

Appendix: 1

MPA Efficiency and Effectiveness Review Programme – Summary

Tranche 1 Reviews

Review Reference Number	
1	Income Generation*
2	Supplies and Stores
3	Transport*
4	Overtime
5	Property Part 1*
6	Interpreter and FME Services
7	Forensic Science Service & DNA
8	Preparation for Financial Devolution*
9	Implementation of Operational Policing Model

Tranche 2 (2002/3)

10	Inspection
11	Civilianisation
12	Uniformed Mgt. Structures
13	IT Benchmarking
14	Sickness
15	Property Part 2
16	Cost of failure/compensation claims
17	Personnel
18	Shift Patterns

Tranche 3 (2003/4)

19	Procurement
20	Corporate Centre
21	Central/area TP Units (exc. CO11)
22	Risk assessment & abstractions
23	Property pt3

* Denotes that these reviews will be supplemented by MPS consultancy/internal work.

Appendix: 2

Changes to the Year 1 Programme as Proposed by Accenture

Review	Type of change	Summary of reason
Overtime	Moved from Year 2	It was felt that this was an issue that should be looked at early in the programme.
Forensic Science Service and DNA	New Review	This was an area identified by the MPS as one that could usefully included in the process.
Interpreters FMEs	Reviews amalgamated	Project Board felt there were many synergies between the processes and they should be done together
Finance/Management Infrastructure Budget and Incentive Structures	Reviews amalgamated and renamed "Preparation for financial devolution"	Project Board felt that work in this area should be amalgamated and closely related to existing work within the Finance area.
Personnel	Moved to Year 2	Project Board agreed that a move to year 2 would allow the proposals in the BVR and review of Personnel (both in 2001/02) to be implemented before the function is reviewed again.
Shift Patterns	Moved to Year 2	Given possible discussions on this area in the national arena it was agreed this should be moved to year 2.
Inspection	Moved to Year 2	This would allow current changes in MPS processes to bed down and then be rigorously evaluated.
National/International Function	Deleted from Programme	It was agreed that this issue would be pursued separately by the MPA Treasurer.

Appendix: 3

Projected Consultant Costs for Tranche 1

Item	Consultant Days	Rate per Day £	Total Cost £	MPS/MPA Input as per Accenture	Consultants Time Requirement
1 Income Generation*	60	1,400	84,000	1fte	2 people x 6 weeks
2 Supplies and stores (procurement)	80	1,400	112,000	1fte	2 people x 8 weeks
3 Transport**	80	1,400	112,000	1fte	2 people x 8 weeks
4 Overtime	120	1,400	168,000	1fte	3 people x 8 weeks
5 Property***	25	1,400	35,000	1-2fte	1 person x 5 weeks
6 Interpreters and FMEs	80	1,400	112,000	1fte	2 people x 8 weeks
7 Forensic Science Service and DNA	80	1,400	112,000	1fte	2 People x 8 weeks
8 Preparation for Financial Devolution****	120	1,400	168,000	1-3fte	2 people x 12 weeks
9 Implementation of operational policing model	70	1,400	98,000	1-3fte	2 people x 7 weeks
TOTAL	715		£1,001,000		

* Existing work by consultants (Phase 1 of project-fees and charges) has been re-badged and will be met from existing MPS budgets – this is not included in these costings

** Existing internal MPS work (Transport) has been re-badged and will be met from existing MPS budgets – this is not included in these costings

*** Existing work by consultants (Phase 1 of project-HQ Property) has been re-badged and will be met from existing MPS budgets – this is not included in these costings

**** Planned internal MPS work (Preparation for Financial Devolution) has been re-badged and will be met from existing MPS budgets – this is not included in these costings

Appendix: 4

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 1 - Income Generation
2. Scope/Coverage	These reviews will be undertaken in two phases: 1. A review of current practices surrounding fees and charges 2. A broader look at income generation in the MPS including the sharing of best practice within the organisation and from similar organisations, and opportunities for further development of the marketing, sponsorship and income generation potential of the MPS. The emphasis will be on maximising the MPS's commercial opportunities and protecting its intellectual property rights.
3. Preferred Timescale	Phase 1 – project start July 2001 Phase 2 – project start October 2001 (after results of phase 1 considered)
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks split over the timescale above
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff. It has been agreed with the Director of Resources that phase 1 of the review will be funded by the MPS.
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Paul Andrae, DPCS
7. How Review Relates to: (a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	Phase 1 of this review is currently planned work and should be re-badged as an efficiency and effectiveness review.
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into the BVR relating to financial management planned for 2002/03
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	Phase 1: there is currently a detailed specification relating to fees and charges in existence within the MPS Phase 2: an Income Generation Steering Group, chaired by Director of Resources, has recently been established to set policy on income generation, sponsorship and grant funding, and to oversee the development of new areas of income generation
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small (£0-5m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 2 - Supplies and Stores (Procurement)
2. Scope/Coverage	<p>The review will be broken down into four main components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the method of procurement for uniforms looking at the Business to Business system in particular and whether this can connect purchasers directly with suppliers. 2. an investigation of other opportunities for efficiency in the supplies and stores functions within the organisation. 3. the re-badging of existing work being undertaken on supply chain management. 4. opportunities for joining consortium arrangements.
3. Preferred Timescale	Project start July 2001
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Peter Theodoulou (Director of Procurement)
7. How Review Relates to:	
<p>(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)</p>	See comment 8.
<p>(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)</p>	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into the BVR relating to financial management planned for 2002/03
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	The MPS is currently preparing to tender for a small project relating to supply chain management. Given the project's clear links with the work being undertaken as part of this programme, it is to be re-badged and included as part of the programme
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small (£0-5m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 3 - Transport
2. Scope/Coverage	This review will look at current practices relating to spot vehicle hire and operational demand within the MPS and benchmark them against similar activities.
3. Preferred Timescale	Project start October 2001
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Chief Superintendent Jim Howard (Director of Managed Transport Services)
7. How Review Relates to:	
(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	HMIC have deferred review of MPS Transport for two years in light of recent MPS review
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into the BVR relating to Managing Assets in 2003/04
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	This review will relate closely to the work now being implemented in the areas of transport and fleet management.
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small to medium (£0-£10m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 4 - Overtime
2. Scope/Coverage	<p>This review will encompass a review of current practices in the MPS relating to overtime, differences in levels of overtime within the current MPS structure and look at other best practice examples in related areas.</p> <p>Relevant national conditions and Police Federation views will provide important context to this report.</p>
3. Preferred Timescale	Project Start August 2001
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	D A C Fuller
7. How Review Relates to:	
<p>(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)</p>	Completed internal audit and the District Audit review, which is currently in progress, will provide essential information for this review. As will the current discussions with the Home Office on Regulation 61.
<p>(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)</p>	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into both the BVR Managing People 2001/02 and the BVR Managing Demand 2002/03.
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	This review has very close links with both the review of shift patterns planned for tranche 2 as part of this programme and other work in the MPS looking at operational policing.
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small to medium (£0-£10m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 5 - Property
2. Scope/Coverage	Building on the current work in PSD (see 8 below) the consultant will scope possible work programmes for years 2 & 3, commencing the review at a strategic level and assessing the implications of the emerging Corporate Strategy for the Estates Strategy.
3. Preferred Timescale	Starting July 2001
4. Time Requirement	5 weeks (excluding the re-badged review below)
5. How Resourced	See note 8 below
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Graham Douglas (Deputy Director(Estates)).
7. How Review Relates to:	
<p>(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)</p>	The review will complement work currently being planned in the Metropolitan Police Authority on Estates Management/Estate Strategy, particularly having regard to the Audit Commission Report 'Action Stations'
<p>(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)</p>	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into the BVR Managing Assets planned for 2003/04
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	<p>The recently-awarded contract (Terms of Reference below) should be re-badged as an efficiency and effectiveness review and programme managed as such.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Strategic advice on possible benefits from alternative methods of holding and managing premises in a public estate (excluding residential property), in order to create greater flexibility and release capital and reduce future revenue costs within the legal and funding constraints of the Authority 2 Review of the Headquarters Office Accommodation Strategy and the utilisation levels of office space <p>It has been agreed (exceptionally) with Director of Resources that this review will be funded by the MPS.</p>
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Medium (£5-10m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 6 – Interpreters and FMEs
2. Scope/Coverage	<p>This review will comprise an evaluation of current practices and pilots within the MPS in these areas and assess the most effective way for the service to manage and operate these functions.</p> <p>A review of other practices nationally will form a key part of this project.</p>
3. Preferred Timescale	Project Start January 2002
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Peter Theodoulou (Director of Procurement)
7. How Review Relates to:	
(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	The MPS has recently reviewed practices in this area and is running a range of pilots relating to FMEs. This review will help evaluate their success.
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	The findings of this review will provide a detailed assessment of these functions and provide useful additional information that can be fed into the later stages of the BVR relating to Investigating and Detecting Crime (2001/02) and Bringing Offenders to Justice (2001/02).
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	See information above
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small to medium (£0-£10m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 7 – Forensic Science and DNA
2. Scope/Coverage	This review will look at current practices within the MPS, benchmark them against similar activities and assess the most effective way for the service to manage and operate these functions.
3. Preferred Timescale	Project start July 2001
4. Time Requirement	8 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	To be arranged
7. How Review Relates to: (a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	See comment 8
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	The findings of this review will complement the information produced as part of the BVR relating to Investigating and Detecting Crime (2001/02).
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	The Scientific Support Project (SSSIP) may impact on this review
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small to medium (£0-£10m)

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 8 – Preparation for Financial Devolution
2. Scope/Coverage	This review will look at financial management information systems within the MPS and evaluate their efficiency and effectiveness and suggest areas for improvement. It will also consider the work being undertaken in Section 8 and how it integrates with this project.
3. Preferred Timescale	Already underway. Consultants will start in July
4. Time Requirement	12 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	Craig Watkins (Directorate of Finance)
7. How Review Relates to:	
(a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	This review has close links with the current work being undertaken by the MPS Director of Resources at the current time to review his Directorate
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	The findings of this review will provide useful information that can be fed into the BVR relating to financial management planned for 2002/03
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	<p>Finance has been conducting work in this area for the last 6 months under the following headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Further devolution in 2001/02 of existing budgets➤ Development of Financial instructions following creation of the MPA➤ Development of a financial framework for devolved budgeting <p>The work will ensure that the organisation has a robust framework for delegated financial authority and the financial management of budgets that supports a devolved scheme and local flexibility to allow local managers to make the most effective use of resources within the corporate framework. The scheme of devolved budget management will cover: respective responsibilities, accountabilities, essential controls, scope of management discretion, budget development and management, flexibilities, monitoring, management information arrangements, support arrangements and training.</p>

9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small (£0-£5m)
--	----------------

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Review Name	Review 9 – Implementation of Operational Policing Model
2. Scope/Coverage	This review will provide assistance to the MPS in the implementation of the Borough Operational Policing Model.
3. Preferred Timescale	Project start January 2002
4. Time Requirement	7 weeks
5. How Resourced	From consultancy budget managed by MPA and MPS staff
6. Lead Project Officer (MPS)	DAC Tim Godwin (Territorial Policing)
7. How Review Relates to: (a) Existing or Recent Reviews (and how further work could build on and develop this)	
(b) Subsequent Best Value Reviews (and how a review would complement that process)	This review will provide information that will feed into the BVR Managing Operational Policing in 2002/03.
8. Identify how Proposed Review Complements and adds Value to Existing MPS work	Currently work is underway within the MPS on the development of an operational model of policing (the Borough Operational Policing Model), this review will assist in the implementation process. Further discussion is needed on the most effective way of assisting the MPS in this area.
9. Possible Outcomes/Financial Implications	Small (£0-£5m) if any. Likely to be medium term benefits in policing efficiency.