

Security Classification:		RESTRICTED IN PART TWO	
Disclosable under FOIA 2000		Partially Part One only ~ Part Two Closed Minutes are not disclosable ~ see continuous Exemption Certificate	
Author:	Rose de la Cuesta	Force/Organisation:	ACPO
Date Created:	22 February 2010	Telephone:	0207 084 8958
There are attachments at paragraphs:		1.5 ; 4.1 ; 4.2 ; 5.1 ; 8.1 ; 9.1 ; 10.1 ; 11.1 ; 12.1 ; 13.1 ; 14.1 ; 15.1	

**ASSOCIATION OF CHIEF POLICE OFFICERS OF ENGLAND, WALES
AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

Telephone: 020 7084 8950 Fax: 020 7084 8951

CABINET MINUTES

**Minutes of the Meeting held at the BIS Building, 1 Victoria Street,
London SW1H 0ET on Wednesday 3 February 2010 at 11am**

1. ATTENDANCE

1.1 Present

Sir Hugh Orde	President (Chair)
Sir Norman Bettison	Vice President
Peter Fahy	Head of Workforce Development Business Area
Stephen Otter	Head of Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Business Area
Steve Finnigan	Head of Performance Management Business Area
Mark Rowley	Head of Futures Business Area
Ailsa Beaton	Head of Information Management Business Area
Grahame Maxwell	Head of Finance and Resources Business Area
John Yates	Head of Terrorism and Allied Matters Business Area
Ian McPherson	Head of Children and Young People Business Area
Chris Allison	Head of Olympics Business Area
Margaret Wood	DCC/DAC/ACC representative
Peter Davies	DCC/DAC/ACC representative
Nigel Brook	Senior Police Staff representative/Honorary Treasurer
Peter Neyroud	NPIA Chief Executive
Tom Flaherty	ACPO Chief Executive

1.2 Special Advisers

Andy Trotter	Media Advisor
--------------	---------------

1.3 In Attendance for Specific Items

Richard Crompton	Lincolnshire Police
John Parkinson	West Yorkshire
Pauline Smith	Nottinghamshire Police

1.4 In Attendance

Jane Dench	ACPO Director of Policy
Oliver Cattermole	ACPO Director of Communications
Dave Spencer	Staff Officer to the ACPO President
Harriet Bradley	Staff Officer to NPIA Chief Executive
Hayley Mill	Programme Support Assistant
Rose de la Cuesta	A/Programme Support Manager (Minute Taker)

1.5 Members noted the [Rolling Attendance Log](#).

2. APOLOGIES

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Mr Hollis; Mr Baggott; Mr Bristow; Mr Hughes; Mr Godwin; Mrs Spence; Mr Stephenson; Mr Shearer and Mr Giannasi.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

- 3.1 Members agreed the [Minutes](#) of the meeting of 2 December 2009, but asked that the minutes reflect Miss Beaton's attendance and Mr Davies' absence. (The meeting scheduled for 7 January 2010 was cancelled, see item 4.2).

4. ACTION LOG: STATUS REPORT

- 4.1 Members agreed the [Status Report Log](#) and requested that 281/09 of the action log be discharged as Mr Brain had already sent a composite response to Keith Vaz.
- 4.2 Members agreed the [Action Sheet](#) which emanated from the cancelled 7 January 2010 Cabinet meeting. The following action sheet items would need to be actioned by Business Areas:
- 10. Crime Stoppers Manual – Crime Business Area to publish and promulgate
 - 14. First Aid Training – Workforce Development Business Area should circulate and seek views before preparing a final draft for endorsement by the Head of the Business Area. Cabinet should then be notified of the outcome of the consultation process and any next steps
 - 18. ACPO-HMRC-UKBA Partnership Agreements and Information Sharing Protocols – Crime Business Area should seek agreement by correspondence and then publish in due course
 - 19. E-Crime First Responders Guidance – The views of Cabinet Members should be sought by correspondence, but prior to circulation, a view should be taken by the Business Area on whether there was an opportunity to revisit some of the detail contained in the documentation. A formal update should then be given to Cabinet in due course.

5. STANDING ITEMS

- 5.1 [Programme Support Update](#)
- 5.1.1 Mr Flaherty advised Members of the list of recent decommissions and newly published and withdrawn doctrine.
- 5.1.2 Members noted the content of the paper.

Item for Information

6. PRESIDENTIAL UPDATE

- 6.1 The President informed Members he had been experiencing difficulties in arranging a meeting with David Cameron and that the Conservative Party's lack of engagement with senior police officers was becoming a matter of concern. The President had however received a more positive response from Labour and the Liberal Democrats. The President asserted the importance of raising ACPO's profile and urged Members to notify the Director of Communications, Oliver Cattermole, of any local meetings with MPs.
- 6.2 Members were also advised that the Conservative plans for policing within their Manifesto was nearing completion and that it contained a proposal for ACPO to have statutory status. The President informed Members that there was a growing debate within all parties regarding the current central policing structure and that questions were being raised regarding whether there was enough room for ACPO, CPOSA, NPIA and SOCA.
- 6.3 The President also informed Members that he and Chris Sims had attended the Joint Committee on Human Rights and a mini conference in the Houses of Parliament. Members were further informed that these meetings had been challenging due to the lack of understanding around the retention of DNA samples and that there was a crucial need to develop realistic Guidance around this area.
- 6.4 The President and the ACPO Chief Executive, Tom Flaherty, had recently attended an APA board meeting to present the case for ACPO funding for 2010/11. The current funding arrangements for ACPO remained unsatisfactory, with part funding being received from the APA and part from the Home Office. There was an urgent need for a different arrangement for future funding to be sought within the next 12 months.
- 6.5 Members noted the Presidential update.

7. POLICE REPORT CARD

- 7.1 Mr Finnigan advised Members that he had received Lancashire's Police Report Card (PRC) which commenced with a positive introduction, however overall it conveyed an obsession with process and an overall lack of contextualisation. Members were informed that no grades would be recorded until the HMIC had received his factual response but that the PRC would be published on the website on 11 March 2010.
- 7.2 Members were further advised that a letter had been sent to Denis O'Connor highlighting concerns around the PRC and the definition of 'fair' in terms of grading performance. Mr Finnigan stated that under the current definition, 55% of forces fall short and that the HMIC was therefore being encouraged to redefine the grading system and to use more contextual information in their assessments, in order to ensure an equal and fair treatment of forces. Members were informed that the HMIC would be conducting a review within the next 12 months.
- 7.3 Members were also informed that Denis O'Connor was expecting to receive further feedback from Chief Constables regarding what should be included in the PRC and around any significant issues relating to the PPSG process. Mr Finnigan acknowledged that this might adversely impact on the existing relationship with the HMIC, which in turn could adversely impact on the

- 7.4 A discussion developed which raised the following points:
- Rounded Assessment and Police Report Cards appeared very 'school' like and that the HMIC and the Police Service appeared to be falling into a 'parent/child' relationship
 - The Anti-Social Behaviour data used in the PRC was prior to Pilkington and did not reflect the current position
 - There was a need to narrow the gap and to restore balance by acknowledging the achievements of forces
 - There was a need to advise the HMIC of the potential impact that the current approach might have on forces
 - The PRC did not appear to be very informative to the public and that forces would benefit from being given a proposed grade prior to moderation
 - There was a need to think about how the critical media might interpret the PRCs
 - There was a need for honest reporting of performance against standard
 - There was a risk that the publication of PRCs might be seen as being politically motivated, as it was being published just prior to a general election being called.
- 7.5 Mr Finnigan also advised Members that the Capability Review had started on 2 February 2010 and that the PPSG put forward a total of 14 recommendations. Mr Finnigan assured Members that he had spoken with the HMIC regarding moving from the ladder of intervention to a more diagnostic approach which would examine the root causes of any problems.
- 7.6 Members noted the update.

Items for Decision

8. SAFE AND CONFIDENT NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

- 8.1 In the absence of Mrs Spence, Mr Parkinson introduced a [paper](#) which advised Members of the developments around the Government's new Safe and Confident Neighbourhood Strategy.
- 8.2 Mr Parkinson explained that the strategy was a forward looking document and that it intended to strengthen neighbourhood policing. Members were advised that this was a high level document which required tripartite support and that the strategy was also connected to the National Contact Management Strategy (NCMS) and the 101 Single Non Emergency Number (SNEN). Mr Parkinson assured Members that the Cabinet Office was supportive of the strategy and that the Prime Minister would be launching the document on 23 February 2010.
- 8.3 Members expressed support and acknowledged the need for neighbourhood partnerships and joint responsibility in ensuring a safer community, but the following observations were raised:

- There was a need to be cautious of endorsing PCSOs due to forthcoming budget constraints in the next financial year
 - The single top down target might lead to difficulties around public confidence
 - There was a need to ensure actual implementation and adequate engagement between central government and local councils
 - The strategy appeared heavily reliant on the NPIA and that it would be useful to identify what could and could not realistically be delivered
 - There was a need for the strategy to be condensed and for emphasis to be placed on the existing connections with other parts of policing.
- 8.4 Mr Neyroud advised Members that there were other plans to create other non emergency numbers and that the NPIA would not be creating any further Guidance around 101 SNEN.
- 8.5 Members agreed to the direction of travel, subject to the above caveats.

9. NATIONAL CONTACT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND NATIONAL CONTACT MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES AND GUIDANCE

- 9.1 The President introduced a [paper](#) on behalf of Mrs Spence which requested the support of Members for the National Contact Management Strategy (NCMS) and the National Contact Management Principles and Guidance (NCMPG).
- 9.2 Ms Smith added that the documents had received extensive consultation and were fully supported by the HMIC. Members were also advised that the website version of the strategy was designed to be interactive and to enhance the work around NCMS.
- 9.3 The President pointed out that some forces had already adopted 101 SNEN and he explained that if forces were to support 101, then the contract would be negotiated; however, if forces chose not to support 101, then it would cease by 2011. Members responded by stating that the majority of forces were in favour of 101 for police only.
- 9.4 Members recognised that the NCMS was a good strategy, but that there was a need to place significant emphasis on equality and diversity and to ensure that the equality impact assessment also covered disability.
- 9.5 Members agreed that the NCMS and NCMPG, including the national contact grades and suite of diagnostic indicators for contact management, would be adopted for implementation by all forces by April 2011, subject to the comments raised by Members.

Action: Mrs Spence

10. ACPO PROJECT FUND

- 10.1 The President introduced a [paper](#) which sought Members' approval for the re-establishment of a centrally held ACPO Project Fund that would enable Members and the Presidential team to meet the costs of funding in-year projects being undertaken on behalf of the Association.
- 10.2 The President informed Members that the joint APA/ACPO project fund would cease by the end of this financial year and Members were requested to endorse:

- i. The establishment of a central ACPO Project Fund of £500k for financial year 2010/11
 - ii. That each force's contribution to the fund should be based on a ratio approach (i.e. half flat-rate and half based on the Formula Spending Shares)
 - iii. The guidelines detailed in respect of the procedure, authority levels and review mechanisms.
- 10.3 Members agreed the recommendations outlined in paragraph 9.1 of the paper and at 10.2 above, but suggested that the authorisation of funds by the President should be raised from 10k to 25k.

Action: ACPO Chief Executive

11. FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE CRIME UNIT

- 11.1 Mr Crompton introduced a [paper](#) on behalf of Mr Hughes which was intended to secure funding contribution of £100k from forces in order to enable the National Wildlife Crime Unit (NWCU) to maintain its current status and to allow for moderate growth in the 2010/11 financial year.
- 11.2 Mr Crompton assured Members that the unit was doing significant work on behalf of forces by providing an intelligence service and that funding was required to ensure that the unit continued to provide a service to forces. Members were also informed that the unit generally received a significant amount of political and media interest and had been commended on numerous occasions on the television programme, Country File.
- 11.3 Members pointed out the need to score priorities and to establish where this work should be positioned in line with other priorities. Members also felt that there was a need to put effort into work which would generate the most savings. It was however recognised that this work did not fit into the ACPO Project Fund and that forces would need to provide the unit with the required financial support in addition to the £500k agreed for the ACPO Project Fund.
- 11.4 The proposals to increase funding for an additional member of staff was rejected, but support for the current level of staffing and work was agreed.
- 11.5 Members therefore agreed the current rate of £75k for the next financial year, but stated that further funding should not be guaranteed beyond 2011.

Action: Programme Support

12. FUNDING FOR POST TO REPRESENT AND SUPPORT ACPO IN THE NATIONAL PAY AND REWARD NEGOTIATING MACHINERY

- 12.1 Mr Fahy introduced a [paper](#) which requested Members support the continued funding of the Pay and Reward Negotiations Coordinator Post and Members were invited to endorse the following recommendations:
 - i. To support the request for funding from forces for the continued provision of the Pay and Reward Negotiations Coordinator for the financial year 2010/11, which would amount to £67k
 - ii. To support the recruitment of a new Pay and Reward Negotiations Coordinator to succeed the current postholder on retirement in 2010.

- 12.2 Members supported funding this post for 2010/11, but could not commit to funding in the future years and given this uncertainty this post should not be filled by a permanent employee.
- 12.3 Members requested that invoices be raised at the beginning of March and agreed the funding of £67k for the post of Pay and Reward Neogitiations Coordinator for 2010/11 and the recommendations stated at 12.1 above and at 4.1 of the paper.

Action: Mr Fahy/Programme Support

13. WORKING FOR THE PUBLIC PRODUCTIVITY FRAMEWORK

- 13.1 Mr Fahy introduced a [paper](#) which sought Members' approval for the Working for the Public Productivity Framework. Members were requested to endorse the following:
- i. Note the content of the Productivity Framework
 - ii. Support the Productivity Framework so that it would become a central part of policing management
 - iii. Respond positively to the invitation for attendance by force senior operational and business support leaders at the briefing workshops.
- 13.2 A discussion ensued which raised the following points:
- The document appeared to entail a significant amount of bureaucracy and there seemed to be an expectation that the Police Service would have all the answers
 - There was a need to explain how the information would be utilised and to ensure that the Service was protected from further bureaucracy
 - Clarity was required on objectives and how productivity would be measured
 - The framework was similar to the HMIC publication on the inspection framework and that it was becoming increasingly more difficult to keep abreast of all the frameworks being developed
 - There was a need to ensure that the doctrine would provide clearer principles and identify areas which required amendments.
- 13.3 Mr Fahy responded by stating that the framework was about leadership and that there was no additional bureaucracy as forces were already performing the bureaucracy embodied in the framework.
- 13.4 Members supported the recommendations outlined in paragraph 5.1 of the paper and at 13.2 above, subject to Members' comments.

Action: Mr Fahy

14. A SCIENCE AND INNOVATION STRATEGY

- 14.1 Mr Neyroud introduced a [paper](#) which sought Members' agreement to the publication of a Police Science and Innovation Strategy that would meet an outstanding public commitment and underpin work to increase the contribution of scientific development activities to today's police priorities, such as confidence and cost-effectiveness.

- 14.2 Mr Neyroud advised Members that this was not a political document and that it would be subject to 6 monthly review to ensure that it remained an active working document.
- 14.3 Members however recognised that further work was required on CT issues. Mr Neyroud assured Members that the document was work in progress and that it would be linked with the Office for Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT).
- 14.4 Members agreed the strategy for publication.

Action: Programme Support

15. A REVIEW OF DOCTRINE

- 15.1 Mr Rowley introduced a paper which informed Members that the NPJA would be reforming the current commissioning arrangements in doctrine production, identifying existing Guidance that could be decommissioned and setting a clear strategic direction for future doctrine work.
- 15.2 Members were requested to endorse the following for immediate action:
- i. That Cabinet agree to an immediate embargo on the commissioning of new doctrine until the Review is complete, and the doctrine under production would be rigorously reviewed and reduced
 - ii. That consent was given to new national commissions for doctrine thereafter coming through the Policing Portfolio Group for agreement, with a full impact assessment and cost benefit analysis, before going to Cabinet for final approval
 - iii. That the review team immediately engage with ACPO colleagues and stakeholders to consult and identify and evaluate alternative approaches.
- 15.3 Mr Rowley advised Members that the Service might be at risk of being perceived as being dishonest with the public, since much of the doctrine in production was unworkable and was not entirely intended for frontline police officers. Mr Rowley stated that there was a need to clarify what the Service could realistically deliver without placing the Service at risk of de-professionalisation. Mr Rowley pointed out that there was a need to move away from the growing compliance culture and suggested that the Policing Portfolio Group (PPG) be used as a tool to slow down and eliminate any unnecessary doctrine production.
- 15.4 Members were supportive of the need for a realistic mechanism to deliver practicable doctrine and for a rigorous approach to the commissioning of new doctrine.
- 15.5 Members agreed the recommendations stated at paragraph 6.1 of the paper at 15.2 above, although the suggestion at 6.2 (ii) of the paper and at 15.2 (ii) above, would require further thought before implementation.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 16.1 Review into the Disability Related Harrassment
- 16.1.1 Mr Otter advised Members that this had partly been driven by the Home Office and that the draft Terms of Reference would soon be published following the Pilkington case. Members were also advised that a letter had

already been circulated to Chief Constables stating that the Police Service would be called to an inquiry.

16.1.2 Members were further advised that a Gold Group, led by Phil Gormley, was in the process of being established in order to analyse any potential impact and to manage the response on behalf of the Police Service. Mr Otter asked for the support of Business Area Heads in the development of a composite response.

16.1.3 Members noted the update.

16.2 NPIA Business Plan

16.2.1 Mr Neyroud stated that the NPIA Business Plan was with the ACPO Chief of Staff for an initial response by 11 February 2010. It was noted that it was important that the narrative would reference to what could not be delivered. Members were informed that this would be tabled at the next meeting of Cabinet.

16.2.2 Members noted the update.

16.3 Chief Fire Officers' Association (CFOA)

16.3.1 Those present were informed that the CFOA Executive would be joining Cabinet Members for lunch at the 31 March 2010 meeting. Heads of Business Areas were asked to identify potential topics, and to forward them to the Programme Support Office, for a discussion which would follow lunch.

16.3.2 Members noted the update.

Action: Heads of Business Areas

17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be held on Wednesday, 31 March, at 11am, at the Basement Conference Room, BIS Building, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET.

18. DATES OF MEETINGS FOR 2010

To note the dates and venues of the meetings of Cabinet for 2010:

At the BIS Building, 1 Victoria Street

Wednesday	31 March
Wednesday	5 May
Wednesday	9 June
Wednesday	7 July
Wednesday	8 September
Wednesday	6 October
Wednesday	3 November
Wednesday	1 December