Objectives and Measures	Target	02/03 Performance	YTD Performance	Projection	Comment
Objective 1	**To minimise the risk to life and property from terrorist activity in London**				
Maximise number of quality intelligence reports submitted	No target[1]	_	_	_	
Appropriate number of Counter Terrorism Deployments	No target[2]	-	-	-	
Objective 2	**To maintain an effective response to suspected and actual terrorist incidents**				
To provide good quality response	90%	92%	93%	92%	Quality measure under review. Refined version due to be implemented by 1 April 2004
Once tasked attend suspected or actual terrorist scene within set target	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	Measure under development with completion and implementation due by 1 April 2004
Objective 3	**To reduce the level of gun enabled crime**				
Gun enabled crime level	- 4%	3,824	2,682[3]	3,576	New measure but being introduced in MB briefings alongside current definition; 'gun-related violent crime'. Data available now.
Detection* rate for gun enabled crime	20%	24%	19%	19%	Further work to establish detection rate by ethnicity of victim is in progress.

---

[1] It is not appropriate to set a target for this measure, however, MPA to be continually appraised of performance in this area of work

[2] It is not appropriate to set a target for this measure, however, MPA to be continually appraised of performance in this area of work

[3] April to December 2003

* All detection targets will use the current definition, however, previous performance data relates to JDs

Objective 4	To disrupt organised criminal activity of persons identified as Class A drugs suppliers				
Number of drug trafficking organisations disrupted [4]	12 pa	n/a	n/a	n/a	SCD to have MI system in place by 1 April 04,
The number of proactive operations against open drugs markets	TP proposal under discussion				TP prefers to focus on number of operations as a strategic measure, rather than speed of response, which will be monitored locally.
The number of proactive operations against crack houses	10% increase on 2003	489[5]	87[6]		TP prefers to focus on number of operations as a strategic measure, rather than speed of response, which will be monitored locally.
Objective 5	To dismantle organised criminal networks and seize their assets				
Value of assets recovered	More than £8M	£7.2M[7]	n/a	n/a	This is a new measure. Developmental work is in progress to establish suitable process for capturing the required information and for providing data
Number of organised criminal networks disrupted[4]	24 pa	n/a	n/a	n/a	This is a new measure. Developmental work is in progress to establish suitable process for capturing the required information and for providing data

---

[4] a disruption has been achieved when an organised criminal enterprise has been disrupted and is unable to operate at its normal level of activities. A disruption may be achieved by various means and does not have to be within the context of the operation. A Class A drug trafficking group may, for example, be disrupted by arrests in respect of Class B drug importation, smuggling, firearms, VAT evasion etc. or by referral to another agency for action. This would still count as a disruption of a Class A drugs trafficking organisation.

[5] calendar year 2003

[6] calendar year to date

[7] Jan 2003- Dec 2003

Objective 6	To improve neighbourhood safety				
Public satisfaction with the way neighbourhoods are policed in London	+5% during the year				Survey measures are moving away from those currently used in the MPS Public Attitude Survey to the PPAF equivalent. The questions asked in PPAF are slightly different, so baseline data will start to accumulate from April 2004
The average number of hours uniformed operational police officers and police staff are visible	+5%	n/a	Approx. 1.4 million hours per month	Approx. 1.4 million hours per month	OPM data available back to April 2003.
Proportion of police officer time available for front line policing	n/a	n/a	89%	89%	This varies from the previous measure. It is however the PPAF definition and as such will need to be reported upon.
% of people who think police are doing a good job	(Increased % of people)	Survey measures are moving away from those currently used in the MPS Public Attitude Survey to the PPAF equivalent. The questions asked in PPAF are slightly different, so baseline data will start to accumulate from April 2004			PAS does not currently collect data on these questions. However, from March/April the PAS/Reassurance survey will ask the following questions; 1. "Would you say police in this areas do a good job or a bad job?" 2. "In this area, would you say there is more or less crime?" 3. "Would you say anti-social behaviour has got worse, got better or stayed the same?"
% who think crime has increased/decreased in neighbourhood where they live	(Increased % of people)				
% who think anti-social behaviour has increased/decreased	(Increased % of people)				

Objective 7	To reduce the level of robbery compared to 2003/04				
The number of robberies	-11%	*42,496*	*30,280[8]*	*40,373*	A target of −11% is feasible subject to additional Home Office funding
Robberies per 1000 pop	-11%	*5.9*	*4.2*	*5.6*	This is not a separate target from that above, but expresses the same challenge in PPAF format
% robberies detected*	15%	*13.0%*	*12.0%*	*12.4%*	
Objective 8	To improve our contribution to the effectiveness of the criminal justice system				
% of TNOs Detected*	20%	12.6%	12.3%	12.3%	
No. of arrest warrants outstanding	-15%	*Previous performance figures available but not to hand at time of print*	*Previous performance figures available but not to hand at time of print*		
Victim satisfaction	Target subject to baseline setting				This data is collected via the Crime Victim Survey. CPG have data on initial satisfaction levels from 1999. With the introduction of PPAF in April, we will also be able to look at overall satisfaction levels.

---

[8] April to December 2003

* All detection targets will use the current definition, however, previous performance data relates to JDs

Objective 9	To recognise and respond appropriately to the differential impact of crime on people taking into account their race, gender, sexual orientation, faith, age or disability				
Detection* rate for rape	*28%*	*28.9%*	*24.1%[9]*	*24.1%*	
Detection* rate for homophobic crime	*23%*	*18%*	*16.6%[10]*	*16.6%*	
Detection* rate for racist crime	*20%*	*18.6*	*16.3%[10]*	*16.3%*	
Detection* rate for domestic violence	19%	16.9%	16.8%[10]	16.8%	
Percentage of victims of racist incidents satisfied	70%	67.5	67.3%[11]		Wording in the new survey builds on current survey but will still capture overall police performance therefore current data can be used to set target
Objective 10	To safeguard Children and Young Persons from physical and sexual abuse				
Detection* rate in allegations of intra-familial abuse	35%	39%	32%	35%	Data not available from corporate crime database but process are in place locally to enable provision of data
Number of arrests of subjects identified by the Child Protection intelligence unit as a danger to children	40 arrests	56 arrests (detection rate not known	11 arrest (detection rate not known)	28 arrests	Data not available from corporate crime database but process are in place locally to enable provision of data
Detection* rate for murders investigated by SCD5 MITs	85%	n/a	75%	100%	Data not available from corporate crime database but process are in place locally to enable provision of data

---

[9] April to September 2003

[10] April to November 2003

[11] April to September 2003

* All detection targets will use the current definition, however, previous performance data relates to JDs