

Public Document Pack

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Cheshire Police and Crime Panel**
held on Friday, 24th March, 2017 at The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall,
Macclesfield SK10 1EA

PRESENT

Cheshire East	Councillor: H Murray (Chairman), S Edgar and J P Findlow
Chester West & Chester	Councillors: R Bisset, A Dawson and M Delaney
Halton	Councillor: N Plumpton Walsh
Warrington	Councillors: A King and B Maher
Independent Co-optees :-	Mr B Fousert Mrs S Hardwick Mr E Hodgson
Officers:-	Mr B Reed, Head of Governance and Democratic Services, Mrs J North, Senior Democratic Services Officer and Mr M Smith, Manager Chief Executive's Office, Cheshire East Council
Also in attendance:-	Mr David Keane, Police and Crime Commissioner for Cheshire Mr Ben McCrorie, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cheshire

53 TERROR ATTACK IN LONDON

The Chairman referred to the terror attack which had taken place in London on 22 March. Members of the Panel stood in silent tribute to those who had been affected, lost their lives and had been injured in the attack.

54 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Thompson, Halton Borough Council.

55 CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATION OF INTERESTS. RELEVANT AUTHORITIES (DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS) REGULATIONS 2012

There were no declarations of interest.

56 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no members of the public present wishing to use the public speaking facility.

57 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meetings of the Panel held on 3 February and 22 February 2017 were submitted.

With regard to the minutes of 3 February 2017, it was agreed that more detail should be included at minute 47, in respect of the questions to the Commissioner and that the Chairman and Vice-chairman be authorised to sign the minutes, once this had been completed and they were satisfied that they were a correct record.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2017 be approved as a correct record and that the minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2017 be approved as a correct record, subject to more detail being included in respect of the questions to the Commissioner and that the Chairman and Vice-chairman be authorised to sign the minutes as a correct, once this has been completed.

58 POLICING INSIGHT ONLINE MAGAZINE AND WEEKLY NEWSLETTER

Consideration was given as to whether the Panel's subscription to "Policing Insight", an online magazine and weekly newsletter, providing analysis and insight on policing governance, policy, politics and legislation, should be renewed.

In considering the proposal the Panel discussed whether access should be to all members of the Panel, at a cost of £950 per annum, or for a limited number of Panel members, at a cost of £250 per member, per annum. It was agreed that access should be available to all Panel members.

RESOLVED

That the subscription to Policing Insight be renewed, for access to all members of the Panel, at a cost of £950 per annum, plus VAT .

59 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - QUESTIONS FOR THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

The Commissioner was welcomed to the meeting.

The Commissioner made a short statement, updating the Panel on the recent terror attack which had taken place in London on 22 March. He felt that the Panel would wish to join with him in condemning the attack and

noted that a minute's silence had been observed at the start of the meeting. He reported that he and the Chief Constable had sent condolences to all those who had been affected and the Metropolitan Police Force. He also provided information in respect of the current threat level and reported that there was no specific intelligence in respect of Cheshire. However, Cheshire Constabulary had responded in the areas of engagement and reassurance within communities. The Constabulary had also engaged with key stakeholders, key representatives and locations across the County and a Gold group had been brought together, which included key emergency services, local authority leads and community safety leads. The threat to Constabulary staff was recognised and a briefing had been circulated to all staff in respect of this issue. The Chairman thanked the Commissioner for the update.

The Chairman of the Panel stated that he was aware that a number of issues relating to the Commissioner's recent appointment of a Deputy and that other matters had been raised with Panel members direct, and/or with officers. He was conscious that Panel members may feel it appropriate to raise these matters with the Commissioner at today's meeting.

He asked members of the Panel to be mindful of the fact that the Panel had adopted Rules of Procedure, which set out a process involving the Monitoring Officer, which must be followed when formal complaints were made against the Commissioner.

Whilst it was quite legitimate for Panel members to raise their own personal concerns with the Commissioner, he asked that they avoid alluding to any formally submitted complaints which were now subject to the complaints procedure, under Item 6: Overview and Scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner. There would be a concern that any formal complaints process might be prejudiced by direct discussion with the Commissioner at today's meeting.

The Commissioner updated the Panel on the following issue, raised at the previous meeting:-

Cllr Dawson had asked a question relating to the related consequences for the Constabulary of investigating non-recent sexual abuse cases. The Commissioner had agreed to report on these issues at the next meeting of the Panel. The Commissioner stated that, as explained at the last meeting, he had been involved in a request to the Home Office for further support. The Constabulary had established a Non Recent Sexual Abuse Team and in order to deal with this issue a decision had been made to increase assets. Initial funding of £120,000 had been approved, but this had not been sufficient and a second bid for £130,000 had been submitted. The Commissioner briefly explained what the impact of the grant would be.

Questions for the Police and Crime Commissioner

A summary of the questions put to the Commissioner and a summary of the responses given are set out below:-

1. Cllr D Thompson had submitted apologies for the meeting, but had given notice of the following question in advance of the meeting:-
“Cheshire currently has 4 borough based Community Safety Partnerships (CSP), reflecting the fact that community safety is a local issue, ably managed through local place-based partnerships in each of the 4 boroughs. The Commissioner stated in his new Police & Crime Plan a wish to work with these CSPs and no mention was made of moving away from a borough place-based model. Can the Commissioner assure the Police & Crime Panel that he continues to support these borough based partnerships and does not support moving towards a single Community Safety Partnership for Cheshire?”

In summary, the Commissioner responded by saying that it was important to note that that he did not have the power or authority to dictate to the CSPs on any merger and had no statutory role. He recognised that each area of Cheshire had individual needs and diversity. He stated that he was a strong supporter of partnerships and referred to the regular community meetings that he held, the most recent being in Halton. Nationally, he had seen a general drive to slim-line structures and saw that there were advantages when people came together in partnership, but thought that there was a case for local delivery which recognised these differences. He stated that his role was in listening to any proposals which came forward from CSPs and partners.

2. Cllr A King had submitted a question in advance of the meeting concerning the recent Cheshire PEEL 2016 results, which had been updated on the 2nd March. She considered this relevant and an important reflection of the challenges in many areas across Cheshire and in helping to make people feel safe. This included high risk offenders (armed offences) and anti-social behaviour and the report was specific to ‘How effective is the force at keeping people safe and reducing crime?’ The results of the assessment was as ‘Good’ status. She asked what was being developed to maintain and move beyond this ‘Good’ status and address the improvement needs highlighted by the report.

In summary, the Commissioner responded to say that he had congratulated the Constabulary on the result and it was proud to receive the “good” outcome. There were some areas which were not quite so good and he was pleased to say that an assessment had taken place on these areas and they had now been assessed as good across the board. His ultimate aim would be to have an assessment of outstanding in all areas. (A Briefing note in respect of this matter was circulated to the Panel and is attached to the minutes for information).

3. Mr B Fousert asked why the agenda and reports relating to the PCC's Scrutiny meeting, which had been due to be held on 9th March 2017 had been removed from the PCC's web site?

The Commissioner responded to say that the meeting had not taken place and the items would be taken to the next Scrutiny meeting. He had not instructed that the papers should be taken off the website and would want all documents to be available.

4. Mrs S Hardwick had submitted a question in advance of the meeting asking what the rationale was behind moving the PCCs office to Warrington and how the Commissioner would maintain his relationship with the Chief Constable and ensure that Halton Cheshire East and Chester West would not be perturbed by what might be seen to be a Warrington focus. She asked what sort of message this would send out to residents , as everything seemed to be located in Warrington.

In summary, the Commissioner responded to say that he recognised that the main role of the Panel was to hold him to account and that this was a decision that he had made and took responsibility for. He stated that he recognised that there had been press coverage and comments from the Panel. He stated that he had focused on the delivery of a location which was accessible to the public, as per his Police and Crime Plan and value for money had been a strong and key consideration. He had carried out a full review and had not made a quick decision. His initial feeling had been that the original office was huge, for a relatively small number of staff and he had made an early decision to review this. He had asked questions regarding the cost o the public and after a full review had found that the cost of his office was £78,000 per annum, which he considered to be a relatively substantial amount of money. He had then looked at other options, which had to produce a cost saving, connect him with the residents of Cheshire and had to be a professional working environment. At the same time, he could not impinge upon any policing operational units. He had then had to look at opportunity cost and had found an empty building that had very little use requirement and had stood empty for some time. He had asked for the full costs of this and had taken professional advice from the Estates Office of the Constabulary and had come up with a total accountancy cost of £21,000 per year. He had wanted to be very careful with these costs and the actual costs that had been put to him from the Constabulary, for ongoing year on year costs, was a £57,000 per year saving, which he considered to be best value in terms of the service provided to the public. He also felt that the other main push for this was the proposals for collaboration between the Fire and Rescue and Police authorities and to have a shared HQ for chief operational staff and he stated that this had been delayed for some time, due to the increased

costs associated with making changes within a PFI building, such as Clemonds Hay. Those extra costs, had he not taken this opportunity to relocate, would have been in excess of £156,000, to move the Fire and Rescue Service management in to Clemonds Hay, as a joint operational HQ. He felt that he had been able to assist to reduce that capital cost, as a one off capital cost, whilst saving an ongoing £57,000 a year, whilst encouraging collaboration between the two management teams. He stated that this would achieve nearly half a million pounds per year, on an ongoing basis and he felt that this gave a really strong business case for the move and that financially it absolutely stacked up. With regard to his relationship with the Chief Constable, he held regular weekly meetings with him and wished to hold him to account and he felt that he had a really good professional relationship with him. He had discussed this issue with the Chief Constable and he understood the measure and the reasons why. He estimated that he would spend a day per week at HQ and he currently spent a full day on a rotating basis at local Police units and meeting the public in the community in each of the eight patches and in his role of holding the Constabulary to account. He did not accept that there would be a Warrington focus in the future any more than there was a Cheshire West focus at the moment. The location was still clearly in Cheshire and he would travel around Cheshire on a weekly basis. He stressed that the move related to the PCC office only and Police HQ remained in Clemonds Hay, Winsford.

A number of supplementary questions and comments were put forward by Mrs Hardwick and Cllrs Murray, Findlow, Dawson and King. The Commissioner was asked why he had not looked at the current accommodation and considered cutting down the existing space, rather than moving and the Panel members asked to see a copy of the business case, to see what it said about this issue. If the Commissioner could not provide this, he was asked to demonstrate the wider public interest for not doing so. Concern was also expressed that Panel Members had not been notified in advance of the relocation and the Commissioner was asked why he had chosen not to consult the Panel before taking such a significant decision. It was commented that, had Panel members had the figures, they could have had a more meaningful discussion and challenged the Commissioner on the figures, before the decision was made. It was also noted that the relocation was likely to result in an increase in travel claims, particularly if in the future, Police and Crime Commissioners were expected to hold the Fire Service to account, as proposed. Councillor Dawson referred to the seven Nolan principles of public life and particularly those relating to openness and accountability and stated that the Commissioner had signed up to these on three separate occasions.

In summary, the Commissioner responded to say that he did not have the business case with him, but he had outlined it and would

provide it to the Panel. He stated that, had he remained in the HQ, the Cheshire Fire costs would still have been high. More importantly, if he had cut his existing office space in half it still would have cost more than £40,000 per year cost to the public and in accountancy terms a three quarter reduction in that expense. He did not feel that he had an operational need to sit in an expensive HQ. He stated that he had a mandate to make the decision and whilst he fully respected the Panel, he did not believe that it was the mandate of the Panel to make the decision. He stated that he had taken the decision with proper and full advice from the Constabulary. He stated that he did agree with the principles of public life and upheld them every day in what he did. He did make decisions on proper information and published his decisions, which were viewable to members of the Panel. He indicated that he was willing to provide the decision papers on which he had made this decision, together with any background information required. He considered that the Panel was there to scrutinise his decisions, but not to stop him making decisions and not to have an impact on the decisions before they were made. He suggested that it may be appropriate to hold an Informal meeting of the Panel in order to take legal advice on what the remit of the Panel was.

The Chairman stated that it would be better to keep the Panel more informed in the future, to enable effective scrutiny of decisions.

5. Mr B Fousert referred to public concern having been expressed at the level of annual pay that the Deputy PCC would receive. He asked, given that this was significantly more than the previous incumbent received, would the Commissioner explain how this level of remuneration was arrived at.

In summary, the Commissioner responded to say that he was proud to have been able to make the appointment of the first Deputy in the County, following an open and competitive recruitment process, which needed to attract the right kind of candidate. In his eyes, the full time salary, was not incomparable with the part-time salary that had gone before, on a pro-rated basis. (The Chairman sought clarification on the previous incumbent's remuneration and how many days per week worked). The Commissioner indicated that he had taken into account the previous role and remuneration, as well as the fact that that had been in 2012 and it was now 2017 and also the vast increase in responsibilities around the realm of Police and Crime Commissioners, of which he gave examples. He stated that he had not taken this decision in isolation, as to how it would affect the rest of his office. This was a staff member role, working full time with an employment contract, holidays, pension and national insurance and tax. The only difference here was the political restriction, which was the reason for it coming before the Panel and he noted that the Panel had backed the recommendation, for which he was grateful.

With regard to salary he stated that he had considered comparisons with other roles within the constabulary and had looked at other job descriptions within the Constabulary, but the main consideration was to look into how his own salary was decided. He had noted that, nationally, PCCs were not all on the same salary, depending on the size of force and population. He had looked at neighbouring and other forces to see what they paid their Deputy Commissioners and several were in excess of what he had decided for the role and not all of these had a competitive process to reach the end result re salary paid. He did recognise that it was a reasonable salary, but felt it was in the a very permissible range for the role expected to be performed.

Mr Fousert ask a supplementary question regarding the role profile. He asked whether the Commissioner had gone through a recognised job evaluation system, such as the Hay system.

The Commissioner responded to say that there was a clear comparator that gave abroad fit with SM1/2, which was a clear grade within the Constabulary and which fitted the salary band of £50,000 and he had taken advice on this. He also stated that, in looking at other Commissioners offices around the country, he had found others with more staff and he that he was trying to be as balanced and level as possible in the decisions that he made. However, he recognised that he needed some resource to help him with his legal responsibilities, not just for scrutiny and holding to account, but also in respect of the new legislation regarding largely taking over the internal complaints system of the Constabulary and the resource for this could not be underestimated. The Deputy Commissioner would have role in this, but not the sole role. There now needed to be a period of co-ordination between his office and the Professional Standards Department, to give some level of transition and this was something that he expected the Deputy Commissioner to become involved in.

The Chairman sought clarification that, on top of the £50,000 salary, there would also be on-costs, such as tax, NI and pension. The Commissioner confirmed that this would be the case, but he stated that the issue of pension was something to be worked through, particularly with regard to pension contributions.

The Commissioner stated that it had never been his intention to keep Panel members in the dark and he felt that there had been some useful discussions in the past at the informal meetings and that perhaps this could be a way of making sure the Panel members were fully appraised on items that were not decisions, but were ongoing thought processes. He felt that it would be helpful to get some clarity on where best to discuss such issues.

The Chairman stressed that this was a public meeting and there was a need to get information into the public domain. He referred to the guidance on this and requested engagement in the future.

Cllr Dawson asked a supplementary question in respect of the long standing relationship between the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner's family. He also referred to the Oath of Office signed by the Commissioner and the need for him to be held to account and also potential conflicts of interest and breach of these provisions.

The Commissioner responded to say that he was fully assured, as he had taken the relevant advice and made declarations at every stage of the process, that the process was completely open and transparent and completely proper. He stated that if the Councillor intended to raise a complaint in respect of this, it may be prejudicial to discuss it.

Cllr Dawson clarified that he had not raised a complaint, but that he was asking a question and asking the Commissioner to comment. He asked that the Commissioner publish all the various declarations that he had made regarding the recruitment process, so that the Panel could see why he had reached the judgment that he did.

The Commissioner responded to say that he had written to the Panel and had stuck to the guidance, as had the Panel and that he had offered to attend the meeting. He had understood that he would be allowed to attend and speak and answer any questions and be accountable to the Panel, as he wished to be legal and transparent.

The Chairman clarified that the Panel had decided that the Commissioner's attendance, sitting next to the candidate, was not required, but that he could have sat in the meeting as a member of the public. He asked why, if the Commissioner had wanted to give all the information in the interest of being open and transparent, he had not provided the Panel with a personal statement or CV, as requested and as required under the guidance.

As a supplementary comment, Cllr Edgar stated that the Panel had not been aware of the relationship until the meeting and he questioned how the Panel could comment, when they had not known in advance, or seen a statement or CV.

The Commissioner responded to say that he had taken legal advice from his office on the whole process and the procedure for writing to the Panel and for providing the Panel with all the necessary statutory information. He believed this to be the correct advice in terms of the process. He believed that the letter that he had provided had given a good overview of the information given to him in the CV and the information which had come out at interview. He

had not been provided with any guidance that there had to be any documents beyond that, but he had been advised that he was statutorily required to sign a letter regarding the information from the CV and interview, to present to the Panel.

The Chairman stated that he would make the letter available to the press, but that he considered it very thin on detail and that he would have expected that the Panel would have personal information and that the information was inadequate for purpose and that there was a public perception of lack of transparency.

Cllr Findlow made a supplementary comment that, if the Panel was not sufficiently informed, it would be unable to perform its proper function and asked the Commissioner what lessons he had learnt from the appointment process and what he would do differently next time.

The Commissioner responded to say he had noted the comments in respect of public perception and that he had received comments from a small number of the public who felt that the Confirmation Hearing was the interview for the position and he felt that this needed clarification and that there was a general misconception on the purpose of the Panel, in terms of holding the decision to account, or offering advice or consultation. He hoped that this could be addressed at an informal meeting of the Panel. He stated that perhaps he needed training on that matter and that there could be a collective agreement. He stated that he really did feel that he had tried to be as open as possible. He would consider the issues raised and would have a review, personally, of the whole process and would also look at perception. He asked that, if there was a serious concern about process, then a complaint be submitted, so that there could be an independent review of the matter in the open.

The Chairman explained that the Panel had no power of veto on this issue and could only put forward recommendations.

The Commissioner undertook to publish all his decision papers, in accordance with law and good practice.

60 MR STEPHEN PICKUP

The Commissioner reported that Mr Stephen Pickup, Head of Scrutiny and Planning Office, at the Police and Crime Commissioner's office, had left his position and asked the Panel to join him in thanking Mr Pickup for his work in relation to the Panel and to wish him well in his new role.

The Chairman added his personal thanks and on behalf of the Panel.

61 WORK PROGRAMME

It was agreed that an item relating to transparency and openness should be added to the list of agenda items for the 23 June 2017 meeting.

RESOLVED

That, subject to the above addition, the Work Programme be approved.

62 MR ERIC HODGSON

It was noted that Mr Eric Hodgson had resigned for the Panel and that this had been his last meeting.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hodgson for his service, diligence and wise counsel, during his time on the Panel.

It was agreed that a letter of thanks should be sent to Mr Hodgson on behalf of the Panel.

The meeting commenced at 10.30 am and concluded at 12.50 pm

Councillor H Murray (Chairman)



Briefing to Police and Crime Commissioner – PEEL: Police Effectiveness 2016

Overview

The results of the most recent HMIC Peel Inspection of Cheshire Constabulary were published in March 2017. The constabulary was assessed on **four** key criteria which contribute to an overall judgement of how effective the force is at keeping people safe and reducing crime. Cheshire Constabulary's overall rating was: **GOOD**

Below is a breakdown of the assessment criteria, the areas within each that the HMIC identified for improvement and a summary of the Constabulary proposals/actions with a view to improving the HMIC effectiveness rating to Outstanding.

Key Areas – Summary

- 1. How effective is the force at preventing crime, tackling anti-social behavior and keeping people safe. Rating: **GOOD****

Area for Improvement: The Constabulary should ensure that its problem solving process is consistently applied particularly at neighbourhood level.

Constabulary Action:

- The constabulary has introduced the OSARA (Objective, scan, analysis response and assess) problem solving model, which is utilised within LPU's and all neighbourhood Police Officers and PCSO's are currently undergoing a mandatory 2 day beat management training course delivered by the constabulary at HQ. This involves theoretical input, practical examples of problem solving techniques and a real world case study. The application of the new approach is reviewed at quarterly inspections of each department and LPU, chaired by the Assistant Chief Constable.
- There are also a number of problem solving strategic groups which focus in on high demand issues such as Night Time Economy (Public Space Violence) and hospitals; to try and reduce such demand but also to promote problem solving across the organisation.
- The Force is in the process of enhancing the Beat Management structure within the force to effectively align teams on appropriate shift patterns and to more firmly embed them in communities so they are more in tune with and able to respond to issues in the community as they arise. Beat managers have had a bespoke tool kit built for them as well as supportive data (ward on a page) to ensure they are best equipped to solve problems in the community.

- 'Street a week' initiative runs in each LPU whereby staff from the beat teams (PC and PCSO's) target a street for the purposes of engagement and reassurance – signing occupants up to alert and introducing local PCSO. Where possible this visible activity is occurring in ASB hotspot areas.
- Constabulary has clear preventative brand "OP Shield" which is understood internally and within communities.

2. How effective is the force at investigating crime and reducing re-offending?

Rating: **GOOD**

Areas for Improvement:

A: The Constabulary should improve its ability to retrieve evidence from mobile phones and other electronic devices quickly enough to make sure that investigations are not delayed.

B: The Constabulary should consider widening its approach to integrated offender management to maximise its impact on reducing threat harm and risk. There should be clear measures of success which enable the constabulary to evaluate how effectively it is protecting the public from prolific and harmful offenders.

Constabulary Action:

1. **Part A :** The constabulary has introduced a triage facility whereby officers from the Hi-Tec crime unit accompany detectives when they attend addresses to execute search warrants. The triage approach enables investigators to seize items considered to be of evidential value as opposed to numerous electronic devices (computers tablets mobile phones etc.). As a consequence the constabulary has reduced a backlog of 18 -20 week to almost being in a position to conduct examinations 'real-time'. The constabulary is also exploring the possibility of purchasing a number of mobile phone kiosks that will enable suitably trained officers to conduct initial enquiries in custody suites/LPU's as opposed to a requirement to submit to the E-forensics unit for examination.

Part B: The constabulary has a successful and effective approach to integrated offender management (IOM) known as Navigate with dedicated staff in each LPU. Navigate teams have traditionally focused on offenders that commit serious acquisitive crime (SAC) but the remit has now been extended to include serious and organised crime and violence.

3. How effective is the force at protecting those are vulnerable from harm and supporting victims? Rating: **GOOD**

Area for Improvement: The Constabulary should ensure that response officers become more proficient at completing risk assessments at initial response and provide sufficient supervisory oversight to prevent opportunities to safeguard vulnerable victims from being missed.

Constabulary Action:

This particular area for improvement was challenged back to the HMIC as no actual evidence was provided as to why they picked up on this; a response from them is awaited. Our own risk assessment processes are matured in force and all front line officers have received training. The key safeguard in this respect is the function of the referral units. All risk assessments go through the referral units and are quality assured to ensure that the judgements are sound. On occasion the gradings are changed following intervention from officers from the referral unit making sure that effective safeguarding is assured.

Vulnerability is a significant area of focus and daily processes are now mature enough to provide daily visibility of the key incidents of vulnerability across the previous 24 hours. This provides the opportunity to ensure we have provided appropriate service and effectively managed risk.

New processes are in place for dealing with missing persons (MFH) and for assessing vulnerable persons via the MASH (multi-agency assessment hub) to improve service delivery.

Cheshire Cares commissioned service meets the needs of every victim and identifies and provides enhanced service as required for vulnerable persons.

4. How effective is the force at tackling serious and organised crime? Rating: GOOD

Areas for Improvement:

A: The Constabulary should engage routinely with partner agencies at a senior level to enhance intelligence sharing and promote an effective, multi-agency response to serious and organised crime.

B: The Constabulary should take steps to identify those at risk of being drawn into serious and organised crime, and ensure that preventative initiatives are put in place with partner organisations to deter them from offending.

C: The constabulary should enhance its approach to the lifetime management of organised criminals to minimize the risk they pose to local communities. This approach should include routine consideration of ancillary orders, partner agency powers and other tools to deter organised criminals from continuing to offend.

Constabulary Action:

The constabulary has introduced organised crime group management (OCGM) as a means of identifying and managing groups and individuals who are involved in serious crime. OCGM's are managed at LPU's and centrally by the major crime unit (MCD) dependent on the level of criminality and risk posed. Organised crime is reviewed monthly at a constabulary meeting and each of the local councils has introduced a partnership board with a lead responsible officer (LRO) with plans to ensure that a multi-agency approach is taken to tackle offenders.

LRO plans have been refreshed to include environmental crime, trading in illicit and counterfeit goods, organised immigration crime and modern day slavery.

The constabulary is organising a CPD event for all partner agencies to ensure a consistent pan Cheshire approach is adopted under the "Prevent." Strand. (The governments Counter Terrorism Strategy)

Training will also be delivered to partners on how to submit information around vulnerability and risk to individuals linked to Serious Organised Crime (SOC). As a consequence, information governance is also under review following a request from the Local Authority leads - This will likely result in a revised information sharing protocol / agreement. The overarching SOC Strategy is also being refreshed as the current one expires this year

As an example of recent activity, Operation Alien sought the arrest of 20 nominals from the Merseyside and Cheshire area, who were charged with a variety of offences related to the supply of drugs and remanded in custody. In addition to constabulary resources, where the level of criminality results in offenders committing crime across borders, Cheshire Constabulary can utilise support from the regional organised crime unit (Titan) who have a number of resources that they are able to provide to assist with investigations. Key nominals arrested under Op Alien as outlined above are being considered for Serious Crime Prevention Orders under the Lifetime Offender Management principle

This page is intentionally left blank