APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNED

Issue from debrief		Actions in response	
1.	The need to integrate the annual planning process with other planning and budgeting processes in the MPA/MPS.	•	MPS is developing an integrated process (see Note 1 below and summary at Appendix 3). Members asked to agree <i>Principles 1 and 2</i> (see Appendix 2).
2.	The need for a clear timetable for developing the annual plan, which is adhered to (and has a timescale which facilitates local planning, especially in borough commands).	•	Summary of planning process at Appendix 3 includes timetable. Planned time of agreement on priorities, objectives and targets has been brought forward to December 2001. Members asked to agree <i>Principle 3</i> (Appendix 2).
3.	The need for a clear 'product- based' process for developing the annual plan.	•	Summary of planning process at Appendix 3 includes product descriptions.
4.	The need to clarify an MPS lead role and improve internal communication on decisions made (by MPA and MPS).	•	Lead management board role is AC Tarique Ghaffur. Ensure use of bi-weekly MPA/MPS officers' meeting.
5.	The need for clear roles and responsibilities (for team members and MPA).	•	MPS is revising structures, roles and responsibilities. Members asked to agree <i>Principle 4</i> (Appendix 2).
6.	The need to limit the number of priorities, objectives, measures and targets in the plan.	•	Members asked to agree <i>Principle 5</i> (Appendix 2).
7.	The need for a more formal process for deciding/recording decisions on priorities, objectives, measures and targets.	•	Members asked to agree <i>Principles 6 and 7</i> (see Appendix 2).
8.	The need to develop consultation to inform decision-making on priorities, objectives, measures and targets.	•	CDO Committee has approved the preferred methods to be used (see Note 2). Members asked to agree <i>Principle 8</i> (Appendix 2).
9.	The need to support MPS managers developing specific descriptions for priorities, objectives, measures and targets.	•	MPS to repeat interactive development process and to establish leads on management board for each. MPS to repeat mid-year performance assessment.
10	The need for an early view on the required content and structure of the published plan.	•	Draft plan to be written using existing guidelines in parallel with close consultation with APA and Home Office on any likely changes. Format to be developed and agreed prior to detailed
			drafting of content.

Note 1 (integration of different planning and budgeting elements)

In preparing the plan for 2002/03 an integrated process needs to address the following:

- Development of a corporate strategy;
- Development of a medium term financial strategy;
- Development of local crime and disorder strategies (Apr 2002 Mar 2005);
- Mayoral / GLA budget cycle;
- MPA/MPS budget cycle (and resource availability);
- Publication of Ministerial Priorities;
- Outcome of consultation (internal and external), performance assessment (corporate and local) and environmental scanning, including consideration of:
 - Mayoral statutory strategies;
 - requirements in relation to national Best Value Performance Indicators;
 - relevant reports by auditors and inspectors;
 - corporate and local assessments of performance against the 'Excellence Model';
 - risk assessments of issues facing the MPA/MPS;
- Preparation of the policing and performance plan including:
 - efficiency plan;
 - programme of best value reviews;
 - differential targets for BOCUs;
- Development of local plans for BOCUs and OCUs (reflecting differential targets).

A summary of the integrated process is attached at Appendix 3. This is supplemented by a more detailed flowchart for use by MPA and MPS officers.

Note 2: (methods to be used for consultation)

At its meeting on 22 May CDO Committee endorsed a set of preferred methods to be used for consultation internally and externally on the policing and performance plan 2002/03 (over and above any other reasons to consult over the coming year and pending the development of a full consultation strategy). These are as follows:

- a. *citizens' panel*: use sooner if able to 'piggy back' on existing arrangements else consider using later in the planning process to discuss draft priorities (lead time and budget constraints could still be problematic);
- b. *general surveys*: repeat Public Attitude Survey; use results of previous MVA survey and await results of independent *Londoners' attitudes* survey (expected in September);
- c. *neighbourhood fora:* use CPCG¹ infrastructure and consider a meeting of CPCG chairs either to propose or review priorities (propose would be sooner in the cycle, review would be later);
- d. electronic consultation: use new method as a pilot exercise pending development of a consultation strategy;

¹ Community and Police Consultative Group (previously PCCG).

- e. *customer satisfaction surveys:* data from these ongoing surveys should be used to help inform decisions on priorities;
- f. referenda: use once draft priorities developed (eg asking respondents for views on relative weighting of priorities);
- g. delegate committees: pursue collation of local crime and disorder audit information as a matter of priority and consider possible consultation of collated findings (subject to when collated findings are available);
- h. action planning / focus groups: consider use if other consultation methods deemed insufficient (may need funding and high priority status since relatively little time to organise big external events).

A key paper to be produced during the planning process will describe:

- the outcome from each type of consultation (internal and external to the MPS);
- an overview of the result following all consultation indicating where there are consensus views and differences of opinion.

This paper will allow the results of consultation to be used, together with other information, to agree priorities, objectives, measures and targets for 2002/03.