

Agenda item:

Warwickshire Joint Audit and Standards Committee Report Summary

Meeting Date: 22nd January

Subject: S22 Collaborations

Contact details: Stephen Russell

Purpose of the Report:

Share with JASC the report which went to change board in October 24 regarding the current assessment on S22 collaborations

Recommendation:

Note the report which was presented to change board – it is an information only item

Background:

Warwickshire Police has several S22 collaboration with other forces and partners. This work was to analyse the status of these collaborations to provide assurance and any recommendations to Change Board.

As part of reviewing the risk register, which includes an item on collaborations, this work was highlighted. It was therefore asked if the findings from this review could be presented to JASC.

The report is replicated below with an example of a detailed response for one such collaboration.

Section 22 Collaboration Data Collection Exercise

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to review the force position in terms of S22 collaborations. This is to ensure there is appropriate governance in place to both manage these arrangements and value for money is being obtained.

Background

Section 22A of the Police Act requires chief officers to keep under consideration the opportunities for using collaboration to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their own police force or one or more other police forces.

Like all forces, Warwickshire is in several collaboration agreements which cover different areas of service. It is important that the force is assured that these collaboration agreements are effective and efficient as compared to alternatives (should alternatives be available). It is also vital the force understands the mitigations and options should the collaboration end or there is a significant change to the terms. Without this we risk being forced into a rushed decision or have no basis on which to compare VFM for the proposed arrangements.

Several collaborations have come forward to change board in recent months (e.g. public order) for various decisions and it was agreed that an annual strategic discussion regarding key collaborations should take place.

To facilitate this a survey was undertaken for all identified collaborations – see Appendix 1 for example response. This captures key information regarding the collaboration to inform any next steps.

Collaborations were identified through consultation with legal services and the OPCC.

Analysis

Responses were received to 9 S22 collaborations and the full responses are outlined in the Appendix.

A simple classification has been undertaken to identify the scale of the collaboration and a view on the impact to the force should the collaboration end. This is to support a proportionate response in terms of governance expectations of managing the collaboration and also activity or assurance required.

Collaboration Name	Scale (of Service)	Impact (if ended)
Modern Slavery & Organised Immigration Programme	Low	Low
Public Order training	Medium	High
NPAS	Medium	High
Archive Records Management	Medium	Medium
ANPR	Medium	Medium
Athena AMO	High	Medium
Police Constable Entry Programme	Medium	Medium
Forensic Collision Investigation Network	Low	Medium
Forensics Services	High	High

There are two force collaborations where no response was received – one of these relates to dog kennelling which is coming back in house so will cease to be a collaboration.

Outstanding

- Airbox
- Dog Food and Kennelling – coming back in house

Recommendation 1: A lead for airbox is identified and the survey completed

Other S22 (paperwork available)

There were several collaborations identified on the list where a lead could not easily be identified and no reply to the survey was received. The OPCC does have a copy of the S22 agreement which they have made available:

- Police Ombudsman Northern Ireland, NPCC, local policing bodies & PSNI – responsibility for investigation of complaints against E&W police officers deployed on mutual aid to NI.
- NABIS – national?
- Property & Wireless Interference Authorisations – national
- Surveillance Operations Rooms
- Provision of Authorisations under the Police Act 1997 and RIPA 2000 – regional
- Counter terrorism – regional
- Covert Policing – regional

These cover very specialist/niche areas and are either regional or national collaborations. Whilst we do have underpinning S22 agreements this to provide the legal framework for regional and national bodies to interact with local forces.

Recommendation 2: Agree if identified leads are needed for any of these agreements or they require active management and oversight.

Question Mark

There are two collaborations which were on the original list but where no paperwork or lead has been identified. Again, they appear to be a standard regional and national collaboration and therefore assessed as low risk in terms of implications.

- National Police Co-ordination centre – assumed to be national
- ROCU regional undercover unit – regional

Recommendation 3: Agree the status of the two above collaborations and satisfy ourselves that all S22 collaborations have been identified.

Having reviewed those collaborations where a survey response was received and those that are bespoke to the force, the following observations are made:

- Public Order training is moving to a new arrangement with West Midlands from January 2024 and the business case was recently considered at change board

- Archive records management – this is now being overseen by the Head of Information Assurance and a paper was submitted to Information Strategy Board in September regarding options and considerations. A recommendation was approved to strengthen the agreement to provide at least 12 months’ notice.
- ANPR has also been the subject of a recent agreement and strong governance and management is in place
- Athena AMO – this is the subject of significant oversight and governance and the force is likely to progress a review of the arrangements in 25/26
- PCEP – this is a new collaboration started in 24/25 and subject to significant oversight and governance
- Forensic Services – this is assessed as the most significant collaboration in terms of scale and impact. The response is comprehensive and a recommendation is referenced below in terms of a change request to undertake a review of the force position ahead of the current collaboration end date in Sept 26.
- FCIN – this is a national network which is well understood and therefore classified as low risk overall
- Modern Slavery & Organised Immigration Programme – this is a national programme which is well understood and therefore classified as low risk overall
- NPAS – whilst this is potentially a significant impact if withdrawn, there is a well-established regional and national governance framework which Warwickshire is well linked into. This is being actively managed and discussed through ACC Smith.

Recommendation 4: Discuss the assessment above and agree any next steps in terms of activity or assurance.

Recommendation 5: Note and discuss the further work planned in terms of forensics and agree TOR, timeline, governance and resources.

This activity has highlighted some of the challenges of pulling together a single list of S22 collaborations and what information we hold centrally.

Recommendation 6: Discuss and agree where and how collaboration agreements are stored centrally. What additional information is required to be captured alongside the agreement and the process for collecting and maintaining this.

Example response

Collaboration Name

Police Constable Entry route Programmes (PCER)

Collaboration Force Lead

Tania Coppola

What services are provided through this collaboration?

Training and assessment of student officers

What forces are involved in this collaboration?

Staffordshire Police

West Mercia Police

Warwickshire Police

What third party suppliers / parties are involved in this collaboration?

Staffordshire University

What business areas within the force benefit from / are impacted by this collaboration?

Learning and Development are the predominant business area impacted and work closely with the Forces and University and HR to a lesser degree. Operational colleagues, such as tutors could also have contact with the University.

Does WKP have the capabilities in-house to deliver the services if the collaboration was not in place? If not, is it because the capabilities are not in-house at all, or would it be necessary to uplift capabilities already in place?

Current capacity within L&D would not be sufficient to deliver the services. The new academic route to train and qualify students would require an uplift in resource and also increased capability and assessment to meet government requirements and Department for Education criteria.

Is it financially and/or operationally viable for WKP to deliver this service as a stand-alone force? If not, why not?

Due to being a small force and the number of student officers we require, it would not be cost effective or proportionate for us to deliver the university elements of the curriculum, due to the extensive degree education requirements. The national bluelight framework has also enabled forces to procure the HEI services at a competitive rate and collaborating with regional forces makes our tender more attractive.

What would be the scenario plan/options for the force should the collaboration end? Has this been considered? What lead in time would be required?

Options which have been previously been considered and discounted as follows:

1. We could choose to not recruit students through an academic route and only bring officers in through PCEP which we manage internally. This would however impact diversity and go against COP and the overarching professionalising policing.

2. We could go out for tender of HEI as a standalone force. It was felt we would not attract suppliers due to our low numbers of recruiting as a small force.

Initial term of Contract 3 years - commenced July 24 - opportunity to come out June 27 - we would need 12 months preparation time if wanted to go with option 2 above

Is the collaboration working effectively from an operational perspective?

Yes - we have only just re-tendered and set up a new Sec 22 with a similar arrangement to previous collaboration as this worked for us and is our best option for delivery

What governance arrangements are in place for this collaboration and are they effective?

Overarching governance in RGG, there is a quarterly PCER board attended by all 3 force ACO leads, OPCC rep and the University and we now also have a new Warwickshire PCER board chaired by Head of L&D. The governance works ok.

Overall, does the collaboration provide value to the force and remains necessary?

Yes as per above is the best option for value for money, with a more competitive rate being secured as part of the new bluelight framework and our revised contract (2024-2027).

The need for this collaboration remains necessary.

Is there any further feedback or commentary you would like to provide on this collaboration?

Nothing further to add