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## A Plan to Deliver the Priorities

## The MPS ambition is to be the safest global city in the world

- Every Community Safer, through: accountable and visible policing at the most local level, a step-change in the effectiveness of our services and a focus on protecting the vulnerable
$\phi$.
A Safer London, through: tackling new and growing threats, freeing up 1,000 officers from existing services and better management of demand
- A Transformed, Modern and Efficient Met, that looks and feels more like London, with officers with the skills, tools and approach necessary to police London effectively,



## Our strategic priorities emerging from the forthcoming Police and Crime plan

- Delivering "real" Neighbourhood Policing
- Protecting Children and Young People
- Violence against women and girls
- A criminal justice system for all Londoners
- Hate crime, Terrorism and Extremism

Reduce high volume low risk demand


Focus on high risk, low volume priority areas

The Strengthening Local Policing
Programme responds to these strategic drivers

- We will deliver local policing in a way that is more personal and responsive. It will also tackle crime and disorder effectively and efficiently across London as a whole.
- We will deliver this change in a way that engages, involves and motivates our officers and staff and that prepares the way for future change across London.
- We will manage change in a way that empowers and devolves responsibility to our leaders - so that they own and drive the change and that will deliver benefits to London.


## Benefits - investment in priorities

## Neighbourhoods

- A minimum of 2 Dedicated Ward Officers (DWOs) and one PCSO per ward that will be 'ring fenced' from abstraction
- Additional DWOs to a total of over 1700 across London, allocated to higher demand wards through local consultation to address local priorities


## O

0281 Youth and Schools Officers rising to 600 working full-time ©in schools, PRUs and other educational institutions to prevent cfrime and protect young people - again allocated through Vocal consultation

- Partnership and Prevention teams in every BCU (approximately 300 officers in total) providing specialist crime prevention/problem solving advice in line with 'Prevention First', owning strategic problems affecting the BCU as a whole and working jointly closely with partners
- All staff will be locally based, and work to deliver on local priorities developed via local consultation


## Protecting Vulnerable People

- This will bring together local and previously centrally managed services that have been dealing with child abuse, rape and domestic violence in one place
- Bringing these resources together will enable us to provide a more joined up, victim-focused service, by delivering larger, more resilient multi skilled teams
- A 'single front door' bringing together MASH and CAIT referral arrangements will offer more efficient referrals, support, information sharing and effective partnership engagement
- Strengthened local accountability in delivering our joint safeguarding responsibilities
- Create a new, response functions to get the specialist skills straight to the scene of more serious crimes. Delivering immediate investigator - victim contact and reassurance at the earliest stage.
- Increased staffing - an additional 400 officers across London


## Benefits - greater efficiency

## Response teams

- These teams will respond to emergency calls and deal with ongoing incidents. They provide a taskable resource in response to crime trends, public order aid and force mobilization.
- More efficient management will improve cross border deployments (currently only 1\%) and improve call allocation to
Dnsure the nearest unit attends the call (currently only occurring in 0 $2 \%$ of calls)
(1)

COnvestigator contact to improve victim care and ownership of
$0_{\text {Investigations }}$
- Reduced 'handover' of investigations improves efficiencies and prevents re working of enquiries already completed during an investigation.
- Management of their own prisoners will ensure effective evidence capture at the scene and more efficient processing
- Efficiency savings and demand reduction will allow reallocation of staff by 2020 to focus on risk and vulnerability.


## Local Investigations

- Teams of investigators will respond directly to the more serious and complex PIP Level 2 crimes, offering immediate victim investigator contact.
- They will also deliver a proactive response to crime, disorder and offending, utilising traditional uniformed tasking teams alongside proactive units dealing with local priorities
- A new approach to tasking \& co-ordination will mean that the BCU has increased visibility of and access to specialist teams
- Pathfinders will test more joined up response to organised crime at the local level


## Leadership

## One BCU Commander - Chief Superintendent

- Single point of contact and responsibility for the BCU
-Reduced number of BCU Commanders who are more empowered and influential across the MPS
- Maintain key relationships with Leaders and Chief Executives
-Enables removal of one 'chief officer' rank
Four Superintendents responsible for functional service delivery across the BCU
-Improved 'specialism' within each function
-Ensure officers are responsible for similar demands and resources across the MPS
-Ensure senior officers are suitably trained and equipped for the portfolio they oversee
-Allows a 'delayered' management structure - removal of one rank within the BCU - giving streamlined decision making by empowered staff at theright level and reducing management costs
0
EQrough Commanders at Superintendent level
- Aach borough will have one of the superintendents accountable for overall service delivery in the borough and providing a single point of contact fónocal stakeholders



## Pathfinder sites

## Governance

Pathfinder sites overseen through joint governance approach with local authorities
>'Oversight Boards' co-chaired with local authority
>'Project Boards' co-chaired with local authority
'Local Implementation Boards' chaired by BCU ©ommander
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{9}$
Po deliver joint and transparent overview of
$>$ Partnership and engagement processes
$>$ Service impact at both BCU and individual borough levels
$>$ Development of local priorities and performance monitoring, particularly with regard to vulnerability and youth services
>Impact on local relationships and ability of MPS to respond to local issues

## Success Factors

Critical success factors for the Pathfinders include:
-Does the BCU model supports partnership through effective engagement and joint working?
-Does it position the MPS to deliver the requirements of the Policing and Crime Plan?
-Abstractions of DWOs and Youth officers will be monitored and reported on a monthly basis
-Delivery of improved outcomes for protecting vulnerable people
-Effective relationships with stakeholders will have been established and working
-Emergency response, crime levels, ASB and investigative/criminal justice performance will be maintained at both BCU and Borough level against corporate standards - reported monthly
-Success criteria will be finalised in conjunction with the Oversight Boards

## How many commands for London?


#### Abstract

Demand and resources vary across boroughs resulting in inconsistency and inefficiency


$>$ Resource: 282 officers in Kingston but 1185 in Westminster
$>$ Crime: 48,000 PIP level 1 crimes in Westminster but only 9,900 in Kingston

## O

ใิEmergency response: 21,000 ' 1 ' grade calls in Lambeth but only 6,800 in Richmond
>Domestic abuse: 3600 crimes at Croydon to 900 at Kensington and Chelsea
$>$ Command: Borough Commander at Richmond commands 24\% of the staff of Westminster
$>$ Command team vary from 3-8 officers spread between 3 ranks C/Supt, Supt to C/Insp

## Considerations; <br> -Commands to be of similar size and demand to offer standardisation and consistency - and a more even workload/level of risk for officers of the same rank - Borough boundaries retained for Local Authority engagement - Build team size around demand and apply consistent and more effective supervision ratios across London

## We have considered options between 11 and 16 BCUs

$>$ We have considered options in a range from 11 to 16 BCUs. Fewer than 11 means too broad a management ratio (greater than 1:10 superintendents to inspectors)
$>$ More than 16 means that there is too much variation in size/demand (largest is $3 x$ smallest)
$>$ Teams (eg in emergency response) need to operate at sufficient size and scale to generate flexibility and realise efficiencies
>smaller commands make PVP teams with right level of specialism unsustainable (eg CAIT teams below 32 officers are not viable)
$>$ Leadership structures need to be organised 'functionally' to get benefits from consistency and professionalism - more BCUs makes it increasingly inefficient (eg reducing PCs in favour of management and preventing consistent functional leadership across London)
$>$ This led to a preference for a 12 BCU model as the best scale to realise the operational and organisational benefits

## What factors affect configuration of BCUs?

## 1. Existing relationships



Key considerations: eg -Wandsworth and Richmond Local Authority -Kingston (with its existing links to Richmond)


Notable physical boundaries, eg
-Lea Valley corridor
-River crossing particularly East London

Major transport routes

## 3. Operational factors

There are some notable cross-borough crime patterns, eg

- Enfield and Haringey
- Camden and Islington
- Lambeth and Southwark

Total Notifiable Offences 2016


Key considerations:
-Central London - should
Westminster be with
Hammersmith \& Fulham and
Kensington \& Chelsea?
-Optimum scale and
configuration of BCUs in South
and East London
-Viability of any single borough command.


