

City of London Police

Counter-Terrorism

January 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Best Value Review Inspection Report

Contents

1. **Executive Summary**
2. **Contextual Background**
3. **Judgement 1: How good is the Service?**
 - Are the service aims clear and challenging?
 - Does the service meet the aims?
 - How does the service compare?
4. **Judgement 2: What are the Prospects for Improvement?**
 - Does the best value review (BVR) drive improvement?
 - How good is the improvement plan?
 - Will the force deliver the improvements?
5. **Recommendations**
6. **Good Practice**

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 By virtue of Section 1(1)(d) of the Local Government Act 1999, all police authorities in England and Wales are required to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which the function of policing is exercised within their force area, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.
- 1.1.2 Police authorities must prepare a Best Value performance plan (BVPP) for each financial year in accordance with orders and guidance issued under the Act. In particular, the authority must conduct reviews of its functions and publish a programme of the BVRs. Whilst it is clear the police authority has the legal accountability for Best Value, the chief constable is constitutionally personally responsible for operational service delivery. Consequently, they will have to work together to ensure that BVRs make a significant improvement to service delivery.
- 1.1.4 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) is charged with the responsibility for inspecting all BVRs within the police service. The resulting reports are 'public' documents, and in every case a copy will be forwarded to the Secretary of State, the chair of the police authority and the chief constable or commissioner of the force concerned.
- 1.1.5 Reviewing authorities must demonstrate that they have challenged why and how a service is being provided; compared their performance with others; embraced fair competition to secure efficient and effective services; and consulted with local people, customers and stakeholders.
- 1.1.6 The purpose of independent inspection, and thus of this report, is to:
- Enable the public to see whether Best Value is being delivered;
 - Enable the inspected body to see how well it is doing;
 - Enable the Home Secretary to see how well Best Value is working;
 - Identify failing services where remedial action may be necessary; and
 - Identify and disseminate good practice.

1.2 Judgement 1: How good is the service?

- 1.2.1 The City of London Police conducted a BVR of counter-terrorism between April - September 2003. At the time of the Inspection in January 2005 HM Inspector judged the service as **Excellent**. Strengths included the following:

- The senior management team (SMT) maintains a very clear focus on counter-terrorism as core business for the City of London Police.
- The Force enjoys a highly effective relationship with the Corporation of London, particularly in relation to counter-terrorism.
- The City of London Police is an established leader in the application of technology to fight terrorism.
- Extensive collaboration between the Force, the Corporation of London and the business community is recognised nationally and internationally as best practice.
- Project Griffin has been an extremely successful response by the Force to meet the needs of the small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) within the City.

1.3 Judgement 2: What are the prospects for improvement?

1.3.1 At the time of the Inspection HM Inspector judged the prospects for improvement as **Promising**. Strengths included the following:

- The Force demonstrates significant improvement in its Best Value processes and outcomes in the last two years and should be congratulated on this fact.
- The Force's use of PRINCE2 and SIGMA business benefits realisation methodology as part of the Best Value process.
- The Police Committee involvement and representation in the review process.
- There is evidence that Best Value implementation is being mainstreamed into the day-to-day business of the Force.
- The Force's structure is aligned with its strategic goals following the review of shape and function.
- The Inspection team established that although some recommendations were not being fully implemented as originally drafted, alternative means of service delivery are fulfilling the intended business benefits.
- The Commissioner has a Best Value objective within his personal development review (PDR).

1.3.2 However, some important aspects require further attention:

- Future reviews may benefit from further time to fully implement recommendations.
- Current monitoring of the implementation plan may benefit from a greater focus on outcomes to ensure business benefits realisation and to ensure deferred recommendations are further prioritised.
- The Commissioner needs the flexibility to modernise the Force in line with the Government agenda.

1.4 Best Value Arrangements of the Committee

- 1.4.1 The Police Committee has overall responsibility for monitoring the Best Value programme. A Best Value sub-committee, responsible for agreeing and monitoring all Best Value improvement plans, supports the committee.
- 1.4.2 Within the Force the strategic tasking and co-ordinating group (STCG), chaired by the Commissioner, sanctions the Best Value programme, terms of reference for BVRs, improvement plans and all completed BVRs before submission to the Best Value sub-committee. In addition, the Force's organisational change board, chaired by the Commander, monitors improvement plans.
- 1.4.3 At the time of this particular BVR, the Force appointed a project manager who was a support staff member of the strategic planning department projects office. She was supported by a further member of that department to form the actual project team.
- 1.4.4 The project team had the support of a Best Value project board, chaired by a member of the Police Committee. The board had responsibility for overseeing and managing the BVR and met every month during the time of the review.
- 1.4.5 The Force's strategic planning department is responsible for co-ordinating and progressing Best Value. One individual within the department acts as programme manager for all BVRs.

1.5 Acknowledgements

- 1.5.1 HMIC wishes to thank the members of the Force and Police Committee who facilitated the Inspection and who generously set aside time to speak to Inspectorate staff. The Inspection would not have been possible without their assistance and contribution.

2. Contextual Background

2.1 Force Structure

- 2.1.1 The City of London Police area is often referred to as the 'Square Mile'. The Force is responsible for policing the inner London area, stretching from the River Thames in the south to the Barbican Centre in the north, Holborn and Fleet Street to the west and Aldgate and Liverpool Street in the east. It also polices the corresponding bridges in the area, namely Blackfriars, Millennium, Southwark, London and Tower Bridges.
- 2.1.2 The Square Mile is the financial and business centre of the country and contains such well-known places of interest as St Paul's Cathedral, the Bank of England, the Mansion House, the Stock Exchange, Lloyds Building, the Monument and the Central Criminal Court (the Old Bailey).
- 2.1.3 The Force is unique in many respects. Surrounded by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) area, it has a low resident population of about 8,000 but a large transient population of commuters and visitors, currently estimated to be in the region of 350,000 per day. Up to 300,000 vehicles pass through the City daily.
- 2.1.4 Budgeted officer strength of the Force at the time of the Inspection was 879 full-time equivalent police officers, with actual strength standing at 880. The Force has 56 special constables and 298 support staff. Net revenue expenditure (NRE) for 2004/05 was £72.8m.
- 2.1.5 Levels of crime are low. There are relatively few serious crimes, although the continuing changing environment within the Force area (large pubs, restaurants, clubs and hotels) is contributing to the changing crime profile.
- 2.1.6 Given its international business and financial profile, the City of London faces continual threats of terrorism and fraud. Prevention and detection of such offences are top priorities for the Force.
- 2.1.7 The Force's proximity to Westminster, and the nature of the Force, makes it an inevitable focal point for public demonstrations – both within the Force area and demonstrations passing through. Organised events, including anti-capitalist demonstrations and animal rights activist organisations, are a frequent issue with which the Force has to deal.
- 2.1.8 The police authority for the City of London is the Corporation of London's Court of Common Council, consisting entirely of locally-elected, independent (ie not party political) councillors. The Police Committee comprises 17 of those members, appointed in three categories, namely, magistrates (three), City residents (five) and people who work in the City (nine).

2.1.9 The Authority has delegated all its functions except the appointment of the Commissioner to the Police Committee. The Town Clerk is the clerk to the Police Authority, and administrative support to the Police Committee is provided by a senior member of that department who is clerk to the Police Committee. Other services are provided by the Corporation of London, eg financial and legal.

2.2. Service under Review

2.2.1 The BVR of counter-terrorism took place between April - September 2003. The review was overseen by a project board chaired by a member of the Police Committee and comprising representatives drawn from the Force, the Corporation and outside organisations. A second member of the Police Committee was also on the board, and an ACPO officer was invited to observe meetings.

2.2.2 Counter-terrorism is the Force's top priority, because the threat of terrorist activity to the City, and therefore to the economic and psychological well-being of the nation, is a real risk.

2.2.3 The aim of the review was to rigorously challenge the Force's present arrangements and its intended outcome was to ensure that the Force counter-terrorism priority continues to deliver the strategic aim of keeping the City safe.

2.2.4 The review addressed counter-terrorism, not anti-terrorism issues. Counter-terrorism is the range of activities designed to establish and maintain a background environment in which it is hard for terrorists to operate.

2.2.5 The scope of this review thus confined itself to the policing activity designed to avert terrorist activity, particularly that which results directly in death, injury, damage to property or to the critical national infrastructure.

2.3 Review Methodology

2.3.1 Best Value arrangements are co-ordinated within the strategic planning department. One individual is responsible for progressing issues within Best Value, with other members of strategic planning assisting as required.

2.3.2 Terms of reference for the review were outlined in the report of the Commissioner to the Police Committee on 29 May 2003:

To examine the current structures and processes that are designed to support the counter-terrorism strategy in relation to:

- **Deterrence.** This is where the Force minimises the likelihood of terrorist attack by using target hardening, tactics and technology.
- **Prevention.** This is where the Force frustrates terrorists' attempts to target the City of London by using effective policing, partnership with the community and tactical interventions.
- **Education.** This is where the Force ensures its communities are aware of steps they can take to counter terrorism, and ensures its staff are trained, practised and equipped to defend against terrorist activity.
- To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of liaison with key partners, including businesses and residents in the City of London.
- To identify to what extent the current performance indicators are relevant and contextually valid.
- To make recommendations for change if necessary.

2.3.3 The review was completed in September 2003. The Best Value sub-committee approved the final report in January 2004; the implementation plan was further approved in March 2004. This plan contained 18 recommendations, which the Inspection team felt were eminently sensible and wholly appropriate.

2.4 Inspection Methodology

2.4.1 The purpose of BVR Inspections (BVRIs) is to make two judgements: 'How good is the service being inspected?' and 'What are the prospects for improvement?'. HMIC has been given the statutory responsibility for conducting BVRIs within the police service.

2.4.2 This Inspection was conducted between 24 – 28 January 2005 on behalf of HM Inspector of Constabulary, Sir Ronnie Flanagan GBE, MA. Prior to the report's publication, both the Police Committee and the Force had the opportunity to comment on its factual contents and challenge the findings.

2.4.3 During the course of the Inspection a wide range of documents were examined, including the original BVR, supporting papers and other related information that provided a greater understanding of the service.

2.4.4 A number of structured interviews and focus groups were conducted during the Inspection. These interviews and focus groups were designed to obtain a fuller picture of how each service is currently delivered, how it has developed recently and how those delivering and receiving the service view it. The manner in which the review was conducted and the likelihood of improvements flowing from it were also considered.

3. Judgement 1: How good is the Service?

3.1 Are the aims clear and challenging?

- 3.1.1 The aim of the review into counter-terrorism conducted by the Police Committee was to rigorously challenge the Force's present arrangements and its intended outcome was to ensure that the Force's counter-terrorism priority continues to deliver the strategic aim of keeping the City of London secure.
- 3.1.2 The growth of international terrorism and the numerous, low-level attacks by single-issue domestic terrorists means that the strategy is frequently, albeit indirectly, revisited by senior officers on a regular basis.
- 3.1.3 The SMT maintains a clear focus on the issue of counter-terrorism as core business for the City of London.
- 3.1.4 The MPS is the only force in the country to match the City of London Police in having a single, over-arching strategy from which all other supporting strategies, operations and policies cascade.
- 3.1.5 There is obvious synergy between the Force's control strategy, the strategic planning process, the National Intelligence Model (NIM) and the identification of potential BVRs within the STCG.
- 3.1.6 The Force found, however, as part of the BVR into this area of business, that the counter-terrorism strategy seems less responsive to the needs of the residential communities than is desirable.
- 3.1.7 The organisational structure of the Force is now aligned with the key strategic goals of the Force following a successful review of shape and function which lead to the formation of the anti-terrorism and public order (AT-PO) department.
- 3.1.8 From interviews conducted with front-line officers, there is a clear understanding of the various policing options available to them to deal with counter-terrorism issues.

3.2 Does the service meet the aims?

- 3.2.1 Having considered the aims the Force has set for the service, as well as those that have been set for it, HMIC assesses how well it is performing. This includes an assessment of performance against specific standards and targets and the Force's approach to measuring whether it is actually delivering what it set out to do.

- 3.2.2 The Force enjoys a highly effective relationship with the Corporation of London, particularly in relation to counter-terrorism issues, and there are excellent links between the Force's AT-PO department and the Corporation's security and contingency planning office.
- 3.2.3 The Force collaborates in the Government-led London resilience team and with such organisations as London First.
- 3.2.4 The automated number plate recognition (ANPR) system and the Corporation of London's traffic and environment zone culminate in what is generally referred to and known as the 'ring of steel'.
- 3.2.5 The strong lead being provided by the SMT in relation to the counter-terrorism priority, coupled with the fact that this area of business is embedded within Force structures and strategies, is having a positive effect on the Force's performance in combating terrorism.
- 3.2.6 It is evident that all officers, particularly the head of AT-PO and the superintendent (terrorism), continually challenge and review the quality of service provision in relation to counter-terrorism. Internal consultation within the Force highlighted the fact that the head of AT-PO is a visible and energetic leader, considered by all ranks to be accessible, involved and knowledgeable.
- 3.2.7 There are still officers within the Force, however, who are unsure and sceptical of the role performed by AT-PO. The Force therefore needs to remain vigilant in marketing and communicating the role of AT-PO to officers on the ground.
- 3.2.8 During the Inspection, officers spoke highly of the quality of the briefing material and the Force's adherence to the National Briefing Model (NBM). However, there was also evidence that the intended benefits of the NBM are being frustrated by the extent of directed patrols and taskings being provided by the system. This has resulted in some supervisors moving away from using the full facilities of the NBM in order to create their own bespoke packages. There also appears to be some level of inconsistency in relation to the quality of debriefings taking place between the two operational sites within the Force.
- 3.2.9 In relation to the Force's use of its powers under Section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000, the number of complaints being recorded against the police tends to suggest that the powers of stop and search are not being used indiscriminately or inappropriately. However, the Force needs to continue to maintain vigilance in monitoring its use.
- 3.2.10 The Force meets the public's expectation through clear citizen focus. This is evidenced by various operations the Force is currently involved in.

These operations have been a very successful response to meet the needs of SMEs.

- 3.2.11 The project board for the BVR included a ‘critical friend’. When the Inspection team interviewed him regarding the Force’s service provision he described it as: ‘Imaginative and positive with no complacency. I could not think of any big ways to improve it’.
- 3.2.12 The Force reported to the Inspection team that it enjoys the overwhelming trust of the business community within the City. This is even extended to the business community within Canary Wharf, an area policed by the MPS.
- 3.2.13 In relation to the residential community, ward-based policing is evolving in the Force and has the potential to provide citizen focus for the residents of the City in the same way that the Force currently provides such focus to the business community. Citizen-focused policing is about putting the law-abiding citizen first, so that decisions are taken and services designed with the involvement of the public to ensure their needs as citizens are met. The Government intends that neighbourhood policing is one of the strands to achieve citizen focus. One option would be to consider the future deployment of police community support officers (PCSOs) in a similar way to the ‘Safer Neighbourhoods’ initiative within the MPS. This work is also being further developed within the pilot sites of the National Reassurance Policing Project (NRPP). As one interviewee stated: ‘Citizen focus of the police is excellent with the business community but not so with the residential community. There is a need to expand that high level of achievement to the resident community’.
- 3.2.14 In view of this, HM Inspector recommends that the Force reviews the learning from the NRPP with a view to further enhancing ward-based policing.

Recommendation 1
HM Inspector recommends that the Force reviews the learning from the NRPP with a view to further enhancing ward-based policing.

3.3 How does the service compare?

- 3.3.1 The City of London Police is recognised by peers as a key player in the field of counter-terrorism. A case in point is the Force being one of only four UK forces in attendance at an international leadership and counter-terrorism course.
- 3.3.2 The extensive collaboration between the Force, the Corporation and the business community is recognised nationally and internationally as best practice.

- 3.3.3 The review benefited from benchmarking with the Civil Nuclear Constabulary and the New York Police Department (NYPD). This revealed, for instance, that the Force was far ahead of the NYPD in the variety of deterrence activity it undertakes.
- 3.3.4 As expected, a significant effect of the City of London's continuous liaison with the MPS is that both have similar approaches to deterrence activity. Comparison against the remaining forces in England and Wales revealed that no respondent could match the breadth of such activity currently being undertaken by the Force.
- 3.3.5 The Inspection team was, however, surprised by the conscious decision made by the project board not to progress benchmarking with the Police Service of Northern Ireland as part of the review.
- 3.3.6 Community partnerships are an important element of prevention for the Force and in relation to the business community are a key strength.
- 3.3.7 The success of Pager Alert is such that not only is a senior officer within the Force leading on a pan-London version, but also the concept has been exported abroad to the NYPD.
- 3.3.8 The Force acknowledged itself that it was unable to find step change improvement emanating from the BVR process; the 'critical friend' on the project board quite properly stated that this was an indication of the high level of service being provided by the Force to the City.
- 3.3.9 The Inspection team believed that the potential existed for more collaboration to be undertaken as part of the review process.
- 3.3.10 Since the review was conducted, the Force has worked hard to increase the awareness of front-line staff in relation to counter-terrorism issues. In light of this, the Inspection team was surprised at the lack of printed material on display in the public foyer and internally throughout Bishopsgate police station. This only serves to demonstrate the constant vigilance that is required by forces on this extremely important subject.

3.4 Overall Judgement

- 3.4.1 HM Inspector grades each service as either excellent, good, fair or poor, depending on the extent to which it meets criteria set out in the Inspection guidance. In light of the BVR's findings and the result of the Inspection, HM Inspector concludes that the service is **Excellent**.

4. Judgement 2: What are the Prospects for Improvement?

4.1 Does the BVR drive improvement?

- 4.1.1 Best Value legislation requires forces to demonstrate that they have considered why they provide the service under review and the alternative ways in which it could be delivered. Generic comments on the review methodology have been made at Section 2.3 of this report.
- 4.1.2 The Force demonstrates significant improvement in its Best Value processes and outcomes in the last two years and should be congratulated on this fact. It is now in a regime of undertaking more cross-cutting fundamental reviews and as such has convinced sceptical personnel within the Force of the benefits to be gained from using the Best Value process to good effect.
- 4.1.3 The STCG decides subjects for review tied into the NIM and strategic planning and baseline assessment processes. The Police Committee also proposes subjects for review and endorses those put forward by the Force.
- 4.1.4 The number of BVRs being undertaken by the strategic planning department is manageable at the moment with the resources currently available.
- 4.1.5 This review was instrumental in providing direction to the newly appointed superintendent (terrorism) and creating clear focus for the department through the BVR implementation plan.
- 4.1.6 The counter-terrorism BVR team exhibited exceptional skills that derived in no small part from their academic background. Continuity within this team also played a part in the production of a final product of high quality. Consideration needs to be given to future succession planning of staff within the strategic planning department in order to maintain this level of expertise.
- 4.1.7 The project board chairman saw the Best Value process as a valuable and welcome tool. He told the Inspection team that the Force had learnt a great deal and looked forward to its continued use in the future.
- 4.1.8 In relation to the counter-terrorism BVR, the project board chairman negotiated an extension to the time limit attached to the review in order to ensure the delivery of a quality final product.
- 4.1.9 The chairman of the project board was instrumental in selecting the members of the project board. This included the review's 'critical friend' whose presence brought both a strategic and tactical perspective to the process and validated the work of others involved with the review. In

short, the Inspection team believed that the project board was a well-balanced, highly-qualified group with knowledge of the subject matter from a wide perspective.

- 4.1.10 HMIC has previously identified as good practice in the MPS the use of a broader independent challenge panel which the Force may wish to further consider.
- 4.1.11 In order to undertake the review, the project team made use of PRINCE2 project management, SIGMA business benefits realisation methodology and HMIC Inspection Protocols. This resulted in a thoroughly researched, well-written report using appropriate methodology and reaching well-reasoned, sound conclusions. The Inspection team feels this is a model of good practice.
- 4.1.12 The Inspection found that members of staff were unfamiliar with the good work being undertaken by the Best Value project team. Opportunities thus exist to raise levels of staff awareness through the Force internal communications systems.

4.2 How good is the implementation plan?

- 4.2.1 BVRs should produce an implementation plan that sets out what needs to improve, why, how the improvement will be delivered and when. They should contain targets that are not only challenging but are also designed to ensure the continuous improvement necessary to raise the level of service delivered, in terms of both cost and quality.
- 4.2.2 The implementation plan has benefited from the use of the SIGMA methodology, which focuses upon business benefit realisation.
- 4.2.3 SIGMA works by bridging the gap between the visualised future state of the service delivery and the current state, and mapping the steps leading from the latter to the former. This forms the foundation of the implementation plan, which will also make a more accurate assessment of stakeholder benefits and disadvantages, such as excessive outlay in time or money. These assessments determine whether the recommendations are truly Best Value overall.
- 4.2.4 The head of AT-PO has now got full responsibility for implementation of the 18 recommendations and there is movement evident on each of them. The Inspection team established that although some of these recommendations were not being fully implemented as originally drafted, alternative means of service delivery are fulfilling the intended business benefits

- 4.2.5 The engagement of an SMT member as an observer on the project board facilitates the management team's involvement in the process.
- 4.2.6 Future reviews may benefit from further time to fully implement the recommendations.
- 4.2.7 Whilst the original implementation plan was clear about the intended business benefits, updates to the Police Committee Best Value sub-committee did not clearly measure success against this criterion. This should not detract from the benefits obtained from using SIGMA but serves to highlight an area for improvement in future BVRs.
- 4.2.8 HM Inspector therefore recommends that Best Value progress reports use comparison against the original success criteria detailed in the implementation plan to outline the progress being made for each of the recommendations.

Recommendation 2
HM Inspector recommends that Best Value progress reports use comparison against the original success criteria detailed in the implementation plan to outline the progress being made for each of the recommendations.

4.3 Will improvements in service be delivered?

- 4.3.1 The Inspection team looked for evidence that the Force will deliver what is set out in its improvement plan, for a record of management change accomplishments within the Force and, where possible, within the service itself. The plan must have the necessary support from committee members, management, staff, service users and other stakeholders.
- 4.3.2 The Inspection team found overwhelming support for the role performed by the chairman of the BVR project board. His role and the considerable involvement and ownership over the product indicate the importance that the Police Committee attached to this particular review. The chairman saw his role as one of facilitation, to scrutinise and to keep challenge going and evidence obtained throughout the Inspection supports this assertion.
- 4.3.3 The Commissioner has a Best Value objective within his PDR, which the Commander also has a responsibility to deliver on.
- 4.3.4 The Force has a good track record in delivering improvements outlined in BVRs as well as other change management projects.
- 4.3.5 Due to the continuous improvement agenda within both the Corporation of London and the City of London Police, a considerable amount of work

had been carried out in relation to counter-terrorism issues between the review being conducted and the Inspection team visiting the Force.

- 4.3.6 The Force has viewed the recommendations with a clear focus on outcomes and is being creative in finding alternative methods of fulfilling recommendations. This involves using police officers in posts that could and should be filled by support staff. The current workforce planning review has the potential to address these issues.
- 4.3.7 The Commissioner needs the flexibility to modernise the police force in line with the Government agenda. There is a need to provide common terms and conditions for Corporation of London support staff in line with national police developments in such areas as PDRs, the Integrated Competency Framework and the grievance procedure.
- 4.3.8 Legislation, which ensures that PCSOs are within the employment of the Corporation of London, could cause difficulties for police accountability and legitimacy in the future. Changes to legislation may be required and HM Inspector will watch these developments with interest.

4.4 Overall Judgement

- 4.4.1 In coming to a judgement on the prospects for improvement, HM Inspector has to assess the evidence within the review, its supporting documentation and that of the Inspection. The judgement will be one of the following: excellent, promising, uncertain or poor.
- 4.4.2 Having regard to the above, HM Inspector concludes that the prospects for improvement are **Promising**.

5. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: HM Inspector recommends that the Force reviews the learning from the NRPP with a view to further enhancing ward-based policing (paragraph 3.2.14).

Recommendation 2: HM Inspector recommends that Best Value progress reports use comparison against the original success criteria detailed in the implementation plan to outline the progress being made for each of the recommendations (paragraph 4.2.8).

6. Good Practice

- 6.1 Good practice includes procedures, processes, methods of operational policing or partnership working, or technological solutions that significantly improve efficiency, effectiveness or quality of service.
- 6.2 Her Majesty's Inspector considers the use of PRINCE2 project management, SIGMA business benefits realisation methodology, together with the HMIC Inspection Protocols as part of the BVR process as being potential good practice (paragraph 4.1.11).