proposals.

I have copied this letter to our borough MPA link member.

Yours sincerely

Daphne Salter  
Chair  
Hillingdon Independent Custody Visiting Panel

cc: Richard Barnes