



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Steve Wood
stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 7 September 2015

To: Members of the
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Julian Benington, David Cartwright, Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Tom Philpott, Michael Tickner and Richard Williams

Non-Voting Co-opted Members –

Precious Adewunmi, Bromley Youth Council
Terry Belcher, Safer Neighbourhood Board
Dr Robert Hadley, Bromley Federation of Residents Associations
Alf Kennedy, Bromley Neighbourhood Watch
Runa Uddin, Bromley Victim Support

A meeting of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be held at Committee Room 1 - Bromley Civic Centre on **TUESDAY 15 SEPTEMBER 2015 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

*Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>*

PART 1 AGENDA

Note for Members: Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

STANDARD ITEMS

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on 9th

September 2015.

- 4 **MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 30TH JUNE 2015** (Pages 1 - 14)
- 5 **MATTERS ARISING** (Pages 15 - 18)
- 6 **CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**
- 7 **POLICE UPDATE**
- 8 **NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PRESENTATION**

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

- 9 **QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on September 9th 2015.

- 10 **PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF PORTFOLIO HOLDER REPORTS**

The Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder to present scheduled reports for pre-decision scrutiny on matters where he is minded to make decisions.

- a **QUARTER ONE CAPITAL MONITORING REPORT** (Pages 19 - 24)

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

- 11 **ASB VERBAL UPDATE**
- 12 **OPERATION CRYSTAL UPDATE** (Pages 25 - 30)
- 13 **EXPENDITURE ON CONSULTANTS 2014/15 AND 2015/16** (Pages 31 - 54)
- 14 **COUNTER TERRORISM AND SECURITY ACT 2015** (Pages 55 - 90)
- 15 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP** (Pages 91 - 104)

It has been resolved that the minutes of the previous meeting of The Safer Bromley Partnership be added as a standard item to the agenda.
- 16 **WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER** (Pages 105 - 112)
- 17 **UPDATE ON VISITS AND CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE**

.....

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 30 June 2015

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Julian Benington, David Cartwright,
Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Kate Lymer,
Tom Philpott and Michael Tickner

Terry Belcher—Co-opted Member

Also Present:

Nigel Davies, (Executive Director of Environmental and
Community Services) Superintendent David Tait,
Councillor Tony Owen, Councillor Kate Lymer

STANDARD ITEMS

28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Runa Uddin (Victim Support).

Apologies were received from Mr Alf Kennedy (Neighbourhood Watch).

Apologies were received from Precious Adewunmi (Bromley Youth Council).

Apologies were received from Cllr Richard Williams, and from the Borough
Commander Chris Hafford.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Cartwright declared an interest as a member of the London Fire and
Emergency Planning Authority.

30 APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS

Report CSD15064

The Committee noted that Bromley Youth Council had elected a new
representative to serve on the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee,
and this was Precious Adewunmi.

It was further noted that Ms Runa Uddin had been nominated by Victim Support to serve on the Committee as a Co-opted Member.

RESOLVED that both Precious Adewunmi and Ms Runa Uddin be accepted onto the Committee as Co-opted Members.

31 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

32 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8TH APRIL 2015

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee held on the 8th April 2015.

Cllr Benington asked for an update on the current situation with “Waste 4 Fuel” following on from the previous minutes concerning the Portfolio Holder Update.

The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services informed the Committee that the Environment Agency was taking legal action against the land owner in an attempt to get the land owner to relinquish possession of the land. It was noted that as at April 2015, the cost of clearing the land was £2m, and that the Council had been provided with a cheque for £1.8m to carry out the clearance. It may be the case that this cost had now increased, and more money may be required from DEFRA (Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). The future disposal of the land would be a matter for Member consultation.

Cllr Benington also asked if enough action was being taken against “Skunkworks”. This was the premises that LBB and the police had previously taken action against because they were selling New Psychoactive Substances (legal highs). The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services felt that LBB had been proactive, and that the measures taken against “Skunkworks” had been successful. LBB were now waiting for the new legislation to be enacted.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the minutes of the meeting held on 8th April 2015 be agreed.

(2) that an update report on Waste 4 Fuel be provided to the Committee at the meeting on the 15th September 2015.

33 MATTERS ARISING

Report CSD 15060

The Committee noted Matters Arising from previous meetings.

The Committee were appraised by the Head of Environmental Protection that there had been a delay with the upgrade to the CCTV system. The delay had been caused by legal problems with the contract. The contractors were not on site, but it was still hoped that works would be completed by September 2015. The concern currently was that the existing system was old and not supported, and there could be a problem with getting parts in the event of a breakdown. Cllr Cartwright requested that Members be kept informed if any adverse cost implications developed.

The dates of the visits to Orpington Fire Station and to the Community Rehabilitation Company in Orpington were confirmed.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report be noted, and that Members be kept informed of any adverse costs around CCTV if they occurred.

34 UPDATE FROM VICTIM SUPPORT

This item was withdrawn from the proceedings.

35 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

The Chairman updated the Committee as follows:

The Chairman met with officers on the 23rd June 2015 to discuss the work programme for the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee. The Chairman was looking forward to a productive working relationship with officers and the police. It was noted that a joint meeting was scheduled for the 14th July 2015 with the GP&L Committee to discuss problems associated with the night time economy in Beckenham and Bromley, and to review licensing policy; the police would be attending to present and to answer questions. The Chairman outlined the planned work programme for 2015/16.

The Chairman informed the Committee that on the 21st June 2015, she observed proceedings (together with Cllr Lymer) around the Emergency Planning Exercise that took place in Bromley. It was noted that on the 23rd May 2015, the Chairman (along with Cllr Tim Stevens, Cllr Lymer and the Police Cadets) canvassed the public concerning concerns about crime in Bromley. Cllr Lymer emailed the results to Members on the evening of the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Chairman's update be noted.

36 POLICE UPDATE

The Deputy Borough Commander (Superintendent David Tait) updated the Committee as follows:

The Committee were directed to the MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime) report that had been tabled concerning "Bromley Safer Neighbourhood Board Performance Summary". The Committee studied the table on page 2 of the MOPAC report which detailed recorded crime data to April 2015.

The Committee were pleased to observe that there were percentage decreases in the areas of robbery, burglary, theft from persons and motor vehicles. They were also glad to see that there had been some percentage decreases over the last year in the areas of gun and knife crime.

However, over the last year there had been percentage increases in the levels of violence with injury, criminal damage, violence against the person, assault with injury, rape and sexual offences, youth violence, domestic abuse and homophobic crime, and the Committee were concerned about these matters, and puzzled by the increase in sexual violence. The Deputy Borough Commander spoke about each specific crime type, providing the Committee with commentary on the reasons for the respective increases.

The Committee heard that there had been an increase in the number of offences involving motor bikes and motor scooters; the police were using off road bikes to try and combat this in green areas.

With respect to criminal damage it was the case that 40% of these offences involved the breaking into of motor vehicles; the main areas that these offences were being committed in were St Mary's Cray, Mottingham and Penge.

The Deputy Borough Commander referred the Committee to page 16 of the MOPAC report and elaborated on "stop and search" distinctions and targets. He also outlined "Operation Omega" which was a MET wide operation to infuse the streets with police officers, especially in problem areas. This had yielded good results. The Committee were reassured that dedicated Ward Officers were not being removed, and the idea of the operation was to avoid secondary investigations.

During the morning of Friday 19 June, police were alerted to aggravated burglaries committed in Barton Road, Sidcup and further addresses in St Georges Road, Bromley; Greenways, Beckenham; Hayes Way, Beckenham; Edward Road, Bromley and Camden Park Road, Chislehurst.

The four suspects were using two mopeds, armed with samurai swords and crowbars. Police stopped a minicab in Downham a short while later, arresting two men and subsequently recovering over £630,000 of stolen property, two

mopeds and a number of weapons. Two suspects were still being sought in connection with the burglaries.

The Deputy Borough Commander updated the Committee concerning fighting that broke out involving a very large number of youths in the Oakley Road area of Bromley. There had been a party that was well run with door staff in attendance but was escalated via social media. It was thought that many of the youths involved had come from Lewisham. Three youths suffered stab injuries, and one was glassed in the face. A car was seized by the police, and investigations are ongoing. It was felt that the incident was not gang related.

The Deputy Borough Commander updated the Committee concerning the recent visit of the MET Commissioner to Bromley Library. The Commissioner was questioned about the proposed budget cuts and their future impact on policing in Bromley. It was noted that the annual cuts to the grant from the Home Office would make things very hard to manage by 2020.

It was expected that the police would have to make cuts of £800m to its £3.5bn budget over the next four years. This was in addition to cuts of £600m made over the last four years.

The Deputy Borough Commander informed the Committee that there had been a recent increase in officer numbers within the CID portfolio, and this was achieving good results as the police were using detectives on the initial investigation, to ensure all investigative opportunities were explored at that time. The importance of good forensic work could not be overstated. It was noted that over the last year, there were 1650 cases of residential burglary, and 932 that were non-residential.

The police had identified crime hotspots, and these were:

- Orpington Town Centre
- Bromley Town Centre
- Hospitals
- Penge
- Schools

The Chairman expressed concern over the data that showed that violence with injury figures seemed to have increased for Bromley Town Centre. The Deputy Borough Commander responded that alcohol was a big problem in most of these cases, alongside the granting of late night licences, and that the police had finite resources.

Cllr William Harmer felt that people were now more confident to report domestic abuse and sex related crimes to the police. He felt that LBB needed to work more holistically as a council in tackling crime, and that there were areas where the Renewal and Recreation Committee and the Environment Committee could get more involved.

Cllr Tony Owen felt that it was important to determine the root cause of the problem. The Deputy Borough Commander was of the opinion that it was difficult to determine the root cause without sufficient analytical data. Cllr Owen informed the Committee that a report was drafted in 2004 by Durham University entitled, "Profiling the Night-Time Economy: Bromley Town Centre". He requested that Mr Paul Lehane access a copy of this report for distribution to Members.

Cllr Samaris Huntingdon Thresher expressed concern regarding the "red" areas on the MOPAC report, which detailed areas where crime levels had increased. She asked what LBB could do to be more pro-active and make the best use of officer resource. She also referenced the empty shop units in the high street, and made the point that LBB should pay attention to what business types were considered for the occupation of those units. She expressed the view that Bromley had reached saturation point as far as bars were concerned, and that it may be better to leave units vacant, rather than occupy them with more businesses selling alcohol.

The Deputy Borough Commander elaborated on page 16 of the MOPAC report concerning Stop and Search statistics; Cllr Cartwright asked if tangible data existed for clear up rates; the Deputy Borough Commander had brought this data to the meeting with him, and this was passed to Cllr Cartwright for his attention.

The Deputy Borough Commander informed the Committee that there were very few vacancies with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and that there were no vacancies with CID.

The Vice Chairman expressed his thanks to the police for what he regarded as excellent work in the Cray areas, stating that the population living in those communities were beginning to feel safe again.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the update from the Deputy Borough Commander be noted.

(2) that LBB should try and work holistically to resolve crime related problems, and that the PP&S PDS Committee should seek the involvement of the Renewal and Recreation Committee and the Environment Committee as appropriate.

37 GANGS UPDATE

The Gangs Update was given by the Deputy Borough Commander.

It was noted that the Gangs Sub Group had met on the 27th May 2015 at Bromley Police Station.

The Gangs Sub Group consisted of:

- David Tait—Bromley Police
- Peter Sibley—LBB Anti-Social Behaviour and Gangs Lead Officer
- Barbara Godfrey—Oxley NHS Trust
- Pat Jennings—LBB Youth Offending Services Manager
- Jane Bailey—LBB Assistant Director of Education
- Kevin Clarke—Bromley Police
- Kay Weiss—LBB AD of Children’s Safeguarding and Social Care
- Sara Bowrey—LBB AD Housing Needs

Superintendent Tait explained to the Board that the main driver for the formation of the Gangs Sub Group was the Peer Review report on Gangs that had come from the Home Office. An action plan had been formulated from the recommendations of the report, and 15 actions had been identified to progress—some of these had already been undertaken. The 15 action points had been detailed in a report tabled by Superintendent Tait at the meeting. Actions that had already been progressed included the mapping of gang activity and the increase in the size of the Police Gangs Unit, and challenging the behaviour of young people where appropriate.

Superintendent Tait had formulated a strategy for dealing with gangs, and the key aspects of this strategy were:

- Prevention
- Intervention
- Enforcement
- Leadership
- Co-ordination

Superintendent Tait briefed the Group concerning an organisation that he had contacted called Growing Against Violence (GAV). GAV was the largest serious violence prevention initiative of its kind in the UK. It was a public health and safety programme, delivering evidence based preventative education sessions. It provided age appropriate sessions delivered universally to students in school years 6 through to 10.

The Committee were informed that the Gangs Sub Group of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group would be meeting again soon. The Committee requested that relevant feedback from the SBP be filtered back into the PDS Committee. The Committee felt that the proposed work with GAV was very positive. The Committee agreed that there should be a presentation on Gangs in the future, and that this should be incorporated into the Work Programme.

The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services pointed out that where matters arose concerning young people, it was important that the Education PDS Committee also be involved and informed. The Committee noted the need for cross communication across the Council and for a holistic approach. The Deputy Borough Commander indicated that he was happy for the PP&S Portfolio Holder or PP&S PDS Chairman to attend the Gangs Sub Group meetings.

The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety requested that in the future, the previous minutes for the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group be incorporated as a standing item on the agenda.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Gangs update from the Deputy Borough Commander be noted

(2) the minutes of future meetings of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group be added as a standing item to future agendas

(3) that all relevant information from SBP meetings be filtered into the PDS Committee

(4) that a future presentation on Gangs be incorporated into the Work Programme

(5) that the Education PDS Committee be kept informed of any developments concerning young people.

(6) the PP&S Portfolio Holder or PP&S PDS Chairman to attend the Gangs Sub Group meetings.

HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

38 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

A) BUDGET MONITORING

Report FSD 15041

The Budget Monitoring report 2015/16 was written by Claire Martin, Head of Finance. The report provided an update concerning the latest budget monitoring position for 2015/16 for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio based upon expenditure and activity levels up to the 31st May 2015.

The budget was balanced, and the latest approved budget figure for 2015/16 was £2277k.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder endorse the latest 2015/16 budget projection for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

B) PROVISIONAL OUTTURN 2014/15

Report FDS15040

This report was written by the Head of Finance to inform the Portfolio Holder of the final outturn position for 2014/15. It also showed the level of expenditure for the selected project within the Member Priority Initiatives, and detailed the provisional outturn within the Community Safety Budget.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the 2014/15 provisional outturn position for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio be endorsed by the Portfolio Holder

(2) the Portfolio Holder note the outturn position in respect of the targeted neighbourhood activity project

(3) the Portfolio Holder note the final allocation of Community Safety Expenditure as set out in appendix 3

(4) the Portfolio Holder approve the drawdown of the carry forward sum of £26,570k held in Central Contingency, to help victims of domestic violence as set out in sections 5.6 to 5.8 of the report.

39 DRAFT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2015-2016

Report ES 15044

The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety (Cllr Kate Lymer) guided Members through the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Plan 2015/16.

Outcome 1: Keeping Bromley Safe.

It was highlighted that re-offending rates for anti-social behaviour had declined due to the success of Operation Crystal. It was felt that the Mentoring Service was running well, and that this had been successful in enabling young people to remain in education, employment and training.

The Portfolio Holder explained how the Safer Bromley Partnership had now evolved into the Strategic Group and how the dynamics, leadership and governance had changed. It was the now the case that LBB were looking for partners on the Group to take more proactive roles—to this end the Chairman was now the Borough Police Commander, and the lead for ASB was the Bromley Fire Commander.

The Committee heard that one of the objectives to keep Bromley safe was to target the night time anti-social behaviour problem in the Bromley night time economy. This would be a joint LBB and police initiative, and a joint meeting was scheduled with the GP&L Committee on the 14th July 2015 to this end.

It was the case that LBB would be working closely with the police to implement the recommendations of the Gangs Review report, and the Portfolio Holder was waiting for a bid for funding so that LBB and the police could use the services of GAV (Growing Against Violence) which was a highly effective public safety programme aimed at combating gang violence.

In terms of dealing with New Psychoactive Substances, LBB had already experienced some success in this area, but would now be seeking to apply new powers and tools from new legislation being introduced by the government.

Outcome 2: Protecting Consumers:

The Committee noted the loss of staff across the Trading Standards Team. The Portfolio Holder referred to section 2.2 of the report relating to the rapid response service to the victims of door step crimes and scams, and informed the Committee that out of 200 calls to this service, only 50 could be classed as emergency calls. It was noted that concerning the matter of tackling the sale of age restricted products and of preventing consumer detriment by tackling problem traders, routine checks would have to be reduced, and would have to be more intelligence led.

Outcome 3: Regulating Food Safety:

The Portfolio Holder notified the Committee that this was another area of the Portfolio which was suffering from the effects of reduced staffing levels. It was going to be the case that the number of inspections would decrease. Priority would be allocated to high risk food businesses, significant complaints, accident reports and statutory responsibilities. The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services informed Members that the Food Standards Agency was coming to LBB for a meeting imminently, and then a revised assessment would be undertaken of the statutory minimum services to be provided around food inspections.

Outcome 4: Protecting the Environment:

The Environmental Protection Team had lost 4 staff members, and currently had a total of 11 staff.

When assessing licences, the Portfolio Holder explained to the Committee that LBB could add in a condition that premises license holders had to install a noise limitation device.

With respect to CCTV team targets, the target was for the team to provide three hundred evidence packages per year to the police. The team are currently providing around six per week so were on target.

The Environmental Protection Team (depending on the result of the new lease negotiations) would analyse and expand on the current noise plan for Biggin Hill.

RESOLVED that the Draft Portfolio Plan for 2015/16 be noted, and that the Portfolio Holder adopt the Portfolio Plan.

40 MOPAC UPDATE

Report ES15046

This report was presented to the Committee to update Members with details concerning the annual submission to MOPAC (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime).

Members noted that the projects concerning domestic abuse would be available to help men as well as women as men were also victims of domestic abuse.

A Member wondered if it would be possible to arrange for a Member of the Committee to visit a refuge to see how they helped victims of domestic abuse.

RESOLVED that the MOPAC update be noted.

41 ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY OCTOBER 2014--MARCH 2015

Report ES15043

This report was presented to Members to advise of the activity taken by the Public Protection Division during the periods of 1st September 2014 to 31st March 2015 relating to the annual Portfolio Plan and enforcement under delegated powers.

The Committee noted:

1. Public Protection Statutory Notices
2. Enforcement activity under the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003
3. Enforcement activity under the Anti-Social Behaviour and Policing and Crime Act 2014
4. Enforcement action undertaken under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000
5. Prosecutions undertaken at Bromley Magistrates Court
6. Prosecutions pending
7. Trading Standards formal cautions
8. Licensing Reviews

RESOLVED that the Enforcement Activity update report—October 2014 to March 2015 be noted.

**42 SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP
UPDATE**

The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services gave an update on the work of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group.

He outlined current SBP strategy and direction, and explained the current composition and work of the various sub groups involved. It was highlighted that the SBP was now a body that depended very much on partnership working, and shared responsibilities and burdens.

The Director expanded on recent presentations given to the SBP by the Probation Service and by the Bromley Community Rehabilitation Company. It was noted that the CRC was now responsible for administering Community Payback.

RESOLVED that the MOPAC update be noted.

43 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report CSD15063

The Committee noted the Work Programme and Contracts Register report.

The following updates to the Work Programme were recommended:

15th September 2015:

- a) Update on Waste 4 Fuel
- b) CCTV Update
- c) Update on PREVENT strategy

3rd November 2015

- a) Update/Presentation from Victim Support

20th January 2016

- a) MOPAC update
- b) Enforcement Activity Update

2nd March 2016

- a) Presentation from Bromley Youth Council
- b) Update from SLaM

RESOLVED that the Work Programme and Contracts Register report and the recommended additions and changes to the work programme be noted.

44 PPS PDS VISITS AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled for 15th September 2015.

The Committee noted that a visit was being planned to the newly refurbished fire station in Orpington on the 11th July 2015, and that there was a visit planned to the Community Rehabilitation Company in Orpington in September 2015.

The Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CSD15099

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 15th September 2015

Decision Type: Non Urgent Non Executive Non Key

Title: **MATTERS ARISING**

Contact Officer: Steve Wood, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 The Committee is asked to review progress on matters arising from previous meetings.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Matters Arising reports and Minutes of meetings. Previous Agenda Document.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: **£326,980.**
 5. Source of funding: 2015/16 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 10 posts (8.75fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" Reports for PP&S PDS meetings can take up to a few hours per meeting.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

<u>Minute Number/Title</u>	<u>Matters Arising</u>	<u>Update</u>
3rd February 2015 Budget Monitoring.	Portfolio Holder mentioned that a new Community Payback contract was being drawn up.	Contract hoping to be finalised around August 2015. Update to be given to the PPS/PDS Committee in September 2015.
3rd February 2015 Minute 5 Matters Arising. CCTV Open Day	The Committee were informed that the date for the CCTV Open Day had not been finalised.	As there have been further delays, it is anticipated that a detailed CCTV report be presented to the Committee in November.
30th June 2015 Minute 32 Previous Minutes	Resolved that an update on Waste 4 Fuel be given to the PDS Committee in September.	Verbal update will be provided by the Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services.
30th June 2015 Minute 33 Matters Arising	Resolved that Members be kept informed of any adverse costs around CCTV if they occurred.	No adverse costs have been accrued.
30th June 2015 Minute 37 Gangs Update	Resolved that a presentation on Gangs be incorporated into the Work Programme.	Verbal update to be provided to the September meeting.
30th June 2015 Minute 40 MOPAC Update	It was suggested that it may be a good idea to arrange for a Member of the PDS Committee to visit a women's refuge.	Cllr Kate Lymer and Cllr David Cartwright will be visiting.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
FSD15053

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Date: For pre-decision scrutiny by the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on 15th September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER 2015/16

Contact Officer: Martin Reeves, Principal Accountant (Technical & Control)
Tel: 020 8313 4291 E-mail: martin.reeves@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

On 15th July 2015, the Executive received the 1st quarterly capital monitoring report for 2015/16 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2015/16 to 2018/19. The report also covered any detailed issues relating to the 2014/15 Capital Programme outturn, which had been reported in summary form to the June meeting of the Executive. This report highlights changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Public Protection and Safety (PP&S) Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio is set out in Appendix A, detailed comments on scheme progress as at the end of the first quarter of 2015/16 are shown in Appendix B and details on the 2014/15 outturn are included in Appendix C.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to note and confirm the changes agreed by the Executive in July.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Affective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. The Council continuously reviews its property assets and service users are regularly asked to justify their continued use of the property. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley".
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Total increase of £320k, due to re-phasing of underspend from 2014/15 (see para. 3.2).
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £340k for the PP&S Portfolio over four years 2015/16 to 2018/19
 5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36 hours per week
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Capital Monitoring – variations agreed by the Executive on 15th July 2015

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive in July, following final outturn figures for 2014/15 and a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 1st quarter of 2015/16. The base position was the revised programme approved by the Executive on 11th February 2015. Changes relating to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio are shown in the table below and further details are included in paragraph 3.2. The revised Programme for the PP&S Portfolio is attached at Appendix A. Appendix B shows actual spend against budget in the first quarter of 2015/16, together with detailed comments, and Appendix C includes details of the final outturn for 2014/15.

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	TOTAL
	£000	£000	£000	£000	2015/16 to 2018/19 £000
Programme approved by Executive 11/02/15	20	0	0	0	20
<u>Variations approved by Executive 15/07/15</u>					
Net underspend in 14/15 rephased into 15/16 (see para.3.2)	320	0	0	0	320
Total Amendment to the Capital Programme in Q1 monitoring	320	0	0	0	320
Total Revised PP&S Programme	340	0	0	0	340

3.2 CCTV Control Room (Refurbishment) – £320k underspend in 14/15 rephased into 15/16

The 2014/15 Capital Outturn was reported to Executive on 10th June 2015. Due to unexpected delays on the CCTV Control Room (refurbishment) scheme, there was an underspend of £320k which was re-phased into 2015/16. This was due to technical problems with the tender process requiring various clarification exercises. An early warning was reported to the PDS committee in April 2015. Since then the tender process has been delayed further due to formal appeal and we anticipate the project completion date to be in Quarter 3 15/16.

Post-Completion Reports

3.3 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. After major slippage of expenditure in recent years, Members confirmed the importance of these as part of the overall capital monitoring framework. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. No post-completion reports are currently due for the PP&S Portfolio, but this quarterly report will monitor the future position and will highlight any further reports required.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to the Executive on 15th July 2015. Changes agreed by the Executive for the PP&S Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in the table in paragraph 3.1.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Approved Capital Programme (Executive 11/02/15). Capital Outturn report (Executive 10/06/15) and Q1 monitoring report (Executive 15/07/15).

Appendix A

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 15th JULY 2015								
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Total Approved Estimate	Actual to 31.03.15	Estimate 2015/16	Estimate 2016/17	Estimate 2017/18	Estimate 2018/19	Responsible Officer
		£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	340	0	340	0	0	0	Jim McGowan
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		340	0	340	0	0	0	

Appendix B

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - QUARTER 1 2015/16					
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Approved Estimate Feb 2015	Revised Estimate Jul 2015	Actual to 28.07.15	Responsible Officer Comments
		£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	20	340	0	Tender process delayed due to formal appeal. Awaiting formal contract from Legal. Project anticipated completion date Qtr 3 2015/16.
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		20	340	0	

Appendix C

PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO - 2014/15 OUTTURN						
Code	Capital Scheme/Project	Actual to 31.03.14	Approved Estimate Feb 2015	Final Outturn	Variation (under-spend '-')	Comments / action taken
		£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
939446	CCTV Control room - refurbishment	0	320	0	-320	Underspend in 2014/15 rephased into 2015/16
TOTAL PUBLIC PROTECTION & SAFETY PORTFOLIO		0	320	0	-320	

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ES15063

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday 15 September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: OPERATION CRYSTAL UPDATE

Contact Officer: Kirsty Armstrong, Business Coordinator
Tel: 020 8313 4727 E-mail: Kirsty.Armstrong@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward:

1. Reason for report

This report is to update Members on the progress of Operation Crystal, the MOPAC (Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime)-funded anti-social behaviour initiative to tackle crime, which will run from March 2013 to December 2016, in four hot-spots of the borough.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 Members are requested to note the points raised in the report and to comment as appropriate.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Safer Bromley Supporting Independence
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal::
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost Non-Recurring Cost Not Applicable: Further Details
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Anti-Social Behaviour Team
 4. Total current budget for this head: £42.2k in 2015/16
 5. Source of funding: Grant funded through MOPAC
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1.0
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents in hot-spots
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 Operation Crystal is a multi-agency, intelligence-led initiative, which tackles crime and anti-social behaviour in four hot-spots of the borough. The Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator was asked to identify key areas for joint operations to target anti-social behaviour, following meetings between the Council's Directors and the Met Police, which established that crime of this nature was generally contained within certain areas of the boroughs, and therefore would benefit from a targeted campaign.
- 3.2 Using both the Police and the Council's data, a mapping exercise was undertaken, which led to the identification of the four hot-spots – Kimmeridge, Riverbirds, and Penge A and B (Groves Estate). A Police Survey of Residents provided insight into the levels of intimidation and anti-social behaviour that residents were facing, which resulted in high levels of dissatisfaction with the area, directed at the Police and the Local Authority. The Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator compiled a number of intelligence reports, mapping out details of the nominals, working with local Safer Neighbourhood teams.
- 3.3 The purpose was to reduce complaints of anti-social behaviour and nuisance, and to improve the public realm and cleanliness of the areas, in order to reduce crime and enhance the quality of life and visual appearance. The approach planned was to undertake a number of highly-visible actions in the course of one day, with one operation a month in each of the locations (i.e. each location visited on a four-month cycle).
- 3.4 An application for grant funding for the project was made to MOPAC and was successful: funding is spread over three years, with £39,370 committed to the project in 2013/14 and £42,200 per annum for each of the next three years.
- 3.5 The aims of Crystal were developed by a multi-agency team chaired by the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator, based on residents' feedback, and were specifically to:
- Clear long-term rubbish in and around the targeted areas;
 - Visibly tackle crime-related matters in the area: in the identified areas, there were a number of high-profile offenders either residing or associating with residents, and they were responsible for a large number of anti-social behaviour and crime;
 - Raise the community's awareness of public services' commitment to the area, in order to reassure the public that crime is being managed;
 - Carry out operations as defined by specific issues raised in the Police Survey of Residents;
 - Find long-term solutions for the issues raised during operations.
- 3.6 Initially, Crystal was led by the Council (including Public Protection, Street Scene – incorporating Kier Street Services – and the Parks and Green Spaces Divisions) with input and support from the Police and the Affinity Sutton Housing Association.
- 3.7 In the first year alone, there was a 58% drop in offences reported to the London Borough of Bromley in the hot spots. Since March 2013, there have been 22 operations. As a result of the operations:
- 84.3 tonnes of fly-tipped waste has been cleared;
 - 868 square metres of graffiti has been cleared;
 - 428 vehicle stops have been carried out, resulting in several arrests and prosecutions;

- 10 FPNs have been issued;
- 42 investigations of benefits fraud have been carried out;
- 23 arrests have been made;
- 10 warrants have been executed, which have led to the recovery of drugs and firearms;
- There have been 11 weapons sweeps;
- 12 ABCs have been issued;
- There have been 9 dog operations;
- There have been 137 HPA visits.

Additionally, public satisfaction (measured through the Police Survey of Residents) demonstrates a 45% increase.

3.8 Each Operation is adapted in accordance with the intelligence received, but, for instance, could include:

- Rubbish and fly-tipping: Enviro-crime Enforcement Officers attend and attempt to obtain evidence regarding fly-tipping offenders. Officers are available to serve enforcement notices if required. Street Scene Officers, together with Affinity Sutton, remove fly-tipped rubbish on the day of the operation. Leaflets are distributed by PCSOs and Housing Officers to residents, explaining the operation, and giving details on how to report offending;
- Graffiti: Street Scene and Affinity Sutton deploy their Graffiti Removal Teams, and, prior to the event, collate all necessary consent forms for graffiti removal on private premises;
- Abandoned vehicles: Street Scene coordinates the Abandoned Vehicles Officers and liaise with the Police regarding visiting sites to serve notices on vehicles prior to the designated week. Street Scene carry out a preliminary visit to the area to identify abandoned vehicles;
- Untaxed vehicles: These are dealt with by the Street Scene Enforcement Officers and Affinity Sutton Officers, in conjunction with the DVLA;
- Anti-social and criminal behaviour: Joint operations are carried out by the Police and Council, as defined by the Police Survey of Residents, intelligence, and reports from various sources, and can include visits, warnings, arrests, or evictions of known individuals. The Anti-Social Behaviour Unit and the Police compile a list of individuals alleged to be involved in prolific ASB in the area in advance of each Operation.

3.9 The outcomes of Operation Crystal are communicated to residents through the local press, in order to ensure that residents are aware of the work being undertaken to improve their locality. The impact of this is not only an increase in satisfaction but also increased assistance from residents and Crime Stoppers.

3.10 Crystal is dynamic: the initial brief, as stated above, was to tackle anti-social behaviour, noise nuisance, crime and enviro-crime.

- It now involves a wider range of agencies, including HMRC, Trading Standards, the Department for Work and Pensions, the Probation Service, and the Immigration Service.

- It also includes operations to tackle problem businesses, such as those selling illicit tobacco or alcohol, or those selling to the under-age.
- There has also been focus on emerging gang issues: effort is being made to target gang nominals and young people who have been committing anti-social behaviour, to encourage engagement and participation in diversion activities, such as an upcoming job fair.
- Drug warrants are also now undertaken and are proving successful: they have led to a number of arrests.

In summary, Crystal's brief was a multi-agency approach to tackling problem areas: it fulfils this brief, and working relationships with a wide number of agencies have been successfully developed so that pertinent intelligence is shared and informs actions, to the significant benefit of the community.

3.11 It is envisaged that an exit strategy will commence in the latter part of 2015, so that the benefits will carry on after Crystal. This will involve working with Residents' Associations, Local Authority Councillors, the Police, and local Safer Neighbourhood Boards.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The project outcomes contribute to the Building a Better Bromley priorities.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The MOPAC grant provides funding until 31 March 2017, for a full time post which manages the project. One-off costs for fly-tip clearance and other associated cleansing operations are met from existing Council budgets.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 One internal Council post is funded through MOPAC grant monies: the grant will end in 2017, which has implications for the continuing employment of the affected post.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
CSD15106A

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday 15 September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: EXPENDITURE ON CONSULTANTS 2014/15 AND 2015/16

Contact Officer: Graham Walton, Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 0208 461 7743 E-mail: graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 At its meeting on 3rd September 2015, the Executive and Resources PDS Committee received the attached report setting out details of expenditure across the Council on consultants. This was for 2014/15 and for 2015/16 to date, covering both revenue and capital budgets. The Committee requested that this be referred on to all other PDS Committees.
- 1.2 It is intended that officers will continue to provide this information to PDS Committees, with reports at the end of each financial year and a mid-year update each autumn.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee considers the information about expenditure on consultants contained in the attached report relating to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.

Corporate Policy: Policy Status: Not Applicable:

2. BBB Priority: Not Applicable:

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
 2. Ongoing costs: All one-off expenditure met from allocated budgets
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Consultants
 4. Total current budget for this head: Not Applicable
 5. Source of funding: Revenue and Capital
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): Not Applicable
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Not Applicable
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Not Applicable
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Not Applicable

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy/Finance/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	See attached report

Decision Maker: EXECUTIVE AND RESOURCES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: 3RD September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: Expenditure on Consultants 2014/15 and 2015/16

Contact Officer: Lesley Moore, Assistant Director Special Projects & Transformation
Tel: 020 8313 4633 E-mail: Lesley.moore@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Doug Patterson, Chief Executive

Ward: N/A

1. Reason for report

Members of ER PDS requested a full report on Consultant expenditure in the last year. Officers have therefore looked at total expenditure in 2014/15 and expenditure to date for 2015/16 for both Revenue and Capital Budgets.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Members to:

2.1 Note the overall expenditure on Consultants as set out in this report.

2.2 Refer this report onto individual PDS Committees for further consideration.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable
 2. BBB Priority: Not Applicable:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: All one-off expenditure met from allocated budgets
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Consultants
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding: Revenue & Capital
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A – one-off costs
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 ER PDS members requested information on the Councils expenditure on Consultants over the last year. To do this officers have looked at the total expenditure in 2014/15 and also the expenditure for this financial year as at the end of June 2015. This work covered both Revenue and Capital expenditure.
- 3.2 The basic reason for the use of consultants is that at times the Council requires that specialised work is undertaken for specific projects. This is particularly valid when consultants are engaged to work on large scale projects. For completeness expenditure on Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and other consultants commissioned to work on Capital Projects have been included as these generally meet the definition of one-off projects. Proposed expenditure on Capital Projects will have been approved by Executive before being included in the Capital Programme.
- 3.3 The Councils Contract Procedure rules (8.5) sets out the procurement process to be followed when appointing a consultant and there is also guidance available to staff about what needs to be included in the formal agreement when engaging a consultant, which as a minimum needs to confirm the overall cost, project deliverables, clear brief and reporting arrangements. Appendix 1 provides this in more detail.
- 3.4 There is an element of subjectivity as to what constitutes a “consultant” as a number of services could fall within this definition, however it is generally defined as “a person brought into the Council to carry out a specific job” which is not on-going. For the purposes of this report expenditure on medical fees, counsel and legal fees have been excluded as these are considered to be professional fees rather than consultants. It has also been difficult for finance staff to pull this information together as budget holders have not always used the correct expenditure codes.
- 3.5 In looking at consultants members need to be minded that officers will use them to carry out work on the Council’s behalf when:-
- There is no one internally with the relevant skills or experience
 - There is no capacity/resources available to undertake this work
 - Specialist skills are required
- 3.6 It is important when recruiting a consultant that the project brief sets out the reasons for the use of consultant, that officers have consider any alternative options and also to evaluate the effectiveness of the work undertaken by consultants within the authority.
- 3.7 The benefit of employing consultants is that the Council makes a saving in relation to employer National Insurance and pension contribution. Also in employing consultants the Council is under no obligation to pay consultants for days when they are not working for the Council e.g. sickness and holiday and they are only engaged for a specific period of time – however offsetting this is that these staff are often more expensive.
- 3.8 The risk in not using consultants is that the Council would have to recruit a more substantial and specialised workforce at a greater expense.
- 3.9 This report provides a detailed breakdown of all costs officers believe are consultants, broken down over Portfolio’s and service areas. This is shown in Appendix 2 (revenue) and Appendix 3 (capital). It also examines the procurement arrangements associated with engaging the consultants as part of that process.

HM Revenue & Customs

- 3.10 From April 2015, Employers must complete a return to the HMRC on a quarterly basis providing a detailed breakdown of all workers they have employed that do not get paid through the PAYE system. The information that needs to be captured is quite detailed and so officers have now reviewed current processes to ensure that this information is collected.
- 3.11 This applies to all staff who are engaged directly as independent self-employed contractors or through personal service companies
- 3.12 It does not apply to the procurement of services from professional services firms such as accountants, actuaries, estate agents or lawyers.
- 3.13 An approvals form has been created that managers will need to complete whenever they are recruiting staff outside of the PAYE system that will need to be signed off by both HR and the Chief Officer.
- 3.14 As the worker is set up on either IPROC or Confirm to authorise payments, they will need to complete this information at the same time. A report can then be run each quarter and submitted to the HMRC.
- 3.15 If the report is late, incomplete or incorrect then the HMRC will charge a penalty based on the number of offences over a 12 month period. These are:-
- £250 – first offence
 - £500 – second offence
 - £1,000 – Third and later offences
- 3.16 Where there are continued failure to by organisations to send the reports or if they are frequently late, then HMRC may penalise organisations for every day the report is late.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Included in the body of the report.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There is a considerable amount of legislation affording specific employment rights such as paid holiday, maternity leave and pay, entitlement to redundancy payments, minimum notice periods and protection from unfair dismissal, to name but a few to employees. Self-employed consultants, on the other hand, are not entitled to these enhanced statutory rights or protections.
- 5.2 In addition to statutory rights, an employer/employee relationship also implies a duty of trust and confidence between the parties concerned and suggests that neither should act in such a way as to undermine it. This notion introduces the idea of reasonableness into the way in which employers treat their employees. But the relationship between an organisation and a self-employed consultant does not have the same implied duties, with the consultant's protection relying largely on the contractual terms in place.
- 5.3 Describing a role as a consultant will not provide a definitive position and as a starting point, there are three key areas that should be evaluated:

- (i) a requirement for personal service
- (ii) the existence of mutuality of obligation
- (iii) the level of control that the council has over an individual.

5.3.1 Personal service - Is the individual personally required to perform services for the company? An employee is someone who is employed under a contract of service, that is, a contract that requires them to personally turn up for work and carry out the duties requested of them.

A consultant, on the other hand, is engaged under a contract for services, that is, a contract under which they agree to provide the company with particular services. But, while they are obliged to ensure that these services are provided, they are not necessarily required to carry out the work personally.

5.3.2 Mutuality of obligation - Are employers obliged to offer individuals work under their agreed contract? Equally, if an employer offers an individual work, are they obliged to accept it? If they are, it could indicate an employment relationship.

5.3.3 Control - How much control does the employer have over an individual? Who decides what work needs to be done, how it should be done and when?

5.4 HMRC uses different, albeit similar, criteria when determining individual's employment status or otherwise. This means that an individual could be considered an employee for tax purposes, yet remain a consultant from an employment perspective. As stated above the process of engaging consultants is being tightened with the appropriate checks and balances. These will reduce or eliminate the obvious employment law risks including the accrual of the statutory protection rights set out in para 5.1 above. HR advice should be sought to ensure that each assignment/engagement is not likely to give rise to employment or "contract of services

Non-Applicable Sections:	
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Held in finance teams

This page is left intentionally blank

CONSULTANT

Coding for Consultants/Agency/Temp Staff

The difference between agency/temporary staff and consultants is often confused and wrongly coded on Oracle. For clarity the difference is explained below:-

➤ Agency staff – Revenue Funded (0104)*

People appointed to cover vacant posts – and paid either by LBB or via comensera. Anyone that we employ but we pay as a company will need to be separately identified and for the purposes of LBB classified as working under a consultancy basis (see below).

➤ Temporary Staff – Revenue Funded (0104)*

People that are employed for less than 3 months to do a specific urgent piece of work, where no post exists, so a supernumerary post is allocated and virement rules apply. Once the post exceeds 3 months a post creation form will need to be set up (back dated to when the post commenced working with the council) and justification and funding identified.

➤ Consultants – Revenue/Capital (1708)**

Consultants should be used to undertake one-off projects, where there is no one internally with the relevant skills. There should be transparency around funding of the post which should be on a fixed fee and clear deliverable, which should be reviewed at the end of the project.

* 0104 codes – there may be a basket of temporary codes so please check the FCB

** 1708 codes – unless there is a good reason, at all times this is the code that should be used.

Consultant - Someone employed for a specific length of time to work to a defined project brief with clear outcomes to be delivered, which brings specialist skills or knowledge to the role, and where the council has no ready access to employees with the skills, experience or capacity to undertake the work.

A Consultant should be engaged on a fixed price contract and would not normally be employed on a day rate (this will ensure VFM).

Employing the Consultant

Audit Commission research has indicated that most consultancy work was not usually let on the basis of lowest price, although few authorities held records to justify their decisions. You must always take account of the available budget.

You should prepare a formal agreement before a consultancy assignment commences. This may range from a letter to a formal legal contract. As a minimum the agreement should:

- confirm agreed total costs (fixed price arrangements are usually preferable),
- description of all project deliverables
- make reference to the brief
- make reference to the consultant's submission
- confirm invoicing and payment arrangements
- set out termination and arbitration arrangements
- set out reporting arrangements

You must also ensure that sufficient provision is made for any necessary Insurances and Indemnities required to protect the Council's position. This includes a need to establish the tax position of the Consultant to ensure payments made under any commission placed are correctly treated.

Requirement for a Consultant

The initial requirements around the commissioning of Consultancy Services should include consideration of how service requirements are met and other approaches which might be used. For example can the requirement be met through the completion of work via Agency Staff, the employment of an interim manager (via a direct/temporary contract of employment with the Council), or Secondment arrangements. Only once the best "fit" has been identified should work be commissioned. The arrangement should also be subject to periodic review as, for example, an initial urgent requirement placed with a Consultant might not be better completed at a later date via a temporary contract of employment

There needs to be a clear **accountable** officer responsible for commissioning the consultants work, who monitors progress and delivery and ensures VFM is delivered at all times. The consultant would not normally manage any staff directly or be responsible for authorising spend.

The Appointment of Consultants (contract procedure rule 8.5)

8.5.1 Consultant architects, engineers, surveyors and other professional *Consultants* shall be selected and commissions awarded in accordance with the procedures detailed within these contract procedure rules and as outlined below.

<i>Estimated Cost(or Value)</i>	<i>Tender procedure</i>	<i>Shortlisting</i>
Up to £30,000	One oral <i>Quotation to be confirmed in writing</i> where the <i>Estimated Cost(or Value)</i> exceeds £1,000	<i>Officer and Line Manager</i>
£30,000 – up to £100,000	Three written <i>Quotations</i>	<i>Officer, SPCM and relevant Head of Finance</i>
£100,000 – up to EU Threshold	<i>Invitation to Tender</i> by advertisement/list to at least three and no more than six <i>Candidates</i>	<i>Officer, SPCM relevant Head of Finance and Head of Procurement</i>
Above EU Threshold	<i>EU Procedure</i> or, where this does not apply, <i>Invitation to Tender</i> by advertisement/list to at least five and no more than eight <i>Candidates</i>	As above and in <i>Consultation</i> with <i>Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services and Director of Resources</i> – see Rule 8.1.4
<i>Note – Where the estimated value of the intended arrangement is £100,000 or more the relevant <i>Portfolio Holder</i> will be Formally Consulted on the intended action and contracting arrangements.</i>		

8.5.2 Where it can be demonstrated that there are insufficient suitably qualified *Candidates* to meet the competition requirement, all suitably qualified *Candidates* must be invited.

8.5.3 The engagement of a *Consultant* shall follow the preparation of a brief that adequately describes the scope of the services to be provided and shall be subject to completion of a formal letter or contract of appointment.

8.5.4 Records of consultancy appointments shall be kept in accordance with Rule 6.

8.5.5 *Consultants* shall be required to provide evidence of, and maintain professional indemnity insurance policies to the satisfaction of the relevant *Head of Finance* for the periods specified in the relevant agreement.

This page is left intentionally blank

Category / Supplier Name	Division / Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills							
MOTT MACDONALD LTD	Regen. & Trans.		980	Professional Cost consultancy advice re sale of land at 111 Eldred Drive	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	Reported to E&R PDS ctee 14/05/2015 to obtain authority to sell.
CALFORDSEADEN LLP	Regen. & Trans.	2,985	1,495	Monitoring surveys & final report on subsidence at Anerley Town Hall to enable Members to make a decision on the future of the building	Framework agreement. Previously carried out the initial survey	1	
MONTAGU EVANS LLP	Regen. & Trans.	27,800	12,000	Chartered Surveyors - Providing specialist property market expertise and general development consultancy advice on potential development of Site G. Also used for 1 Westmoreland Rd because other companies had a potential conflict of interest.	Originally selected for Site G through a competitive tendering exercise from a panel of consultants drawn from the Homes & Community Agency's Property Panel. Subsequently also used for 1 Westmoreland Rd. for which a single quote was obtained under CPR 8.5.1 .	See procurement procedure	Appointment reported to R & R PDS 17/01/2013 in Town Centres Development Programme Report.
SOLACE ENTERPRISES LTD	CEX	10,112		Services of R. H for Confidential Investigation	Selected from a list of three shortlists provided by SOLACE	3	
POSEIDON CONSULTING LTD	Fin. Serv.	4,000		Researching & delivering a paper on Treasury Management opportunities and presenting to Cabinet	Already had contact with this company as they are linked to Allenbridge Investment Advisers who provide Pensions advice	1	
One-off specialist work total		44,897	14,475				
Insufficient in-house skills / resources							
WILKS, HEAD & EVE LLP	Regen. & Trans.	17,190		Asset Register Valuations. Work tendered in 2012. Quote from Wilks Head & Eve was substantially cheaper than others. Latest quote based on same rate per valuation.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Insufficient in-house skills total		17,190					
Training							
BARONY CONSULTING GROUP LTD	HR	2,800	1,250	Commissioned to deliver Contract & Commissioning training	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
BIP SOLUTIONS LTD	HR	4,875		Commissioned to deliver Contract & Commissioning training	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
SNOWDROP CONSULTING LTD	HR	1,310		Provide Internet Security training	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Training total		8,985	1,250				
GRAND TOTAL		71,073	15,725				

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	DSG/R SG/OTHER	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills								
EMINENCE GREY ASSOCIATES LTD	Educ	72,600		DSG	Behaviour consultancy and interim executive head teacher cover. A contract was awarded via exemption from competitive tendering, on grounds of urgency due to the immediate need to provide management support at the PRU provision. A request for quotes process would have delayed the ability of LBB to rapidly address the management issue at the PRU provision and would have increased the risk of a negative inspection outcome as a result. It was considered unlikely that suitable alternative candidates could be identified.	CPR 8.5 - Waiver	1	30/01/14
KEEGANS LTD	Educ		31,549	DSG	Provision of Multi Disciplinary Lead Design Services on the project to refurbish Beacon House in line with LBB Brief and LCP Framework Agreement. Suppliers selected via Framework, all suppliers within relevant 'lots' were invited to quote. Some work may be capitalised	CPR 8.5 - Competitive Tender	See Description	11/02/15
PINNACLE ESP LTD	Educ	29,519		DSG	Consultant costs to specify and project manage urgent H&S works at Burwood School. If works had not been carried out school would have had to be close due to it not complying with H&S legislation. Suppliers selected via Framework, all suppliers within relevant 'lots' were invited to quote	CPR 8.5 - Waiver/Competitive Tenders	See Description	
ARK COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES LTD	Educ	21,150	2,925	DSG	Independent chair of FAP. An exemption to competitive tendering was sought to award the contract to Ark Commercial Enterprises on a consultancy basis due to the need to mutually identify and agree a suitable person for this role in partnership with Bromley schools. This does not lend itself to competitive tendering. It is particularly important, in this transition stage towards a new Fair Access Protocol and supporting structure, to ensure the role of Chair is undertaken by somebody familiar with Bromley schools and trusted by them	CPR 8.5 - Waiver Obtained	1	04/09/14
CROYDON COUNCIL	Educ	15,000		RSG	Joint SEN Commissioning Programme with Croydon Council who are responsible. Programme involves Consultancy which has been brought in by Croydon and Bromley is sharing the cost.	See Description		
ENFIELD COUNCIL	Educ	18,500		OTHER	Programme joint with Enfield Council who provide support to LBB which include bespoke support, case studies, attend Pathfinder Champion meetings, provide and deliver training at Delivery Partner workshops. Funded from SEND Pathfinder Grant	See Description		
RBMM EDUCATION LTD	Educ	15,000		OTHER	Expressions of interest from four consultancies who would be able to carry out this specialist review of SEND services. This consultancy was the only respondent and after careful analysis of quality and price we decided to use the service which has provided very good work resulting in a report provided to MOWGSEN during the first quarter of this year. SEN Reform Grant Funded	CPR 8.5 - Waiver/Expression of Interest.	4	
BAILEY PARTNERSHIP	Educ	10,800		DSG	Appointed to review premises and playground improvement works at Grovelands that were to be funded by historic carry forward. Works suspended on request by Bromley College prior to school conversion. Suppliers selected via Framework, all suppliers within relevant 'Lots' were invited to quote	CPR 8.5.1 - Competitive Tender	See Description	Agreed by Portfolio Holder
BROMLEY PARENT VOICE	Educ	12,000	862	OTHER	SEND Reform project management. Procured for the lifetime of the Pathfinder (one year in first instance) then waivers obtained over the last two years as the grant funding has continued.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1 - Waiver Obtained	1	
MOTT MACDONALD LTD	Educ	4,375		OTHER	Consultancy support funded from SEN pathfinder Grant. LBB has national pathfinder status which trails and tests proposals in government's reform to service for children and young people with Special Education Needs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
E. A LTD	Educ	283		OTHER	Consultancy support funded from SEN pathfinder Grant. LBB has national pathfinder status which trails and tests proposals in government's reform to service for children and young people with Special Education Needs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
BURWOOD SCHOOL	Educ	40,800		DSG	Consultant Cost in relation to interim head, LBB previously agreed to reimburse Burwood School.	Reimbursement of cost incurred by Burwood School		
B. L	Educ	500		OTHER	Consultancy support funded from SEN pathfinder Grant. LBB has national pathfinder status which trails and tests proposals in government's reform to service for children and young people with Special Education Needs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	DSG/R SG/OTHER	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS	Educ	700		DSG	Fee for the provision of independent advice in relation to Settlement Agreement in accordance with clause 10.2 in agreement	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
TL SERVICES LTD	Educ	300		DSG	An additional sum to provide 'one off' additional work as discussed and agreed in advance with Senior Teacher of the PPS	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
One-off specialist work total		241,527	35,336					
Insufficient in-house skills / resources								
L. B	Educ	52,800	5,830	RSG	A SENDIST report, commissioned in 2004, identified that Bromley had the highest volume of SEND appeals in England. As a result it was agreed at Chief Officer level to commission additional consultancy to support the Tribunal process. Numbers of appeals may vary considerably from year to year. For this reason the model used provides no minimum guarantee of referrals to the consultancy.	CPR 8.5 - Waiver Obtained	1	
OSBORNE THOMAS LTD	CSC		23,100	RSG	This is a specialist post that was created with the help of Mr. Sandhu who was the most expensive but agreed to reduce his rate by £50 per day when interviewed by AD and Director of ECHS. Portfolio Holder was informed verbally by Director of ECHS	CPR 8.5.1 - over three written quotation	7	
M. P	Educ	12,244		DSG	Only supplier available. Highly specialised. Mobility Officer for Visual Impairment. Exemption obtained last year and will be renewed for 15/16. There are very few skilled VI mobility officers available and M provides excellent value for money	CPR 8.5 -Waiver Obtained	1	
C. M	Educ	5,150	1,575	DSG & RSG	Providing school leadership support to a school judged RI by Ofsted	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Insufficient in-house skills total		70,194	30,505					
Training								
AMBER & GREENE LTD	CSC		6,320	RSG	Training for Delivery of Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders (02.07.14) and Training for Bespoke design and delivery of Critical & Thinking Skills (CATS)	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
P. P	Educ	3,800	800	RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
A. D	Educ		825	RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
A. S	Educ	300		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
B B	Educ	900		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
EDUDATA UK LTD	Educ	410		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
G. H	Educ	375		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
LEARNING POOL LTD	Educ	1,335		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
M. H / MIND KIND	Educ	1,582		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
MR K. B	Educ	960		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION	Educ	645		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
R. H	Educ	350		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
ROBBINS TRAINING AND CONSULTANCY LTD	Educ	2,006		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
THE LIFE SKILLS COMPANY (LINGFIELD) LIMITED	Educ	1,750	795	RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
W. C	Educ	595		RSG	Various training course for School Governors	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
J. H CONSULTING LTD	Educ	1,721		OTHER	Training & support funded from SEN pathfinder Grant. LBB has national pathfinder status which trails and tests proposals in government's reform to service for children and young people with Special Education Needs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
J. C LTD	Educ	1,200		OTHER	Training & support funded from SEN pathfinder Grant. LBB has national pathfinder status which trails and tests proposals in government's reform to service for children and young people with Special Education Needs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
COPE CONSULTANTS	Educ	1,350		RSG	Various training course for School-based Staff	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
P. S	Educ	830		RSG	Various training course for School-based Staff	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
H.M EDUCATION CONSULTANCY LTD	Educ	1,450		RSG	Various training course for School-based Staff	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	DSG/R SG/OTH ER	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
PLAYBACK STUDIO LTD	CSC		700	RSG	N-GageU apprenticeship roadshow on 20th November 2014 at Bromley Youth Music Centre	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT & ASSESSMENT LTD	CSC	650		RSG	Education Development Assessment (W. N) NVQ level 1 in Customer Service delivery one student 2014	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
K. M	Educ	600		RSG	Delivery of Positive Behaviour Workshop on 16th October 2014	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
RE CONSULTANT LTD	Educ	550		RSG	Various cost relating to teaching the new syllabus course June 2014	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
TLT TOP LINE THERAPISTS LTD	CSC	300		RSG	Provision of workshops at the N-GageU Apprenticeship roadshow on 20th November 2014	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
L. N	Educ	250		RSG	Various training course for School-based Staff	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
ARTICULATE HANDS LTD	Educ		200	RSG	British Sign Language provided by P. M	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
T. O	Educ	200		RSG	Various training course for School-based Staff	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Training total		24,109	9,640					
GRAND TOTAL		335,830	75,481					

Category / Supplier Name	Division/ Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills							
F D COLEMAN * INACTIVE	CSC	15,093		Review Fostering processes and procedures	Waiver Exemption Agreed May 2013		
IMPOWER CONSULTING LIMITED	Comm.	227,035		Adult Social Care Changes	Tender process	5	Executive 22/07/15
HOUSINGDELIVERY	Hous.	950		Recruitment and interview advice & support	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
DEBIGNO LTD T/A PATHWAY ANALYTICS	Public Health	4,000		Sexual Health (local population) consultancy	This is in line with Section 8.5 of the Contract Procedures Rule. Pathway Analytics is the system developer for the London Sexual Health Integrated Tariff Project and is the only company that has access to the substantial database that captures all London GUM activities by providers. The company is commissioned to provide a one-off analysis to support service remodelling of GUM services using their data collected through the Integrated Tariff project. The aim of this analytical work is to ascertain the potential of limiting Bromley's exposure to open access services.	1	
MIB CONSULTANCY LTD	Public Health	1,040		NHS Pension Scheme Consultancy	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
PHARMABBG LLP	Public Health	14,000		Pharmacy Health Champions Project	Exemption from tendering approved in line with sections 3 and 13 of the contract procedure rules.	3	
RBE ASSOCIATES LTD	Public Health	14,719		(1) Bromley Health Champions - Asset based community development project (£11,750) (2) Training Delivery Levels 1 & 2 RSPH (£2,474)	Exemption from tendering approved in line with sections 3 and 13 of the contract procedure rules.	3	
SOCIAL SENSE LTD	Public Health	7,960		Second third of social norms project. This is a specialist school-based intervention and survey (R U Different)	This is a unique intervention and we were not able to identify any other provider. The exemption from tendering was approved in line with section 3 and 13 of the contract procedure rules.	1	
TSE CONSULTING LTD	Public Health	18,500		Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment/Seasonal Health Consultancy	Section 8.5 of the Contract Procedure Rules. Other options (agency or temporary staff) were not considered suitable because the role requires specialist pharmaceutical knowledge. The use of a consultant would be appropriate for this project which has a specific brief describing the scope of the services to be provided within a defined time period.	1	
ETRE CONSULTING LTD	Strategy / CSC	4,925		Strategy - Social work consultancy, NQSWs on ASYE training programme. Children's - Delivery of training	Exemption and Award Paper Signed	1	
LYNNE PHAIR CONSULTING LTD	Strategy	162		Speaking at Safeguarding Conference	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	Budget decisions are taken by the BCSB and BSAB Executive Committees on how the partnership's funds are deployed. The Portfolio Holder is a member of the strategic partnership
LYNNE PHAIR CONSULTING LTD	Strategy	972		Draft SILP report re Lauriston House review	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	Budget decisions are taken by the BCSB and BSAB Executive Committees on how the partnership's funds are deployed. The Portfolio Holder is a member of the strategic partnership
One-off specialist work total		309,356					

Category / Supplier Name	Division/ Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
Insufficient in-house skills / resources							
MISS SB. D	Strategy	7,975		Safeguarding Adults Conference	Competitive tender within CPR's 8.5.1	3	PDS and Portfolio Holder receive an annual report including details of the conference. Budget decision's are taken by BSAB Executive committee on how partnerhsip funds are deployed. The Portfolio Holder is a member of the Board.
Insufficient in-house skills total		7,975					
Training							
AMBER & GREENE LTD	CSC	2,220		Deliver Training for YOT	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
LYNNE PHAIR CONSULTING LTD	Strategy	4,874		Delivery of healthcare investigation skills training	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Training total		7,094					
GRAND TOTAL		324,425	0				

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills							
TGMS LTD	Street Scene & Green Space	12,179		Sparrows Den - Beccehamians RFC - Geophysical and levels survey, design spec, contract management etc	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
ALPHA PARKING LTD	Transport & Highways	1,470		Notice Processing Review for Shared Service. Health check and efficiency of parking appeals service	2 quotes sought	2	
One-off specialist work total		13,649					
Insufficient in-house skills / resources							
AECOM	Transport & Highways	92,992	13,403	Highway design and construction consultancy services from TfL framework as agreed by Members	Part of TfL Framework	N/A	16/06/2010, 17/04/2012 & 07/07/2015
BM LTD	Street Scene & Green Space	29,000		Advice on outsourcing of remaining parks service & associated variation in in parks contract	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS LTD	Street Scene & Green Space	9,900		Study to devise options for the management of greenspace	sought more than 1 quote, however only 1 returned		
WILKS, HEAD & EVE LLP	Street Scene & Green Space	4,500		Undertake an initial appraisal and negotiate rent review settlement	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Insufficient in-house skills total		136,392	13,403				
Planning							
WATERMAN INFRASTRUCTURE	Transport & Highways	7,400		Provide an Expert Highway Witness for Public Inquiry	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Planning total		7,400					
GRAND TOTAL		157,441	13,403				

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Serv. Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills							
OSBORNE THOMAS LTD	Public Protection	10,710		Consultant employed to undertake staff investigation re disciplinary	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
One-off specialist work total		10,710					
Insufficient in-house skills / resources							
ALLIED SURVEYORS DILIGENCE LTD	Public Protection	700		Expert witness valuation of property	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
DVC	Public Protection	1,350		Expert witness valuation of property	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
ECLIPSE RESEARCH LTD	Public Protection	27,968		CCTV Consultant costs	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
GRAHAM G BISHOP SURVEYORS LTD	Public Protection	550		Survey report on 15 Chaffinch Road Fraud case 14/02048/CMPP	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
	Public Protection		1,440	Forensic survey of properties	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
STANDING TOGETHER AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	Public Protection	5,525		Domestic Violence Homicide Review Work completed up until 31st March 2015	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
N R	Public Protection	14		Food sampling (Goats meat)	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Insufficient in-house skills total		36,106	1,440				
GRAND TOTAL		46,816	1,440				

Category / Supplier Name	Division/Service Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
One-off specialist advice, no one with relevant specialist skills							
STUDIO EGRET WEST LTD	Planning	15,000		Architectural fees for Bromley Central High Street Detailed Design	Waiver to extend consultancy commission for Bromley Town Centre public realm design taken to R&R PDS Committee	NA	R&R PDS 17/01/2013
ADVICE2GO LTD	Recreation	4,825		Fundraising strategy and bid for the CPP dinosaurs.	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
COLLIERS INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY CONSULTANTS	Recreation	15,000		Bromley Valley Gym Club - valuation & property advice	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
DRAUGHT ASSOCIATES LTD	Recreation	3,000		Central library exhibition visuals	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
FRANKHAM CONSULTANCY GROUP LTD	Recreation	4,000		Feasibility study for the Biggin Hill Heritage Centre	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1 - prices compared to LPC framework	1	
THE MORTON PARTNERSHIP LTD	Recreation	1,750		Condition survey work for Crystal Palace Park railings	Request for quotations	6	
THE OAKLEAF GROUP	Recreation	18,753		Condition survey work for Churchill Theatre, libraries and Mytime buildings	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
TP BENNETT LLP	Recreation	11,340		Consultancy work re Bromley Valley Gymnastics Centre	Competitive tender	2	
CS	Recreation		2,345	Reviewing papers, advising by telephone and drafting advice - Library Closures	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
One-off specialist work total		73,668	2,345				
Insufficient in-house skills / resources							
COLE JARMAN LTD	Planning	9,169	4,016	Biggin Hill Airport - Noise action plan	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
URS INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT UK LTD	Planning	61,360		Work on Growth Areas in the Borough	Tendering Exercise through HCA's Multi-disciplinary Framework Panel	3 bids received	Exec 10/06/2014
CALFORDSEADEN LLP	Recreation	940	950	Structural inspection of Penge library	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
PLAYLE & PARTNERS LLP	Recreation	715		Fees re BH library & swimming pool	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
CACI LTD	Recreation	950		Provision of retail footprint report and map for Bromley Town Centre	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
JB MARKET RESEARCH SERVICES LTD	Recreation	10,800	5,987	To undertake face to face shopper surveys in Bromley Town Centre and outlying town centres & provide committee style report on the findings	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
QUARTERBRIDGE PROJECT MANAGEMENT LTD	Recreation	11,057	4,576	Provision of consultancy services for the proposed Bromley Town Centre Market Strategy	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
WARNER LAND SURVEYS LTD	Planning		1,790	Bromley Town Centre Central Area Public Realm Project - Topographical survey	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Insufficient in-house skills total		94,991	17,319				
Planning							
COLIN TOMS & PARTNERS LLP	Planning	900		Arboricultural Consultant to provide an assessment & report in relation to a tree being implicated in subsidence	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
THE HOOK SURVEY PARTNERSHIP	Planning	650		Topographical Survey	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
DELOITTE & TOUCHE PUBLIC SECTOR INTERNAL AUDIT LTD	Planning	7,473		Financial Viability work on Conquest House planning appeal (invoice 1111050937)	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	3	
HERRINGTON CONSULTING LTD	Planning	900		Daylight/Sunlight reviews for HG Wells and Maybrey planning applications	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
KEEGANS LTD	Planning	3,095		Survey & costing work for pub refurbishment proposal for Porcupine PH planning appeal	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
KEMP & KEMP LLP	Planning	3,500		Planning consultancy for All Saints School Planning Appeal	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	3	
LAND USE CONSULTANTS LTD	Planning	1,017	593	Land Use Consultants for ecology surveys re applications & appeals eg Bassetts application	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
MACCREANOR LAVINGTON LTD	Planning	3,109		Architectural and Design consultancy work for planning appeal for Conquest House	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	3	
MORGAN CLARKE CHARTERED SURVEYORS	Planning	7,140		Specialist Pub Viability Evidence including report & appearance at public inquiry for The Porcupine public house/Lidl proposal	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
MRS C S	Planning	1,803		Arboricultural consultancy work for planning appeal at The Porcupine PH Mottingham	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
MR R M	Planning	3,050		Planning Appeals consultant fees	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
READING AGRICULTURAL CONSULTANTS LTD	Planning	990		Agricultural Consultants re planning application	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
RICHARD GRAVES ASSOCIATES LTD	Planning	1,820	2,460	Ecology Advice for planning applications	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
Category / Supplier Name	Division/Service Area	14-15 £	15-16 £	Description	Procurement procedure followed	No. of quotes obtained	Date Reported to Members
S S	Planning	4,703	1,418	planning appeals consultant	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
SUTTLE PICKETT & PARTNERS LTD	Planning	8,670	1,486	Structural Consultant checking of structural elements of applications	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
THE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP	Planning	992		Written advice regarding submitted Japanese Knotweed report for planning application at Wilderwood	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	

THE POWER SERVICE	Planning	8,400	2,150	Consultant Electrical Works to ascertain compliance with Part P - Building Regulations	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
WATERMAN INFRASTRUCTURE	Planning	3,700		Consultant costs for pubic enquiry	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
AJ OAKES & PARTNERS	Planning		220	Professional Fees	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
COLLIERS INTERNATIONAL UK PLC	Planning		8,470	Financial Viability work for Hayes Court & 208-214 High Street	3 quotes in line with Financial Regulations	3	
PHD CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS	Planning		3,319	Planning appeal consultancy fee	Single quote under CPR 8.5.1	1	
TIBBALDS PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN LTD	Planning		11,424	Planning appeal work	3 quotes in line with Financial Regulations	3	
Planning total		61,912	31,540				
GRAND TOTAL		230,571	51,204				

Category /Supplier Name	Portfolio					Grand Total £	Scheme	No. of Quotes	Procurement Procedure followed i.e. Full tendering, Waiver etc..	Procurement reported to Members
	CARE SERVICE S	EDUCATION	ENVIRONMENT	RENEWAL & RECREATION	RESOURCES					
	£	£	£	£	£					
Architects										
PICK EVERARD		31,009				31,009	Glebe expansion works feasibility	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
Total - Architects	0	31,009	0	0	0	31,009				
Engineers										
TRUEFORM ENGINEERING LTD				1,746		1,746	Bromley North Village Public Realm Improvements	1	TfL Call -off contract (TfL Framework)	No
Total - Engineers	0	0	0	1,746	0	1,746				
Surveyors										
GLEEDS		500				500	Glebe expansion works feasibility	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
PENNINGTON CHOICES LTD		2,320				2,320	Basic Needs	1	Under £30,000 within CPR's 8.5.1	No
RIVERSIDE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LTD		3,600				3,600	Basic Needs	Single Quotes (2 in total)	Individual orders raised on various projects - each individual order is under £5,000 and is within CPR's 8.5.1	No
RPS HEALTH SAFETY & ENVIRONMENT					1,175	1,175	Acquisition - Properties Acquisition	1	Under £30,000 within CPR's 8.5.1	No
Total - Surveyors	0	6,420	0	0	1,175	7,595				
Multi disciplinary / Other Consultant										
AECOM LTD			332			332	Biking Boroughs	TfL Framework	TfL Framework (mini tender)	Executive 16/06/10
			31,852			31,852	Maintenance	TfL Framework	TfL Framework (mini tender)	Executive 16/06/10
			250			250	LIP Formula Funding	TfL Framework	TfL Framework (mini tender)	Executive 16/06/10
			515			515	Bromley Town Centre - increased parking capacity	TfL Framework	TfL Framework (mini tender)	Executive 16/06/10
APPLEYARD & TREW				500		500	Bromley North Village Public Realm Improvements	1	Under £30,000 within CPR's 8.5.1	No
ATKINS LTD			10,700			10,700	LIP Formula Funding	4	Mini competition	No
BAILEY PARTNERSHIP		148,480				148,480	Basic Needs	Appt made via Lewisham Consultants Framework	Tender	No
BAILY GARNER LLP		41,969				41,969	Basic Needs	Appt made via Lewisham Consultants Framework	Tender	No
CALFORDSEADEN LLP		736				736	Basic Needs	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No

Category /Supplier Name	Portfolio					Grand Total £	Scheme	No. of Quotes	Procurement Procedure followed i.e. Full tendering, Waiver etc..	Procurement reported to Members
	CARE SERVICE	EDUCATION	ENVIRONMENT	RENEWAL & RECREATION	RESOURCES					
	£	£	£	£	£					
COLLIERS INTERNATIONAL UK PLC					49,147	49,147	Acquisition - Properties Acquisition	3 responses	ESPO Framework – 2700 Estate management Services, lot 5A	No
					3,000	3,000	Acquisition - Properties Acquisition	1	Under £30,000 within CPR's 8.5.1	No
FRANKHAM CONSULTANCY GROUP LTD		4,823				4,823	BSF (Building Schools for the Future)	1	Appointed in 2007 for this project. (Consultant for architectural services- appointed for a fixed term following competitive tenders in 2005)	No
				4,044		4,044	Central Library & Churchill Theatre - chillers & controls	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
		19,713				19,713	Basic Needs	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
KEEGANS LTD		3,682				3,682	Glebe expansion works feasibility	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
MOTT MACDONALD LTD		1,482				1,482	Basic Needs	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
			630			630	LIP Formula Funding	3 requested	Mini competition	No
M&S TRAFFIC LTD				200		200	Bromley North Village Public Realm Improvements	3 requested	Mini competition	No
		79,282				79,282	Basic Needs	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework (£10,344.92) and Lewisham Consultant Framework (£68,937.17)	No
		7,366				7,366	Sensory Support (Vision) - Access Initiative	Appt made via Lewisham Consultants Framework	Framework tender via mini-competition	No
PELLINGS LLP	1,237					1,237	Social Care Grant (Department of Health)	Appt made via Framework / Direct call off	Tender/Under Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
		70,755				70,755	Basic Needs	Appt made via Lewisham Consultants Framework	Tender	No
PINNACLE ESP LTD		41,434				41,434	Universal Free School Meals	Appt made via Lewisham Consultants Framework	Tender	No
STACE LLP				1,001		1,001	Central Library & Churchill Theatre - chillers & controls	All suppliers within the relevant Lot were invited to quote.	Construction Related Consultancy Services 2012 Framework	No
WORSLEY BRIDGE CATERING CONSORTIUM		2,000				2,000	Universal Free School Meals	1	Under £30,000 within CPR's 8.5.1	No
Total - Multi disciplinary / Other consultant	1,237	421,722	44,279	5,745	52,147	525,131				
Total Consultants	1,237	459,151	44,279	7,491	53,322	565,480				

Report No.
ES15065

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: 15th September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: Update on the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015

Contact Officer: Rob Vale, Head of Trading Standards & Community Safety
Tel: 0208 313 4785 rob.vale@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: All wards

1. Reason for report

To update Members on the implications of the Government's Prevent Strategy and the duty placed on local authorities by the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Members are asked to note the contents of the report and the statutory obligations placed on the local authority and agree the following:

- 2.1 The Safer Bromley Partnership will be lead on the governance of the PREVENT duty
- 2.2 The training of LBB front line staff will be co-ordinated by the HR organisational Development Team although the overall responsibility of the implementation of the requirements of the Act sit with the Executive Director of Environment & Community Services through the Community Safety Team.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Safer Bromley:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: The cost of demonstrating compliance with the statutory duty is estimated to be £10k
 2. Ongoing costs: Non-Recurring Cost:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Community Safety Management
 4. Total current budget for this head: £10k
 5. Source of funding: £10k grant funding from the Home Office
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 40
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough Wide
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: NA

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 PREVENT is part of the Government's counter terrorism strategy CONTEST, which is led by the Home Office. It is the national strategy to respond to the threat of extremism and prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.
- 3.2 The Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, which came into force in July 2015, places a general duty on specified authorities to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism (section 26). A specified authority includes London Borough councils. Statutory guidance has been issued under section 29 of the Act and is attached to this report.
- 3.3 In order to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism, local authorities will be required to fulfil a range of responsibilities as articulated in the Prevent Guidance. Broadly, this work falls into the following categories:
- 3.4 **Partnership** – local authorities should establish or make use of multi-agency groups to coordinate and monitor Prevent related activity. There are a number of multi-agency forums which may be appropriate to lead on the governance of the duty, for example the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group, or either of the Children or Adult Safeguarding Boards.
- 3.5 **Risk Assessment** – local authorities should use Counter-Terrorism Local Profiles to assess the risk of individuals being drawn into terrorism in their local area. The CTLP informs the local PREVENT partnership of the threat from terrorism and non-violent extremism and should be used to develop an appropriate local response. Where a risk has been identified, an action plan should be developed
- 3.6 **Action Plan** – Using the risk assessment, if the local authority assesses a risk in the local area, a Prevent action plan should be developed to prioritise and facilitate delivery of projects, activities or specific interventions to reduce the risk of people being drawn into terrorism in the local authority.
- 3.7 **Staff Training** – The purpose of the training is to ensure all front line staff, and those of any contractors for the authority, have a good understanding of PREVENT and are able to recognise vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism. Where there are concerns, staff should be aware of the CHANNEL referral process and the programmes available to deal with the issue.
- 3.8 **Use of local authority resources** – local authorities will be expected to ensure that publicly owned venues and resources do not provide a profile for extremists. Consideration should also be given as to whether IT equipment available to the general public should use filtering solutions that limit access to terrorist and extremist material. New contracts for the delivery of services in a local authority should reflect the principles of the duty in a suitable form.
- 3.9 Local authorities are required to organise and chair a multi-agency panel (CHANNEL) in their area (section 36). The purpose of the CHANNEL is to ensure any vulnerable child or adult at risk of being drawn into terrorism receive support before their vulnerabilities are exploited.
- 3.10 In order to ensure the effective and controlled sharing of personal data, authorities must introduce local information sharing agreements are in place, taking into account necessity and proportionality, consent, the power to share and the Data protection Act and Common Law Duty of Confidentiality.
- 3.11 There is an expectation that local authorities maintain records demonstrating compliance with their responsibilities and provide reports on request. Those authorities identified as priorities

for this programme will receive central support from the Home Office. The London Borough of Bromley is not a priority borough.

- 3.12 Existing safeguarding policies should incorporate the PREVENT duty, in particular those policies for children at risk.
- 3.13 In addition to a one off £10k grant for non-priority boroughs, a support package may also be available to some areas which will cover access to training, regional awareness raising events, a peer support network and an innovation fund available to authorities and third sector groups.
- 3.14 The HR Organisational Development team are likely to co-ordinate the training of front line staff.
- 3.15 It is the Governments view that the mainstay of this work will not constitute a significant burden on local authorities. It sees Prevent work normally falling under the jurisdiction of the community safety department. It should be noted the Community Safety Team presently consists of 1.0fte Community Safety Co-ordinator (on maternity leave until February 2016), one Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator, one ASB case officer.
- 3.16 All local authorities will be expected to assess the threat of radicalisation within their areas and take action as appropriate. This will include senior management time, the implementation of action plans (if appropriate), chairing Channel panels and staff training. The financial implications will vary with the level of the threat. The Department for Communities and Local Government have estimated costs for non-Priority areas as ranging from £4k-£40k per authority. For Bromley, the estimated costs are expected to be £10k.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Reducing crime and disorder and providing reassurance to the people of Bromley are key elements of Building a Better Bromley.
- 4.2 All local authorities have a statutory duty to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The estimated cost of training the front line staff is expected to be £10k which will be funded from the Home Office grant. The £10k grant should cover the costs of activities required to commence the Duty.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, which came into force in July 2015, places a general duty on specified authorities to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism (section 26). A specified authority includes London Borough councils.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The authority will need to ensure the effective delivery of training to all front line staff in order that it demonstrates due regard to the duty. Consideration will need to be given to the options available to deliver the training, in particular the co-ordination and recording of staff who have been trained, in order that the authority is able to produce evidence of compliance.

Non-Applicable Sections:	[List non-applicable sections here]
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

This page is left intentionally blank



HM Government

Prevent Duty Guidance: for England and Wales

Guidance for specified authorities in England and Wales on the duty in the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

© Crown Copyright 2015

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and other departmental or agency logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

ISBN: 978-1-78246-7933-9

Contents

A. Status and Scope of the Duty.....	2
B. Introduction.....	2
C. A risk-based response to the <i>Prevent</i> duty.....	3
D. Monitoring and enforcement.....	5
E. Sector-specific guidance.....	6
Local authorities.....	6
Schools (excluding higher and further education).....	10
Further education.....	13
Higher education.....	16
The health sector.....	19
Prisons and probation.....	21
The police.....	25
F. Glossary of terms.....	27

A. Status and Scope of the Duty

Statutory guidance issued under section 29 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015.

1. Section 26 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (the Act) places a duty on certain bodies (“specified authorities” listed in Schedule 6 to the Act), in the exercise of their functions, to have “due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism”. This guidance is issued under section 29 of the Act. The Act states that the authorities subject to the provisions must have regard to this guidance when carrying out the duty.

2. The list of specified authorities subject to the provisions can be found in Schedule 6 to the Act. Further details can be found in the sector-specific sections of this guidance.

3. The duty applies to specified authorities in England and Wales, and Scotland. Counter terrorism is the responsibility of the UK Government. However, many of the local delivery mechanisms in Wales and Scotland, such as health, education and local government, are devolved. We will ensure close cooperation with the Scottish and Welsh Governments in implementing the Prevent duty where there are interdependencies between devolved and non-devolved elements. There is separate guidance for specified authorities in Scotland.

4. The duty does not confer new functions on any specified authority. The term “due regard” as used in the Act means that the authorities should place an appropriate amount of weight on the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism when they consider all the other factors relevant to how they carry out their usual functions. This purpose of this guidance is to assist authorities to decide what this means in practice.

B. Introduction

5. The Prevent strategy, published by the Government in 2011, is part of our overall counter-terrorism strategy, CONTEST. The aim of the *Prevent* strategy is to reduce the threat to the UK from terrorism by stopping people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism. In the Act this has simply been expressed as the need to “prevent people from being drawn into terrorism”.

6. The 2011 *Prevent* strategy has three specific strategic objectives:

- respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism and the threat we face from those who promote it;

- prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and ensure that they are given appropriate advice and support; and

- work with sectors and institutions where there are risks of radicalisation that we need to address.

7. Terrorist groups often draw on extremist ideology, developed by extremist organisations. Some people who join terrorist groups have previously been members of extremist organisations and have been radicalised by them. The Government has defined extremism in the *Prevent* strategy as: “vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs. We also include in our definition of extremism calls for the death of members of our armed forces”.

8. The *Prevent* strategy was explicitly changed in 2011 to deal with all forms of terrorism and with non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists then exploit. It also made clear that preventing people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism requires challenge to extremist ideas where they are used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups. And the strategy also means intervening to stop people moving from extremist (albeit legal) groups into terrorist-related activity.

9. Our *Prevent* work is intended to deal with all kinds of terrorist threats to the UK. The most significant of these threats is currently from terrorist organisations in Syria and Iraq, and Al Qa'ida associated groups. But terrorists associated with the extreme right also pose a continued threat to our safety and security.

10. Islamist extremists regard Western intervention in Muslim-majority countries as a 'war with Islam', creating a narrative of 'them' and 'us'. Their ideology includes the uncompromising belief that people cannot be both Muslim and British, and that Muslims living here should not participate in our democracy. Islamist extremists specifically attack the

principles of civic participation and social cohesion. These extremists purport to identify grievances to which terrorist organisations then claim to have a solution.

11. The white supremacist ideology of extreme right-wing groups has also provided both the inspiration and justification for people who have committed extreme right-wing terrorist acts.

12. In fulfilling the duty in section 26 of the Act, we expect all specified authorities to participate fully in work to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. How they do this, and the extent to which they do this, will depend on many factors, for example, the age of the individual, how much interaction they have with them, etc. The specified authorities in Schedule 6 to the Act are those judged to have a role in protecting vulnerable people and/or our national security. The duty is likely to be relevant to fulfilling other responsibilities such as the duty arising from section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

13. This guidance identifies best practice for each of the main sectors and describes ways in which they can comply with the duty. It includes sources of further advice and provides information on how compliance with the duty will be monitored.

C. A risk-based approach to the *Prevent* duty

14. In complying with the duty all specified authorities, as a starting point, should demonstrate an awareness and understanding of the risk of radicalisation in their area, institution or body. This risk will vary greatly and can change rapidly; but no area, institution or body is risk free. Whilst the type and scale of activity that will address the risk will vary, all specified authorities will need to give due consideration to it.

15. There are three themes throughout the sector-specific guidance, set out later in this document: effective leadership, working in partnership and appropriate capabilities.

Leadership

16. For all specified authorities, we expect that those in leadership positions:

- establish or use existing mechanisms for understanding the risk of radicalisation;
- ensure staff understand the risk and build the capabilities to deal with it;
- communicate and promote the importance of the duty; and
- ensure staff implement the duty effectively.

Working in partnership

17. Prevent work depends on effective partnership. To demonstrate effective compliance with the duty, specified authorities must demonstrate evidence of productive co-operation, in particular with local Prevent co-ordinators, the police and local authorities, and co-ordination through existing multi-agency forums, for example Community Safety Partnerships.

Capabilities

18. Frontline staff who engage with the public should understand what radicalisation means and why people may be vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism as a consequence of it. They need to be aware of what we mean by the term “extremism” and the relationship between extremism and terrorism (see section B, above).

19. Staff need to know what measures are available to prevent people from becoming drawn into terrorism and how to challenge the extremist ideology that can be associated with it. They need to understand how to obtain support for people who may be being exploited by radicalising influences.

20. All specified authorities subject to the duty will need to ensure they provide appropriate training for staff involved in the implementation of this duty. Such training is now widely available.

Sharing information

21. The *Prevent* programme must not involve any covert activity against people or communities. But specified authorities may need to share personal information to ensure, for example, that a person at risk of radicalisation is given appropriate support (for example on the Channel programme). Information sharing must be assessed on a case-by-case basis and is

governed by legislation. To ensure the rights of individuals are fully protected, it is important that information sharing agreements are in place at a local level. When considering sharing personal information, the specified authority should take account of the following:

- necessity and proportionality: personal information should only be shared where it is strictly necessary to the intended outcome and proportionate to it. Key to determining the necessity and proportionality of sharing information will be the professional judgement of the risks to an individual or the public;
- consent: wherever possible the consent of the person concerned should be obtained before sharing any information about them;
- power to share: the sharing of data by public sector bodies requires the existence of a power to do so, in addition to satisfying the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Human Rights Act 1998;
- Data Protection Act and the Common Law Duty of Confidentiality: in engaging with non-public bodies, the specified authority should ensure that they are aware of their own responsibilities under the Data Protection Act and any confidentiality obligations that exist.

22. There may be some circumstances where specified authorities, in the course of *Prevent*-related work, identify someone who may already be engaged in illegal terrorist-related activity. People suspected of being involved in such activity must be referred to the police.

D. Monitoring and enforcement

23. All specified authorities must comply with this duty and will be expected to maintain appropriate records to show compliance with their responsibilities and provide reports when requested.

Central support and monitoring

24. The Home Office currently oversees *Prevent* activity in local areas which have been identified as priorities for this programme, and will provide central monitoring for the new duty. The Home Office shares management (with local authorities) of local *Prevent* co-ordinator teams.

25. The Home Office will:

- draw together data about implementation of *Prevent* from local and regional *Prevent* co-ordinators (including those in health, further and higher education), the police, intelligence agencies and other departments and inspection bodies where appropriate;
- monitor and assess *Prevent* delivery in up to 50 *Prevent* priority areas;
- maintain contact with relevant departments and escalate issues to them and inspectorates where appropriate;
- support the *Prevent* Oversight Board, chaired by the Minister for Immigration and Security, which may agree on further action to support implementation of the duty.

26. Where a specified body is not complying with the duty, the *Prevent* Oversight Board may recommend that the Secretary of State use the power of direction under section 30 of the Act. This power would only be used when other options for engagement and improvement had been exhausted. The power would be used only to ensure the implementation and delivery of the *Prevent* duty. It is also capable of being exercised in respect of Welsh specified authorities, and would be used following consultation with Welsh Ministers.

Inspection regime in individual sectors

27. Central support and monitoring will be supported by existing inspection regimes in specific sectors. Not every specified authority has a suitable inspection regime and in some areas it may be necessary to create or enhance existing regimes.

28. We will work with the Welsh Government on *Prevent* monitoring arrangements and provide support to Welsh inspection regimes as required.

E. Sector-specific guidance

Local authorities

29. With their wide-ranging responsibilities, and democratic accountability to their electorate, local authorities are vital to *Prevent* work. Effective local authorities will be working with their local partners to protect the public, prevent crime and to promote strong, integrated communities.

Specified local authorities

30. The local authorities that are subject to the duty are listed in Schedule 6 to the Act. They are:

- a county council or district council in England;
- the Greater London Authority;
- a London borough council;
- the Common Council of the City of London in its capacity as a local authority;
- the Council of the Isles of Scilly;
- a county council or county borough council in Wales; and
- a person carrying out a function of an authority mentioned in section 1 (2) of the Local Government Act 1999 by virtue of a direction made under section 15 of that Act.

31. Other local authorities, including stand-alone fire and rescue authorities, are not listed in the Act and are not subject to the duty, but it is anticipated, considering their wider prevention role, that in many areas they will be partners in local efforts to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

32. In fulfilling the new duty, local authorities, including elected members and senior officers should be carrying out activity in the following areas.

Partnership

33. Local authorities should establish or make use of an existing local multi-agency group to agree risk and co-ordinate *Prevent* activity.

Many local authorities use Community Safety Partnerships but other multi-agency forums may be appropriate.

34. It is likely that links will need to be made to other statutory partnerships such as Local Safeguarding Children Boards Safeguarding Adults Boards, Channel panels and Youth Offending Teams.

35. It will be important that local or regional *Prevent* co-ordinators have access to senior local authority leadership to give advice and support.

36. We expect local multi-agency arrangements to be put in place to effectively monitor the impact of *Prevent* work.

37. *Prevent* work conducted through local authorities will often directly involve, as well as have an impact on local communities. Effective dialogue and coordination with community-based organisations will continue to be essential.

Risk assessment

38. We expect local authorities to use the existing counter-terrorism local profiles (CTLPs), produced for every region by the police, to assess the risk of individuals being drawn into terrorism. This includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit. Guidance on CTLPs is available here:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/118203/counter-terrorism-local-profiles.pdf

39. This risk assessment should also be informed by engagement with *Prevent* co-ordinators, schools, registered childcare providers, universities, colleges, local prisons, probation services, health, immigration enforcement Youth Offending Teams and others, as well as by a local authority's own knowledge of its area.

40. We would expect local authorities to incorporate the duty into existing policies and procedures, so it becomes part of the day-to-day work of the authority. The duty is likely to be relevant to fulfilling safeguarding responsibilities in that local authorities should ensure that there are clear and robust safeguarding policies to identify children at risk. This guidance should be read in conjunction with other relevant safeguarding guidance, in particular Working Together to Safeguard Children (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-safeguard-children>).

Action plan

41. With the support of co-ordinators and others as necessary, any local authority that assesses, through the multi-agency group, that there is a risk should develop a Prevent action plan. This will enable the local authority to comply with the duty and address whatever risks have been identified.

42. These local action plans will identify, prioritise and facilitate delivery of projects, activities or specific interventions to reduce the risk of people being drawn into terrorism in each local authority. Many of these projects and activities will be community based.

Staff training

43. Local authorities will be expected to ensure appropriate frontline staff, including those of it's contractors, have a good understanding of Prevent are trained to recognise vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism and are aware of available programmes to deal with this issue.

44. Local authority staff will be expected to make appropriate referrals to Channel (a programme which provides support to individuals who are at risk of being drawn into terrorism which is put on a statutory footing by Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015) and ensure that Channel is supported by the appropriate organisation and expertise. Guidance on the Channel programme can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/channel-guidance>

Use of local authority resources

45. In complying with the duty we expect local authorities to ensure that publicly-owned venues and resources do not provide a platform for extremists and are not used to disseminate extremist views. This includes considering whether IT equipment available to the general public should use filtering solutions that limit access to terrorist and extremist material.

46. We expect local authorities to ensure that organisations who work with the local authority on Prevent are not engaged in any extremist activity or espouse extremist views.

47. Where appropriate, we also expect local authorities to take the opportunity when new contracts for the delivery of their services are being made to ensure that the principles of the duty are written in to those contracts in a suitable form.

Collaboration between areas

48. In two-tier areas, county and district councils will need to agree proportionate arrangements for sharing the assessment of risk and for agreeing local *Prevent* action plans. It is expected that neighbouring areas will also agree proportionate arrangements for sharing the assessment of risk and for agreeing local *Prevent* action plans as appropriate.

Prevent priority areas

49. The Home Office will continue to identify priority areas for *Prevent*-related activity. Priority areas will, as now, be funded to employ a local *Prevent* co-ordinator to give additional support and expertise and additional Home Office grant funding is available for *Prevent* projects and activities. The Home Office will continue to have oversight of local *Prevent* co-ordinators and the funding, evaluation and monitoring of these projects.

Other agencies and organisations supporting children

50. A range of private and voluntary agencies and organisations provide services or, in some cases, exercise functions in relation to children. The duty applies to those bodies, which include, for example, children's homes and independent fostering agencies and bodies exercising local authority functions whether under voluntary delegation arrangements or via the use of statutory intervention powers. These bodies should ensure they are part of their local authorities' safeguarding arrangements and that staff are aware of and know how to contribute to *Prevent*-related activity in their area where appropriate.

Out-of-school settings supporting children

51. Many children attend a range of out-of-school settings other than childcare including supplementary schools, and tuition centres to support home education. These settings are not regulated under education law. Local authorities should take steps to understand the range of activity and settings in their areas and take appropriate and proportionate steps to ensure that children attending such settings are properly safeguarded (which should include considering whether children attending such settings are at risk of being drawn into extremism or terrorism). In assessing the risks associated with such settings, local authorities should have regard to whether the settings subscribe to voluntary accreditation schemes and any other evidence about the extent to which the providers are taking steps to safeguard the children in their care. Where safeguarding concerns arise, local authorities should actively consider how to make use of the full range of powers available to them to reduce the risks to children, including relevant planning and health and safety powers.

Monitoring and enforcement

52. In fulfilling its central monitoring role (section D above) the Home Office can (and already does) scrutinise local *Prevent* action plans, project impact and overall performance. It will also consider work with local authority 'peers' to provide targeted assistance and help authorities develop good practice.

53. The Government anticipates that local authorities will comply with this duty and work effectively with local partners to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. Where there are concerns about compliance, the Government may need to consider the appropriateness of using existing mechanisms such as section 10 of the Local Government Act 1999. This allows the Secretary of State to appoint an inspector to assess an authority's compliance with its statutory "best value" duty in relation to one or more of the specified functions.

54. If the Secretary of State is satisfied that a council in England has failed to discharge its "best value" duty in relation to the new *Prevent* duty, it would be open to him to use his powers under Section 15 of the Local Government Act 1999 to intervene. This could include requiring the council to undertake specific actions, appointing Commissioners and transferring some of the council's functions to them. The Secretary of State must consult the council before issuing a direction. The Secretary of State may also direct a local inquiry to be held into the exercise by the authority of specified functions. Welsh Ministers' powers of intervention in relation to a Welsh council that has failed to discharge its "improvement" duties are set out in the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009.

55. If the Secretary of State is satisfied that a local authority is failing to perform any function relating to education, childcare or children's social care to an adequate standard he may use his powers under section 497A or the Education Act 1996 (applied to childcare under section

15(3) of the Children's Act, and children's social care under section 50(1) of the Children Act 2004) to take whatever action is deemed expedient to achieve necessary improvement. In Wales, Welsh Ministers have the power to intervene under the School Standards and Organisation (Wales) Act 2013. These intervention measures are considered in cases where Ofsted inspections (or Estyn in Wales) identify inadequate practice and serious concerns about practice in relation to safeguarding, adoption and looked-after children. The Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) has a role here in terms of care settings and standards.

56. In addition to the powers above, the Act provides the Secretary of State with the power to issue a direction where a local authority has failed to discharge the duty (see paragraph 26, above).

Schools and registered childcare providers (excluding higher and further education).

57. In England about eight million children are educated in some 23,000 publicly-funded and around 2,400 independent schools. The publicly-funded English school system comprises maintained schools (funded by local authorities), and academies (directly funded by central government. In Wales, over 450,000 children attend Local Authority maintained schools, and there are 70 independent schools.¹

58. All publicly-funded schools in England are required by law to teach a broad and balanced curriculum which promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils and prepares them for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of life. They must also promote community cohesion. Independent schools set their own curriculum but must comply with the Independent School Standards, which include an explicit requirement to promote fundamental British values as part of broader requirements relating to the quality of education and to promoting the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils. These standards also apply to academies (other than 16-19 academies), including free schools, as they are independent schools. 16-19 academies may have these standards imposed on them by the provisions of their funding agreement with the Secretary of State.

59. In Wales, independent schools set their own curriculum, but must comply with Independent Schools Standards made by the Welsh Ministers. These Standards also include a requirement to promote the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils.

60. Early years providers serve arguably the most vulnerable and impressionable members of society. The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) accordingly places clear duties on providers to

keep children safe and promote their welfare. It makes clear that to protect children in their care, providers must be alert to any safeguarding and child protection issues in the child's life at home or elsewhere (paragraph 3.4 EYFS). Early years providers must take action to protect children from harm and should be alert to harmful behaviour by other adults in the child's life.

61. Early years providers already focus on children's personal, social and emotional development. The Early Years Foundation Stage framework supports early years providers to do this in an age appropriate way, through ensuring children learn right from wrong, mix and share with other children and value other's views, know about similarities and differences between themselves and others, and challenge negative attitudes and stereotypes.

62. This guidance should be read in conjunction with other relevant guidance. In England, this includes Working Together to Safeguard Children, Keeping Children Safe in Education and Information Sharing: Her Majesty's Government advice for professionals providing safeguarding services to children, young people, parents and carers.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-safeguard-children;](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-safeguard-children)

[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education;](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education)

63. In Wales it should be read alongside Keeping learners safe²:

[http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/150114-keeping-learners-safe.pdf.](http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/150114-keeping-learners-safe.pdf)

64. The authorities specified in paragraph 65 below are subject to the duty to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism. Being drawn into terrorism includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an

¹ Schools Census results on Wales.gov.uk

² Keeping Learners Safe includes advice on radicalisation on page 51

atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit. Schools should be safe spaces in which children and young people can understand and discuss sensitive topics, including terrorism and the extremist ideas that are part of terrorist ideology, and learn how to challenge these ideas. The Prevent duty is not intended to limit discussion of these issues. Schools should, however, be mindful of their existing duties to forbid political indoctrination and secure a balanced presentation of political issues. These duties are imposed on maintained schools by sections 406 and 407 of the Education Act 1996. Similar duties are placed on the proprietors of independent schools, including academies (but not 16-19 academies) by the Independent School Standards.

Education and childcare specified authorities

65. The education and childcare specified authorities in Schedule 6 to the Act are as follows:

- the proprietors³ of maintained schools, non-maintained special schools, maintained nursery schools, independent schools (including academies and free schools) and alternative provision academies⁴
- pupil referral units
- registered early years childcare providers⁵
- registered later years childcare providers⁶
- providers of holiday schemes for disabled children
- persons exercising local authority functions under a direction of the Secretary of State when the local authority is performing inadequately; and
- persons authorised by virtue of an order made under section 70 of the Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994 to exercise a function specified in Schedule 36A to the Education Act 1996.

66. In fulfilling the new duty, we would expect the specified authorities listed above to demonstrate activity in the following areas.

Risk assessment

67. Specified authorities are expected to assess the risk of children being drawn into terrorism, including support for extremist ideas that are part of terrorist ideology. This should be based on an understanding, shared with partners, of the potential risk in the local area.

68. Specified authorities will need to demonstrate that they are protecting children and young people from being drawn into terrorism by having robust safeguarding policies in place to identify children at risk, and intervening as appropriate. Institutions will need to consider the level of risk to identify the most appropriate referral, which could include Channel or Children's Social Care, for example. These policies should set out clear protocols for ensuring that any visiting speakers – whether invited by staff or by children themselves – are suitable and appropriately supervised.

Working in partnership

69. In England, governing bodies and proprietors of all schools and registered childcare providers should ensure that their safeguarding arrangements take into account the policies and procedures of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). In Wales, Local Service Boards provide strategic oversight.

³ Reference in this guidance to the 'proprietor' in the case of a maintained school, maintained nursery school and non-maintained special school is a reference to the governing body of the school.

⁴ Including early years and later years childcare provision in schools that is exempt from registration under the Childcare Act 2006

⁵ Those registered under Chapter 2 or 2a of Part 3 of the Childcare Act 2006, including childminders

⁶ Those registered under Chapter 3 or 2a of Part 3 of the Childcare Act 2006, including childminders

Staff training

70. Specified authorities should make sure that staff have training that gives them the knowledge and confidence to identify children at risk of being drawn into terrorism, and to challenge extremist ideas which can be used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups. They should know where and how to refer children and young people for further help. Prevent awareness training will be a key part of this.

IT policies

71. Specified authorities will be expected to ensure children are safe from terrorist and extremist material when accessing the internet in school, including by establishing appropriate levels of filtering.

Monitoring and enforcement

72. The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) inspects the specified authorities in England listed above, with the exception of some privately funded independent schools. When assessing the effectiveness of schools, Ofsted inspectors already have regard to the school's approach to keeping pupils safe from the dangers of radicalisation and extremism, and what is done when it is suspected that pupils are vulnerable to these. Maintained schools are subject to intervention, and academies and free schools may be subject to termination of their funding agreement, if they are judged by Ofsted to require significant improvement or special measures, or if they fail to take the steps required by their local authority, or for academies or free schools by the Secretary of State pursuant to their funding agreement, as applicable, to address unacceptably low standards, serious breakdowns of management or governance or if the safety of pupils or staff is threatened. In Wales, all publicly funded schools are inspected by Estyn.

73. Ofsted inspects 16-19 academies under the Common Inspection Framework for further education and skills.

74. Privately funded independent schools in England are inspected by Ofsted or one of three independent inspectorates. In Wales, Estyn inspects independent schools. If they fail to meet the Independent School Standards, they must remedy the problem or be subject to regulatory action by the Department for Education or the Welsh Government, which could include de-registration (which would make their continued operation unlawful).

75. Early education funding regulations in England have been amended to ensure that providers who fail to promote the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance for those with different faiths and beliefs do not receive funding from local authorities for the free early years entitlement.

76. Ofsted's current inspection framework for early years provision reflects the requirements in the Statutory Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Further education

77. There is an important role for further education institutions, including sixth form colleges and independent training providers, in helping prevent people being drawn into terrorism, which includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit. It is a condition of funding that all further education and independent training providers must comply with relevant legislation and any statutory responsibilities associated with the delivery of education and safeguarding of learners.

78. There will be further guidance issued on the management of external speakers and events, including on the interaction of the Prevent duty with institutions' existing duty to secure freedom of speech.

79. But it is important to realise that the risk of radicalisation in institutions does not just come from external speakers. Radicalised students can also act as a focal point for further radicalisation through personal contact with fellow students and through their social media activity. Where radicalisation happens off campus, the student concerned may well share his or her issues with other students. Changes in behaviour and outlook may be visible to staff. Much of this section therefore addresses the need for institutions in receipt of public funding to self assess and identify the level of risk, ensure all staff have access to training, and that there is welfare support for students and effective IT policies in place which ensure that these signs can be recognised and responded to appropriately.

Further education specified authorities

80. The further education specified in Schedule 6 to the Act fall into the following categories:

- further education institutions on the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) register of training organisations (ROTO), including sub-contractors which receive more than £100,000 of SFA funding via lead providers. This includes

approximately 950 further education colleges and independent providers – such as private companies and third sector organisations that are eligible to receive public funding from the SFA to deliver education and training and the 93 Sixth Form Colleges and other organisations funded by the Education Funding Agency to deliver post 16 education and training;

- further education institutions in Wales funded by the Welsh Government; and
- private further education institutions who are not in receipt of public funding who may be on the UK Register of Learning Providers and have similar characteristics to those on the register. We define these as institutions that have at least 250 students who are undertaking courses in preparation for examinations which either receive public funding or are regulated by the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation or the Welsh Government.

81. Most institutions already understand their *Prevent*-related responsibilities, especially in the context of ensuring the welfare of learners, staff and visitors, and there are numerous examples of good practice in these areas. As with higher education (see below), compliance with this duty will reflect existing best practice and should not add significant new burdens on institutions. It is to be implemented in a proportionate and risk-based way.

82. To comply with the duty we would expect further education institutions to be delivering in the following ways.

Partnership

83. In complying with this duty we would expect active engagement from governors, boards, principals, managers and leaders with other partners including police and BIS regional higher and further education *Prevent* co-ordinators (details of BIS *Prevent* co-ordinators can be found at www.safecampuscommunities.ac.uk). We would expect institutions to seek to engage and consult students on their plans for implementing the duty.

84. Where the size of an institution warrants, management and co-ordination arrangements should be implemented to share information across the relevant curriculum areas within an institution, with a single point of contact for operational delivery of Prevent-related activity.

Risk assessment

85. Each institution should carry out a risk assessment which assesses where and how students or staff may be at risk of being drawn into terrorism. These policies and procedures will help an institution satisfy itself and government that it is able to identify and support these individuals.

86. We would expect the risk assessment to look at institutional policies regarding the campus and student welfare, including equality and diversity, and the safety and welfare of students and staff. We expect the risk assessment to address the physical management of the institution's estate, including policies and procedures for events held by staff, students or visitors, and relationships with external bodies and community groups who may use premises, or work in partnership with the institution.

87. Institutions must have clear and visible policies and procedures for managing whistle-blowing and complaints. In England, if an individual feels that their complaint has *not* been taken seriously by the college or provider they can raise it with the SFA (for Further Education and Private Providers) or EFA (for sixth form colleges or private providers funded by it).

88. Where an institution has sub-contracted the delivery of courses to other providers, we expect robust procedures to be in place to ensure that the sub-contractor is aware of the Prevent duty and the sub-contractor is not inadvertently funding extremist organisations.

89. In Wales the Safer Working Practice Guidance and assessment process should also be adhered to.

Action Plan

90. Any institution that identifies a risk should notify the relevant BIS *Prevent* co-ordinator and others as necessary (such as the SFA, EFA Welsh Government and the police) and develop a Prevent action plan to set out the actions they will take to mitigate the risks.

Staff Training

91. We would expect institutions to demonstrate that it undertakes appropriate training and development for principals, governors, leaders and staff. This will enable teachers and others supporting delivery of the curriculum to use opportunities in learning to educate and challenge. It will also allow leaders and teachers to exemplify British values in their management, teaching and through general behaviours in institutions, including through opportunities in the further education curriculum. We expect institutions to encourage students to respect other people with particular regard to the protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010.

92. We would expect appropriate members of staff to have an understanding of the factors that make people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism and to challenge extremist ideas which are used by terrorist groups and can purport to legitimise terrorist activity. We define extremism as "vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance for those with different faiths and beliefs. We also include in our definition of extremism calls for the death of members of our armed forces, whether in this country or overseas." Such staff should have sufficient training to be able to recognise this vulnerability and be aware of what action to take in response. This will include an understanding of when to make referrals to the Channel programme and where to get additional advice and support.

93. At a corporate level we would expect the institution to have robust procedures both internally and externally for sharing information about vulnerable individuals. This should include information sharing agreements where possible.

94. As the independent body responsible for standards and quality improvement for further education, the Education and Training Foundation will work with the sector to ensure that appropriate training is available. This will include and draw from training provided through the network of Prevent co-ordinators.

Welfare and pastoral care/chaplaincy support

95. All institutions have a clear role to play in the welfare of their students and we would expect that there to be sufficient pastoral care and support available for all students.

96. As part of this, we would expect the institution to have clear and widely available policies for the use of prayer rooms and other faith-related facilities. These policies should outline structures in place for the managing prayer and faith facilities (for example an oversight committee) and mechanisms for managing any issues arising from the use of the facilities.

IT policies

97. We would expect institutions to have policies relating to the use of their IT equipment. Whilst all institutions will have policies around general usage, covering what is and is not permissible, we would expect that all policies and procedures will contain specific reference to the duty. Many educational institutions already use filtering as a means of restricting access to harmful content, and should consider the use of filters as part of their overall strategy to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

98. Institutions must have clear policies in place for students and staff using IT equipment to research terrorism and counter terrorism in the course of their learning.

99. The Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) can provide specialist advice and support to the FE sector in England to help providers ensure students are safe online and appropriate safeguards are in place. JISC also has a Computer Security Incident Response Team who can provide assistance in the event of an online incident occurring.

Monitoring and enforcement

100. Ofsted inspects publicly funded further education and skills providers in England under the Common Inspection Framework. This inspection is risk-based and the frequency with which providers are inspected depends on this risk. Safeguarding is inspected as part of leadership and management judgement. In Wales the inspection regime is operated by Estyn.

101. Where Ofsted finds a publicly-funded further education institution or independent training provider inadequate intervention action would be taken. In the case of independent providers this is likely to result in their contract being terminated by the Skills Funding Agency. In the case of further education institutions and local authority providers, this would result in the Further Education or Sixth Form College Commissioner making an immediate assessment. This could lead to governance and leadership change, restructuring or even dissolution under the Secretary of State's reserve powers. Under the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 Act, and following intervention action, it would also be possible for the Secretary of State to issue a direction as the ultimate sanction.

102. For those institutions that are not publicly funded, the Secretary of State will have a power to nominate a body to monitor compliance with the duty and undertake risk-based assessments.

Higher education

103. Universities' commitment to freedom of speech and the rationality underpinning the advancement of knowledge means that they represent one of our most important arenas for challenging extremist views and ideologies. But young people continue to make up a disproportionately high number of those arrested in this country for terrorist-related offences and of those who are travelling to join terrorist organisations in Syria and Iraq. Universities must be vigilant and aware of the risks this poses.

104. Some students may arrive at universities already committed to terrorism; others may become radicalised whilst attending university due to activity on campus; others may be radicalised whilst they are at university but because of activities which mainly take place off campus.

105. Radicalisation on campus can be facilitated through events held for extremist speakers. There will be further guidance issued on the management of external speakers and events, including on the interaction of the *Prevent* duty with universities' existing duties to secure freedom of speech and have regard to the importance of academic freedom.

106. But managing the risk of radicalisation in universities is not simply about managing external speakers. Radicalised students can also act as a focal point for further radicalisation through personal contact with fellow students and through their social media activity. Where radicalisation happens off campus, the student concerned may well share his or her issues with other students. Changes in behaviour and outlook may be visible to university staff. Much of this section addresses the need for universities to have the necessary staff training, IT policies and student welfare programmes to recognise these signs and respond appropriately.

Higher education specified authorities

107. The higher education institutions specified in Schedule 6 to the Act fall into two categories:

- the governing body of qualifying institutions within the meaning given by section 11 of the Higher Education Act 2004.
- private higher education institutions that are not in receipt of public funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) or the Higher Education Funding Council Wales (HEFCW) but have similar characteristics to those that are. This includes governing bodies or proprietors of institutions not otherwise listed that have at least 250 students, excluding students on distance learning courses, undertaking courses of a description mentioned in Schedule 6 to the Education Reform Act 1988 (higher education courses).

108. Most of these institutions already have a clear understanding of their *Prevent* related responsibilities. Institutions already demonstrate some good practice in these areas. We do not envisage the new duty creating large new burdens on institutions and intend it to be implemented in a proportionate and risk-based way.

109. Compliance with the *Prevent* duty requires that properly thought through procedures and policies are in place. Having procedures and policies in place which match the general expectations set out in this guidance will mean that institutions are well placed to comply with the *Prevent* duty. Compliance will only be achieved if these procedures and policies are properly followed and applied. This guidance does not prescribe what appropriate decisions would be - this will be up to institutions to determine, having considered all the factors of the case.

110. We would expect universities and higher education institutions to be delivering in the following areas.

Partnership

111. In complying with this duty we would expect active engagement from senior management of the university (including, where appropriate, vice chancellors) with other partners including police and BIS regional higher and further education

Prevent co-ordinators. We would expect institutions to seek to engage and consult students on their plans for implementing the duty.

112. Given the size and complexity of most institutions we would also expect universities to make use of internal mechanisms to share information about *Prevent* across the relevant faculties of the institution. Having a single point of contact for operational delivery of *Prevent*-related activity may also be useful.

113. We would expect institutions to have regular contact with the relevant *Prevent* co-ordinator. These co-ordinators will help universities comply with the duty and can provide advice and guidance on risk and on the appropriate response. The contact details of these co-ordinators are available on the Safe Campus Communities website: www.safecampuscommunities.ac.uk.

Risk assessment

114. Universities will be expected to carry out a risk assessment for their institution which assesses where and how their students might be at risk of being drawn into terrorism. This includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit. Help and support will be available to do this.

115. We would expect the risk assessment to look at institutional policies regarding the campus and student welfare, including equality and diversity and the safety and welfare of students and staff. We would also expect the risk assessment to assess the physical management of the university estate including policies and procedures for events held by staff, students or visitors and relationships with external bodies and community groups who may use premises, or work in partnership with the institution.

Action Plan

116. With the support of co-ordinators, and others as necessary, any institution that identifies a risk should develop a *Prevent* action plan to institution to set out the actions they will take to mitigate this risk.

Staff Training

117. Compliance with the duty will also require the institution to demonstrate that it is willing to undertake *Prevent* awareness training and other training that could help the relevant staff prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and challenge extremist ideas which risk drawing people into terrorism. We would expect appropriate members of staff to have an understanding of the factors that make people support terrorist ideologies or engage in terrorist-related activity. Such staff should have sufficient training to be able to recognise vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism, and be aware of what action to take to take in response. This will include an understanding of when to make referrals to the Channel programme and where to get additional advice and support.

118. We would expect the institution to have robust procedures both internally and externally for sharing information about vulnerable individuals (where appropriate to do so). This should include appropriate internal mechanisms and external information sharing agreements where possible.

119. BIS offers free training for higher and further education staff through its network of regional higher and further education *Prevent* co-ordinators. This covers safeguarding and identifying vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism and can be tailored to suit each institution or group of individuals

Welfare and pastoral care/chaplaincy support

120. Universities have a clear role to play in the welfare of their students and we would expect there to be sufficient chaplaincy and pastoral support available for all students.

21. As part of this, we would expect the institution to have clear and widely available policies for the use of prayer rooms and other faith-related facilities. These policies should outline arrangements for managing prayer and faith facilities (for example an oversight committee) and for dealing with any issues arising from the use of the facilities.

IT policies

122. We would expect universities to have policies relating to the use of university IT equipment. Whilst all institutions will have policies around general usage, covering what is and is not permissible, we would expect these policies to contain specific reference to the statutory duty. Many educational institutions already use filtering as a means of restricting access to harmful content, and should consider the use of filters as part of their overall strategy to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.

123. To enable the university to identify and address issues where online materials are accessed for non-research purposes, we would expect to see clear policies and procedures for students and staff working on sensitive or extremism-related research. Universities UK has provided guidance to help universities manage this, which is available at

[http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Oversight Of SecuritySensitiveResearch Material.aspx](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Oversight%20Of%20SecuritySensitiveResearchMaterial.aspx)

Student unions and societies

124. Institutions should have regard to the duty in the context of their relationship and interactions with student unions and societies. They will need to have clear policies setting out the activities that are or are not allowed to take place on campus and any online activity directly related to the university. The policies should set out what is expected from the student unions and societies in relation to *Prevent* including making clear the need to challenge extremist ideas which risk drawing people into terrorism. We would expect student unions and societies to work closely with their institution and co-operate with the institutions' policies.

125. Student unions, as charitable bodies, are registered with the Charity Commission and subject to charity laws and regulations, including those that relating to preventing terrorism. Student Unions should also consider whether their staff and elected officers would benefit from *Prevent* awareness training or other relevant training provided by the Charity Commission, regional *Prevent* co-ordinators or others.

Monitoring and enforcement

126. The Secretary of State will appoint an appropriate body to assess the bodies' compliance with the *Prevent* duty. A separate monitoring framework will be published setting out the details of how this body will undertake monitoring of the duty.

The health sector

127. Healthcare professionals will meet and treat people who may be vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism. Being drawn into terrorism includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit.

128. The key challenge for the healthcare sector is to ensure that, where there are signs that someone has been or is being drawn into terrorism, the healthcare worker is trained to recognise those signs correctly and is aware of and can locate available support, including the Channel programme where necessary. Preventing someone from being drawn into terrorism is substantially comparable to safeguarding in other areas, including child abuse or domestic violence.

129. There are already established arrangements in place, which we would expect to be built on in response to the statutory duty.

Health specified authorities

130. The health specified authorities in Schedule 6 to the Act are as follows:

- NHS Trusts
- NHS Foundation Trusts

131. NHS England has incorporated *Prevent* into its safeguarding arrangements, so that *Prevent* awareness and other relevant training is delivered to all staff who provide services to NHS patients. These arrangements have been effective and should continue.

132. The Chief Nursing Officer in NHS England has responsibility for all safeguarding, and a safeguarding lead, working to the Director of Nursing, is responsible for the overview and management of embedding the *Prevent* programme into safeguarding procedures across the NHS.

133. Each regional team in the NHS has a Head of Patient Experience who leads on safeguarding in their region. They are responsible for delivery

of the *Prevent* strategy within their region and the health regional *Prevent* co-ordinators (RPCs).

134. These RPCs are expected to have regular contact with *Prevent* leads in NHS organisations to offer advice and guidance.

135. In Wales, NHS Trusts and Health Boards have CONTEST *Prevent* leads and part of multi-agency structures where these are in place. This guidance should be read in conjunction with *Building Partnerships- Staying Safe* issued by the Department of Health and Social Services, which provides advice to healthcare organisations on their role in preventing radicalisation of vulnerable people as part of their safeguarding responsibilities.

136. In fulfilling the duty, we would expect health bodies to demonstrate effective action in the following areas.

Partnership

137. All Sub Regions within the NHS should, under the NHS England Accountability and Assurance Framework, have in place local Safeguarding Forums, including local commissioners and providers of NHS Services. These forums have oversight of compliance with the duty, and ensure effective delivery. Within each area, the RPCs are responsible for promoting *Prevent* to providers and commissioners of NHS services, supporting organisations to embed *Prevent* into their policies and procedures, and delivering training.

138. We would expect there to be mechanisms for reporting issues to the National *Prevent* sub board.

139. We would also expect the *Prevent* lead to have networks in place for their own advice and support to make referrals to the Channel programme.

140. Since April 2013 commissioners have used the NHS Standard Contract for all commissioned services excluding Primary Care, including private and voluntary organisations. Since that time, the Safeguarding section of the contract

has required providers to embed *Prevent* into their delivery of services, policies and training. This should now be bolstered by the statutory duty.

Risk Assessment

141. All NHS Trusts in England have a *Prevent* lead who acts as a single point of contact for the health regional *Prevent* co-ordinators, and is responsible for implementing *Prevent* within their organisation. To comply with the duty, staff are expected, as a result of their training, to recognise and refer those at risk of being drawn into terrorism to the *Prevent* lead who may make a referral to the Channel programme. Regional health *Prevent* co-ordinators are able to provide advice and support to staff as required. In Wales, Health is a member of the Wales Contest Board and similar arrangements are in place.

Staff Training

142. The intercollegiate guidance, *Safeguarding Children and Young people: roles and competences for health care staff* includes *Prevent* information and identifies competencies for all healthcare staff against six levels.

143. The training should allow all relevant staff to recognise vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism, (which includes someone with extremist ideas that are used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups), including extremist ideas which can be used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups, and be aware of what action to take in response, including local processes and policies that will enable them to make referrals to the Channel programme and how to receive additional advice and support.

144. It is important that staff understand how to balance patient confidentiality with the duty. They should also be made aware of the information sharing agreements in place for sharing information with other sectors, and get advice and support on confidentiality issues when responding to potential evidence that someone is being drawn into terrorism, either during informal contact or consultation and treatment.

145. We would therefore expect providers to have in place:

- Policies that include the principles of the *Prevent* NHS guidance and toolkit, which are set out in *Building Partnerships, Staying Safe: guidance for healthcare organisations*, which can be found here:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/215253/dh_131912.pdf

- A programme to deliver *Prevent* training, resourced with accredited facilitators;
- Processes in place to ensure that using the intercollegiate guidance, staff receive *Prevent* awareness training appropriate to their role; and
- Procedures to comply with the *Prevent* Training and Competencies Framework.

Monitoring and enforcement

146. Within the NHS, we expect local safeguarding forums, including local commissioners and providers of NHS Services to have oversight of fulfilling the duty and ensuring effective delivery.

147. Externally, Monitor is the sector regulator for health services in England ensuring that independent NHS Foundation Trusts are well led so that they can provide quality care on a sustainable basis. The Trust Development Authority is responsible for overseeing the performance of NHS Trusts and the Care Quality Commission is the independent health and adult social care regulator that ensures these services provide people with safe, effective and high quality care. In Wales, the Healthcare Inspectorate Wales, and the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales could be considered to provide monitoring arrangements. We will work with the Welsh Government to consider the arrangements in Wales.

148. We are considering whether these internal arrangements are robust enough to effectively monitor compliance with the duty or whether the duty should be incorporated into the remit and inspection regimes of one of the existing health regulatory bodies, or another body.

Prisons and probation

149. As an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is responsible for protecting the public and reducing re-offending through delivery of prison and probation services.

150. There are 122 prisons in England and Wales including 14 prisons operated under contract by private sector organisations. There are around 85,000 prisoners in custody at any one time and 150,000 individuals in custody during a 12 month period.

151. Probation services are delivered by the National Probation Service (NPS), which supervises high-risk and other serious offenders, and 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs), which supervise low and medium-risk offenders. NOMS is currently responsible for around 220,000 offenders under probation supervision, subject either to community sentences or to licence conditions after release from custody.

152. This responsibility for public protection and reducing re-offending gives both prisons and probation services a clear and important role both in working with offenders convicted of terrorism or terrorism-related offences and in preventing other offenders from being drawn into terrorism and the extremist ideas that are used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups.

Criminal justice specified authorities

153. The criminal justice specified authorities listed in Schedule 6 to the Act are as follows:

- prisons and Young Offender Institutions (YOI), including those that are contracted out;
- the under-18 secure estate (under-18 YOI, Secure training centres and Secure care homes;
- secure training centres;
- the National Probation Service; and
- Community Rehabilitation Companies.

Prisons

154. NOMS manages the risk of offenders being drawn into, or reverting to, any form of offending as part of its core business (identifying and managing the risks presented by offenders).

155. To comply with the duty we would expect public and contracted out prisons to carry out activity in the following areas.

Preliminary risk assessment

156. Prisons should perform initial risk assessments on reception, including cell-sharing risk assessments, and initial reception and induction interviews to establish concerns in relation to any form of extremism, be that faith based, animal rights, environmental, far right, far left extremism or any new emerging trends.

157. Contact with prisons chaplaincy should take place, as an integral part of the induction process. Any concerns raised as a result of chaplaincy contact with prisoners, including any concerns about extremism, should be reported throughout the sentence.

158. Prisoners should have regular contact with trained staff who will report on behaviours of concern.

159. Appropriate information and intelligence sharing should take place, for example with law enforcement partners, to understand whether extremism is an issue and to identify and manage any behaviours of concern.

Assessing ongoing risk and interventions

160. For offenders convicted of terrorist or terrorist-related offences, mainstream offender management processes will be used to determine whether interventions are necessary. These are intended to challenge the index offence and can include, where appropriate, intervention disruption and relocation.

161. Where concerns around someone being drawn into terrorism (which includes someone with extremist ideas that are used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups) are identified, either during the early days in

custody or later, prison staff should report accordingly, through the intelligence reporting system. All such reporting should be regularly assessed by specialist staff in conjunction with the police.

162. Where such concerns are identified an establishment should look to support that individual. This could take the form of moving them away from a negative influence or providing them with mentoring from the relevant chaplain providing religious classes or guidance.

163. Management actions could also include a reduction in privilege level, anti-bullying intervention, adjudication or segregation. Alternatively, it may be appropriate to provide theological, motivational and behavioural interventions.

164. Intelligence and briefing packages targeted at staff working with terrorist and extremist prisoners and those at risk of being drawn into terrorism should continue to be made available and delivered. These should continue to be jointly delivered by appropriately trained prison staff and police, and will be updated as required. In complying with this duty, extremism awareness training provided to new staff should be increased.

Transition from custody to supervision in the community

165. Pre-release planning should take place for all prisoners, including those subject to sentences less than 12 months, who will now receive some level of post-release supervision. Prisons, probation providers and the police should consider what risks need to be managed in the community including those that have arisen whilst in custody and indicate a vulnerability to being drawn into terrorism. Where this is the case, a Channel referral will be considered as part of the risk management plans and a referral to Channel made at the earliest opportunity where appropriate.

166. For offenders already convicted of terrorism or terrorism-related offences, prisons will complete appropriate pre-release processes such as Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) with relevant agencies including the police and the NPS. These processes ensure that the requirements of the duty are met in the management of terrorist offenders in the community with the NPS the lead agency in MAPPA for such cases.

167. For all prisoners, where sufficient remaining sentence time permits, a formal multi-agency meeting which includes the police and the probation counter terrorism lead, should take place to inform decisions after release. This will ensure that partner agencies work together to share relevant information and put provision in place to manage the risk or any outstanding concerns. This can apply to periods of Release on Temporary Licence, Home Detention Curfew as well as eventual release on licence.

168. Where insufficient time remains, police and probation staff should be given fast time briefing by prison counter-terrorism staff as above and the National Probation Service CT lead will ensure the probation provider in the community is aware of the information, the risks and relevant personnel within partner agencies.

Staff training

169. In complying with the duty, we would expect all new prison staff to receive Prevent awareness training (tailored specifically to the prison environment). For staff already in post, this should be provided through specialist training and briefing packages that cover working with extremist behaviour. This training can be delivered in partnership with the police and be available to those members of staff who work most closely with terrorist and identified extremist prisoners. All staff should have an understanding of general intelligence systems, reporting and procedures to enable them to report on extremist prisoners and those vulnerable to extremist messaging.

Under-18 secure estate

170. The under-18 secure estate differs in terms of governance and service provision to that of the prisons and probation services for adults.

171. The Youth Justice Board (YJB) has a statutory responsibility to commission secure services for children and young people under the age of 18 and has a statutory duty to place children and young people sentenced or remanded by the courts into secure establishments.

The under -18 secure estates consists of:

- **Secure Children's Homes (SCHs)**
Secure children's homes are run by local authority children's services, overseen by the Department of Health and the Department for Education. They have a high ratio of staff to young people and are generally small facilities, ranging in size from six to forty beds.
- **Secure Training Centres (STC)**
Secure training centres are purpose-built centres for young offenders up to and including the age of 17. They are run by private operators under contracts, which set out detailed operational requirements. There are currently three STCs in England.
- **Young Offender Institutions (YOI)**
Young offender institutions are facilities run by both the Prison Service and the private sector and can accommodate 15 to 21-year-old male offenders.

172. We would expect that staff at each secure estate and Youth Offending Teams (YOT) overseeing the care of the child or young person would receive appropriate training in identifying and managing those at risk of being drawn into terrorism.

173. As part of the ongoing care and monitoring of each child or young person, any indication of risk should be identified and a referral made to Channel if appropriate

Probation

174. To comply with the duty we would expect all providers of probation services, particularly the National Probation Service (NPS) and Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) to demonstrate that they are delivering activities under all of the following categories.

Leadership

175. We would expect every NPS division to have a designated probation counter-terrorism lead (PCTL) to provide the leadership necessary at a regional level to ensure processes for identifying, assessing and managing high-risk terrorist offenders are followed. We would expect PCTLs to provide a consultative role to CRCs.

Partnerships

176. In all partnership working we would expect that all providers of probation services will comply with the duty; for example both the NPS and CRCs are partners in local Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). Active participation in CSPs will enable all probation providers to work together with other partners to share information and develop joint referrals and interventions.

Risk assessment

177. We would expect probation staff to adopt an investigative stance in undertaking risk assessments as they should in all cases. Where there are concerns, albeit these may be intelligence led, about someone being at risk of being drawn into terrorism this should initially be recorded in the core risk assessment.

178. Additionally, we would expect existing risk assessment processes to be supplemented by specialist assessments, for example, extremism risk screening. We would expect PCTLs to provide a consultative role to CRCs in doing this, where appropriate.

179. For offenders already convicted of terrorist or terrorist-related offences we would expect the NPS to work in partnership with other agencies, including prisons and the police, to

manage any risks identified via MAPPA and to provide bespoke interventions where relevant. For offenders who have not been convicted of a terrorism-related offence and may not be MAPPA eligible, but who are subsequently at risk of being drawn into terrorism, we would expect probation providers to have processes in place to escalate these cases to other agencies or otherwise refer the offender for appropriate interventions – for example to the Channel programme.

Staff training

180. We would expect probation providers to ensure that all staff receive appropriate training in identifying and managing those at risk of being drawn into terrorism including those with extremist ideas that can be used to legitimise terrorism and are shared by terrorist groups. *Prevent* awareness training has already been given to probation staff in recent years. In complying with the duty, we expect this and other relevant *Prevent* training to continue.

181. In the future, we expect *Prevent* awareness training to be included within the Probation Qualification Framework, which is completed by all newly qualified probation staff in both the NPS and CRCs. In addition PCTLs should lead the development of, for example, faith awareness or Extremism Risk Screening training of local training and staff development to supplement the *Prevent* awareness training. This should focus on emerging issues and any new support and interventions that become available.

Monitoring and enforcement for prisons and probation

182. Within prisons, we would expect compliance with the duty to be monitored and enforced internally by:

- mandatory compliance with Prison Service Instructions and Orders which define policy and best practice; and
- regular assessment of levels and risk of extremism and radicalisation internally via regional counter-terrorism co-ordinators.

183. Externally, our preference is to use existing inspection regimes where appropriate to do so. We consider that a thematic inspection by HM Inspector of Prisons could be a useful addition to the monitoring arrangements outlined above.

184. For probation providers, internally, we would expect compliance with the duty to be reinforced by detailed operational guidance set out in Probation Instructions. CRCs are contractually required to comply with the mandatory actions in relevant Probation Instructions and a similar requirement exists for the NPS in Service Level Agreements. Compliance with Probation Instructions is monitored and assured internally by contract management and audit functions within NOMS and the Ministry of Justice

185. Externally, we consider that a thematic inspection by HM Inspector of Probation could be a useful addition to the monitoring arrangement outlined above.

186. The YJB monitors the flow of young people through the Youth Justice system identifying the needs and behaviours of young offenders working closely with local partners to improve the support available.

The police

187. The police play an essential role in most aspects of *Prevent* work alongside other agencies and partners. They hold information which can help assess the risk of radicalisation and disrupt people engaged in drawing others into terrorism (which includes not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit). The Police work alongside other sectors in this document to play a galvanising role in developing local *Prevent* partnerships and bring together a wide range of other organisations to support local delivery of *Prevent*.

188. The police are uniquely placed to tackle terrorism and whilst it is acknowledged that the Police Service will designate dedicated *Prevent* roles within Policing, a key objective for the police is to ensure that *Prevent* is embedded into all aspects of policing including patrol, neighbourhood and safeguarding functions. In fulfilment of their duties consideration must be given to the use of all suitable police resources, not just those specifically designed as *Prevent*.

Police specified authorities

189. The police specified authorities listed in Schedule 6 to the Act are as follows:

- police forces in England and Wales;
- Police and Crime Commissioners;
- the British Transport Police;
- port police forces; and
- the Civil Nuclear Police Authority

190. In fulfilling the new duty we would expect the police to take action in the following areas.

Prosecute, disrupt and deter extremists

191. In complying with the duty, police should engage and where appropriate disrupt extremist activity, in partnership with other agencies. We expect the police to prioritise projects to

disrupt terrorist and extremist material on the internet and extremists working in this country. Officers should consider the full range of investigative and prosecution options when it comes to disrupting extremist behaviour, including the use of public order powers where appropriate. This may include:

- Enforcing terrorist proscription and public order legislation;
- Working with local authorities to consider municipal powers, including local highways and leafleting by-laws, using safeguarding of young people legislation;
- Advising other specified authorities, for example local authorities or universities, to develop venue booking processes and good practice;
- Lawfully disrupting or attending events involving extremist speakers in both private and municipal establishments;
- Providing high visibility police presence at relevant events in public places.

Supporting vulnerable individuals

192. *Prevent* requires a multi-agency approach to protect people at risk from radicalisation. When vulnerable individuals are identified the police will undertake the following:

- In partnership with other agencies including the local authority, consider appropriate interventions, including the Channel programme, to support vulnerable individuals;
- Work in partnership with and support Channel Panels chaired by local authorities to co-ordinate Channel partners and Channel actions;
- Support existing, and identify potential new Intervention Providers.

Partnership and risk assessment

193. The police should:

- Engage fully with the local multi-agency groups that will assess the risk of people being drawn into terrorism, providing (where appropriate) details of the police counter-terrorism local profile (CTLTP);
- Support the development and implementation by the multi agency group of a Prevent action plan to address that risk;
- Support local authority Prevent co-ordinators, regional further and higher education co-ordinators, regional health Prevent leads and regional NOMS Prevent co-ordinators in carrying out their work;
- Co-ordinate the delivery of the Channel programme by accepting referrals, including acting as a conduit for Channel referrals with partners; and
- Ensure Prevent considerations are fully embedded into counter-terrorism investigations.

194. The success of Prevent work relies on communities supporting efforts to prevent people being drawn into terrorism and challenging the extremist ideas that are also part of terrorist ideology. The police have a critical role in helping communities do this. To comply with the duty, we would expect the police, to support others including local authorities, to build community resilience by:

- Supporting local authority Prevent Coordinators in developing Prevent-related projects and action plans;

- Supporting the Charity Commission in providing guidance to avoid money being inadvertently given to organisations which may endorse extremism or terrorism and enforcing legislation where fraud offences are identified.
- Supporting opportunities to develop community challenges to extremists; and
- Collate and analyse community tension reporting across the UK that enables police and partners to identify and respond to emerging concerns.

Monitoring and enforcement

195. The Strategic Policing Requirement makes clear that Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) and Chief Constables must demonstrate that they have contributed to the government's counter terrorism strategy (CONTEST). This includes the Prevent programme, where they are required to take into account the need to identify and divert those involved in or vulnerable to radicalisation. The Home Secretary can direct a PCC to take specific action to address a specific failure.

196. HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) is the statutory body for inspecting the police. They can carry out thematic inspections and can be asked to inspect a particular force or theme by the Home Secretary.

F. Glossary of terms

‘Having due regard’ means that the authorities should place an appropriate amount of weight on the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism when they consider all the other factors relevant to how they carry out their usual functions.

‘Extremism’ is defined in the 2011 Prevent strategy as vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs. We also include in our definition of extremism calls for the death of members of our armed forces, whether in this country or overseas.

‘Interventions’ are projects intended to divert people who are being drawn into terrorist activity. Interventions can include mentoring, counselling, theological support, encouraging civic engagement, developing support networks (family and peer structures) or providing mainstream services (education, employment, health, finance or housing).

‘Non-violent extremism’ is extremism, as defined above, which is not accompanied by violence.

‘Prevention’ in the context of this document means reducing or eliminating the risk of individuals becoming involved in terrorism. Prevent includes but is not confined to the identification and referral of those at risk of being drawn into terrorism into appropriate interventions. These interventions aim to divert vulnerable people from radicalisation.

‘Radicalisation’ refers to the process by which a person comes to support terrorism and extremist ideologies associated with terrorist groups.

‘Safeguarding’ is the process of protecting vulnerable people, whether from crime, other forms of abuse or (in the context of this document) from being drawn into terrorist-related activity.

The current UK definition of **‘terrorism’** is given in the Terrorism Act 2000 (TACT 2000). In summary this defines terrorism as an action that endangers or causes serious violence to a person/people; causes serious damage to property; or seriously interferes or disrupts an electronic system. The use or threat must be designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public and is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause.

‘Terrorist-related offences’ are those (such as murder) which are not offences in terrorist legislation, but which are judged to be committed in relation to terrorism.

‘Vulnerability’ describes the condition of being capable of being injured; difficult to defend; open to moral or ideological attack. Within Prevent, the word describes factors and characteristics associated with being susceptible to radicalisation.

This page is left intentionally blank

SAFER BROMLEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 10.00 am on 16 June 2015

Present:

Chris Hafford ((Borough Commander)) (Chairman)
 Nigel Davies ((LBB Executive Director, Environmental and Community Services)) (Vice-Chairman)
 Councillor Kate Lymer, Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety)
 Anne Ball, (Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime)
 Louise Hubbard, (National Probation Service, London)
 Lissa Moore, (Croydon and Bromley Community Rehabilitation Company)
 Paula Morrison, (LBB Assistant Director, Public Health)
 Rob Vale, LBB Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety
 Superintendent David Tait (Bromley Police)
 Susie Clark (LBB Communications)

Also Present:

Terry Belcher, Safer Neighbourhood Board

1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	Action
	Apologies were received from Clare Elcombe Webber, Daniel Cartwright and from Kay Weiss.	
2	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING	Action
	The notes of the last meeting held on 16 th April 2015 were received. It was AGREED that the minutes be approved.	
3	MATTERS ARISING	Action
	Report CSD 15076 The Board noted the Matters Arising report and that a verbal update on Gangs would be provided at the meeting by the acting Deputy Borough Commander— Superintendent David Tait. With respect to IOM, it was noted that Probation Services were in need of administrative support. The Group were updated concerning the current allocation of MOPAC funding. It was the case that £400k had been allocated, and was fully committed. The funding was currently allocated to domestic abuse, communications, initiatives to deal with ASB such as Operation Crystal, and to the Lawyers Service. It was also noted that we were half way through the funding cycle.	

	<p>The Board heard that the way the funding was allocated could be reprofiled, but that all funds were currently allocated. It was the case that currently no funds had been allocated to support IOM. The lack of funding was frustrating IOM practioners who were in dire need of administrative support, and of other funding that could be used as a contingency fund to help support offenders in various ways; this could include money for basic needs such as clothes, food and bus passes.</p> <p>It was suggested that admin support for IOM could take the form of a part time post. It was also noted that currently LBB Community Safety had no administrative support. It was anticipated that the officer in question would be back with LBB in the new year, and that it may be possible to allocate one day per week to IOM support.</p> <p>Mr Nigel Davies (Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services) agreed that he would look at the issue of reprofiling MOPAC funding with the Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety, and also would investigate to see if there were any other funding pools that could be used.</p> <p>Louise Hubbard (Probation Services) felt that whatever funding was resourced should be allocated to providing administrative support for co-ordination as a priority, as there was an urgent need for strategic support for practioners. The Group were informed that the National IOM Board meeting was scheduled for the 9th July 2015. In view of this, it was the general consensus that a solution to the problem of administrative support be resolved before that date.</p> <p>Anne Ball (MOPAC) informed the Board that MOPAC would be running IOM workshops in the near future. The workshops would be for practioners, and the training would provide guidance around data analysis. Anne would confirm the dates in due course.</p> <p>Cllr Kate Lymer gave an update concerning the Safer Neighbourhood Board (SNB). It was noted that there was currently an underspend of £4.5K; there was going to be a meeting on the 23rd June 2015 to see how this money could be spent. A resident's survey would help to steer funding allocation. Bids for funding would be submitted to MOPAC by the 30th June 2015.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>(1) A solution to the problem of no administrative support for Probation Services and IOM be looked at urgently, and that a solution be found by the 9th July 2015;</p> <p>(2) Details of MOPAC workshops for IOM practioners around data analysis be forwarded by Anne Ball in due course.</p>	<p>ND/RV</p> <p>AB</p>
--	--	------------------------

4	CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE	Action
	<p>The Chairman's update was provided by the Borough Commander, Chris Hafford.</p> <p>It was noted that there was only seven months to go until the end of MOPAC 7. The MOPAC 7 monthly offence volume for Bromley between March 12th 2015 and May 15th 2015 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burglary offences had decreased from 347 to 250 • Criminal Damage offences had decreased from 196 to 189 • Robbery offences had decreased from 54 to 34 • Theft of Motor Vehicles had decreased from 183 to 108 • Theft from Person had decreased from 23 to 20 • Theft of Motor Vehicles had increased from 65 to 79 • Violence with Injury had increased from 137 to 153 <p>Bromley Police were three weeks into Operation Omega which was a 60 day plan aiming to place more police officers on the street to combat MOPAC 7 crime. This was a MET wide initiative.</p> <p>The Borough Commander reminded the Group that Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (The Police Commissioner) was coming to Bromley Central Library on Wednesday 24th June at 6.30pm to speak and to answer questions.</p> <p>The Borough Commander mentioned the new BBC documentary that aired at 21.00 on Mondays; The MET: Policing London. It was noted that this was not a documentary controlled by the Police, but by the BBC. The Borough Commander was pleased with the unbiased and factual content of the documentary, and noted the coverage of the Notting Hill Carnival and the Marc Duggan case.</p> <p>Lissa Moore (Croydon and Bromley Community Rehabilitation Company) asked if surveys had been carried out to assess the fear of crime in Bromley. Susie Clark (LBB Communications) stated that surveys had been carried out in the past, but not recently. It was the case that many people regarded Bromley as a safe shopping environment, and that there was evidence that people were travelling into Bromley from other areas to shop as they felt safe.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the Chairman's update be noted.</p>	
5	UPDATE ON THE SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD BOARD	Action
	<p>The Safer Neighbourhood Board update was provided by Cllr Kate Lymer.</p> <p>It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled for the following</p>	

	<p>week, and that Mr Terry Belcher was the Vice Chairman, and Cllr Tim Stevens was still in place as the Chairman.</p> <p>A stall was planned for the “Big O” festival that was scheduled to take place in Priory Gardens on the 4th July. The next public meeting would be held in Biggin Hill on the 1st July, and the acting deputy Borough Commander (Davit Tait) would be speaking. It was also expected that the new fire station manager at Biggin Hill would also be speaking.</p> <p>Cllr Lymer highlighted what she perceived to be a lack of communication in the Biggin Hill area between the police and the fire service, but this matter had now been resolved. It was also noted that the police and fire service were looking at the possibility of joint visits to schools. It was hoped that the fire brigade operating at Biggin Hill airport would be available to speak at the meeting in Biggin Hill.</p> <p>Finally, Cllr Lymer informed the Board that the SNB had recently conducted a survey around resident’s perception of crime. It was noted that many residents did not consider crime in Bromley to be a big problem. Areas of possible concern were identified as burglary, robbery and problems in the town centre at night time.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the update on the Safer Neighbourhood Board be noted.</p>	
6	<p>PRESENTATION ON PROBATION SERVICES AND COMMUNITY REHABILITATION COMPANIES</p> <p>The presentation was done jointly by Louise Hubbard and Lissa Moore.</p> <p>Louise Hubbard (NPS London- Head of Bexley, Bromley & Greenwich and Extremism & Hate Crime) commenced the presentation with a focus on the National Probation Service.</p> <p>The Board heard that the new Probation Delivery Model was introduced on the 1st June 2014. The Transformation Programme was aimed to continue protection against serious offenders, whilst at the same time, aiming to reduce the rate of serial reoffending by low and medium risk offenders, and look at mentoring and rehabilitation. It also opened up the Probation Service to competition. Under the new guidelines, high risk and MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements) offenders would still be dealt with the National Probation Service (NPS), whilst medium and low risk offenders would be dealt with by Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRC’s). As the name suggests, a primary function of the CRC’s would be looking at offender integration and rehabilitation, whilst the NPS would have more of an advisory and protective function.</p>	Action

The Group were informed that it was the NPS who would identify which offenders were suitable to be dealt with by the CRC's. This would usually take place at the court or at the point of transition from youth to adult services. It was explained to the Group that the NPS remained in the Public Sector under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice, whilst the CRC's were private companies.

Louise Hubbard explained to the Group that it was the function of the NPS to advise courts concerning sentencing, and that any advice from the NPS would be free of any commercial bias. The NPS would also provide advice to the Parole Board.

Ms Hubbard provided a concise overview of the NPS as follows:

- Providing reports and advice to Courts and Parole Boards
- The management of high risk offenders and MAPPA clients
- Dealing with breaches of orders beyond the first warning
- Managing changes in the risk of harm
- Managing Approved Premises
- Liaison with victims and keeping them informed in accordance with statutory guidelines
- Managing sex offender programmes

Ms Hubbard outlined the main aim of the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 (ORA). The Act stipulates that anyone who has been sentenced to a custodial term of more than one day would receive at least 12 months of supervision after release, again the emphasis was on rehabilitation. Many of these individuals were being dealt with by the CRC's.

Ms Hubbard informed the Group that:

- The NPS worked in partnership with CRC's, the MPS, and Community Safeguarding Boards.
- The NPS was likely to provide officer support to Youth Offending Teams
- The NPS would advise the Youth Management Board
- The NPS would aid in the transition process from CRC to NPS
- Both NPS and CRC's sit on Safeguarding Boards
- The NPS sit in on DHR (Domestic Homicide Review) cases.

The CRC update was provided by Lissa Moore--Assistant Chief Officer - Croydon and Bromley CRC.

Ms Moore explained that on February 1st 2015, the transfer of ownership of the London Community Rehabilitation Company, to MTCnovo was completed.

MTCnovo was a new venture between the third, public and private

sector, established to provide rehabilitation services across London and the Thames Valley from February 2015.

It was further explained that MTCnovo was a joint venture involving:

MTC (Management Training Corporation) – a private company

Novo – a consortium with public, private and third sector shareholders including:

RISE – a probation staff community interest company

A Band of Brothers – a charity

The Manchester College – a public sector education provider

Thames Valley Partnership – a charity

Amey – a private company.

Ms Moore informed the Group that the London CRC was the largest, with 25,000 cases—500 of these in Bromley. She explained that CRC's had been set up to deal with the reoffending rates of medium and low risk offenders who had been sentenced to under 12 months in custody. They did not manage serious offenders or MAPPA clients.

The emphasis was on integration of offenders and reducing re-offending rates by various means:

- Facilitating Resettlement
- Mentoring
- Integrated Offender Management
- Restorative Justice
- Offender Programmes

Ms Moore informed the Group that the CRC structure was changing in the near future. Instead of dealing with boroughs, the CRC would instead be dealing with demographic cohorts. To facilitate this, a new Operations Centre in Newcastle had been set up, and new IT systems were being introduced that would provide greater efficiencies. Community Payback would feed into all the cohorts. There was an October deadline for moving into the new cohort structure.

Superintendent David Tait asked Ms Moore who the police would talk to under the new CRC structure, and if managers were being dispensed with to save money. Ms Moore responded that managers were still required, and were not being dispensed with to save money; money would be saved through the sale of Estates. There would be a dedicated IOM officer allocated to each borough for the police to speak to.

The Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services asked how LBB could tap in to Community Payback under the current arrangements and Lissa Moore promised to provide the relevant

	<p>information to the Director. The LBB Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety stated that it was important for the Group to engage with Community Payback.</p> <p>The LBB Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety enquired what the CRC performance drivers were, and how both services were performing. Lissa Moore answered that the main driver was to reduce reoffending and that local and national data would be available. Ms Hubbard added that the problem was that re-offending data was often not up to date, and that it would be better if real time data was available. Mr Vale felt that it would be good to see data on how individual investment in a person's rehabilitation benefited the individual, and the resultant social and economic benefits.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>(1) Lissa Moore would provide the contact details that LBB required to engage with Community Payback</p> <p>(2) Following from (1) above, LBB would engage with Community Payback</p>	<p>LM</p> <p>LBB</p>
7	<p>REVIEW OF SBP INITIATIVES AND OPERATIONS</p> <p>An overview was provided on the latest developments concerning Operation Crystal.</p> <p>A new operation had been launched to target crimes against the elderly, and this was Operation Sterling.</p> <p>An operation had also been launched to target courier fraud.</p> <p>Police and Trading Standards had been working with Banks to increase awareness of bank fraud targeting the elderly and vulnerable.</p> <p>It was hoped that a report on the work with Banks could be brought to the December 2015 meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that a joint meeting would be held between the GP&L Committee and the Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee on the 14th July 2015 at 6.30pm. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the problems with the night time economy in Beckenham and Bromley, and the Police would be attending. An update on this meeting would be brought to the SBP in September.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>(1) A report on the work done by the Police and Trading Standards with Banks be brought to a future SBP meeting</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>DT/RV</p>

	(2) It was agreed that an update on the joint meeting of the 14th July be brought to the September SBP meeting	TBC
8	REVIEW OF SBP STRATEGY AND THE REVISED STRATEGY DOCUMENT	Action
	<p>It was noted that the work on the SBP Strategy Document was ongoing.</p> <p>It was anticipated that the document would be ready for the next meeting of the SBP in September 2015.</p> <p>It was AGREED that work on the revised SBP Strategy Document be prioritised, and presented to the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group Members at the meeting in September 2015</p>	RV
9	UPDATE ON NEW PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCES	Action
	<p>A brief update on New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) was provided by Mr Rob Vale.</p> <p>It was noted that LBB and the Police were considering action against a premises in Anerley.</p> <p>The Group were reminded that following the election, a Bill was now being processed for a blanket ban on NPS substances. The new Bill would allow for criminal sanctions that included fines and up to seven years in prison, as well as civil sanctions.</p> <p>The previous action against “Skunkworks” in Orpington had been highlighted in the Safer Bromley News. Mr Vale felt that LBB and Bromley Police would be well placed to enforce the new legislation. There had been positive feedback from both local residents and businesses concerning the action taken against “Skunkworks”, and Mr Vale praised the good work undertaken by the Police.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the Group note the NPS update, and that any further developments concerning the premises in Anerley be reported to the Group in due course.</p>	RV
10	REPORTS FROM SUB-GROUPS	Action
11	Domestic Abuse Sub Group Update	Action
	The Lead for the Domestic Abuse Sub Group (Clare Elcombe Webber) sent apologies and provided a written document that was tabled to update the Strategic Group.	

	<p>The main points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bromley Domestic Abuse and VAWG Steering Group met last on the 25th March 2015 • The required action plan arising from the last Domestic Homicide Review was 19 months overdue because of a lack of response from some partner agencies • A tabled list of those invited to the Steering Group was provided • Ms Webber requested assistance from the Strategic Group in addressing the lack of commitment from partner agencies, and in revising group membership and scope if required • The date for the next meeting of the Steering Group had not been finalised. <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>(1) The Domestic Abuse Sub Group report be noted</p> <p>(2) The Borough Commander would contact relevant groups or organisations that had not been engaging with the Bromley Domestic Abuse and VAWG Steering Group to encourage participation and support.</p>	CH
12	<p>Youth Offending Sub Group Update</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Kay Weiss who was the Lead for the Youth Offending Sub Group.</p> <p>The Group were made aware that a meeting of the Youth Offending Service Management Board had taken place the previous day, to formulate an action plan that could be approved by the Inspectorate.</p> <p>It was noted that consideration be applied concerning how Ms Weiss would feed into the SBP Strategic Group.</p> <p>Louise Hubbard felt that the YOS Police should talk to the National Probation Service Board to understand how both parties could interface and work together. It would also be relevant to consider when the IOM Model should be used when dealing with the 17+ cohort.</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder informed the Group that a “triple” meeting was being planned for July 22nd 2015. The meeting was a combined one involving:</p>	Action

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Education PDS Committee • Care Services PDS Committee • Public Protection & Safety PDS Committee <p>The meeting was being convened to debate the Youth Offending Team Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Ms Hubbard made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough detail was being made available to understand decisions being made • Were Members of the Group being given the information that they needed to fulfil their obligations • It was important to have a detailed strategic plan, and for the Strategic Document to be completed <p>It was Agreed that the Youth Offending Sub Group Update be noted.</p>	
13	<p>Gangs Sub Group Update</p> <p>The Gangs Sub Group Update was given by Superintendent David Tait.</p> <p>It was noted that the Gangs Sub Group had met on the 27th May 2015 at Bromley Police Station.</p> <p>The Gangs Sub Group consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Tait—Bromley Police • Peter Sibley—LBB Anti-Social Behaviour and Gangs Lead Officer • Barbara Godfrey—Oxley NHS Trust • Pat Jennings—LBB Youth Offending Services Manager • Jane Bailey—LBB Assistant Director of Education • Kevin Clarke—Bromley Police • Kay Weiss—LBB AD of Children’s Safeguarding and Social Care • Sara Bowrey—LBB AD Housing Needs <p>Superintendent Tait explained to the Board that the main driver for the formation of the Gangs Sub Group was the Peer Review report on Gangs that had come from the Home Office. An action plan had been formulated from the recommendations of the report, and 15 actions had been identified to progress—some of these had already been undertaken. The 15 action points had been detailed in a report tabled</p>	<p>Action</p>

by Superintendent Tait at the meeting. Actions that had already been progressed included the mapping of gang activity and the increase the size of the Police Gangs Unit, and challenging the behaviour of young people where appropriate.

Superintendent Tait had formulated a strategy for dealing with gangs, and the key aspects of this strategy were:

- Prevention
- Intervention
- Enforcement
- Leadership
- Co-ordination

It had been decided that Jane Bailey would lead on Prevention; Pat Jennings on Intervention; Davit Tait on enforcement and that the Gangs Sub Group would collectively own Leadership and Co-ordination.

Superintendent Tait briefed the Group concerning an organisation that he had contacted called Growing Against Violence (GAV). GAV was the largest serious violence prevention initiative of its kind in the UK. It was a public health and safety programme, delivering evidence based preventative education sessions. It provided age appropriate sessions delivered universally to students in school years 6 through to 10.

A document had been tabled by Superintendent Tait that outlined the GAV curriculum:

1. Friends vs Friendly (Year 6)
2. Gangs: Myths v Realities (Year 7)
3. Knives: Choices and Consequences (Year 7)
4. Anti-Social Media: What happens online can hurt you offline (Year8/9)
5. Stop & Search (Year 8/9)
6. Girls, Gangs & Consequences (Year 10)
7. Parent and Family Session
8. Professional Session

The Group heard that GAV had been approached for quotation, and the full package was costed at £10k. It was felt however, that the full, package was not required, and that a package estimated at £7K would be sufficient. The Police would be able to contribute £2k, which would leave the rest of the SBP Strategic Group to find the remaining £5K. It was expected that 600 young people would be targeted in the right areas and ages. Superintendent Tait was strongly in favour of going ahead and using GAV.

	<p>The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services asked what overlap there may be with the “Prevent Programme”, which was a programme designed to prevent the radicalisation of young people to Islamic fundamentalism. The Superintendent felt that there would not be significant overlap. The Group agreed in principle to use the services of GAV, and to source the remaining funding required. Lisa Moore suggested that the St Giles Trust and “Catch 22” may be able to be approached to assist with funding.</p> <p>Anne Ball (MOPAC) informed the Group that MOPAC would be looking to fund a “Gangs Exit Service” in July. Ms Ball promised to forward details of the bidding process to the Group in due course.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>(1) The SBP Strategic Group would seek to employ the services of GAV to aid in the work against Gangs in Bromley</p> <p>(2) Anne Ball from MOPAC would forward details to the Group concerning the Gangs Exit Programme that was going to be funded by MOPAC.</p>	<p>GROUP</p> <p>AB</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>Offender Management Sub Group Update</p> <p>Ms Lissa Moore provided the Integrated Offender Management Sub Group Update. She reminded the SBP that Integrated Offender Management was the term used to describe an overarching framework for bringing together agencies in local areas to prioritise interventions with offenders who cause crime in their locality. It was the case that the (IOMSG) was a subgroup of The Safer Bromley Partnership Board. The Safer Bromley Partnership Board acted as the statutory Community Safety Partnership for Bromley as stipulated by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and subsequent 2009 review.</p> <p>The IOM subgroup was due to meet in July, and there would be updates from the police and from practitioners.</p> <p>It was the case that currently 100 individuals had been allocated to the IOM scheme, and there were “ragged”. KPI’s were being formulated; at the moment the police were struggling with data due to high reoffending rates. It was possible that “IDIOM” may be used to collate IOM data.</p> <p>It was the case the IOM was struggling with funding issues.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the IOM Subgroup be noted, and that the SBP Strategic Group be provided with an update concerning the IOM meeting in July in due course.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>LM</p>

15	ASB Sub Group Update	Action
	<p>The Chairman of the Bromley Borough Anti-Social Behaviour Sub Group (Borough Fire Commander Daniel Cartwright) provided a documented update that was tabled at the meeting as he was not able to attend in person.</p> <p>The Group were updated that in May 2015 the LFB were aware of 18 deliberate fires in the borough, and that Cllr Kate Lymer had expressed concern about suspected incidents of arson in the Biggin Hill area. There were also plans in place for the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and LFB to attend local schools.</p> <p>The document contained a brief update on Operation Crystal, including LFB attendance at a business premises that was causing a fire risk with collective debris.</p> <p>It was noted that a number of abandoned vehicles that had been reported via the "Fix My Street" site, and had been removed. It was also noted that there was a general perception that the antisocial use of motorcycles had fallen, and that applications had already been received for fireworks displays from the four main public display areas in the borough.</p>	
16	FUTURE PRESENTATIONS	Action
	No future presentations were agreed.	
17	COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE	Action
	Susie Clark informed the Group that the next edition of the Safer Bromley News would be produced around November 2015, and that she would be looking for appropriate news stories over the summer.	
18	INFORMATION ITEMS	Action
19	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	Action
	<p>The Group noted that a Major Incident Training Exercise was scheduled to take place in Bromley on 21st June 2015.</p> <p>Louise Hubbard informed the Group that she was leaving her current role, and would be working for NOMS (National Offender Management Service) instead.</p> <p>Anne Ball informed the Group that MOPAC had just commissioned a £5M 2-year Pan London Domestic Violence Service that would run from July 2015 to June 2017. This was a mayoral manifesto commitment. The award of the contract for the service was to Victim Support. For Bromley this equated to an additional 0.5 caseworker</p>	

	<p>and 2.5 IDVA. (Independent Domestic Violence Advocates).</p> <p>Anne Ball also informed the Group about a new website for a victim information service – the details of which are below:</p> <p>Live from 1st April is the Government’s Victim Information Service: https://www.victimsinformationservice.org.uk/.</p> <p>Its main purpose is to direct victims to their local support service as quickly as possible.</p> <p>It was AGREED that Anne Ball from MOPAC would forward the link concerning funding for Domestic Abuse Services.</p>	AB
20	DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING	Action
	It was noted that the date of the next meeting was currently set at 10.00am on the 17 th September 2015.	

The Meeting ended at 12.00 pm

Chairman

Report No:
CSD15100

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee

Date: 15th September 2015

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

Contact Officer: Stephen Wood, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 Members are asked to review the Committee's Work Programme and to consider the contracts summary for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio.
- 1.2 Members should note that the Work Programme is fluid and subject to as change as required.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Committee:

- (i) reviews its Work Programme (Appendix 1); and
- (ii) Notes the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Contracts (Appendix 2).

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Committees normally receive a report on The Work Programme and Contracts Register at each meeting.
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safer Bromley
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
 4. Total current budget for this head: £326,980.
 5. Source of funding: 2015/16 revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 10 posts (8.75fte)
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Maintaining the Committee's work programme normally takes less than an hour per meeting.
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable: This report does not involve an executive decision.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is primarily for the benefit of Committee Members.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Forward Programme

- 3.1 The table at **Appendix 1** sets out the Public Protection and Safety PDS Forward Work Programme. The Committee is invited to comment on the schedule and to propose any changes it considers appropriate.
- 3.2 Other reports may come into the programme - schemes may be brought forward or there may be references from other Committees, the Portfolio Holder or the Executive.

Contracts Register

- 3.3 A Public Protection and Safety Contracts Register Summary is at **Appendix 2**.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Each PDS Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Previous Work Programme Reports and Minutes of the previous meeting.

PP&S PDS COMMITTEE - FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—30th June 2015
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Appointment of New Co-opted Members from BYC and Victim Support
Budget Monitoring
Mopac Update
Draft Portfolio Plan 2015/16 and Portfolio Holder Update
Enforcement Activity October 2014-March 2015
Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group Update
Provisional Outturn 2014/15
Work Programme and Contracts Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—15th September 2015
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Neighbourhood Watch Presentation
Operation Crystal Update
Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015
Portfolio Holder Update
Review of SBP Minutes
Work Programme and Contracts Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—3rd November 2015
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Budget Monitoring
CCTV Update
Portfolio Holder Update
Review of SBP Minutes and Agenda
Presentation from Victim Support
Substance Mis-Use Update-Joint Meeting with Care Services
Work Programme and Contracts Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—20th January 2016
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Budget Monitoring
Portfolio Holder Update
MOPAC Update

Review of SBP Minutes and Agenda
Enforcement Activity Update
Trading Standards Update Report
Work Programme and Contracts Register
PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS—2nd March 2016
Matters Arising
Chairman's Update
Police Update
Review of SBP Minutes and Agenda
Presentation from Bromley Youth Council
Update from SLAM
Budget Monitoring
Portfolio Holder Update
Food Safety Update Report
Work Programme and Contracts Register

Public Protection and Safety Contracts Register Summary

Contract	Start	Complete	Extension granted to	Contractor	Total Value £	Annual Value £	Public Protection & Safety PDS
CCTV Maintenance	1.4.2012	31.03.17	N/A	Eurovia	Fixed 5 years £214,256	£42,851	Capital programme approved by Executive-February 2015
CCTV Control Room Monitoring	1.4.2012	31.03.17	N/A	OCS	Fixed 5 years £1,263,258	£252,652	Capital programme approved by Executive-February 2015
Dog Collection – Stray and Abandoned Dogs Gateway Review	1.12.2012	31.03.14	30.04.17	SDK Environmental Ltd	£63,566	£63,566	PP&S PDS 08/04/2017 Extended to 30.04.2017
Kennels – Stray and Abandoned Dogs Gateway Review	1.12.2012	30.03.14	30.04.17	Woodland Annual Care Ltd	£96,000	£96,000 (Average variable cost)	PP&S PDS 08/04/15. Extended to 30.04.2017.
Vets Animal Welfare Enforcements	1.4.2014	31.3.15	31.03.17	Corporation of London Veterinary Service	£16,000	£16,000	Waiver agreed by Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services.
Bromley Domestic Abuse Support Groups	1.9.2013	31.3.17	N/A	Bromley Women's Aid	£92,212	£23,618	Funded by MOPAC
Safer Bromley Van	1.4.2013	31.3.2017	N/A	Victim Support	£102,413	£25,713	Funded by MOPAC

Contract	Start	Complete	Extension granted to	Contractor	Total Value £	Annual Value £	Public Protection & Safety PDS
Domestic Abuse Advocacy Project	1.4.2014	31.3.2017	N/A	Victim Support	£349,285	£116,385	MOPAC funded.
Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Programme	1.5.2015	31.3.2017	N/A	DVIP	£54,627	£26,120	Funded by MOPAC
Schools Programme, Volunteer Manager, and Resettlement Officer	1.4.2015	31.3.2017	N/A	Bromley Women's Aid	£86,570	£25,960	Funded by DCLG

This page is left intentionally blank