

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency: Home Office	Title: Impact Assessment of Police Green Paper: Protective Services and Collaboration	
Stage:	Version: 1.1	Date: 19 May 2008
Related Publications:		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www>.

Contact for enquiries: Oscar Ramudo

Telephone: 020 7035 3660

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

The HMIC report Closing the Gap in 2005 told us that faced with a more 'widespread enterprising organized criminality' the police in England and Wales was not in a position to rise to the challenge and provide the necessary capacity and capability that is needed to deliver effective protective services. To be in the best possible position to meet this challenge police forces and authorities will need to work collaboratively with one another.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

The policy objective is to facilitate or mandate greater collaborative work between police forces to increase their reactive and proactive capability in protective services at a force, multi-force and national level. Greater collaboration will help to ensure that the right level of capability and capacity exists to enable the effective deployment of protective services and provide resilience to meet surge in need.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

Option 1: Do nothing.

Option 2: Facilitate collaboration and explore mandating collaboration.

Option 2 is the preferred approach. We have made good progress through the Protective Service Programme but wish to explore what options exist to facilitate collaboration further and exploring what opportunities exist for mandating collaboration. The extent to which these options are taken any further will be based on responses to this consultation, ongoing engagement with members of the tripartite, and further discussions with stakeholders on the emerging proposals.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?

Reviews will be undertaken through the bi-monthly tri-partite Protective Services Strategy Group. Those policies requiring separate legislation will be subject to their own impact assessment.

Ministerial Sign-off For consultation 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: Protective Services	Description: Facilitate collaboration and exploring mandating collaboration.
--	---

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS	Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'		
	One-off (Transition) Yrs			
	£ 0			
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0	Total Cost (PV)	£ 0	
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' Costs will be incurred by forces if identified collaboration models are implemented. May be some additional costs of central resourcing a programme team.				

BENEFITS	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' Streamlining the mechanism by which collaboration can get off the ground, avoiding duplication of work between forces and identifying appropriate models of collaboration.				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks A shift in decision-making level, as a result of the model's application, should only be carried out where there is strong evidence it will result in improved cost-effectiveness.

Price Base Year 0	Time Period Years n/a	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England & Wales			
On what date will the policy be implemented?	2008			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	N/A			
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?	N/A			
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?	No			
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro 0	Small 0	Medium 0	Large 0
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

[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.]

A. Evidence to support the nature and scale of the problem:

The HMIC *Closing the Gap* report highlighted that the police was facing a significant challenge in delivering protective services.

The HMIC report highlighted the need to:

- Address gaps in intelligence provision. Gaps exist in what we know about organised criminal enterprises and serious crime above the local level. Whilst commitment and investment on intelligence gathering and tasking at the local level has led to effective outcomes, the same cannot be said at force level; For example, the report highlighted the scale of the challenge facing the service in relation to organised crime, notably the findings of Association of Chief Police Officers, which concluded that typically less than 6% of the over 1,500 organised crime groups active at force or regional level were actually targeted by police on an annual basis.
- Ensure the right level of capability and capacity exists to enable all forces to deploy effective reactive and proactive protective services. For example, forces are able to mobilise to deal with public order/major crime incidents - including access to equipment and appropriate expertise;
- Guarantee national resilience across the protective services needs to be adequate when events culminate to put strain on police resources. This is of particular significance in light of the drive to meet the demands of the Olympics whilst dealing with business as usual and any other unexpected events. Recent events that saw force resources diverted to deal with CT and severe flooding are a timely reminder that national resilience in these key areas is paramount.

B. Existing work:

On the back of the HMIC report in 2005 and having considered mergers, forces and authorities told us that these outcomes could be achieved via collaboration. In February 2007 Ministers launched the Protective Services and made it clear that we expected them to put **plans in place to make significant improvements** in those areas of high need by 2009 and to meet minimum standards (developed by ACPO) in all protective service areas by 2011.

It is widely accepted that 43 forces working independently to deliver protective services will not achieve the improvements necessary we have been clear that we expect forces to **collaborate to make the necessary improvements**. A key policy output is for evidence-led and structured collaborative solutions to be undertaken as part of mainstream policing. Collaboration complements and adds value to national and local structures, forming a key part of how policing is delivered in the 21st Century. To this end we are funding a range of collaboration demonstration sites to provide lessons learnt and best practice to all forces.

Acute gaps in particular protective services have also been addressed and in 2006 the Home Office provided start-up funding to ACPO's project to tackle serious and organised crime at regional level by establishing intelligence capabilities (Regional Intelligence Units (RIU)) in each of the ACPO regions and an operational capability (East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU)) in the East Midlands, assessed by HMIC as a geographical region particularly at risk. A key element of this work is to build a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of organised crime groups who are committing serious crime, assessing the risk they pose and managing effective responses to the threat. This work feeds into existing regional assets such as the work undertaken by Regional Asset Recovery Teams (RARTs) and Regional Tasking and Coordination Groups (RTCGs).

The extent to which this approach is successfully closing the gap will be **tested by HMIC** over the summer/autumn 2008, reporting to Ministers in January 2009.

C. Policy options and assessment of each option:

Do nothing: The approach at present, without any further intervention would see protective service improvements via collaboration occurring over a slower time frame.

We undertook a high level review of progress in the autumn 2007 on how well police forces were progressing in collaborating to deliver improvements in protective services. This showed that forces had taken some significant steps to improve their protective services and it showed that the vast majority were considering and/or planning to collaborate whilst a significant number were already collaborating to deliver improvements. The 'do nothing' option would allow forces to continue to take on the lessons learnt through the collaboration demonstration sites (see above) and begin to implement them in a much slower time frame.

Facilitate collaboration and explore mandate: This is an option that sees us building on what we know already and exploring options to accelerate progress. We will:

1. Use the emerging lessons from the demonstrator sites and those stakeholders currently involved in collaboration to explore the robustness of the **legal and governance frameworks** to ensure they facilitate collaboration.
2. Explore the opportunity to use our performance arrangements to **reward collaboration**.
3. Set out how we intend to use our **performance management processes** to support, monitor and challenge forces where a particular protective service is not being adequately provided and/or improvements in protective services in the round are unacceptable.
4. **Consider mandating collaboration** for those protective service areas where voluntary force collaboration is not proving to be sufficient and where there is sufficient evidence to show that there is an operational and business imperative for decisions and processes to be taken jointly at particular levels and in a consistent manner. We should not expect forces, alone, to provide the level of investment or strategic overview to deliver improvements which require more centralised decision-making and coordination, collaboration is a means by which to achieve this. A recent HMIC report on cover surveillance, for example, concluded that regionalisation could usefully increase capacity and capability. Any mandated collaboration would, where relevant, build on what is already in place: Regional Intelligence Units, Regional Tasking and Coordination Groups, Regional Asset Recovery Teams. Mandated collaboration will be considered as part of the work on subsidiarity and on the back of the work being undertaken by HMIC to review progress on protective service improvement.

Collaboration is not only an option for operational delivery but it should also be seen as a business imperative that is applied to back office functions. Two areas where collaboration could play an important part in freeing up funding to fill critical gaps like those in protective service delivery is on the procurement of goods and services and the delivery of corporate services. While demonstrable progress has been made over the past five years we know there are further unrealised opportunities to be had from forces collaborating more closely in these areas. Procurement and corporate services are both business areas that could usefully fall under the mandated collaboration.

5. **Encourage and support close collaboration across a wide range of business areas** as an important first step for those exploring the possibility of voluntary merger. Whilst some forces feel that they will not benefit from mergers, there are others that feel that their forces could benefit from it. Funding is not available to pay for a programme of mergers but we will look at what additional support we can provide forces to develop and accelerate plans for close collaborative working. We are already providing funding to in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire to this end. Having explored close collaboration and developed a robust business plan forces and authorities are more likely, with the right impetus, to merge successfully.

F. Costs & benefits of each option:

Do Nothing: Funding has been allocated in the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) period to fund the programme of work that is currently being taken forward (see section B) and so there would be no additional costs incurred from this option.

Facilitate collaboration and explore mandate:

1. **Benefits:** Providing clarity over the legislative and governance frameworks will minimise the need for forces to seek separate legal advice and will streamline the mechanism by which collaboration can get off the ground, reducing bureaucracy and allowing business change to happen more readily.

Costs: The costs associated with exploring the robustness of existing legislation and potentially developing further legislation or guidance notes will be incurred by the Home Office. Any changes to legislation will require a separate impact assessment.

2. **Benefits:** Collaboration is not an end in itself but a means by which to achieve better outcomes, when those improved outcomes are achieved we should seek to reward forces. Incorporating this into existing performance management reduces duplication.

Costs: The costs associated with exploring potential for performance arrangements to reward collaboration will be incurred by the Home Office.

3. **Benefits:** The Protective Services Programme has a clear timetable for delivery and we expect forces to put plans in place to make significant improvements in those areas of high need by 2009 and to meet minimum standards (developed by ACPO) in all protective service areas by 2011. We will want to take stock of whether forces have met these targets and in order to minimise duplication and reduce bureaucracy it is right that we should consider the outcomes as part of our broader performance management systems. This allows us to minimise duplication and bear in mind the force's wider performance.

Costs: The costs associated with aligning performance management systems and providing support to forces and authorities will be borne internally from existing resource (protective services programme funds).

- There may be additional costs incurred by partner agencies in providing additional support but it will not be possible to cost this until we are in a position to identify what that additional support should look like.

4. **Benefits:** Exploring mandating collaboration will allow us to work with partners to identify where there is sufficient evidence to show that there is an operational and business imperative for decisions and processes to be taken jointly at particular levels and in a consistent manner. Where this is the case mandating will ensure that service provision is equitably distributed around the country and that increased capacity and efficiencies are universal.

Costs: The costs associated with mandating collaboration on particular police functions will depend on the findings of the consultation with stakeholders, the development of the subsidiarity model and what, if any mandation is taken forward. Any decisions to mandate will require legislation and will be the subject of a separate regulatory/legislative impact assessment.

- Any exploration and implementation of mandated collaboration will require additional central programme resource that is likely to be absorbed by the Home Office, additional resource may be procured externally.
- Any decision to mandate collaboration is likely to lead to a change in business processes by police forces and authorities and therefore lead to additional costs that would be off-set through the cost savings brought about by the collaboration and/or the increase in capacity and capability. Existing collaborative ventures undertaken through the Collaboration Demonstration Sites project range from **£150,000 (collaborating to align policy and procedures) to £1.5m (set up costs for delivering a joint Serious and Organised Crime resource).**

5. **Benefits:** For some forces mergers may yield the cost savings and efficiencies needed to increase capacity and capability in a range of police functions. By encouraging forces to explore close collaboration and develop robust business plans, forces and authorities are more likely, with the right impetus, to merge successfully and realise the intended service and business improvements.

Costs: The costs associated with encouraging and supporting close collaboration will depend on what additional support and encouragement is developed in consultation with stakeholders.

- Any additional resource is likely to be incurred by the Home Office but some of this work may be procured externally.
- The set-up and running cost of two or more forces collaborating closely will depend on those areas of business that the police forces and authorities concerned have decided to work jointly on. The collaboration demonstration sites show that estimated costs for planning and entering into wide-ranging collaborations are **approximately £1million**. This is to be off-set through the cost savings brought about by the collaboration and/or the increase in capacity and capability. Given this will be voluntary close collaboration it will be for forces to voluntarily incur costs set against cost-savings and increased capacity and capability.

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.>