

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency: Home Office	Title: Impact Assessment of Police Green Paper: Bureaucracy	
Stage:	Version: 1.4	Date: 30/50/08
Related Publications:		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www>.

Contact for enquiries: Stephen Cummins

Telephone: 020 7035 1836

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

Despite initiatives to reduce bureaucracy since 2002, the Flanagan review of 2007/8 evidenced persistent problems in terms of underlying cause (risk aversion) and specific drivers - such as compliance with procedures to secure best performance. The review noted that officers still spend 20% of their time on paperwork. The review recommended tackling both cause and specifics.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To reduce the amount of unnecessary bureaucracy in the police service by driving forward recommendations from the Flanagan review and the Green Paper, tackling risk aversion and challenging government and the police service on impact and drivers of unnecessary bureaucracy. The intended benefits are time saved that may be re-invested in other activities.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option. 1. Maintain the status quo with past achievements and ongoing work around the speedy summary justice initiative in the CJS; 2. To drive recommendations in Flanagan and Green Paper with a reducing bureaucracy champion. Such a figure would have responsibility for (a) leading on delivery of recommendations in Flanagan and GP; of convening an implementation reference unit (awaiting reply to sub); and of challenging Govt and ACPO on impact of initiatives. 3. relace 2nd option with a committee with analagous role.

The second is preferable to give delivery focus and grip. Greater costs than 3).

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects? Some of these will be available by the end of this callendar year (2008). A full range may be available after 12 months in post.

Ministerial Sign-off For SELECT STAGE Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

..... Date:

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: 2	Description:
-------------------------	---------------------

C O S T S	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Cost of funding the reducing bureaucracy champion and supporting office including expenses and costs of commissioning additional services as required. Cost estimates assume £500,000 annual cost from 2009/10 for 5 years.
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£	5	
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 500,000	Total Cost (PV)	£ 2,256,000
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Bureaucracy Champion will require interaction with Police forces in order to identify opportunities to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy. This will require that forces work with the Champion in identifying opportunities and implementing proposals and initiatives			

B E N E F I T S	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£ 0		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0	Total Benefit (PV)	£ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Reduction in unnecessary bureaucracy will result in more effective use of police resources in tackling crime			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks The success of such a post is dependent on government continuing to view bureaucracy in the police service as a political priority and on the individual appointed commanding respect from all bodies involved and being bestowed enough authority to give weight to any actions. Cost estimates assume £500,000 annual cost from 2009

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ - 2,256,000
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		England & Wales		
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2009		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		Home Office in lead.		
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£ 0		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		No		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£ 0		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£ 0		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		Yes/No		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of	£ 0	Decrease of	£ 0
		Net Impact	£ 0

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

Evidencing the Problem

Police bureaucracy has been identified as an ongoing problem for a considerable number of years – principally in media reports and as an issued from the largest staff association, the Police Federation. *Diary of a Police Officer* (2001) provided something of an evidential base. The O'Dowd report of 2002 was commissioned to address the issue. 52 recommendations were made and implemented. However, bureaucracy in the police service has continued to occupy a prominent position on the political agenda. The Flanagan review (September 2007 and February 2008) adduced evidence to support the continued existence of a problem. According to the review, officers still spend 20% of their time on paperwork (activity based costing 2006/7). This raises an issue of resource usage.

Flanagan identified that the long term failure of past attempts to reduce bureaucracy is largely attributable to the approach and attitude to bureaucracy reduction. Past attempts have focused primarily on selectively targeting individual systems and processes without viewing the problem as symptomatic of a wider systemic and cultural cause. Drawing on wide ranging evidence submitted by forces, individual officers, central policing bodies and personal observations made whilst visiting West Midlands Police, Sir Ronnie Flanagan reaffirmed the existence of high levels of bureaucracy. He identified drivers such as new legislation, performance management, inspection compliance, initiatives by Government or police service to improve the handling of specific categories of criminal activity or handling of victims, high profile failures, requirements of the criminal justice system, increasing litigation and 43 forces implementing their own processes, IT and forms. Underlying all this, Sir Ronnie Flanagan identified risk aversion as the cultural factor overlaying processes with additional bureaucracy – either to ensure that nothing wrong can ever happen again or as part of a “just in case” mentality.

Flanagan's fresh approach demands a shift in tackling unnecessary bureaucracy; there is a clear need to address the drivers of bureaucracy in addition to the symptoms, which necessitates combining previous approaches with a new initiative

The reducing bureaucracy report produced by Sir David O'Dowd in 2002 also prompted the creation of a 'bureaucracy advisor'; a senior police officer appointed to oversee implementation of the recommendations and prevent the creation of new bureaucracy. The role was advisory and the key benefit was working with individual forces and thereby building up an overview of the issues of concern. Progress was piecemeal – as the post was structured to deal with issues in that way. The post, funded by the Home Office, remained until 2006. Funding was transferred to the National Policing Improvement Agency in 2007. The post proposed under option 2 has a different focus.

Options

1. Maintain status quo

This would accept that bureaucracy is necessary in a business where officers are assigned coercive powers over their fellow citizens. It recognises the need for the police to be accountable in individual cases and capable of been audited against their actions. However, there is a strong resource argument as well as one around morale that states that police officers

are motivated by considerations much wider than bureaucracy and that the public is better served if unnecessary bureaucracy and its drivers are tackled.

2. Create the new role of reducing bureaucracy champion.

A senior individual appointed to oversee the reduction of bureaucracy by driving forward recommendations from Flanagan and the Green Paper, tackling risk aversion and challenging government and the police service. The role would no longer be simply an advisory one. It would, if necessary be directive. It would have a comprehensive role and have terms of reference that centre around tackling risk aversion.

Benefits of creating a 'Bureaucracy Champion'

It would bring oversight and accountability to the drive to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy through an individual who would be accountable for and have the authority to push forward a range of solutions. The post holder would:

- Have a staff and budget;
- Be responsible for driving through relevant recommendations of Flanagan and Green Paper;
- Report to the Home Secretary, but not be constrained by considerations of Govt or ACPO policy in discussing bureaucratic impact;
- Convene front line practitioners to assess what works and doesn't;
- Engage with regulatory bodies, CJS and other agencies to promote effective value for money policing;
- Work (including with the Risk and Regulation Advisory Council) on how to improve the exercise of professional judgement and tackle risk aversion.

Implementation of this solution would ensure the focus and grip and increase the prospects for delivery of the savings (time equivalent to 2,500 – 3,500 officers) referred to by Sir Ronnie Flanagan as the benefit of implementing his recommendations. .

The consequence of having a long term solution such as the bureaucracy champion in place would be considerable savings in terms of police time; allowing officers to be more visible and to spend more time on frontline duties.

Costs of creating a 'Bureaucracy Champion'

We envisage that the cost of employing the reducing bureaucracy champion, providing support staff and accommodation, expenses and resources for procuring additional services will be around £500,000 pa. The exact structure of this team is to be decided.

3. A committee

This option would be cheaper than option 2. Such a committee could be of key stakeholders and/or practitioners with a senior figure – either Government service, police or external – who would be tasked with monitoring the implementation of Flanagan proposals and test major developments in policy for bureaucratic impact.

Cost: potentially half of option 2.

Benefits: consensual amongst policing stakeholders

Problems: insufficient challenge and less independence than individual post-holder. Reliant on committee meetings to address issues whereas a lead post-holder would bring the flexibility and resource of full time commitment. Unlikely to be proactive. Simply would not create the expectation that a lead post-holder with appropriate credibility will generate.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

We have carefully considered the related impacts of this specific proposal and have concluded that it will not affect the private sector nor will it raise any issues around the other impacts listed. An Equality Impact Assessment has been produced for the Green Paper which can be seen at [\[link/page\]](#). We have considered whether a Privacy Impact Assessment was necessary and decided it was not.

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	No
Small Firms Impact Test	No	No
Legal Aid	No	No
Sustainable Development	No	No
Carbon Assessment	No	No
Other Environment	No	No
Health Impact Assessment	No	No
Race Equality	No	No
Disability Equality	No	No
Gender Equality	No	No
Human Rights	No	No
Rural Proofing	No	No

Annexes

< Click once and paste, or double click to paste in this style.>