METROPOLITAN POLICE · Working together for a safer London

MPA
Metropolitan Police Authority

New Scotland Yard	10 Dean Farrar Street
Broadway	London
London	SW1H 0NY
SW1H 0BG	
www.met.police.uk	www.mpa.gov.uk

9 July 2007

Sir Ronnie Flanagan, GBE QPM
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary
Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ

Dear Sir Ronnie

THE REVIEW OF POLICING

1.   Thank you for your letter of 18 May inviting initial thoughts on the key areas of your Review of Policing. We are providing a joint Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)/Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) response which reflects the London experience and perspective but which also, we think, has a wider resonance.

2.   Our comments and thoughts centre, at this stage, on the reducing bureaucracy and neighbourhood policing strands of your review. Our understanding is that this is where your primary focus will be in terms of your interim report to the Home Secretary in August. But we also set out some points we think should be addressed as part of the accountability and resourcing strands of the Review. We look forward to the proposed wide-ranging discussion with you where we can explore the issues in further detail.

3.   For now though, we would make the following comments over and above the points made in the attached material:

<u>Scope of the Review</u>

4.   The MPS and MPA support your view that the four key strands of the Review must be seen in the wider policing context. There are significant challenges, as you know, in terms of leadership capability, the protective services debate and tackling the continuing terrorist threat for example. And

there are direct links here with your Review. We feel strongly, for instance, that you cannot separate completely neighbourhood policing from that dealing with serious crime and counter terrorism. Incidents of serious crime and terrorism happen in local communities; the perpetrators live in communities; and we need the active co-operation of those communities to help us combat crime successfully. In London, we see our Safer Neighbourhoods teams as key to tackling not only anti-social behaviour and volume crime at one end of the crime spectrum but also serious, organised crime and terrorism at the other.

5.   We also strongly endorse your point about the need for the police service to put an even greater focus on customer service and responsiveness. These are mission critical issues for us. 'Citizen Focus' is one of our strategic priorities and we are now focusing our efforts on a small number of key initiatives to drive performance improvements. These include our approach to front counters; introducing routine supervisor call back and victim focus units; and – by way of a further example of just how interconnected many of these things are – our Safer Neighbourhoods teams to whom we are looking to deliver and sustain improved engagement, victim reassurance and public confidence in policing.

Reducing bureaucracy

6.   We have recently agreed to establish a new programme within the MPS to provide better co-ordination for the range of initiatives across the organisation aimed at reducing unnecessary bureaucracy. Details are contained in the attached paper at <u>Annex A</u>. To highlight one area - effective IT is pivotal to reducing burdens and helping us deliver better outcomes. Information quality is one of our strategic priorities and we have action in hand for example to save officer time by less re-keying of information and joining more systems together; improving (secure) access and sharing of information; and trailing and extending the use of mobile devices for our officers.

7.   Some of the initiatives we have underway are MPS-specific. But others are a consequence of national level policies and initiatives. And the police service is, of course, but one element of a wider Criminal Justice System where there is scope to reduce bureaucratic burdens (through simplified case files for example). We have, as you know, been here before. Police forces and authorities should take a continuous, rigorous look at the internal burdens they create. But we hope that your Review will be challenging Government at the national level about their responsibilities. We would highlight a one significant point here – the whole area of recording crime. It is our firm belief that officers are spending a disproportionate amount of time on the administration of crime information and that the time is ripe for a fundamental look at the burdens imposed as a result of the National Crime Recording Standard.

8.   There may be some unrealistic expectations about bureaucracy reduction and a danger in this debate of confusing bureaucracy with accountability. Police officers have a unique role in society and should be

properly and transparently accountable for their actions and decisions. Removing the *unnecessary* level or instances of bureaucracy which prevent those same officers doing an effective job for the public should be our goal.

Neighbourhood Policing

9.   Neighbourhood policing – delivered through the roll out of our Safer Neighbourhoods teams – is integral to our whole approach for policing in the capital. Details are attached at <u>Annex B</u>. There is, we recognise, a significant challenge in integrating neighbourhood policing with, for example, response policing. We are conscious that replicating the Safer Neighbourhoods model will not fit the local challenges faced by other forces and that the MPS has enjoyed significant national investment to underpin its development (though we have made choices and sacrifices to ensure the delivery of Safer Neighbourhoods across London).   But we think that our approach to neighbourhood policing has thrown up significant lessons and evidence about what works which is directly applicable elsewhere.

Local accountability

10.   The whole issue of policing accountability is, as you know, a hugely complicated one. Our starting position is that accountability should be seen at three (linked) levels:

- **engagement** at local (neighbourhood) level – through dedicated local teams working with communities and councillors (who should not dominate though) to solve problems;

- **joint answerability** at Basic Command Unit (BCU) level – where meaningful partnership work should take place with joint answerability for performance: presently a very crowded field with e.g. CDRPs, LSPs;

- **accountability** at the strategic (force) level – where a genuinely connected view of policing can take place.

11.   Our view is that it is difficult to disentangle activity at the neighbourhood level from that which takes place at the levels above. We have, for example, experience of the work of ward panels in terms of engaging local people over local policing priorities but they do not operate in a vacuum.

12.   As a strategic police force and authority we believe we have experience to assist the debate. We would like to offer detailed thoughts in due course but for the moment, we would welcome the Review addressing: the 'accountability' links between neighbourhood, BCU and strategic force level; the impact of Community Call(s) for Action; the development of the neighbourhood management agenda; Local Area Agreements; CDRPs/LSPs; the experience of a strategic force with a Mayor/Assembly, Government Office and strategic police authority; and Government's role in the tripartite arrangement.

13.   We also think there is another dimension to the accountability question which is not brought out explicitly in the terms of reference of the Review but which, we believe, it should explore. This concerns the number of bodies, aside from police authorities, which today have some kind of scrutiny/accountability role with regard to various elements of policing – e.g. the Police Standards Unit; HMIC; IPCC; the Audit Commission; Surveillance Commissioner and in areas such as data protection and health and safety. There appears only ever to be a growth of these bodies, not a rationalisation. And to make a link with another area of your Review, each body brings with it an attendant level of bureaucracy which, when put together, is considerable.

Managing resources

14.   As with the above strand of the Review, we would like to come back to you with detailed thoughts on the whole area of managing resources. Suffice to say here that this is an issue uppermost in our minds at present as, together, we are examining a range of options to address the strategic financial challenge of delivering a balanced budget in a very tight resource environment in 08/09 and beyond whilst delivering sustainable improvements to the policing service Londoners receive.

15.   Productivity is central to our approach. We are focusing on a wide range of process reviews; exploring what further savings can be made within our modernisation programme; undertaking a thorough review of our corporate overheads; considering opportunities for savings from outsourcing and in the area of sustainable development; and placing more focus on benefits realisation. Most fundamental of all in our view, we are looking at achieving a productivity performance framework that provides transparent and visible management data at the level of managerial accountability for improving productivity. This means, we believe, moving towards a framework which is different to the existing ABC model. We will expand on this when we come back with our more detailed thoughts on this element of the Review.

16.   In turn, we would very much welcome it if your Review covered the following:

• how to ensure that if, as the political parties now accept, policing should be measured by outcomes rather than by a simple focus on officer numbers - the focus going forward is on performance, workforce modernisation, visibility and accessibility, not just staffing;

• a look at further relaxing the strictures and rigidity around some funding – in terms of 'ring fences' and specific grants – to provide local flexibility on how money is spent;

• a funding formula that promotes stability and reflects the unique position of London;

- transparent funding of activities required by Government e.g. Dedicated Security Posts;

- how to deliver on the stated ambition to rebalance the relationship between Government and delivery partners with genuine freedom for managers to manage and local flexibility for delivering improved outcomes (we welcome Gordon Brown's reference to this in his recent speech to the ACPO conference);

- having an overall performance regime which has robust directional targets rather than rigid, over-prescriptive ones;

- the need for a new PSA framework which reinforces the above positions (we welcome the genuine progress Government has made in the development of the Safer Communities PSA).

17.   As a final point, you will be aware of our contention that London should be treated differently in policing terms.   There is a case for seeking asymmetric solutions not a one size fits all policy.   The MPS is already a regional, strategic force delivering a complete range of services from neighbourhood policing to counter terrorism.   We perform national functions, police large public events on a scale matched nowhere else in the country and are, of course, preparing now to deliver safely the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic games.   In terms of resources, we would argue that the definition and funding of the national, international and capital city dimensions of the MPS's responsibilities requires a serious re-examination.   We estimate that in 2005/06, the commitment of MPS resources to these functions appears to have exceeded income by some £156m.

18.   We stand ready to expand on any of this if you would find that helpful. As a final thought, you will be aware of the Opposition's recent thoughts on policing contained in *Policing for the People*.   We wonder whether your independent Review might be a helpful catalyst to strive for cross-party consensus on the big issues and approaches to tackling them.

19.   A copy of this letter and its attachments goes to the Mayor, Ken Jones, Peter Neyroud and Bob Jones.

Ian Blair   Len Duvall OBE AM
Commissioner   Chair

REDUCING BUREAUCRACY

There are a number of initiatives across the MPS designed to reduce the level of unnecessary bureaucracy, including:

Single Sign On

Reduces the number of passwords police officers and staff require to access MPS IT applications and helps improve the security of our systems. To date, just one password can now give access to six separate MPS systems. A further twenty systems are under consideration.

The Integrated Information Platform
The Integrated Information Platform has been rolled out MPS wide. It enables a single search of the information held within CRIS, Custody, Crimint, Stop and Search and CADMIS. This means that rather than logging on to each system individually, users can log on to one system and get all the information they need.

NSPIS Custody rollout
Half the MPS BOCUs have now received the NSPIS Custody system. It is an electronic detention management and processing application that replaces the current custody system. It is being rolled out across the MPS as part of a wider Criminal Justice IT programme. It enables officers to electronically record detainees personal and arrest details to ensure their detention is managed in line with PACE and the Codes of Practice.

AS number completion now simplified
As a result of the NSPIS Custody system, the laborious process whereby officers and staff have to manually ring PNC Bureau to obtain an AS number has now been totally eliminated.
(PNC Bureau point out there has been a 70% increase in AS numbers since 2004.)

National Bureaucracy Awards 2006: MPS wins first prize
The MPS Forms Unit has successfully implemented a process whereby the ten most commonly used electronic forms automatically complete the personal sections of the form, eg the authors name, unit attached to and so on. Although the timesavings for the reduction in rekeying are modest, they very soon mount up because of the numbers of officers and staff in the MPS using the forms. Also, transcription errors are minimised if not avoided.

PDA's for traffic officers
The Fixed Penalty Notice pilot project is a 12-month trial jointly developed by the Traffic OCU and the Traffic CJU to examine the feasibility of replacing hand written FPNs with ones produced by a personal digital assistant. From June 2006 onwards 80 Traffic officers from the NW Area Traffic Unit will be trained to use the PDAs to issue FPNs electronically.

Simplified case files
The MPS has introduced a simplified case file in anticipated guilty pleas (Directors Guidance Quick Process Files. 303 DGQP files have been completed in the pilot boroughs, 95% pleaded guilty and officers report time saved of one or two hours per file. These files comprise 65% of total cases, a big hit on unnecessary bureaucracy.

Virtual Courts launch
The MPS has recently launched a trial of the 'virtual court' concept, where defendants appear before magistrates via a secure video conference link from a police station.

Magistrates or the District Judge will conduct the proceedings from the courtroom. They will be able to view on line the defendant, the defence solicitor, the police and the CPS prosecutor at the police station.
There will also be a dedicated Virtual Court Officer, who will act as an agent of the court, attached to each police station, while the legal adviser and probation officer will be situated at court.

Workforce modernisation
For 2007/8, the focus will be on delivering a number of pilot initiatives around staff mix. These initiatives cross various business groups across the MPS and include:

Police Staff Investigators in DPS, SCD5, SCD1, and Integrated Prosecution Teams. Expanding the Dedicated Detention Officer role to include custody inputting, Police Staff Collision Investigators, Police Staff Firearm Trainers on CO19, and Financial Investigators in SCD6.

Transforming Human Resources
The MPS is now actively considering how Human Resources services can be improved across the MPS, with a view to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy and manage resources more efficiently.

MPS Bureaucracy Improvements Under Development.

Bureaucracy Minimisation Programme

The Bureaucracy Minimisation Programme has been recently been formally approved by the MPA as a means of ensuring that there is effective coordination of all activity within the MPS aimed at reducing unnecessary bureaucracy. It will also ensure that the National Bureaucracy Adviser's report and other initiatives arising through the National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) are also mainlined into MPS activity.

Staff Suggestions Scheme

Management Board and the MPA have also formally approved a re-launch of an MPS Suggestion Scheme. Work is underway in conjunction with DoI to secure the necessary software to implement this work.

Rekeying of data

DoI are about to launch a project to reduce re keying of data. Initially, it will transfer a modest amount of information from the CAD or Custody system directly onto CRIS. This is a necessary first step (due to the age and differing specifications of our computers) that will ultimately lead to an automatic transfer of data.

Self-reporting of personal injury/fail to stop collisions

The MPS is one of the few Forces to tackle this issue. A number of forms have been designed and are now at "printers proof" stage. It is expected that this radical process will be implemented Met wide within the next three months. It is designed to significantly reduce the workload of station receptions officers as well as providing an enhanced service for the public reporting these accidents.

Signing on bail reduction

It is estimated that "Signing on bail" costs the MPS anything up to £6 million in administrative costs. A proposal to significantly reduce the process has been fully agreed with the Crown Prosecution Service and a formal approach to take joint action with the London Courts is currently in hand.

Corporate Data Warehouse
The DoI is developing a Corporate Data Warehouse, which will contain more information including NSPIS Custody, Firearms, Merlin, full CAD, ViSOR, Custody Imaging, Warrants Management, Holmes and more. The Corporate Data Warehouse will be made available to 35,000 people across the MPS by 2008.

Designated Detention Officers
Operation Emerald are about to embark on a pilot at Newham Bocu that sees Designated Detention Officers conducting an enhanced role, inputting information onto the Custody terminals. This should release the Custody Sergeant to perform a more supervisory role within the suite and aid throughput of prisoners.

Forensic capture and medical provision

Operation Emerald are reviewing current forensic capture and also medical provision in Custody suites. Again a pilot scheme is scheduled to be launched this summer to look at a new model of medical provision in the custody environment. Both of these pilots are focused on improving throughput and efficiency in the Custody arena.

Home Office / NPIA : Bureaucracy Improvements Considered Necessary

Policing Bureaucracy Implementation Steering Group

This group last met in September 2006. Despite concentrated pressure from the MPS and many other key stakeholders, the NPIA have yet to decide on the successor to this forum and the vacuum is of some concern to the MPS.

National Bureaucracy Advisor

The last NBA completed her posting in September 2006. The NPIA have yet to decide whether the post should be continued. The last postholder compiled a list of some twelve key bureaucracy initiatives that needed some urgent action on behalf of the Home Office and now the NPIA. We would welcome clarity about how these are to be now addressed.

Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act

In order to investigate nuisance phone calls, the MPS has to contact the telephone companies involved and seek information about the suspect. Prior to January 2004, officers obtained this information by completing just one side of an A4 sized form, and having this countersigned by an Inspector.

In January 2004, the Home Office widened RIPA to include investigation of these relatively minor offences.
Officers now have to complete three separate forms covering fifteen pages. The first set of forms still require countersigning by an Inspector, but the other two need a Superintendent to sign off the process.

Sir John Giffard, Ch Constable of Staffordshire Constabulary and joint chair of the PBISG stated that RIPA "had become a significant burden on officers" and that "the processes involved in seeking authorisation were too complicated and the authorising ranks were too high".

Following pressure from the PBISG, the Home Office are now considering changes to the RIPA legislation. Unfortunately, we understand that it could be up to two years before a slot in the legislative timetable will become available.
Impact of Race & Diversity Learning and Development Programme

The annual appraisal required by the Race and Diversity Learning and Development Programme will require nearly all MPS employees to provide evidence across a wide range of competencies in order to be formally assessed for the purposes of promotion and pay increments. This will have an arguably unduly significant training and development impact across the organisation. We understand that the NPIA has taken an interest in addressing this.

Penalty Notices for Disorder

All Forces are now involved in this process. It maximises opportunities to bring offenders to justice, by issuing a PND in lieu of sending a suspect to court for minor crimes such as Section 5 Public Order Act, (POA) drunkenness and minor thefts.

Unfortunately, the Home Office still classify S 5 POA as a serious crime; with the result that widespread use for S5 offences automatically increases a Forces likelihood of receiving a "poor" grading in their PPAF figures. As a result, Staffordshire Constabulary, (amongst many) are considering suspending the use of PND's for S5 offences.)

Despite being made aware of this issue some 18 months ago, the Home Office have yet to take any specific action to address this problem.

Courts charging for cash seizure hearings.

Seizing cash from criminals is a significant boost to the powers of police officers. Unfortunately, in June last year, the Courts started charging police and Customs for POCA hearings related to cash. This was introduced without warning, consultation, clear internal Courts guidance or central administration. The result has been chaos, with individual courts charging different rates, accepting or refusing diverse means of payment and creating needless tension between officers and Courts staff across the country.

NSPIS Case Preparation package

The MPS is one of many forces rolling out the Custody package but cannot implement the Case Preparation process because there seems to be little or no movement from the Crown Prosecution Service or the Courts to implement their systems.

NSPIS Custody

Despite this being a "national" system the NBA found inherent bureaucracy. If two Forces wished to brigade their custody suites, prisoners from one force could not be booked in on the custody system of the other force: separate systems would have to be installed.

Stray dogs

Removing police involvement with stray dogs was one of the 51 Changes recommended by Sir David O'Dowd in 2002. Some five years later, the Home Office and the Association of Police Authorities are still arguing about the level of compensation the authorities will be paid to deal with this issue.

Sustaining and mainstreaming progress in Neighbourhood Policing

Performance Management: it is essential for neighbourhood policing to operate within a performance framework that drives improved outcomes for local people. This will involve increasingly sophisticated analysis of primary outcomes (ie confidence in local policing) and associated drivers (ie understanding and dealing with local priorities, concern about ASB and visibility). Given the inevitable time delays involved in working to survey based outcomes, it is also essential to build a suite of more immediate key diagnostic indicators (KDIs). These KDIs should provide a broad framework within which each BCU can drive, robustly, action that will lead to improved outcomes. These measures will need to both reflect assessed best practice but also be broad enough to account for the inevitable differences that will exist between different neighbourhoods and Boroughs. As an example of how this might operate, the recent MPS CCSM on Neighbourhood Policing enabled BCUs to begin to assess their profiles in terms of key outcomes and drivers and also established the linkages between outputs (as measured by EPIC) and key outcomes.

Development of Borough and Force level frameworks for neighbourhood policing (NIM): recent NPIA guidance on neighbourhood policing and NIM was welcome, nevertheless many BCUs are still challenged by the task of combining the top-down and centralising NIM process with the bottom up, de-centralised process implicit in neighbourhood policing. Further work to refine this guidance and build on emerging good practice is essential. At present, in London, highly promising structures are emerging in Westminster (Civic Watch) and Enfield (the SAFE Joint Action Group meeting). The central SN unit are currently beginning a thematic inspection of TTCG processes to identify best practice across London and this is expected to provide a summary of its finding by October 2007.

Moving neighbourhood policing beyond neighbourhoods: the full roll-out of Safer Neighbourhoods has provided an essential first step in bringing policing closer to the people of London. However, this development has also highlighted the extent to which people operate and exist within non-geographic communities (culture, faith, employment, interest etc). This is important for two reasons. First, working with non-geographic communities is essential if SNTs are to effectively support SCD (ie to tackle organised crime in distinct communities) and counter-terrorism. Second, recent research suggests that increased confidence in policing is driven most strongly by the extent to which the service can meet individual needs. Geographic policing is an essential first step, but, if continued improvements in outcome are to be achieved, this will need to be supplemented with a focus on other, non-geographic communities that may define the needs of an individuals more distinctively than their place of work or residence. As an example of how this non-geographic activity might function, SCD and SN recently initiated work to provide long term support to the Turkish/ Kurdish community using local SNTs. Of note is that one community member at a recent event was very

supportive but cautioned that for her, as an individual, her confidence to participate in a group examining issues that specifically affected the Turkish Kurdish communities was inextricably linked with her confidence in police to deal with issues in her local neighbourhood.

Problem Solving: a key activity for neighbourhood policing teams is the delivery of effective problem solving to resolve local issues. Problem solving in partnership is a highly skilled activity, requiring training/ coaching at various levels coupled with a strong infrastructure to provide support and performance management of work being undertaken. The profile of problem solving appears to have fallen in recent years, however this needs to change if neighbourhood policing teams are to be enabled, with partners and the public, to deliver optimum results for their local communities. In response to these challenges, the MPS is currently examining options that will provide a software system to support partnership problem solving across London. In addition, through the work of SNTs and the MPS Problem solving team, the Safer London Foundation Awards have seen year on year improvements in the number and quality of initiatives. One of these initiatives, the Street Drinkers Project from Clerkenwell, was a runner up for the National Tilley Awards in 2006.

Development of PCSO role: as PCSOs become embedded within neighbourhood policing teams, it is becoming apparent that there is significant scope to expand the range and quality of their work whilst maintaining their distinctive role. Emerging best practice has involved the development of locally based initiatives that operate in partnership with other agencies and that have been tailored to meet the local context. In Enfield, PCSOs have been provided with a City & Guilds accredited Crime Prevention course. This enables them to provide appropriate crime prevention advice to victims of burglary and to produce, using a simple check sheet, a bespoke crime prevention report for every house visited. In Kingston, a PCSO worked closely with a PPO to provide support and assistance in getting the individual off drugs and into treatment. In Barking & Dagenham, PCSOs are to be provided with a City & Guilds accredited course on "Reading the Streets" to enable them to diagnose and report those environmental issues that contribute to the generation of volume crime and disorder.

Conditional Call Deployment Protocols: as recent national research has demonstrated, neighbourhood policing is integrated with response functionality in different ways in different forces according to local policy. A common requirement is to ensure clarity regarding the role of different units and the mechanism by which they can be mutually supportive. In London this has been achieved through the development of a Conditional Call Deployment protocol that sets out the terms by which neighbourhood policing teams can be deployed. As would be expected, neighbourhood officers may be deployed to calls that relate to critical incidents or involve potential loss of life, limb or serious damage. In addition, they may be deployed to calls that relate to their local priorities. This protocol provides clear definition as to the role and responsibilities of each unit whilst ensuring that the public receive an optimum service from all available police officers on duty at any one time. In Barnet, the

Integrated Borough Operations Office (IBO), are provided with an easy to access spreadsheet that provides information on both the activity and priorities of SNTs across the Borough on a daily basis.

Local knowledge supporting investigation: the relationship between neighbourhood policing teams and investigative units is increasingly strong and has significant potential. SNTs are expected to have ownership of their neighbourhood and to be the repository of local knowledge about the prolific and serious offenders and the vulnerable victims who live in their area. In practical terms this means that SNTs have taken an increasing degree of ownership for PPOs, PYOs and those involved in Prevent and Deter schemes. Where appropriate they have linked into MAPPA arrangements and, in some areas (most notably Barnet) they monitor nominals on the VISOR database. The expectation that SNTs have high levels of local knowledge means that they can support the delivery of sanctioned detections. As an example, one South London PCSO has been involved in the identification of 15 street crime offenders from his local area. In addition, Op Bustag has involved the circulation of photographs of offenders on public transport. This operation has achieved over 1000 detections in a 23 month period – an estimated 50% of which have been generated by SNTs, particularly PCSOs, identifying the individuals involved. Continuing to strengthen and foreground the work of SNTs in terms of understanding their neighbourhood and the individuals within it, will, if harnessed correctly, generate increasing results in terms of the investigation and detection of offenders.

Safer Neighbourhoods - lessons

The following information summarises those lessons from the Safer Neighbourhoods process evaluation that pertain to people's perspectives on their local area and the police.

There are a variety of actions SN teams can take in order to develop an understanding of who "their" local people are and how they experience the local area and policing. It is suggested that, in following these actions, SN teams will obtain benefits in engaging with their communities.

1. Key Drivers of public confidence and satisfaction
   - Police reliability
   - Positive perceptions of police community relations
   - Local police helpfulness
   - High visibility
   - Reduction in worry about ASB and teenagers hanging around

2. How people perceive their local area

Analysis of the SN Survey suggests that individual characteristics are far more influential on people's attitudes than the area where they live. This means that wards are not homogenous, but very diverse areas.

We know that contact is a driver of confidence. We also know that face-to-face contact matters most to people. We suggest that community engagement needs to reach a wider variety of people and that teams need get creative about engaging with a diverse local population.

3. How people identify local problems

When people's opinions about local problems converge, they do so around what are perceived to be the "most serious" problems. Where and what these are will differ from ward to ward.

People who identify at least one area they are afraid of, are also likely to worry more about crime and anti-social behaviour, feel less safe, have lower confidence in and lower satisfaction with local policing. Victims, particularly victims of violent crime, are more likely than non-victims to identify an area in their ward they are afraid of.

4. Do people notice when problems shift?

Local problems are not static – they change in response to a number of things, including police actions. A problem shifted does not necessarily mean a problem ended. The aim is to minimise harm. When people see problems shifting, this becomes a key success factor in increasing confidence local policing.

5. SN - The Basics:

Having a detailed knowledge of who lives on the ward and in surrounding wards
Remember: ward populations are diverse, the influence of individual characteristics on attitudes is huge, and geographical ward boundaries will not necessarily correspond with what local people perceive as their neighbourhoods.
Do the SN teams know how their ward is used for business, leisure and shopping, and by whom?
Do the SN teams know the residents associations, the ward councillors and community groups?
Do the SN teams know the neighbourhoods and estate clusters on their ward?
Do the SN teams know where the victims of crime live on their ward?

Being accessible to local people in how we engage
Remember: the majority of people think it is important to know a local police officer.
Do the SN teams know the people who are more likely to tell them what is going on in their ward? Do the SN teams know who they are not currently talking to but need to?
Do the SN teams refresh their KIN contacts routinely?
Do the SN team use a variety of both formal and informal engagement tools?

Do the SN teams have the communication skills needed to speak with such a wide variety of stakeholders?
Do the SN teams return calls / update contacts in a timely manner?

Knowing why people on the ward use the police
Remember: people who are afraid of specific locations on the ward tend to have lower confidence in and satisfaction with local policing. Some tell the police about this and victims are a valuable starting point for knowing where the 'scary' areas are.
Do the SN teams know what kind of crime is being reported and why people are calling about ASB in the ward?
Do the SN teams know how the picture of 'use' compares with what local people feed back via KIN, ward panels and everyday encounters?
Do the SN teams know how this compares with what is happening on the borough as a whole / in other areas of policing?

Giving local people relevant and regular information about policing issues in their area

Remember: Those who feel informed have higher confidence in and satisfaction with the local police.

Do the SN teams inform people about local police problem-solving?
Do the SN teams tell their ward panel members about the outcome of problem-solving?
Do the SN teams provide ward panel members with local crime and disorder information so that their deliberations at meetings can be fully informed?
Do the SN teams provide follow-up information directly to residents or businesses after incidents?