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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOCU</td>
<td>Borough Operational Command Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCU</td>
<td>Basic Command Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>Computer Aided Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIT</td>
<td>Child Abuse Investigation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Crime Assessment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASO</td>
<td>Child Abuse and Sexual Offences (formerly SC&amp;O17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Change Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANNEL SHIFT</td>
<td>A movement of demand from one business area to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIME FIGHTERS</td>
<td>A meeting of senior leadership to identify and address performance issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIS</td>
<td>Crime Recording Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Community Safety Unit responsible for domestic abuse investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWO</td>
<td>Dedicated Ward Officer (constable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERPT</td>
<td>Emergency Response and Patrol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRPM</td>
<td>Local Resource Planning Meeting. A meeting to manage the movements, development and welfare of all staff on a BOCU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARAC</td>
<td>Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASH</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLIN</td>
<td>Missing Persons &amp; Related Linked Indices System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET CC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Command and Control Centre, consisting of Bow, Lambeth and Hendon Centre’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPAC</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI list</td>
<td>Open Incident list, relating to calls from the public to the MPS recorded on CAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCLO</td>
<td>Police Conference Liaison Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPPHIRE</td>
<td>Sexual Offences Investigation teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOIT</td>
<td>Sexual Offences Investigative Technique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Context: Delivering local policing at a larger scale has been considered on several occasions in recent years. The aim is not solely to obtain efficiencies of scale and resilience. The objective is also to improve the quality of policing, increase efficiency, improve decision making and simplify team and leadership structures. Greater consistency of operating practice, within a reduced number of operational commands, provides the added benefit of a solid foundation for future change.

The Pathfinders were intended to test ideas that have been considered and been in development for a number of years – providing learning as to what works and what does not to support a wider roll-out.

Two sites were selected to provide an insight into how the proposals operated in different policing environments in London. These sites were “Central North” (CN) comprising the boroughs of Camden and Islington; and “East Area” (EA) made up of Barking & Dagenham, Havering and Redbridge. Preparation for the pathfinder started in October 2016 and a phased implementation began in January 2017. The Pathfinders and associated technology changes were fully in place by April 2017.

The operational context to pathfinder delivery was challenging. The terrorist attacks on Westminster, London Bridge, Finsbury Park and Parsons Green as well as the tragedy of Grenfell Tower occurred during the Pathfinder tests. This placed unprecedented pressure on the MPS as well as on the BCUs.

This period also saw clarification of the financial pressures facing the MPS. It is now clear that the MPS must reduce to 30,000 officers by April 2018 and, in all likelihood, must make significant further reductions by 2021. A significant proportion of these savings must inevitably come from local policing. A twin pressure is to provide the resilience to be able to deal with unforeseen events and pressures, which have recently included investment in servicing public inquiries, increasing MPS firearms capability and responding to Grenfell Tower.

This reduction will put the resilience of current Borough structures under increasing and unsustainable pressure. Problems are particularly acute with smaller specialist functions such as safeguarding and offender management. In this context, operating at a scale and in a way that maintains operational resilience is essential.

Pathfinder Design: The design of BCUs was predicated on delivering change in 5 key functions. Key features of what has been achieved and learnt are as follows:

- **Neighbourhoods**: an uplift in ring fenced Dedicated Ward Officers was delivered across both sites – with an associated increase in youth officers (an increase from 151 to 348 police officer posts across both pathfinders). Key learning is to ensure that any change to Neighbourhood policing is delivered in collaboration with partners, accompanied by a strong communications plan and operates within a strong tasking and co-ordination framework.

- **Response**: the original response design was fully delivered in April when technology changes were delivered on both BCUs. When Response performance started to drop on both sites – particularly in EA – joint analysis identified causes and then put in place recovery measures (which included changes to the original design). This was delivered to the extent that both BCUs are now operating at levels that are higher than when they operated as individual boroughs. BCUs are now increasing their focus on other aspects of response performance – including positive investigative outcomes and quality of service.

- **Safeguarding**: the safeguarding design was delivered in March – which involved the integration of central sexual offence and child abuse teams into local safeguarding arrangements and the integration of MASH and Child abuse referral mechanism.
The cultural and operational change in this area is challenging and work is ongoing to deal with some of the challenges involved. This includes enabling both BCUs to fill their posts with suitably trained officers and delivering an effective shift pattern given the different workloads of the specialist functions.

Performance across both pathfinders has broadly been maintained – with good performance in the East (which is often above the MPS average). There has been much more positive feedback on partnership working in the North, which received good feedback from Ofsted on the collaboration, than in the East where feedback has been more mixed. Whilst the BCU structures provide more resilience, maintaining good relationships with individual Borough Safeguarding arrangements and Boards has proved more challenging – particularly where more Boroughs are involved.

Key learning in this area has been the need to deal with the issues highlighted above as well as early and continual engagement with partners on the local changes.

- **Criminal Investigation Department (CID):** changes within CID (previously called Local Investigation) were fully delivered by March 2017. The primary change involved a shift of workload so that detectives were able to focus on a smaller number of more serious crimes across the BCU. Other changes include concentration of proactive resources within CID alongside ownership of Offender Management in all forms (i.e. a holistic approach that brought together YOTS, IOM and Jigsaw). Key learning is the need to ensure that resources are distributed in line with demand (via the shift pattern).

- **HQ and Leadership:** Both BCUs began using a streamlined leadership model involving 4 Superintendents (one per local policing function) and without chief inspectors. By the time the pathfinders went fully live in April, it was recognized that more capacity was needed to support senior leadership in the BCUs. As a consequence, the design has been changed to provide a 5th superintendent and 6 chief inspectors for every BCU. In addition, greater investment has been required in support functions and to support Professional Standards.

Other key learning has been the importance of providing a Superintendent level senior point of contact for every Borough and of ensuring effective collaboration and communication with existing partnerships throughout and following transition.

The design for BCU pathfinders has been tested and has already changed to deal with lessons learned. Response has moved to a model that is closer to the existing command and control model but which maintains the shift in responsibilities to Mi-Investigation. Greater capacity has been provided to support senior leadership across the model and there is work ongoing to address demand/resource alignment within Safeguarding and CID.

A key piece of overall learning is the importance of local ownership of the design. Different challenges are faced by different BCUs – whether this be the number of borough partners involved or the specific operational challenges facing particular BCUs (such as central London). The BCU design and blueprinting process is pivotal in ensuring that the BCU design is fit for purpose. This provides a fundamental building block for transition and one that will set both clear objectives and tone for the remainder of the implementation.

**Benefits:** the Pathfinder BCUs have delivered efficiencies that are above the level expected at this stage – whilst retaining additional officer investment in key areas such as 2 DWOs per ward, Youth Officers, Safeguarding and Offender Management. These efficiencies have been delivered without the mobile technology from which further benefits will still accrue. Total posts expected to be saved by April 2018 against the original design baseline are 73 in EA and 90 in CN.

The pathfinders have demonstrated the ability to deliver acceptable levels of performance with overall post reduction and investment into priority areas (Neighbourhoods and Safeguarding). It has also has also shown that management savings can be delivered as planned (even given the increase in superintendents and chief inspectors) to assist in keeping the number of frontline PCs and DCs as high as possible.
Implementation: The evaluation has identified learning in the following areas: consultation, engagement and communications; implementation phasing and cultural change; HR planning and resources, skills and training; stabilisation and continuous improvement; and leadership and governance.

Partner feedback has fallen into the areas of: communications, collaboration and engagement, planning, leadership and some areas of design. However, the cross-cutting themes across the feedback are as follows:

- **Local ownership**: the pathfinders tested specific new ways of working on behalf of the organisation. This limited local flexibility and impacted on the sense of local ownership. Moving forward, both in the pathfinders and other BCUs, the process will generate a strong sense of local ownership of design and implementation. This applies both internally and for external partners.

- **Local leadership**: leaders, both at SLT and other levels, must have sufficient time and support to get used to their new roles and responsibilities and to genuinely be able to own the transition in their own way. The longer lead-in time and early appointment of leadership teams will be pivotal in enabling ownership of the change at every level. Local leadership roles should provide clear points of contact for individual policing functions (such as Safeguarding) but there should also be a senior designated point of contact for each Borough – and the increase in management resilience through additional superintendent and chief inspector posts will enable this.

- **Communication and Engagement**: there should be sustained and consistent communication and engagement – both during and following any transition. Whilst a large part of this activity must rest with those in leadership roles, the resources and skills that are essential to support this work have also been in short supply. Sustained investment in the capability to deliver communication and engagement is essential.

- **Partnerships**: pathfinder partners and Safer Neighbourhood Boards believe that that the BCUs could have worked more collaboratively and obtained more support from local partners. Collaborative relationships will continue to develop within the pathfinders as the BCUs stabilise – and will be built at the earliest stage so that development of BCUs is as collaborative as possible.

- **Timescale**: the speed of transition generated significant pressure on both enabling functions (such as HR) as well as on business change supporting BCU officers. Externally, this speed did not allow sufficient time for partners to develop an understanding of the change or provide an input to plans. This resulted in a sense that this was being imposed on them rather than worked through with them. Further roll will allow more time for internal preparation and the earliest possible involvement of partners.

- **Business change**: clarity of design, an understanding of the impact of that change and a structured readiness plan that focuses on priority areas are pivotal to ensuring effective business change. This approach will launch the BCUs in an appropriate way, minimising some of the challenges of transition, but it is also apparent that several elements of the BCU will take a considerable time to fully bed in and to deliver the benefits expected. This will require a readiness to maintain the strategic direction for the long haul – and to build a framework that can support and consolidate the changes required.

- **Organisational readiness for change**: many officers and staff have found the pathfinders a difficult experience – sometimes because of how the changes have been implemented and sometimes because of the nature of the changes implemented. The experience of being in an organisation needing to reduce in size is also a new one to many MPS officers. The longer lead in time and local ownership by BCU leadership teams will allow improved opportunity to listen and respond – and to change design or plans when necessary.
• **Performance**: there are inevitably challenges with maintain performance during a period of change - and both Pathfinders suffered initial performance dips. The subsequent recovery to performance levels has been a hard fought achievement. This performance has been delivered whilst headcount has been reducing – and without the delivery of some of the changes that were intended to support increased efficiency (such as mobile technology). In this context, delivery of current BCU level performance with the knowledge that further support is coming, gives cause for increased confidence that the revised BCU design provides the right foundation for policing in London.

• **Resources to support delivery**: some planned support to Pathfinders was either not provided or provided to an inconsistent quality. The Pathfinders were established during a period in which the MPS Portfolio has been in transition and support functions were (and are) still in development. There are also significant resource pressures within programme teams. Plans to ensure the resources to support change (both in the programme and the new Local Change Networks) are in place to assure effectiveness of the future roll-out.

• **Governance**: revised governance processes will be established alongside support arrangements from SLP, BCUs and Partners. These arrangements should provide clarity of accountability for key decisions – which should normally rest with the BCU Commander or Senior Responsible Officer – with explicit requirements to consult with on decisions affecting partnership working.

**Pathfinder delivery against objectives** is summarised as follows:

To enable more effective and efficient delivery of policing across London:

• Key elements of the design have been delivered as planned – with minor exceptions.

• Changes have been made to aspects of the model that did not run as planned initially to enable original benefits to be delivered.

• The model has delivered expected efficiencies and has also demonstrated the potential to deliver additional savings/reinvestment opportunities.

• Current indications are that performance is recovering at Borough as well as BCU level, despite initial issues in some areas.

To enable the MPS to deliver the Mayor’s Police and Crime 2017-2021:

• Performance is broadly tracking MPS levels – with acceptable performance being delivered in most areas (as defined by whether there are statistically significant differences between MPS and BCU delivery)

• There are particular performance areas which have seen significant increases. Analysis indicates that where this has happened (eg burglary), the crime trends form part of wider national/London trends and is not directly attributed to BCU working.

• Victim satisfaction has fallen. Whilst this is associated with the initial fall in response performance other factors are involved. The mitigation put in place together with improvements in the response model there is increasing confidence that the quality of service will recover.

To support delivery of strategic objectives through effective partnership engagement and joint working:

• There has been positive feedback on elements of the model, particularly within safeguarding.

• There have also been significant concerns raised by partners and SNBs. This has been a challenging area for all involved – and one in which significant learning has been gathered and which will be taken into account in plans for further roll-out.
The MPS is confident that further change will be able to deliver a more collaborative approach based on the lessons learned and changes to the implementation plan.

**MPS readiness for roll-out:** as a consequence of considering delivery, the learning drawn from Pathfinders and wider developments in the MPS, the MPS is in a position to continue roll-out. This conclusion is drawn on the following basis:

a. The pathfinder experience has been a difficult experience for many of those involved – but through their efforts the model has stabilised across both sites and performance (with reduced numbers is now at an appropriate level).

b. The learning that has been gathered has been used to inform the implementation approach and forward plan articulated in the SLP Full Business Case. This approach addresses many of the points highlighted above – and specifically those relating to planning, organisation and resources to support the change.

c. Organisational and Leadership readiness are being addressed both through pan-London forums such as Senior and Extended leadership events as well as through the new “Leading for London” programme.

d. The Transformation Directorate – and the support and skills it offers – is significantly more mature than at the start of the 2017 and provides a far stronger framework to systematically manage the change and dependencies involved in full roll-out. Whilst resourcing remains a challenge, the priority to be accorded the roll-out of BCUs has been recognised and forms part of the requirement agreed within the FBC.

e. The BCU design has already evolved to take on board the learning from pathfinder delivery. Systems are now in place to manage some of the remaining challenges but also to manage the introduction of other changes required either by further savings requirements or through dependencies with other programmes of work.

f. Definition of key steps in delivery – blueprinting, change impact and change readiness plans – is significantly more advanced than 12 months ago. Current plans take account of the length of time needed to ensure effective delivery of each of these steps and also to ensure strong and effective local ownership.

g. Changes to the BCU design – particularly to emergency response – coupled with increasing focus on developing investigative skills will support BCUs to maintain performance throughout the transition period. These changes, coupled with a revised readiness assessment and go-live decision making process, provide strong grounds for confidence that performance challenges can be minimised during the transition period.

Of particular note is that the revised design and approach will minimise any short term impact on victim satisfaction and set the foundation for the realisation of the longer term benefits to victims that BCUs will provide.

h. Whilst recognising that the pathfinder process has been a difficult one for partnerships – and that there remain some issues to be addressed on both sites – there is also a willingness to develop strong and effective partnership working and to work collaboratively with the MPS to resolve issues.

i. Outstanding issues on the Pathfinders should be dealt with in the form of a close down “Action” plan, agreed with partners, to ensure that any outstanding issues with implementation and BAU delivery on both pathfinders are recognised and addressed to the satisfaction of both the MPS and key stakeholders.
Part A: Context

This section describes the case for change along with the Vision and objectives of the SLP programme (to be tested within the pathfinders). It also describes the operational context in which the pathfinders took place – and how this changed in the course of the pathfinder.

1. The Case for Change

The Strengthening Local Policing (SLP) programme was initiated in 2015 to address a number of issues affecting the delivery of Borough policing. These included:

- Financial pressures – a requirement for further savings of at least £400m by 2020.
- The objective of increasing confidence in local policing and improve police visibility.
- Internal operational tension – to reduce a focus on “remit” and multiple hand-offs across policing teams.
- Inconsistent processes and operating models across the 32 boroughs.
- Changes in the pattern of demand requiring new ways of management.
- Officers becoming de-skilled in investigation and prisoner processing.
- Inefficient and inconsistent crime investigation processes which did not provide the best service to victims.
- Neighbourhood Officers being abstracted from neighbourhoods with general policing activities taking them away from being visible and active in the communities they serve.
- Inefficient frontline response with resulting impacts upon incident response times and the probability of successful outcomes.
- The lack of a joined-up response to safeguarding, vulnerability and risk.

London Boroughs vary in size, and often have different ways of doing things, with different resourcing levels that make them difficult to manage and operate in a consistent way. The MPS needs to generate greater resilience as several boroughs may find it difficult to operate due to the anticipated number of officers by 2018/19.

2. Vision, Objectives and Ambition

The MPS is committed to increasing community confidence and it will achieve this by building on what worked under the Safer Neighbourhoods model, taking into account current resource pressures. The MPS must meet community and partner expectations, maintain community confidence and increase collaborative working with partners.

There is a recognition that the MPS needs to take a more holistic and effective approach to dealing with risk and vulnerability. The MPS must protect those members of the public who need help the most and also effectively manage offenders and ensure a more joined up approach. The vision for local policing was therefore that, by the end of FY 2018/19, the MPS was to be:

“Delivering local policing in a way that is personal, responsive and tackles crime and disorder effectively and efficiently across London as a whole”
In order to achieve this vision, SLP set the following objectives:

- **Improved quality of service** – driving increased confidence in local policing and public satisfaction.
- **Improved decision making** – driving continuing reduction in crime and increasing the MPS’s ability to bring offenders to justice.
- **To make better use of people** – increasing job satisfaction and the confidence of the MPS’s own staff in the services provided.
- **Increased efficiency and productivity** – making savings that will enable reinvestment back into local policing and/or other MPS and Police and Crime Plan priorities.

To achieve these objectives the local policing delivery approach has been redesigned from 32 Borough Operational Command Units (BOCUs) to 12 Basic Command Units (BCU).

Operating on a larger scale, in a BCU, is intended to deliver the following:

- By operating with more **even levels of demand and resources** – to make best use of our senior leaders and have the greatest opportunity to make sure that they are dealing with appropriate workloads. In the current model the largest Boroughs are four times the size of the smallest and deal with four times the demand.
- Make decision making more straightforward, without the layers of complexity we currently have to work through. Officers and staff close to the front line will be empowered to take more decisions and will be supported when they do.
- **Simplified team and leadership structures**, devolving power to leaders who are closer to the frontline and operate with larger but more flexible teams.
- Operate in a more consistent way to work across geographic areas with more speed and flexibility – and with a common understanding of who is responsible and accountable for service delivery in every part of London.
- Each BCU will have a Superintendent leading core local policing functions: Neighbourhoods, Response, CID, Safeguarding and BCU HQ Leadership. This development of specialist functions will enable quality to be improved and future change to be more easily managed through consistent organizational structures with better defined roles and responsibilities.
- BCUs will provide **opportunities to rationalise the MPS estate and simplify the demands placed on both operational and business support services**. A smaller number of operational units reduces the complexity in the provision of support to multiple users.

**Crime and offending patterns in London are continuing to change.** As a result we need to cater for increased demand in a way that is not so tightly linked to geography as has been the case in the past. Both local and specialist units will have a main area of geographic responsibility – but will move across boundaries as required to deal with surges in demand and ensure effective 24/7 policing across London.

The high level description of delivery of services within the BCUs is as follows:
We will provide a skilled first point of call for all operational demand – our response teams. More efficient management of this service, by operating cross-border and at scale, will enable us to invest in other areas involving more specialist requirements, particularly those that involve the management of high levels of vulnerability, complexity and risk.

Real neighbourhood policing will involve providing a dedicated, visible service for local communities and young people. Physical presence will be supported by improved digital contact with the public online and through social media.

Driving efficiency through more effective management of high volume demand will also enable us to invest in a revised, local Safeguarding service. This will bring together local and previously centrally managed services dealing with child abuse, sexual offences and domestic abuse in order to provide a more joined up, victim-focused service. We will also join up offender management functions and provide a capability that will deal with the most difficult and high risk offenders.

In this model, local CID teams will be released to provide a faster response to serious and complex crime and to provide a better quality, end to end service to victims of those crimes. They will also drive a proactive response to crime, disorder and offending – utilising uniformed tasking teams alongside proactive units dealing with longer term crime problems.

The leadership that brings this all together and which drives delivery at a local level will become functional and consistent across London.

- A BCU Commander of Chief Superintendent rank will have overarching responsibility for the delivery of local policing within a BCU – and will make sure that all local services combine effectively and efficiently to deliver a high quality service to local people.
- Each of the main service areas – Response, Neighbourhoods, Safeguarding and Criminal Investigation – will be led by a Superintendent who will be responsible for local delivery but will operate in line with standards and expectations set across London.
- Superintendents will also provide a senior point of contact for individual boroughs, recognizing that boroughs needs a single senior person to go to who will be responsible for ensuring borough-specific issues are addressed in a cohesive way.

They will be supported in their role by a BCU HQ comprising an Operations Room dealing with real time operational delivery and a “back office” providing organizational support.

3. Development of the SLP Programme

From its start in 2015, the SLP programme has always held two deliverables in balance. First, to improve the quality and effectiveness of policing in London. Second, to improve efficiency – enabling re-investment into priority areas and making savings so that the MPS can operate within its budget.

The original business case for BCUs was submitted to MPS Management Board in September 2015. The financial context at that time was an expectation that the MPS budget could be reduced by up to £1.2 billion leading to a reduction of up to 5,000 officers.

Key benefits of moving to a BCU model were not just that it enabled efficiencies in its own right but, by building a consistent operating model at a larger scale, it also enabled support functions to drive out further efficiencies and provided a platform that made further changes much more easy to deliver.
The budget in December 2015 changed the level of financial challenge for the MPS. The Mayoral elections of 2016 further changed the operating context.

Awareness of the potential for increased financial pressure in 2018 was one of the driving factors in moving into “full system” tests within the pathfinders. The challenge at that point, however, was that the full extent of the financial challenge was not yet known.

In the course of pathfinder delivery, there has been increased clarity on the challenge to the MPS budget. The MPS now expects to move from 32,300 to 30,000 posts by April 2018 and to have to make further significant reductions by 2021.

It has also become increasingly clear that the MPS needs to operate in a way that gives it the resilience to respond quickly to new challenges – and to have the ability to invest in new and emerging priorities. Recent examples include: the requirement to support and service public inquiries, the operational need to increase firearms capability across London and to provide support to the investigation into the Grenfell Tower fire. These changes on their own have placed an additional requirement of around 1000 officers onto the MPS. Whilst these are being managed it is inevitable that further events will take place or priorities will arise that need to be addressed.

In such a situation, three factors have become much more significant than they were at the start of the pathfinder process:

- Efficiencies that can be driven out within the BCUs
- Efficiencies that the BCUs enable in MPS support functions
- Stability and consistency that BCUs provide for further changes – particularly those within technology programmes.

In addition to learning from the pathfinders themselves some of these benefits are already becoming evident:

- **Within BCUs:** these are explored in more detail later in this report, but in summary working to a consistent model has already pointed to where further efficiencies can be drawn (either through functional or policy change) and to where there is evidence that the benefits of further productivity improvements have been underestimated (e.g. current performance which is in advance of where it would be expected to be given resource levels).

- **Support functions:** under pressure to reduce costs in support rather than front line operational functions several units have started to work on the cashable benefits that can be achieved via the delivery of a BCU model. These include Property Services, Locally Delivered Support Services, and Fleet services.

- **Foundation for further change:** the SLP has already had to develop options to meet an additional saving requirement of 562 posts in 2018/19. It has been able to do this by looking at further opportunities within the BCU model – and to be able therefore to understand the implications of such change and to make risk based decisions as a consequence. Further options are being developed to look ahead, based on the foundation of a BCU model, and that can consider resilience and operational effectiveness in a more structured way than can operate within a 32 borough environment.

Any analysis of the learning from pathfinders and consideration of next steps needs to take into account the above context. Consideration of BCU performance, resources and benefits alone may miss some of the wider importance of BCUs to the MPS.
4. Number and configuration of BCUs

The number, scale and configuration of BCUs has been a key consideration from the outset. The MPS recognises that this is a highly contentious issue not only in relation to the move away from borough-based commands, but also the increased scale and the specific combinations of boroughs within each command.

The options considered throughout the development of the programme have ranged from maintaining 32 Boroughs at one end of the scale to operating with 7 BCUs at the other. The options were narrowed down on the basis of considering operational risk, demand and efficiency; communities and partnerships; and geography and logistics.

Key considerations were balancing demand as evenly as possible in order to maximise the opportunities for management and supervisory efficiency; provide consistent operational resilience; and be at a scale that provided a foundation for further reductions in officer numbers. A particular concern was to ensure that we could deliver the priorities regarding Safeguarding and Neighbourhood policing.

Smaller BCUs and more in number make it difficult to maintain specialist units (such as those within Safeguarding) in each command at a viable level. They also make it more difficult to maintain the ring-fenced investment in DWOs. As the proportion of ring fenced officers within overall officer numbers increases in smaller BCUs operational flexibility is reduced. Boroughs that would be particularly affected by this are generally the outer London boroughs with relatively low demand but a large number of wards.

The configuration is based on working through a number of factors including existing relevant shared services between local authorities; significant crime ‘hotspots’ that cross borough boundaries; and the profiles of identifiable communities that straddle boundaries. It is not possible to satisfy every one of the potential factors in every part of London. Priority throughout has been on the most effective and efficient configuration for the delivery of operational policing services.

Although it was recognised that combining three or more boroughs adds complexity, these BCUs include the boroughs that benefit most in terms of being able to maintain the investment in local policing whilst delivering other services at a BCU level. As discussed elsewhere in this report, we are confident we can mitigate the additional complexity in three Borough configurations.

In addition, a higher number of BCUs would incur additional cost to set up and maintain. This would affect support functions across the MPS – including LDSS, PSD and DP – and key concerns were the implications for BCU HQ buildings, fleet, and estate alongside an uplift in posts for leadership teams and supervisory roles.

The resulting 12 BCU configuration was agreed by the MPS Management Board in October 2016. Management Board reviewed this in April 2017 and confirmed that it remained the professional judgement of the MPS that this provided the most operationally effective BCU design for local policing.
5. Timeline of Key Events

A brief time line of some key milestones of preparation, engagement and decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Sept</td>
<td>Outline Business case considered at Management board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Testing in Westminster begins – functional and streamlined leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Mayoral commitment to 2 DWOs per ward across London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Aug</td>
<td>Strategic Outline Case (SOC) agreed at Management Board – including proposal for BCU pathfinders to be run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Oct</td>
<td>MB approve the 12 BCU model and preferred configuration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nov</td>
<td>East Oversight board initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov</td>
<td>Press release and internal communication re BCU pathfinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov</td>
<td>BCU pathfinder Blueprints signed off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec</td>
<td>North Oversight board initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dec</td>
<td>BCU pathfinder Expressions of Interest (EOI) processes initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan</td>
<td>Phase 1: BCU Governance formally established with BCU Cmdrs and SLT taking up new roles. Neighbourhood Officers (DWOs) in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb</td>
<td>Phase 2: Response, HQ and Investigation strands go live – but without supporting CAD/radio technology changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Mar</td>
<td>Phase 3 Safeguarding go live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Apr</td>
<td>Phase 4: CAD and radio changes delivered. This effectively completed the response model and BCU Ops room as per the design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Jun</td>
<td>Review of Response delivery and performance initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jul</td>
<td>Response Action plan (including technical changes) agreed at SLP Programme Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Sept</td>
<td>Technical changes implemented on both pathfinders to improve response performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period, other significant changes have included:

- **26 April 2017** – Management Board approve a fifth Superintendent for the BCU model design.
- **30 June 2017** – MB reverses the decision regarding the removal of the Commander and Chief Inspector ranks. This decision was reviewed by the new Commissioner in the light of current operational pressures and was reversed as a consequence. The BCU design has therefore responded to this change in direction.

6. Operational Context

Assessment of how successfully the BCU pathfinders are operating needs to take into account pressures across London as a whole that may affect operational performance. This enables BCU performance to be more accurately compared against other boroughs. Key pressures affecting the MPS include:

- Crime has increased by 5.7% in the 12 months to September 2017 with particularly challenging increases in violent crime and crimes which are more complex to investigate (shootings, stabbings, cyber, serious sex offences etc.).
• Crime involving corrosive substances has increased by 16%.
• 999 calls have gone up 12% in the last year and 22% over the last two years.
• Non-crime demand is increasing: every day there are, on average, 160 missing person reports across London (up 8% from last year) and 315 calls associated with Mental Health (75% unrelated to crime).
• The threat from terrorism has been brought into sharp focus following incidents in Westminster, London Bridge, Finsbury Park and Parsons Green.
• As a consequence of terrorist and other incidents, including Grenfell Tower, the level of central public order aid abstraction from boroughs has risen by 40%.
• Moped enabled crime is an example of a new crime type affecting both the BCU pathfinders and a number of other boroughs across London.

Central Aid

The overall increase of central aid across London between April – Aug 2016 and the same period for 2017 was 43%.

In the two pathfinder sites, the level of abstraction increased by 33% for North and 19% for East across the whole of this period – the difference reflecting the fact that the East was protected from this during July and August.

However for a specific month during the delivery period, June 2017, the increase in central aid for North was 82% when compared with 2016. For East the increase was even higher – at 118%.

These pressures were felt across the MPS – but are a significant factor to be taken into account when assessing delivery by pathfinders during a key phase of implementation.

7. Organisational Context

Given its size, Territorial Policing will deliver the overwhelming majority of any further savings in officer numbers for the MPS. There is therefore an expectation of a significant further reduction in local policing numbers by 2021. In these circumstances, the professional judgement of the MPS is that a significant number of boroughs will be unable to sustain the full range of policing services on a 24/7 basis. Kingston and Richmond for example have already – independently from the SLP programme – had to amalgamate their CID.

In order to manage this operational impact the MPS needs to:

a. Establish units of a suitable size to provide resilience in the delivery of core policing services.

b. Protect the requirements of functions that require a higher degree of specialism (e.g. offender management or child abuse investigation) and are therefore difficult to maintain on an individual borough basis.

Failure to change the operating model from the existing 32 Borough structure will render some Boroughs increasingly unsustainable as independent units.
This section describes the success criteria of the BCU Pathfinders and how they evolved in the light of the finalisation of the Police and Crime plan 2017-2021. It includes consideration of the impact of change on performance more generally.

The MPS monitors performance across a broad range of measures linked to operational activity, as well as crime levels. Under the current Police and Crime Plan the organisation has moved away from ‘hard’ numerical targets (such as the 20% reduction in MOPAC7 neighbourhood crimes) and success is defined as lasting significant change on the previous rolling year. This approach is intended to avoid the pitfall of missing deteriorating performance in areas that are not subject to specific targets, avoiding the ‘what’s measured is what matters’ approach, and seeks to drive a culture of continuous improvement.

Assessing the success of the BCU pathfinders follows the same approach. All areas of delivery have been subject to routine performance monitoring, data analysis and interpretation. This has allowed adaptation of the model over time to ensure the best possible service delivery to the public. The main criteria has been to ensure that performance on the two BCU pathfinder sites has been consistent with trends across London and across policing in England and Wales more generally, and that there has not been a statistically significant deterioration in performance during a period of unprecedented change. For example, recorded crime has been rising nationally for around two years, this has been replicated in London, and on the BCU pathfinders. Trends can be temporal, and may reflect wider crime drivers which may not necessarily recognize geographical policing boundaries. In this context this should not be seen as a failure of the BCU model, but rather as a reflection of a much wider trend.

---

**Key Points:**

- Financial challenges facing the MPS have become far more significant during the period of pathfinder delivery.
- As a consequence, the benefits of operating at scale have become an increasingly important factor when considering operational resilience across London.
- The benefits for enabling functions (such as PSD and LDSS) of operating at scale should form part of any consideration of the benefits of the SLP.
- Stability and consistent operating practice within larger and more evenly sized operational units is considered a strong foundation for further change.
- Operational events placed an unforeseen pressure on the MPS and on the BCU pathfinders during a critical period of implementation.
- Aid following incidents in June 2017 placed particular pressure on both pathfinders.
- The MPS Transformation Directorate has been evolving throughout the BCU pathfinder period and developing an increased capability and capacity to support change.

---

8. Testing and Assessing Success

This section describes the success criteria of the BCU Pathfinders and how they evolved in the light of the finalisation of the Police and Crime plan 2017-2021. It includes consideration of the impact of change on performance more generally.
9. Success Criteria

The three objectives of the BCU Pathfinders were set out in January 2017:

- To enable more effective and efficient delivery of policing across London in line with agreed programme benefits – to be assessed through:
  - Delivery of key elements of the new operating model; confirmation that the model is running as designed.
  - Confidence that it will deliver expected efficiencies and benefits; and maintenance of appropriate levels of service delivery at Borough as well as BCU level.

- To enable the MPS to deliver the Mayor’s Police and Crime 2017-2021 – through delivery of acceptable performance that is realistic within the time scale of the BCU pathfinder in relation to crime, ASB and victim satisfaction, including performance against agreed borough priorities.

- To support delivery of strategic objectives through effective partnership engagement and joint working – assessed through the maintenance or improvement of Safeguarding performance, maintenance or improvement in partnership working, and community confidence in policing.

Acceptable performance in this context means performance that is consistent with, or within normal variation from, London-wide performance; is on track to deliver to that level; or is in line with pre-existing trends before the start of the pathfinders.

Specific criteria for effective operational delivery include, but are not limited to:

a. **Emergency response performance** is at the required standard against corporate commitments or has been on an upward trend and is on track to deliver the standards.

b. **Borough priorities**: the ability to deliver the local agreed borough priorities. In EA these are burglary and non-domestic violence with injury (all boroughs). In CN these are theft from person (both); common assault (Camden); and motor vehicle theft (Islington).

c. **Safeguarding**: detection rates for sexual assault, child cruelty and domestic violence are on a par with pre-BCU performance and in line with MPS performance overall, and/or are on an upward trend towards achieving this level of performance.

The development of the PCP performance framework after the start of Pathfinder delivery has led to a number of questions about the success criteria. It is important to highlight that the BCU pathfinder success criteria, and therefore the focus of the lessons learned and review, were defined in this way to take into account the change following the Mayoral elections from pan-London performance targets, such as the reduction of MOPAC 7 neighbourhood crimes by 20%, set by the previous administration and against which the MPS’s performance was measured for four years. It also took into account the timing of the public consultation on the Mayor’s Policing and Crime Plan (PCP) which ran from December 2016 to March 2017¹, overlapping the BCU pathfinder go live date of 16 January 2017 by two months.

Once agreed, the PCP performance measures were accommodated for each BCU. These are not accompanied by specific targets, but they are amongst the indicators examined within the analysis of BCU pathfinder performance (see below).

10. Impact of Change on Performance

An additional factor when examining pathfinder performance is to gain a better assessment of the likely impact of the change involved on performance. The Kubler-Ross change curve model has been used to describe the impact of change on an organisation.

Figure 1: Kubler-Ross change curve

Leopold and Kaltenecker\(^2\) noted that a dip in performance in the change curve occurs when the change necessitates that the people in the organisation have to unlearn old behaviours, processes and systems and learn new ways of doing things. Also new systems and processes need to be embedded in the organisation and made to fit with existing structures and processes.

They argue: “During the process of change, it is almost always the case that something new must be learned and, as is all too frequently forgotten, something old must be unlearned. Structures must be brought to life; processes practised; competences acquired; patterns of behaviour cultivated.”

Going through the change curve inevitably touches significantly on an organisation’s culture, which in turn is influenced by its leadership. Cultural change is often more challenging to bring about than the changing of processes or police procedures. This complex and enduring aspect of policing is described in more detail in Part C and is being driven forwards by the Leading for London initiative:

The ‘Leading for London’ programme identifies the leadership and cultural needs of the MPS and provides a solution (comprehensive training package) that will benefit organisational culture, build greater leadership capability and support the wider transformation programme…” (MOPAC, 2016)

Given the transformational nature of several aspects of the BCU model, the risk of a performance dip is very high – and one aspect of pathfinder learning is to recognise the high likelihood that this will happen but also to understand how best to minimise the intensity and length of time of any performance reduction that happens.

The pathfinder tests and the learning from them provide confidence that we are able to mitigate these impacts. For example, the changes to the response element of the model means that the pathfinder experience in reduced service delivery will not happen elsewhere; the increased lead in time for internal and external engagement will address those issues that have arisen in stakeholder relationships and staff understanding of the changes; and the response timeliness improvements, training and preparation prior to merger on Mi-Investigation, and bedding in of other organisational changes in crime management (online and telephone reporting) will address the fall-off in victim satisfaction.

---

Part B: Design and Performance Data

The following section examines each of the functions within the pathfinder in terms of the original design, the extent to which that design was put in place, the performance delivered, the lessons learned and the design changes as a consequence of that learning.

Each function within the pathfinder design is considered using the following information:

A. **Design** – is based on high level and detailed documentation approved in 2016
B. **Performance** – is based on analysis of relevant data by the MPS Insight & Strategy unit.
C. **Lesson learned** – drawn from feedback from across BCUs and partners
### 11 Neighbourhoods

#### a. Original Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Expected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>• Will be delivered through dedicated and ring fenced officers and PSCOs who will have an explicit focus on engaging with the community and on problem solving the priorities for local communities and young people. These officers will focus on enabling communities and young people to live and thrive in London&lt;br&gt;• Neighbourhood policing will be delivered through physical presence, supported by improved digital engagement&lt;br&gt;• Officers and PCSOs will be locally based, supported by mobile technology, to maximise their presence in their community (whether that be a ward a school or a PRU)&lt;br&gt;• Local problems will be linked to strategic London Issues through the new Partnership &amp; Prevention units on every BCU. These teams will support partnership working and collaboration, lead on strategic problem solving and provide expert advice on current priorities (e.g. licensing, alcohol or drugs issues)&lt;br&gt;• Neighbourhood officers will be supported by deployable resources from BCU Proactive teams and from Response teams.&lt;br&gt;• There will be a Superintendent lead for Neighbourhoods on every BCU who will build and drive strategic partnerships within the BCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key elements of the design have been delivered but with challenges experienced in terms of ring fencing, the functionality within partnership and prevention hubs, and the delivery of problem solving and enabling support – particularly from technology.

**DWO and Youth Numbers:** as part of the Commissioner and Mayor’s commitment to neighbourhood policing, the design created two DWO posts on every ward with additional posts for high demand wards. Both BCUs received an additional 33 of these demand based DWOs. The BCU pathfinders consist of a total of 90 wards (CN BCU pathfinder has 34 wards, EA BCU pathfinder consists of 56 wards).

In EA there were a total of 60 DWO posts across the three boroughs prior to the BCU implementation – 18 in Barking & Dagenham, 19 in Havering and 23 in Redbridge. At go-live this increased to 145 posts, all of which were filled. The additional ‘demand based’ officers were distributed between the individual boroughs (12 to Barking and Dagenham, 12 to Redbridge and 9 to Havering). Normal staff movement and the lead-in time for recruitment means that there are currently 128 DWOs in post, with recruitment in hand to fill the remaining posts.

The number of youth officer posts was increased from 31 (12 Barking & Dagenham, 9 Havering, 10 Redbridge) to 56 for the BCU. There are currently 44 in post.

In CN there were 43 DWO posts prior to the BCU (22 Camden and 21 Islington). This was increased to 101 (68 to provide 2 on each ward and an additional 33 demand based allocation). The additional ‘demand based’ officers were distributed between the individual boroughs – 17 to Islington and 16 to Camden. The 101 figure was based on the original design but has reduced to 89 posts, of which 87 are currently filled. This is because 12 posts are now part of neighbourhood tasking teams. Schools/youth officers increased from 17 (9
Camden and 8 Islington) to 46 with 31 currently in post. In both BCUs the additional demand-based DWOs were allocated in discussion and agreement with the local authority.

Examples of the operational results these officers have delivered during the pathfinder period are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Neighbourhood activity in EA BCU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues such as prostitution across the Redbridge/Barking border (Op Bering) are being tackled. The joint tasking arrangements on each of the three boroughs has been reviewed and measures agreed to strengthen them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Havering there were reports of “drifting vehicles” and other anti-social and nuisance vehicle use. The team have worked with Local Authority Partners and businesses to get extra CCTV in place to actively catch and record it happening. Several people have been processed for offences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After reports of drug dealing and associated rough sleeping in Valentines Park IG1, the team carried out mobile patrols, foot patrols and have held crime preventions stalls and street briefings in the area. The reports have reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods now attend all three borough tasking meetings with joint operations now business as usual. This includes the Barking Learning Centre being used as a joint briefing location between DWOs and council enforcement teams. On Havering joint patrols with trading standards take place in relation to rogue traders which protect vulnerable residents. These locations overlap with burglary hotspots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus callers were reported in Francis Avenue, Clementswood. The team have worked closely with local authority partners with regard to CCTV. Also they liaised with Family Mosaic to arrange security for local people and have distributed Smartwater during street briefings to provide practical crime prevention and reassure local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Partnership Hub is focusing on repeat callers and locations with a view to reducing incidents. They continue to have a licensing team and have enhanced our media and communication with the public and partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Bering has been run in partnership with the LBs of Redbridge and Barking &amp; Dagenham and outreach workers. It commenced during July 2017 in order to tackle prostitution, those who control sex workers and those who seek their services. Since the operation began there have been 40 arrests and 37 cautions for prostitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Chesapeake, run in partnership between Ilford Town Centre Safer Neighbourhoods Team with LB of Redbridge and British Transport Police, commenced in September 2017 in response to increasing reports of drug dealing and associated criminal activity. The operation also focuses on vulnerable people caught up in this criminal activity, undertaking safeguarding activity for girls at risk of CSE and proactive work targeting offenders. There have been over 70 arrests and prosecutions since the operation commenced: 12 arrests have been for drug supply offences, 8 arrests for weapons - 5 knives, 2 baseball bats, 1 knuckle duster and 1 imitation firearms. The operation will continue over the Christmas period up until the end of 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Neighbourhood activity in CN BCU

A schools programme has been rolled out across the BCU. Schools and Youth officer posts have been used to provide a university liaison service to in excess of 30 university sites across Camden and Islington. This includes University College London, SOAS–University of London and City-University of London. In addition to delivering a named police officer for each of the BCU’s secondary schools, CN have a team of Primary School liaison officers who work alongside their secondary school colleagues to deliver a schools engagement programme unique to 5-11 year olds. The secondary delivery areas are focussed on knife crime, choices and consequences discussions and crime prevention, and the primary teams focus on stranger danger, e-safety and wellbeing. These engagement activities are planned and delivered in partnership with head teachers, staff and governors.

Police hospital teams have been established, providing a liaison service to 19 NHS sites across the BCU. This includes three Central London A&E sites (Royal Free, Whittington and University College Hospitals), as well as Great Ormond Street and Moorfields Eye Hospitals. These officers have been resourced from the Partnership and Prevention hub. These strategic relationships have made a real difference in terms of how the MPS responds to crimes against A&E staff, how we will manage major incidents within a hospital setting and have also forged better working relationships between our safeguarding function and partners such as Great Ormond Street. The hospital team work directly within the hospital environment (overnight at weekends) and also act as an effective conduit between NHS service providers and the police – particularly when supporting mental health teams and complex investigations across the BCU. Their work has been recognised nationally, particularly in respect of the support provided to GOSH during the Charlie Gard case.

As a result of reports of drugs being smoked/dealt near the Odeon cinema in Shaftesbury Avenue, the team have conducted uniform and plain clothes patrols and proactive operations (Operation Stinger). Since July there have been multiple arrests for drugs in the area under Operation Voltiguer.

On the Curnock Estate NW1 there were reports of drug use. The neighbourhood team have conducted targeted foot patrols and worked with the council CCTV leading to a reduction in the problem in the area and reduced complaints.

After reports of Anti-social scooter riding in a park in Rosemary Gardens N1, the team carried out regular targeted patrols with Parkguard, carried out weapons sweeps and put a dispersal order in place over several weekends.

B. Performance

Many areas of performance related to Neighbourhoods tend to take a significant length of time to see change in terms of problem solving and community confidence. This report focuses on ASB, abstraction rates and use of social media.

Antisocial Behaviour: This is a local priority for every borough across London. Levels of ASB are subject to seasonal rises over the summer months, and this is reflected in the rises on both EA and CN since the launch of the BCU model. Current performance is in line with the trend across London.
The data indicates that there has been not been a negative effect on levels of ASB compared to the rest of London as a result of the introduction of the BCU model, and it is too early to see the results of longer term problem solving in ASB statistics. Local problem solving and communication with local residents and businesses is key to reducing antisocial behaviour, and DWOs play an important part in a local approach. The experience of the Pathfinders gives confidence that the Neighbourhood element of the model will allow us to work effectively in partnership to target the issues that concern local people in a structured way.

**DWO Abstraction:** the ring-fencing of DWOs is a key commitment of the Neighbourhood design, allowing DWOs to maximise the amount of time that they can spend on their wards, tackling the issues that matter most to local communities. The table below shows the percentage of time DWOs spent on their wards, or on adjacent wards to jointly tackle common problems. If they are required to work further away, but still within the BCU, this is shown as Local Aid. The time spent off their wards includes activities such as training, court, ‘aid’ to events elsewhere in London and staffing up response teams.
Figure 4: DWO abstraction rates in BCU pathfinders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>On Ward</th>
<th>Percentage On Ward</th>
<th>Off Ward Activity</th>
<th>Off Ward</th>
<th>Percentage Off Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Up ERPT</td>
<td>Staffing Up ERPT %</td>
<td>Central Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>14945</td>
<td>14964</td>
<td>96.76%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>12595</td>
<td>12528</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>12586</td>
<td>12195</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>13913</td>
<td>13841</td>
<td>99.50%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>14484</td>
<td>14398</td>
<td>99.41%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>14907</td>
<td>14759</td>
<td>98.95%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ring-fencing of DWOs in EA was suspended for a period in August as a result of problems experienced in the implementation and performance of the response function there. This was to support short-term risk management while the problems were rectified, and ring fencing was reintroduced in mid-September. The next section deals with the response function problems and the steps to rectify them and as a result there are high levels of confidence this will not be repeated. The communication of this to partners is acknowledged not to have been as timely as it should have been given the commitments made on ring fencing.

Apart from the temporary suspension in EA of ring-fencing, this demonstrates that the model allows the MPS to meet the commitment to invest in additional DWOs and to ensure they are not unnecessarily abstracted from their core role.

Use of Social Media: the Neighbourhood element of the BCU includes a commitment to increase the digital footprint of the Neighbourhood officers as well as their physical presence. This is seen as a key element in building confidence in local policing by demonstrating the activity that DWOs are involved in, as well as communicating the opportunities for the public to contact their local ward officers. All wards now have Twitter accounts and smartphones, allowing them to send updates while out on patrol. Figure 6, below, illustrates the percentage of BCU wards that tweeted in a 7-day period during each month. Both of the BCU pathfinders are above the MPS average and work has been ongoing on both sites to continue this increase.
Figure 5: BCU pathfinder wards using Twitter in a 7 day period

C. Lessons Learned

Within the design, the following key areas of learning emerged:

- **Communications**: the Neighbourhoods function is particularly reliant on an effective approach to media and communications. Steps taken to resolve this were not as effective as needed – in part due to a lack of skills and capacity to manage the work required. Local steps have been taken in the East to provide a systematic process to manage communication and engagement in tandem with local authorities. Future implementation will include the early development of a communication strategy and plan that harnesses the joint opportunities with local authorities to maximise the information provided to the public.

- **Resources**: the original design involved the use of response officers to support neighbourhood policing with additional operational capacity. In practice this has not worked, mainly because of the competing pressures on response teams. Tasking arrangements have subsequently been developed in both BCUs – but this relies on greater flexibility of ‘discretionary’ DWOs and Youth officers and on effective engagement with the Proactive Teams in Crime Investigation. Future BCUs will have flexibility to determine how best to use their demand based DWO allocation. They may assign some officers as additional ring-fenced DWOs to high demand wards and use the remainder to form neighbourhood tasking teams. This will be determined in the individual BCU blueprint process and will be an operational decision for the BCU Commander, but will be undertaken in consultation with local partners.

CN BCU Pathfinder recently received agreement from both local authorities to create two dedicated neighbourhood tasking teams which will enable effective tasking of some of the additional DWOs towards local problems and priorities, delivering effective and timely interventions where the resident ward officers are insufficient in number. This was in direct response to feedback from our Neighbourhood Sergeants that their levels of proactivity had reduced as a result of ring-fencing dedicated ward staff.
• **The Neighbourhood Partnership & Prevention Hub (PPH)** is accepted as a good idea in principle but has lacked direction and clarity of design. Local differences and requirements play a significant part in getting this area to work effectively. The revised design places the hub at the core of the neighbourhood strand, providing support, coordination and tasking capabilities. There is more clarity as to how it should interact with DWOs, schools officers and other departments. It will work within a framework of 5 thematic areas – vulnerable people/places, young people, social media/technology, CT/hate crime and alcohol/drugs. BCUs will still have flexibility to model this to local needs.

**Dedicated Ward Officers - DWOs**

There is broad agreement that two DWOs per ward is a positive aspect to the model, it has allowed more focused work and more problems solving work in communities and has generally allowed DWOs more time without the burden of investigations. This has allowed them to concentrate on ward priorities which has been popular with the community.

**D. Design Changes:**

The next iteration of the Neighbourhoods design has taken the following into account:

- **Policy and Process:** Clarity has been provided regarding the co-ordination role of the Partnership Prevention hub (PPH) and how it will task Neighbourhood officers.
- **Improved communication with partners from an early stage** has been identified as a key component of success to ensure that strong local partnerships are built upon.
- **A Neighbourhood tasking asset** will be developed to support all Neighbourhood officers where there is a demand for extra support to core functions such as warrants or local aid.
- **There has been the provision of a clearer definition** of the activities to be regarded as ‘off ward’ or abstracted activity.
- **More clarity of roles** which will be held within the PPH, to reduce any gaps in the service provided by Neighbourhoods. This includes more detail with regard to the role and function of the Early and Late Duty SNT supervisor.
- **Response issues** which have impacted Neighbourhood Officers (DWOs and Schools officers) have been addressed which should allow those officers to concentrate on their role.
12. Response

A. Original Design

| Response | • Response Teams will become the professional, first line of policing across London, providing initial intervention for all crimes and incidents and then owning the majority of crimes from cradle to grave. They will be significantly larger than they are now and will have the majority of corporate skills required by the MPS (Public order, POLSA, TASER etc.)
• They will provide a high quality service to victims without requiring victims/ witnesses to deal with multiple units or officers.
• Where appropriate, specialist officers from the BCU or from Central Specialist teams will attend to deal with more serious or complex offending. These specialists will operate on the same basis as the response teams – they will hold the crimes themselves and build and maintain a productive relationship with victims and witnesses.
• Response Teams will provide public order aid and the ability for London to mobilise as needed, 24/7. They will provide additional support to problem solving by Neighbourhoods teams
• Inspectors line managing these teams will have oversight across a BCU – either as an Incident manager (deployed to Incidents) or an Operations Manager (based at the BCU HQ/ Operations Room)
• Sgts will take on core leadership roles for most response functions and all but the most serious incidents.
• There will be a Superintendent lead on every BCU – with responsibility for response to incidents and the investigation of PIP1 crime on the BCU. |

B. Performance

The key feature of emergency response performance is attendance at ‘I’ calls (arrive within 15 minutes) and ‘S’ calls (arrive within 60 minutes).

The timeliness of response performance has been a challenge across the MPS over the last year. This has been impacted by a number of factors including surges of demand, staffing issues at Met CC (the MPS’s centralised command and control function) and the availability of drivers. This has centred on the 11 boroughs in north and east London that are serviced by the Bow Met CC Centre, which include all the boroughs in the BCU pathfinders. For this reason, performance is shown against this peer group below.

---

4 The College of Policing describes PIP1 crime as priority and volume crime including “street robbery, burglary and vehicle-related criminality, but can also apply to criminal damage or assaults”. There are 4 levels to the PIP structure of crime investigation. PIP level 1 – priority and volume crime investigations, PIP level 2 – serious and complex investigations, PIP level 3 – major investigations, PIP level 4 – strategic management of highly complex investigations. Source: College of Policing
There was an initial deterioration in response performance following the launch of the new model. Some impact on performance was expected due to the scale of the changes, but the level of service reduction was significantly higher than anticipated, especially EA where the fall off was much greater than at CN. Response performance has now returned to the levels of neighbouring boroughs, and for both EA and CN BCU pathfinder performance has returned to and surpassed the levels at the start of the BCU pathfinders.

To address the performance dip, immediate steps were taken to minimise risk to the public. These include additional joint review processes between MetCC and EA BCU pathfinder to prioritise calls presenting the highest level of risk, and additional resources being put into response through the temporary suspension of ring fencing DWOs. Despite the decrease in attendance times, these measures ensured that no member of the public was put at increased risk. The risk management plan and progress to resolve the issues were closely monitored by the DMPC.

At the same time, urgent analysis was conducted to identify the causes of the problem. These were identified primarily as being:

- Increased despatch times – due to changes to the ‘open incident’ (OI) list structure from borough to BCU; changes to the usage of radio channels including the use of a single despatch channel for the BCU; training for MetCC staff in the new approach not having been fully delivered.

- Longer response times – due to problems in ‘recycling’ units from call to call; changes to the usage of radio channels; and insufficient clarity about supervisory roles and responsibilities.

- Higher than anticipated demand levels – the planned shift of 42% of crime calls from response teams to being dealt with online or over the telephone against which resource levels were modelled, had only reached 30% prior to the changes to the response function.
The response model was reviewed, and options to address the problem were explored with staff from the pathfinders and MetCC. As a consequence of this work, changes were made to the response model on the two pathfinder BCUs.

- Both BCU pathfinders now have clearly defined sub-sectors (in practice working along borough boundaries). This model is much closer to the previous way of working but, crucially, officers have retained end to end responsibilities for investigations - one of the primary changes necessary to deliver increased efficiency and which is intended, subject to the comments above, to improve the quality of service provided to victims.

- A key issue was the impact of new ways of working on the sergeants and inspectors - and their ability to manage both the change to their responsibilities and those of their officers and teams. Small changes to the ways in which front line leaders exercised control over their teams led to a rapid build-up of incidents – which placed stress throughout the command and control system. Changes made to radio and incident management systems have been aimed at enabling more effective team leadership.

- CN have made adjustments to how the radio channels operate but have retained a BCU-wide despatch function - maximising cross-border deployment. EA deliver despatch on a sector/borough basis.

- As a consequence of these changes, there are now differences of responsibility for the Operations Manager and Duty Officer roles across the two sites. Resolving these differences is the subject of ongoing design work.

- The dual systems now in place meet local requirements but create a challenge for MetCC to manage in terms of their staffing, training and operating practice.

- In EA BCU pathfinder, the implementation of three OI lists and three Duty Officers on a borough basis resulted in immediate improved I and S grade performance.

The early challenges in the response function meant that there has, rightly, been significant focus on this issue. It is therefore important to recognise that the performance currently being delivered at least equals and in many aspects improves on the performance prior to the establishment of the BCU pathfinders.

CN performance suffered a limited dip in performance with the implementation of the pathfinder, and to reflect this the changes to the structure of the response service was subject to limited adaptation in September 2017. I call performance for both boroughs has been on a steady upward trajectory since June; is better than it was at the same time in 2016 prior to the BCU; and in December achieved the MPS target of 90% calls attended within 15 minutes. S calls have similarly improved steadily since June and are now significantly better than prior to the BCU.
BCU pathfinder response performance – I and S grade calls

In the following charts, the blue line shows 2017 performance and the orange line 2016.

**CN BCU Pathfinder**

Figure 7: CN BCU ‘I’ calls on target

Figure 8: CN BCU ‘S’ calls on target

Figure 9: Camden ‘I’ calls on target

Figure 10: Camden ‘S’ calls on target
EA BCU Pathfinder

EA experienced a much greater dip in performance and more substantive measures were required to stabilise the response function (see below). The improvement has been dramatic and residents of all three boroughs are receiving a substantially better service in response to calls than prior to the BCU – I call performance has exceeded the same month in 2016 for the last 5 months in Redbridge, for the last three in Havering, and two in Barking & Dagenham. S call performance has been better on each borough for the last three months. The strong upward trend gives confidence that this performance will continue to improve as the new working practices continue to bed in.

The performance in Havering is of particular note. There have been significant concerns that the outer London boroughs would receive a lesser service in a BCU as resource is drawn towards the higher demand areas. Havering has the lowest demand of the three boroughs in EA BCU, but in relation to the performance element of the model has received the greatest dividend in improved service, while still delivering improved performance on the other two boroughs.

The impact on public confidence and satisfaction caused by the fall off in response performance following the implementation of the BCU was and is significant, and clearly will take longer to recover than the actual performance itself.

Figure 11: Islington ‘I’ calls on target

Figure 12: Islington ‘S’ calls on target

Figure 13: EA BCU ‘I’ calls on target
Figure 14: EA BCU ‘S’ calls on target (December 2017 84.3% -65.5%)  

Figure 15: Barking and Dagenham ‘I’ calls on target

Figure 16: Barking & Dagenham ‘S’ calls on target

Figure 17: Havering ‘I’ calls on target

Figure 18: Havering ‘S’ calls on target
C. Lessons Learned

Both BCU pathfinders implemented BCU wide response teams operating on a re-configured command and control system. This change operated a BCU wide despatch channel that would, in principle, enable the most efficient management of policing across the wider area. However, as a consequence of a drop in operational performance and feedback from officers this system was reviewed and changed.

The response operating model is based on changes to the management of crime leading to a reduction in the number of physical deployments by officers. This involves moving to the point at which 42% (rather than the starting level of 19%) of crime is dealt with either by telephone or online. These changes were implemented in January 2017 – but had not delivered the expected level of channel shift by the time that the response changes were made. This resulted in higher than expected workloads for response teams at go-live. Subsequently, up to 36% of incoming crime demand has been dealt with in this way. This has not yet reached original target levels (as a proportion) but, given the increase in crime across London, these units are now dealing with a higher volume of crimes than originally envisaged.

Both BCU pathfinders have also now introduced locally based Resolution Centres. These units aim to resolve appropriate non-crime incidents without the immediate deployment of officers. These have proved successful in contributing to a significant drop in demand – particularly for S grade calls (which are now 40% lower in 2017 than 2016).

The learning from telephone investigation on the pathfinders has already been used to inform MPS wide roll out of the Telephone and Digital Investigation Unit and is also leading to the accelerated development of Contact & Resolution Centres across London.

Demand reduction activity did not take place in advance of changes to response, causing higher workloads. This impact has reduced over time, but contributed to initial challenges in the effectiveness of response design.
There is, however, continuing concern among front line staff that demand modelling has not accurately measured the workloads within response, and therefore about the ability of the design to cope with abstractions, aid and surges in demand. These concerns were exacerbated by the unforeseen increase in aid across the MPS in the first half of 2017. There were also difficulties in establishing and communicating ERPT minimum strengths, and on occasion this generated misunderstanding that caused resourcing problems for the BCUs, MetCC and SCO22. However current performance on the pathfinders and the changes made to the design of the response function gives confidence that the modelling of resources against demand has come into line.

ERPT sergeant roles are critical to the recycling of units to service CAD demand. The idea of cross border working has yet to fully embed itself and officers are still attached to their borough identities. However, the role of the section sergeant is a key driver in achieving BCU response performance, not just at a sector level.

The deployment of specialist investigators to serious and complex crimes is seen as a very positive aspect of the design. However, some feedback suggests that there is a reversion to pre BCU pathfinder ways of working, with a telephone triage system being operated and this is being addressed.

The management of the BCU Ops Room has been different for each BCU pathfinder. From the outset, CN have managed the Ops Room as part of the Response strand, while within EA it has remained under the BCU HQ. There has been significant learning in this area:

- The role of the BCU Ops room was not clearly articulated in the designs of all other strands – and this has now been addressed.
- The impact of the Ops Room was diluted due to delays in the IT changes to the CAD (Computer Aided Despatch) system.
- The role profiles of strands required revising with BCU input.
- The presence of staff from each strand in the Ops Room was inconsistent requiring management intervention to secure buy in.

The tension between Borough and MetCC operations functions has continued in respect of grip processes, incident management, performance and recycling of units. There is work in Programme 2 of the One Met Model portfolio (Optimising Response) that is addressing this.

D. Design Changes

- To avoid the risk of decreased performance during implementation, response inspectors will be responsible for performance and will have the flexibility to manage their resources to meet demand.
- The Operations Manager role has been redefined to ensure oversight across the BCU and ensure flex between sectors according to demand to release efficiencies.
- Mi-Investigation will be introduced prior to allow stabilisation in investigation prior to structural changes in response.
- The section sergeant role has been redefined to ensure the ability to effectively recycle units to meet demand.
- Inspector roles have been redefined to ensure accountability for performance with autonomy on how it is delivered within their teams.
- The configuration of Open Incident lists and radio channels will be done on an individual BCU basis and reflect the demands on that BCU.
- Sectors in each BCU will be configured in the blueprinting process to reflect the specific requirements of that BCU.
13. Safeguarding

A. Original Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Expected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safeguarding (formerly named Protecting Vulnerable People) | • This new service is focussed on a holistic approach to both offending and victimisation – in which vulnerability and risk are identified as early as possible and addressed, quickly, by the most appropriate and skilled resources  
• Under this model, assessment and referrals are made via a single team, making sure that there is a joined up safeguarding approach to both low and high risk individuals  
• The approach to investigation is to create pods consisting of three specialist investigation teams; CAIT (Child Abuse Investigation Team); Sapphire (sexual offences and rape); Community Safety Unit (dealing with domestic abuse including sexual offences, vulnerable adults and hate crime). This provides the skills necessary to bring offenders to justice, coupled with the ability to make sure that the needs of the victim are prioritised. Multifaceted crimes will be allocated to one IO who is skilled to undertake the full investigation with the support of other specialists.  
• Investment in a team to investigate Level 1 Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) with the development of a bespoke training course.  
• High risk misper investigations will be led by the Safeguarding Hub DI with ‘fast time’ tasking support of other strands. The Missing Person policy is under review, however medium and low risk investigations within the first 48hrs remains the responsibility of ERPT teams supported by the Local Resolution Desk.  
• A holistic approach will be based on a single risk assessment framework and a leadership structure that is focussed on prioritising against risk to make best use of all available resources. This framework will not simply drive the activity of the safeguarding teams but also action across the whole of the BCU to protect the vulnerable  
• This service will be led by a superintendent, who will have responsibility for delivering this integrated approach in the BCU, and will operate within a London-wide framework in which the MPS drives consistency of operating practice across London – with the ability to draw on additional and specialist resource when necessary. |

Staffing: this strand has seen the devolution of 153 posts (89 to EA, 64 to CN) from SC&O17, the teams previously managed within Specialist Crime and Operations dealing with serious sexual offences and child protection, into the integrated model with existing borough-based units. This has been a very significant change in terms of the previous working practices.

In addition to the movement of posts from the centre to the BCU pathfinders, the overall safeguarding model has seen an increased investment of staff, reflecting one of the strategic objectives of the SLP programme:

• EA BCU have increased the number of posts by 50 (188 to 238)  
• CN BCU have increased the number of posts 33 (132 to 165).

Safeguarding Investigation: Sexual Offences Investigative Techniques (SOIT) officers are now aligned to Safeguarding investigation teams and are therefore able to service and support
CAIT and CSU investigations. Previously they were only used within the specific remit of Sapphire investigations under SC&O17 (CASO).

The expertise of a SOIT officer assigned to a CAIT or CSU serious sexual offence investigation means that best evidence can be obtained at the earliest opportunity, as well as providing the maximum support to the victim.

The full integration of the Safeguarding investigative strands (three specialisms working alongside collaboratively) will, given the degree of organisational and cultural change, take time to further bed in. Overall, however, the implementation of the safeguarding structure has been one of the most important elements of the BCU model and a significant amount has been achieved.

**Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE):** both BCU pathfinder sites have in place dedicated CSE Level 1 investigation teams that form part of the BCU Safeguarding Hub. Previously there was a lack of consistency as to how these investigations were allocated across boroughs, with no dedicated staff, which inhibited effective training investment and oversight. CSE Level 2 and 3 crimes are currently investigated by the CASO Sexual Exploitation Team (SET). Feedback on supervision and CSE workloads within the Safeguarding Hub has resulted in an additional DS post. Level 2 and level 3 CSE allegations currently within the SET remit will remain in a centralised team, providing reactive and proactive capability across London and County Lines. The team will continue to deal with the more complex and protracted investigations, whilst providing support and expertise to BCUs.

**Safeguarding Referrals:** both BCU pathfinder sites have a single referral gateway for adult and child Safeguarding services, which has brought together on each borough Public Protection Desks/Multi Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) and the CAIT referral desks – previously managed and located separately – within local authority based referrals desks, including Case Conferencing teams. This has physically brought together police and multi-agency Safeguarding experts at a local level, focusing on early identification of risk and vulnerability in relation to Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse and Child Sexual Exploitation.

Co-location of these services has developed better collaborative working, and most partner feedback has suggested there is improved information sharing which supports timely strategy discussions and enhanced decision making for a more coordinated and consistent inter-agency response with effective use of joint service resources reducing overall demand by focusing on those cases that require fast time intervention and support. CAIT referrals are now integrated into the daily MASH management meetings, as there is representation from CAIT that was not there before.

**Mental health:** The full effectiveness of this part of the design is not yet known. Officers for the Mental Health team have yet to be recruited for EA. The CN Mental Health Team is currently fully staffed and has been in place since the Safeguarding strand of the BCU went live. Their main role should be to problem solve and work with partners to provide an improved service to those suffering from mental health issues which brought them into regular contact with the police. However the team has predominantly been involved in the management and execution of section 135 MHA warrants for the BCU. The responsibility of the Mental Health Team as designed is being reinforced in order to allow officers to focus on identifying, investigating and problem solving repeat mental health demand and engage in early intervention work with service users, and partners in health.

**MARAC:** the MARAC team, within the Safeguarding Hubs on both BCU pathfinders, works in partnership to manage and minimise risk in domestic abuse cases, providing initial support and guidance to response teams investigating standard risk non-crime domestic abuse incidents.

The CN Safeguarding Hub DI attends both the CN borough MARAC meetings. EA initially started with the Safeguarding Hub DI attending all three MARAC meetings but made changes in order to meet local needs and to manage the volume of work. EA has given MARAC responsibility to the Safeguarding Investigation DIs so that a specific DI has primary
responsibility for each local authority within the BCU, which provides a more personal and improved service whilst sharing the MARAC workload of a tri-borough command and addressing partner concerns about the consistency of attendance.

B. Safeguarding Performance:

Assessment of overall performance within safeguarding is complex given the range of different functions involved. The design is to retain specialist teams working alongside each other collaboratively led by a DI. Developing and upskilling officers and working collaboratively gives flexibility of resource at high demand times across the three specialisms.

CN investigative teams and Safeguarding Hub are all co-located at the same site, this provides greater opportunity for flexing resources at high demand times and low resilience periods due to sickness/leave. EA Safeguarding Hub and investigative pods are split across three sites, and pod teams are not co-located, which has been a barrier to effective team working. The EA team locations are being reviewed to address this.

CASO (formerly SC&O17) staff will be devolved into 12 BCUs whereas previously it was split into 4 areas for CAIT and 5 for Sapphire (serious sexual offence) teams. The pre-existing structure involved larger teams with the capacity to have a higher proportion of flexible working. As a result of devolution to smaller BCU teams there is a need to review the ratio of flexible working in addition adjusted duties to ensure Safeguarding teams are able to meet demand and operational commitments. Both CN and EA have been challenged in meeting their 24/7 cover due to the disproportionate impact of flexible working together with vacancies and abstractions.

The abstraction of Safeguarding officers was subject of negative feedback both from MPS staff and partners in disrupting their core business. The ring fencing of SOITs with specialist skills has been reinforced, and ‘aid’ from Safeguarding is now a last resort so that officers can meet their core operational and partnership commitments.

Safeguarding Investigation: a key requirement is the ability of the new Safeguarding function to deliver an effective investigative capability. A traditional measure of performance in this respect is by monitoring the sanction detection (SD) rate\(^5\). The following section covers investigation of domestic abuse, sexual offences, child abuse, CSE, joint investigations and investigation caseloads:

**Domestic Abuse SD rate**

Figure 21: MPS All Boroughs last 12 months.

\(^5\) A sanction detection is counted as any police-recorded crime where a suspect has been identified and notified as being responsible for committing that crime and what the full implications of this are, and has received an official sanction. Official sanctions included are: charges, cautions, penalty notices, offences taken into consideration (TICs) and cannabis warnings. Source HMICFRS.
The MPS sanction detection rate for domestic abuse offences for October 2017 was 32.5%. For the same month EA was at 35.1 % and CN was at 18.9%. The trend in investigative performance on both BCUs reflects both the overall MPS trend and pre-existing local variation. This is subject of performance improvement work across the MPS.

**Figure 22: DA Sanction Detections for CN BCU pathfinder.**

![Graph showing DA Sanction Detections for CN BCU pathfinder.](image)

**Figure 23: DA Sanction Detections for EA BCU pathfinder.**

![Graph showing DA Sanction Detections for EA BCU pathfinder.](image)

**Serious Sexual Offences SD Rate**

The MPS sanction detection rate for serious sexual offences is currently 14% for the 12 months to December 2017. Detection rates are 10% for CN and 27% for EA (although this is influenced by the completion of a SC&O17 investigation involving multiple offences).

The MPS rape SD rate for the latest 12 months is 9%. For CN this is 7% and for EA 9%.

**Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE):** Over the past year, there has been a trend away from central investigation of CSE, with few, very specialist investigations being retained by CASO teams. The overall number of CSE investigations undertaken has remained broadly the same on all five boroughs with the exception of Havering where the number has reduced; however the increased proportion conducted locally is in line with the intention to strengthen local ownership of the issues and generate opportunities for closer partnership working to improve outcomes, as well as ensuring that the specialist central resource is focussed on the highest risk cases.

**Case Management and Referrals:** A key element of safeguarding is how case management and referrals systems are operating. The following section looks at CAIT referrals, child safety strategy discussions, Police Conference Liaison Officers, child protection CRIS (crime recording system) reports and Missing Persons.

The indication from the pathfinders is that the BCU referrals model has improved the triaging of referrals with partner agencies in relation to the number of single agency (Children Social Care (CSC) based investigations) and multi-agency investigations (involving both police and CSC).
The number of CAIT referrals in CN BCU has increased from 1,093 to 1,325, while in EA it has remained broadly the same (1,919 compared to 1,931). The proportion of cases in which joint strategy discussions were held within 24 hours has improved overall on both BCUs, although EA has achieved this more consistently.

Joint agency investigations have increased slightly at CN (from 155 to 160), while single agency investigations have reduced by about a third (122 to 76). At EA the opposite has occurred, with joint investigations decreasing by a quarter (547 to 400) and single agency investigations increasing from 267 to 286.

The trend at EA mirrors more closely the London-wide experience in which joint investigations have decreased by 13% and single agency investigations increased by 6%. It should be noted that the volume at EA is considerably higher than at CN (45% greater in 2017).

As noted above, there has been some improvement in holding strategy discussions on Child Safety within the 24 hour target time. The MPS wide ambition is to achieve this in 90% of cases in order to mitigate any further risk to the child, and both the BCU pathfinders are doing this more often than the MPS average.

It is also important to note that once a joint or multi-agency investigation has been agreed then the process thereafter with regards to the management of CAIT investigations in particular has not changed as a result of the BCU pathfinder model, with many of the same CAIT investigators that were previously employed by SCO17 (CASO) being transferred into the BCU pathfinder sites and working to the same local authorities as they did before.

The feedback from the Police Conference Liaison Officers (PCLOs) has been positive with regards to efficiency savings made by significantly reducing travelling time to and from Child Protection Case Conferences as most conferences are based in the Local Authority buildings, including developing a healthier rapport and closer partnership working with their counterparts within Social Services.

The data indicates different patterns on the two BCUs with positive aspects to both – given that the response needs to reflect the specific features of the local demand. There are no areas where the revised structure is leading to risk being managed less effectively, and the direction of travel on partnership working is positive.

**HMIC Recommendations:** The main recommendations from the HMIC report into Safeguarding were that the MPS should:

- Put in place arrangements which ensure that it has clear governance structures in place to monitor child protection practices, across borough teams and specialist units.
- Take action to improve child protection investigations by ensuring that every referral the police receives is allocated to those with the skills, capacity and competence to undertake the investigation.
- Take action to improve child protection investigations by ensuring that it conducts regular audits of practice that include assessing the quality, timeliness and supervision of investigations.

These recommendations have been progressed through current business as usual structures, but the contribution that will be made by BCUs and the safeguarding function that assist in meeting these requirements are:

- Ensuring a single governance structure for safeguarding within a BCU enables all aspects of the MPS response to child protection to be joined up - and to be both delivered and monitored more effectively through a single, local Superintendent.
- Development of the BCU Safeguarding function is designed with the specific intent of building greater skills and expertise across all ranks.
- The more holistic approach to safeguarding is intended to ensure that child protection investigations are supported by sapphire, domestic abuse and other specialists as
needed. This flexibility is intended to make sure the right areas of expertise are involved more quickly and efficiently in dealing with vulnerable victims.

- Identification, risk assessment and review of child protection will be improved through the enhanced integrated MASH/CAIT referral process.

- Given the scale at which BCUs operate, they are able to establish a more comprehensive and consistent response to particular areas of concern within both child and adult safeguarding: CSE, Missing Persons and Mental Health.

- The Safeguarding HQ function, designed by SLP to support local safeguarding, incorporates both adult and child protection matters under one local command structure (the “Continuous Improvement Command” or “CPIC”). The main functions of this HQ are to support service delivery, compliance, review and partnership engagement.

- A key benefit of the BCU design is that it delivers efficiencies that enable reinvestment in Safeguarding functions (including offender management). It also provides a solid foundation to look at other efficiencies should further investment be required.

Safeguarding Investigation Caseloads: Using previous Demand Analysis, the Safeguarding Investigation teams’ optimum caseloads were set at 16 per officer for CSU and CAIT, and 13 for Sapphire (serious sexual offences). The BCU pathfinders have remained below these levels since the start of the BCU model (this does not factor in the initial caseloads carried over from SC&O17, but workload generated by the BCU). The data below identifies the number of open crimes taken from the CRIS database in 2017.

- **Sapphire**: (serious sexual offences). The average caseload per officer for Sapphire Investigations for CN was 10.5 in November 2017, down from 16.5 in May. The average caseload for EA was 11.5, down from 14.7. The number of cases per officer has reduced since June 2017, with officers holding an average of 11 throughout the period.

- **CAIT**: The average caseload per officer for CAIT investigations for CN was 10.3 in November. This has increased from 8.7 in May, but remains below the optimum 16 crimes. The average caseload for CAIT investigations for EA was 10.9 in November 2017 and 9.9 in May, but again remains below the optimum 16 crimes.

- **CSU**: The average caseload per officer for CSU investigations for CN was 11.4 in November 2017, increased from 7.7 in May but remaining below the optimum 16 crimes. The average caseload for EA was 10.2 in November 2017 up from 8.9 in May, but remains below the optimum 16 crimes.

Overall, there has been a notable reduction in the number of open serious sexual offences since the commencement of the BCU pathfinders, however it should be noted that CASO Sapphire officers had taken with them previous cases and therefore they started with a higher than normal workload. Overall CAIT and CSU workloads have increased since the inception of Safeguarding on the BCU pathfinder sites, although the current levels are within the maximum workload parameters for both investigative strands, with a gradual increase recorded over the last 7 months that reflects the expected increase in demand within these areas of business.

**Missing Persons**: a Missing Persons policy change is currently being piloted on the BCU pathfinder sites to ensure an appropriate response that reflects the level of risk. Response teams have responsibility for managing low and medium risk missing persons within the first 48 hours; those in that particular risk category who remain missing after 48 hours become the responsibility of the safeguarding missing persons unit to continue the enquiries/investigation.

During the initial 4 weeks of the Pilot, there were 572 reports entered onto Merlin (the missing person recording system) across both BCUs; 213 on CN-CU and 359 on EA-CU. 80 Merlin records and 60 random CADs were dip sampled and reviewed. No risks specifically relating directly to the pilot were identified. However, this did identify issues requiring improvement,
which are believed to be replicated across all MPS boroughs – for example lack of recorded rationale. This was identified at the start of the process, and feedback and guidance to officers has resulted in significant improvements, raising the standards and understanding on the BCU pathfinders. Dip sampling of the risk assessments to those aged 14 to under 18 year olds, particularly concentrating those where the grading was assessed as LOW, confirmed that did appropriate risk assessments were being made.

The analysis of quantitative data showed that on both CN and EA BCU pathfinders there was a significant improvement in call handling times for missing person calls. There was a reduction across the two sites in the number of cases necessitating a police response. Additionally, there was an improvement in the time taken to create Merlin records and in the timely completion of Safe and Well checks.

C. Lessons Learned

Resourcing: Vacancies are being held on both BCU pathfinder sites in relation to Safeguarding personnel (CN at 17% and EA at 10%). This substantially reflects the Met-wide shortage of SOIT officers and accredited child abuse investigators, mirroring the pre-existing and current situation in CASO. During the evaluation meetings on EA, discussion’s with officers highlighted that they believed the number of posts in Safeguarding were correct, however officers were being abstracted at that time to support the response function in the BCU. Since the stabilisation of response this has stopped and the abstraction of safeguarding officers has been significantly reduced so that this is, as mentioned above, a last resort. In particular feedback form the Pathfinders resulted in SOIT officers being ring fenced from aid requirements due to their specialist skills and vacancies.

Demand analysis within the BCUs has been conducted to ensure the correct allocation of Safeguarding staffing levels as the model is rolled out across all BCUs. This has included the investment of 64 officers for CSE Level 1 investigation which under the borough structure has no dedicated capability. As a result of the feedback received from the BCU pathfinder sites additional Detective Sergeant posts have been included in the design for CAIT referral, CSE investigation and Missing Persons, providing additional resilience and supervisory support to these key functions.

CSU (domestic abuse investigation teams) numbers have been reviewed due to the demand created by the need to deal with people arrested by response teams, which disrupts the ability to manage their ongoing investigations. Partners voiced their concerns that consistent flexing of CAIT resources into dealing with this demand could have a negative impact on quality and service on child abuse investigations. An additional ten posts have been added to EA CSU numbers and four CSU posts to CN to meet this demand and reduce the necessity to flex resources into CSU from CAIT and Sapphire. The uplift into CSU teams will address those concerns and provide the necessary support to CSU investigation teams.

Supervisory Roles: The importance and empowerment of DSs within the Safeguarding strand was highlighted, with practitioner level decision making being encouraged and micro-management discouraged. There is a strong belief that teams need to work in close physical proximity with their DS to ensure effective team working. Every MASH has been given a CAIT referral DS post to work alongside the PCLO DS giving greater capacity to meet the demand on case conferences.

Officers and staff highlighted insufficient supervision and support in the Safeguarding Hub within the existing design. The new DS for CSE will give greater support for CSE teams and provide the capacity for timely supervision and opportunity to provide investigative, as well as being a local lead with regards to partnership engagement and joint agency working. Investigators and DSs for Missing Persons and for CSE are expected to become multi-skilled in both areas of business improving support and resilience, providing a flexible work force for the future.

Shift patterns: The original Safeguarding shift pattern compiled and agreed by the BCU pathfinder sites has challenges, especially in relation to CAIT responsibilities and joint working
with local authorities and weekend cover. As a result of feedback it become evident that the original Safeguarding shift pattern needed to change. CAIT staff felt, in particular that they were abstracted from their core period of business (Monday – Friday, 10.00 – 18.00.). EA BCU also has all parts of Safeguarding working the same shifts across their Safeguarding investigation units. A new shift pattern is being developed with wide consultation and will be incorporated across all the BCU sites for Safeguarding and the CID.

**CSE:** The design invests 64 constables into CSE Level 1. The demand analysis by the transformation shows that the resourcing for CSE across the MPS is correct. As a result of the feedback received from the BCU pathfinder sites Detective Sergeant posts for CAIT referral, and CSE have been included.

Feedback from staff is that there is considerable pressure in this role and that a key part of the problem is that more training is required to ensure they have the requisite skills. CSE training has therefore been incorporated into the new Missing Persons training package, and a separate CSE training module for those working in CSE is being developed.

**Training:** CN and EA BCU were given priority on certain training courses for the Pathfinder Safeguarding Officers; however not all of the training courses were filled due to operational demand. A new Missing Persons course including CSE input has been developed and there is an ongoing review of the current Safeguarding courses with proposals to create new training courses e.g. Public Protection Desk training for MASH Officers. Ensuring training and upskilling officers for safeguarding roles takes place is part of the preparation work for future roll out of BCUs. Data shows that there have been 93 courses given to EA and CN since April for Safeguarding Officers.

**Partnership Working:** The relationships with local authorities and co-location of staff are becoming more positive in CN BCU pathfinder and in some parts of EA BCU pathfinder. The co-location of functions has had a direct impact on dealing more effectively with cases. Ofsted recently published Single Inspection Reports for Children’s Services for both Camden and Islington. The report for Camden, published in November 2017, praised Partnership working, stating this was of high quality, effective and led to quick and appropriate decision making, and solving problems together at early stage.

“A number of agencies and services in Camden, led by the local authority and the police, work really well together to protect children from harm. This includes complicated risks such as gangs, knife crime, drugs and sexual exploitation… Common associations and factors seen across gang memberships, drug misuse, radicalisation, serious youth violence, and child sexual exploitation and going missing are understood well in a constructive, multi-agency environment… Partners, led by the expertise and guidance of the police and local authority, recognise that the victim and offender status of these young people are often entwined. This mature approach has led to the development of a continuum of multi-agency interventions, adapted to and targeted at the particular profiles and risks of young people identified, and extends to effective cross-borough coordination of intelligence. Child sexual exploitation screening tools are used effectively and risks are recognised. Strategy meetings about child sexual exploitation coordinate strong partnership work and prioritise well-formulated safety plans” (Ofsted, Single Inspection Report Summary Children’s Services 27th November, 2017)

Similar observations were made in Ofsted’s Single Inspection Report for Islington Borough (July 2017) which found:

---

6 There were no recent Ofsted single inspection children’s services reports for EA BCU pathfinder boroughs applicable for pathfinder go live.

7 https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/local-authorities/camden
“Social workers, teachers, police and health workers work well together to help things to get better for children and families. This means that problems are often solved at an early stage...work with the police to identify and broker cross-authority police cooperation for children placed in the borough by other local authorities is effective. A detailed analysis of this group identifies those most at risk, and contact is made with the placing local authority. In one case, this resulted in a robust challenge to the placing local authority about the effectiveness and safety of the care planning for a highly vulnerable child; this led to immediate protective action.”

The leadership, management and governance was shown as outstanding. The MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference) was described as extremely effective. In relation to CSE, the report stated that risk is managed through timely and appropriate action being taken through partnership working, resulting in young people at risk being given excellent support.

D. Design Changes
- The DC role in the Ops Room has been given a more focussed role profile to support first response to safeguarding issues.
- Individual supervisors will not be required to attend all borough MAPPA and MARAC meetings in three borough BCUs. There will be an identified supervisors who will lead for each borough within the BCU.
- Training needs have been updated to reflect the requirements of the BCU design.
- A revised shift pattern for safeguarding will be implemented taking account of the learning.
- Additional supervisors (DSs) have been included in the design for CAIT referrals, CSE and Missing Persons.
- Offender management in the pathfinders was moved from the initial design intention that it was part of safeguarding to the CID; this is being reviewed with a view to reinforcing its placement in safeguarding.

8 https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/local-authorities/islington
14. Investigation: Criminal Investigation Department (CID)

A. Original Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Expected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CID (formerly named in programme as Local Investigation) | • The transfer of the majority of PIP level 1 crimes to Response Officers will reduce reactive CID workloads, ensuring we use the specialist skills possessed by detectives for only the most serious of crimes (PIP2)  
• Early mobilisation of investigators to Pip2 ‘I and S’ Grade calls will release response officers from scenes earlier, ensure better evidence gathering and expedite completion of enquiries. This will provide a more streamlined service to the victim and will reduce overall retained caseloads. 2 dedicated cars per BCU per shift will respond to these calls, improving victim care and allowing a fast time response to serious crimes.  
• Investigative channel shift and efficiency will free up resources to enhance local proactivity both to meet local priorities and work closer with SC&O proactive units on intelligence led operations. Resources will be available to staff both a uniformed BCU task force and a dedicated true proactive team focussed on NIM level 1 investigations. |

**Caseload**: CID reactive investigation teams have been established with a greater focus on complex and serious crimes. Average caseloads are between 5 and 8 crimes per officer, a significant improvement on the borough position.

**Response Capability**: A response capability has been established enabling CID officers to take more rapid control of serious crime investigations – however this is proving challenging to deliver and further work is needed to refine the design as well as the relevant command and control processes.

**Crime Workload**: The nature of the serious crime workload in BCUs is very similar to a significant proportion of work currently held within Specialist Crime teams and the revised structure provides opportunities to move certain crime types into the BCUs as Specialist Crime and Operations reduces in size.

**Offender Management**: Jigsaw (RSO) and integrated offender management (IOM) units have been established with posts that better reflect caseload. Unit strength in the North has moved from 4.7 (Oct 16) to 7.1 (July 17) and in the East from 9.5 to 13.5 during the same period. In the EA BCU pathfinder case load per officer have dropped from 65.9 to 48.4 for overall cases, and from 9.5 to 5.8 for very high/high risk offenders (included in overall total).

**Gangs**: Gangs units now cover all the boroughs in the BCU pathfinders – two boroughs in the East were not previously covered. A named officer from the gangs unit now provides a link to the YOS in each borough in the East. In the North, the Gangs Unit is co-located and engaged in increasingly strong joint working.
Proactivity: BCU proactive units have been established. Proactive capability has been pressurised across both sites due to response demands. However examples of good practice are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactivity in East Area BCU Pathfinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Op Ohio</strong>, an undercover operation targeting organised crime and associated ASB in Barking &amp; Dagenham. To date, 10 offenders charged and Criminal Behaviour Orders obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin, to the street value of 5 million pounds, and a handgun were seized, and two people have been charged with multiple offences as a result of an operation by EA BCU’s new proactive investigation unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An operation against cross border people trafficking, working closely with the Police Service of Northern Ireland, led to the arrest of the principal organisers and disruption to the trafficking of young girls from Romania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Op Java</strong> was a covert operation targeting an RSO engaging with 6-8 year old children leading to arrest and current court proceedings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactivity in Central North BCU Pathfinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation Attrition</strong>: an operation conducted in Camden and Islington where a dedicated unit patrols hot spots and manages offenders, focussing on robbery, theft person and mobile phone theft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation Vocare</strong>: Launched in September 2016, this operation targets suspects involved in moped-enabled crime across north London. On 31 January, 13 people were arrested as part of an intelligence-led operation for a variety of offences including conspiracy to rob. Ongoing work is being developed with SCO7 (Serious and Organized Crime) to target the gang elements connected with some of this criminality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Performance

There is no statistical analysis of CID performance in this report, as the nature of the investigations does not lend itself to assessment in this way.

C. Lessons Learned

- **Partnership**: As was found with Safeguarding, the partnership contribution to the design of offender management processes is essential and more time needed to be taken to ensure that roles, responsibilities and processes within offender management were understood by all parties. Timescale between identifying and rolling out BCU pathfinders limited the extent of consultation. The BCU blueprinting process is now scheduled to

---

involve partners at an earlier stage so that there is better engagement on how processes will operate.

- **Deployment:** the response function for CID units has proved difficult to embed and requires further work. This has involved both MetCC (for whom the command & control systems need to change) and on BCUs – where there have been different understanding as to how exactly the CID response function should work. This has been picked up in the revised design and, direct, with MetCC. It is also noted that for this function to be delivered, 24/7 working is required – which has an implication for both resources and shift patterns.

- **R emit:** a significant area of tension has been the investigative remit in terms of how it affects response teams, CID and Safeguarding. This has been problematic as it governs how crimes complex investigations are escalated from response teams to the CID. The issue has been identified as partly design (and a revised process has been set out to clarify how crimes are escalated) and partly culture (the working arrangements between uniform and detective functions).

- **Series Crime and Forensic Conversion:** linked to remit, the responsibility of dealing with series PIP1 crime and the specialist skills needed to deal with Forensic dockets was initially an area of contention and has been addressed, in design terms, through a revised process. However, further work is required to clarify responsibility for series identification to enable crimes to be passed to appropriate investigating officers more systematically.

**D. Design Changes**

- The DC in the Ops Room has been given a more focussed role profile.
- To increase investigative opportunities a DS will replace a sergeant in supervising IOM/YOT offender management.
- Aid commitments for YOT officers will be reduced, as a result of the improvements that have been made in the response function.
- All fully trained officers (Visor/MOSOVO/ARMS/vetted) will be retained in role in the implementation so that OM productivity is not adversely affected.
- Location of OM within the model to be reconsidered with a view to reverting to the original design as part of safeguarding.
15. BCU HQ Leadership

A. Original Design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Expected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BCUHQ (Formerly named Leadership) | • We will reduce the number of senior leaders with the implementation of a new leadership model, providing a single accountable leader for every BCU supported by four superintendents with functional leadership for local policing services resulting in significant financial savings to the MPS.  
• Increases in supervision ratios will create a culture of delegated authority and provide further financial savings that can be re-invested in the areas most in demand.  
• By separating functional leadership into the four distinct strands of Neighbourhoods, Response, Safeguarding and CID, we will provide clear lines of responsibility and accountability for the delivery of policing services. This approach will serve to professionalise policing disciplines, develop the staff that deliver services and enhance partnership working.  
• We will implement a BCU Headquarters in every BCU. Managed by a Headquarters Manager working to the BCU Commander, the headquarters will provide a single point of entry into the BCU for internal and external stakeholders and co-ordinate the delivery of pan-BCU policing services and operations. It will bring together BCU and MPS support services to provide frontline support for BCUs through the co-ordination of the two components of business and operational support. |

B. Performance

There are no specific performance criteria for leadership functions – although there is qualitative feedback on leadership during transition that is covered later in this report under implementation. The BCU Ops room is part of BCU HQ Leadership and this proved challenging to implement. The operational functions of the BCU HQ were covered during the response review – and some changes made as a consequence.

C. Lessons Learned

**Senior Management Resilience:** The original design was based on a four Superintendent model and the removal of the Chief Inspector rank. This was based primarily on ensuring clear lines of functional accountability and on the ability of Inspectors to step up into decision making roles. It was quickly identified that these changes, during a period of transformation, weakened the overall resilience of the Senior Leadership Team – particularly when dealing with the twin challenges of unexpected major incidents in London and significant performance problems in response. As a consequence the model has been changed to include a fifth Superintendent and six Chief Inspectors/DCIs – covering each of the operational functions with two in Safeguarding.

**Leadership Culture:** the role of BCU SLT and the wider leadership team in developing a supportive BCU culture is critical to effective delivery. Listening and engaging must be embedded in this process. Challenging issues early, offering information and guidance leaves less opportunity for negativity to have an impact. The earliest possible identification of the leadership team in the implementation process is critical to this process.
Functional Skills: the transition from what are often generalist leadership roles to specific functional responsibilities is more challenging than originally envisaged. Officers moving into these roles need more preparation for these responsibilities – and selection processes need to take into account individual skills and experience to ensure a good match with the role being undertaken.

Senior Borough Point of Contact: the original design intended to provide a superintendent as the principal day to day contact for senior stakeholders on each borough. This has not worked as effectively as it needs to. In CN this has been less of an issue as the two borough command means the BCU commander has been able to maintain appropriate relationships with both boroughs’ senior stakeholders. This has been less satisfactory in EA partly due to the fact that the command contains three boroughs, partly because the resilience pressures have been more keenly felt across three boroughs, but also because the expectations for the superintendents has not been defined clearly enough. The increased resilience in the senior leadership team by the provision of a fifth superintendent will be supported by a revised role specification for the borough lead aspect of their role.

SLT Support: it is evident that the leadership support element of the HQ design had difficulty in managing day to day business and partnership coordination. The collection of different administrative and HQ demands at a BCU level means that there is a stronger case for individuals in specialist support roles within the HQ to support the running of the BCU as a whole. This covers such areas as duties planning, professional standards and support to the SMT. This is subject to additional design work – connecting as appropriate with other pan-London functions.

Communications: a consistent issue, particularly in the East, has been the support that the BCU HQ design has been able to provide for media and communications. No specific role was originally established to undertake this activity and this created a gap in capability within the BCU. This caused problems both in implementation (albeit that there is scope to manage this via the Local Change Network) and the capability to deliver effective communications across multiple boroughs.

Estate: The location of the BCU HQ and SLT is an important factor in enabling visibility and leadership and facilitating relationships with partners. This is governed by available space in existing police buildings and will ultimately be a decision for each BCU Commander and PSD at the blueprinting stage.

D. Design Changes

• A dedicated Professional Standards function will be incorporated in the BCU HQ design.
• The Operations Manager role will be empowered to make decisions that are not overruled by senior officers from individual functions.
• Introduction of the fifth superintendent and reintroduction of chief inspector roles (minimum six per BCU) will increase operational resilience and support partnership engagement at the most appropriate level.
16. BCU Pathfinder Overall Crime Performance

This section examines overall crime trends on the BCUs and the impact of the introduction of the BCU pathfinders. It considers performance against MPS and MOPAC priorities in line with the success criteria established for the BCU pathfinders. Monthly corporate data has been used where appropriate.

The trend for Total Notifiable Offences\(^\text{10}\) (TNOs) on both BCUs has been broadly consistent with the MPS wide trend. Both BCUs and London as a whole have seen levels of crime rise above normal variation since the summer, caused by London wide increases in theft person, violence, robbery and sexual offences which suggests other causational factors other than the implementation of the BCU model.

Figure 24: Total Notifiable Offences (TNOs) EA BCU Pathfinder and MPS.

![Figure 24: Total Notifiable Offences (TNOs) EA BCU Pathfinder and MPS.](image)

Figure 25: EA BCU TNOs showing borough breakdown

![Figure 25: EA BCU TNOs showing borough breakdown](image)

Total crime in EA follows the MPS trend. Since the start of the pathfinders the three boroughs have followed consistent patterns, with some variation occurring in the last quarter of 2017. Redbridge experienced a spike in overall crime between September 2016 and January 2017 - which clearly predates the start of the BCU – after a sustained period of crime reduction. However crime levels overall have stabilised in line with wider patterns since the BCUs started.

---

\(^{10}\) TNOs is a count of all offences which are statutorily notifiable to the Home Office. See HOCR ‘notifiable offences list’. Source: MOPAC Volume Crime Priorities Dashboard Glossary of Terms.
CN closely follows the MPS pattern in overall crime since the start of the BCU. Levels of crime on both boroughs have been disproportionally impacted by theft person. Both prior to and since the BCU pathfinders started Camden and Islington accounted for a significant proportion of the phenomenon of moped enabled crime (along with the neighbouring boroughs of Westminster and Hackney) which is a significant driver for this category.

Overall there is no apparent detrimental impact on levels of overall crime as a result of the implementation of the BCUs.

**Sanction Detection (SD) Rate:**

**The MPS SD Rate:**

The MPS has recorded 57,411 more TNOs than the previous 12 months, representing an increase of 8%. There has been a decrease in the SD rate when compared to the previous 12 months (14.3% compared to 17.3%) and in Dec 17 the MPS achieved an SD rate of 13%.
CN BCU Pathfinder

CN BCU pathfinder recorded 11,584 more TNO than in the previous 12 months (+21%).

Sanction detection rates reduced between February and June 2017, reaching a low of 8% at the time when there was greatest pressure on the MPS and the BCU. However, since October 2017, rates have started to increase and in December 2017 the rate was 10.9%.

EA BCU Pathfinder

Like CN BCU pathfinder, EA has experienced significantly more offences (5,528) which is +10% than the previous 12 months.

Sanction detection rates have been varied over the past year with no clear trend. However, in Dec 17, the BCU achieved an SD rate of 13.2% a rate now above the MPS average of 13%.
Overall Satisfaction

Overall Satisfaction\(^{11}\) with service has decreased by three percentage points when comparing the rolling 12 months to Q2 2017-18 with 2016-17, and five percentage points when compared with the 2015-16. Overall satisfaction is now at the lowest levels since before 2012-13, and the decrease has been swift. Victim Satisfaction on the BCU pathfinders has dropped 12 points in the past two quarters, compared to a six percentage point change in other boroughs. This has been most pronounced on EA where response performance deteriorated the most. It is our assessment that the decline in response times was one of the principle causes of the decline in victim satisfaction.

The East London boroughs of Havering, Redbridge and Newham are the lowest performing boroughs. Satisfaction on each of these boroughs has decreased in the most recent 12 months compared with the previous 12 months. In particular, Havering has seen a notable decrease in satisfaction over this time (-12 ppts), bringing it into the lowest three boroughs.

More recent downward trends, within the last 12 months, have been particularly pronounced within boroughs under the MPS' Strengthening Local Policing programme, where current satisfaction levels have fallen 13 percentage points since before the programme started compared to a 3 percentage point change in sites not included in the programme.

Whilst there have been significant improvements in the service to the public on the BCU pathfinder sites, particularly in emergency response, it will take some time for this to be evidenced in the survey data. Improving victim satisfaction is a priority and a major focus as the model is embedded – the principal contributing factors will be the increasing confidence and experience of response officers as they adapt to the changes in their roles in relation to crime investigation, combined with the impact of improved response times.

This is being mitigated through the changes to the implementation plan, by allowing more time prior to merger and changes in the response model for My-Investigation to be introduced and embedded with additional training and preparation for the officers affected. The improvements in the response model regarding timeliness will address the significant driver for reduced satisfaction identified in the survey data – which relates to the low point in response performance.

The shift in the management of some crime demand to online and telephone reporting is also likely to be a significant factor. The processes associated with this are bedding in and the impact on victim satisfaction is being monitored. There are a number of technological developments in progress to improve the service (for example the introduction of voice recognition software and ‘live chat’), as well as an action plan to alleviate the current problems (outside the SLP programme) in the 101 service due to staff shortages in MetCC.

Local Priorities under the Policing and Crime Plan 2017 -2021

Burglary is a local priority for Havering and Redbridge. While the trends on the BCU for burglary is in line with the rest of London, increase in Redbridge in particular is clearly cause for concern.

This level of increase is not restricted to these boroughs. MPS wide, burglary offences\(^{12}\) are up 11% over the past year and current burglary levels across London are outside normal statistically expected levels (the peaks have an upper control limit at 1 standard deviation).\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Using quarterly report data. The months up to December have not yet been published.

\(^{12}\) Total burglary – residential and business and community. On 1 April 2017 the Home Office recording rules for burglary changed. Instead of ‘Burglary Dwelling’ and ‘Burglary in a Building Other Than a Dwelling’, the categories will be ‘Residential Burglary’ and ‘Burglary – Business and Community’.

\(^{13}\) Data retrieved from MPS dashboard.
Current rolling 12 month burglary levels highlight the following boroughs as also having significant increases: Richmond +39%, Kingston +29%, Waltham Forest +30%, Bexley +18%, Greenwich +24%, Hammersmith & Fulham +25%.

Within EA BCU there has been some variation amongst the boroughs, with increases in Redbridge far exceeding the increases seen elsewhere. Over the past 12 months, Redbridge has seen an increase of 51% in burglary, returning to 2013/14 levels. This rise is comparable to the trend over the past year in Waltham Forest, and the increase begins in September 2016, predating the changes to the BCU model. The variation between the boroughs within EA BCU, the timing of the start of the increase, and the similar pattern in other boroughs suggests that this is not an effect of the BCU.

However, partners make the point that addressing the rise has been more difficult because the traditional relationships with the Borough police command have changed and the structures through which they would have worked are no longer in place in the same format. There has undoubtedly been a need to adapt to the new arrangements, although this is not the cause of the increase, and there is work ongoing in EA to ensure appropriate borough based partnership burglary plans are in place to address the shared local priority.

Figure 32: Burglary - EA BCU pathfinder and MPS trend

Burglary is not a local priority for Camden and Islington but is a crime type considered here for comparison and given its significance across London. Burglary trends within CN BCU
pathfinder have mirrored each other. Over the past year, both Islington and Camden have also recorded rises of 16%. The pattern of burglary on the BCU varies from the MPS picture as it did pre-dating the pathfinder. There is no apparent impact from the BCU pathfinder process on burglary levels.

Data has been gathered and presented to show BCU pathfinder performance alongside data from its constituent single boroughs.

Figure 30: Burglary - CN BCU pathfinder and MPS trend

Figure 31: Burglary - CN BCU pathfinder and constituent Boroughs - offences
Theft Person

Figure 34: Theft Person – CN BCU and constituent Boroughs: Offences

Both boroughs within CN have theft person as a local priority. Increases in this crime type have been linked to the growth of moped enabled crime, which predominantly impacts on group of central London boroughs. However, the rest of the country has also seen this crime proliferate and a national working group has been convened to tackle it which is headed by the MPS. Both boroughs have seen this crime type continue to rise – as have Westminster and Hackney – despite targeted activity to prevent and apprehend offenders.

The initial rise in theft person in both boroughs pre dates the launch of the BCU. There has been limited success in both Camden and Islington, and this is consistent with trends in Westminster, Hackney and other neighbouring boroughs.

Common Assault is only a local priority for Camden Borough

Figure 35: CN BCU and constituent Boroughs: Common Assault: Offences
**Violence with Injury**

All boroughs on EA BCU pathfinder have violence with injury (excluding domestic abuse) as a local priority. This crime grouping has seen substantial national increases, with Violence against the Person (VWI is a subset) up 19% in the 12 months to December 2016.

Levels of VWI are comparable across the three boroughs, with fluctuations generally echoing seasonal trends. VWI increases slightly through the summer months and that is evident in the data for the EA BCU pathfinder but this is strongly influenced by changes in Redbridge.

**Figure 36: Non DA VWI – EA BCU Pathfinder and Boroughs Offences**

At odds with the London picture, Barking and Dagenham have recorded a 1% reduction in non DA VWI in the past 12 months, whilst Havering is up 5% and Redbridge 6%. The MPS has an increase of 3% over the rolling 12 months to October 2017.

**Robbery**

**Figure 37: Robbery - EA BCU Pathfinder and Boroughs - offences**

Robbery is only a local priority for Barking and Dagenham amongst the BCU pathfinder boroughs. Like violence, robbery is increasing both across London and nationally. The MPS is currently +33% over the past year after over 15 years of reduction, breaching normal
variation in March this year. Barking & Dagenham are in line with this trend at +35%, EA as a whole is +49%. The increases above normal variation begin in April for Havering, but do not start in Redbridge and Barking & Dagenham until July.

Figure 38: Robbery - CN BCU Pathfinder and Boroughs (offences)

Looking at patterns across EA BCU, it is clear that there has been no uniform trend across the pathfinder, and CN BCU again shows different trends and a much more significant increase caused by the rise in moped enabled robbery. The challenge presented by robbery is London wide, and there are rises across many boroughs contributing to a 37% overall increase.
Key points – BCU Pathfinder Performance

Overall, crime performance has not been negatively impacted by the introduction of the BCU model. There are some individual borough challenges – for example theft person and robbery on Camden and Islington and burglary on Redbridge. There has been no lasting significant deterioration in levels of recorded crime.

User Satisfaction has decreased on the pathfinders from the period of BCU implementation onwards. There may be several reasons this has occurred but our assessment is that this is linked to the drop in I and S grade response performance and that the recovery in this area of performance will need some time to show in future user satisfaction results.

Positive outcomes dropped after the move to Mi-Investigation, but have since shown improvement and it is anticipated that as the model is further embedded and officers gain more experience the proportion of positive outcomes will continue to improve.

Demand in the Safeguarding area continues to rise, but processes on the BCU are improving to ensure that vulnerable victims are given the support they need, either through specialist investigators like those in the CSE teams and Sapphire officers and through multi agency action plans developed at child abuse strategy meetings.

Emergency response has been the most challenging area of performance since the launch of the BCU pathfinders, and was also a challenge prior to go live. However, changes in the model made in late August produced fast and lasting improvements that have brought I calls on target above the levels at go live.
17. The “Refreshed” BCU Design

The work documented above has led to a refreshed set of high level and detailed design documents, building on the lessons of the pathfinders. It is recognised as part of this work that “blueprinting” – the translation of these designs into something that meets local needs – is a critical first step in implementation. An overview of the current design is set out in the diagram below:

**The BCU model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Investigations</th>
<th>Neighbourhoods</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Safeguarding</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part B:**

- **The work documented above has led to a refreshed set of high level and detailed design documents, building on the lessons of the pathfinders.**
- **It is recognised as part of this work that “blueprinting” – the translation of these designs into something that meets local needs – is a critical first step in implementation.**
- **An overview of the current design is set out in the diagram below:**

**Diagram:**

- **BCU Model Overview:**
  - **REACTIVE:**
    - Public
    - Victim
    - Witness
  - **PROACTIVE:**
    - Local Authorities
    - Schools
    - Partner agencies
    - Public

- **Tasking and prioritisation:**
  - TTCG
  - PACE
  - LIT
  - MIM

- **Response:**
  - Local Dispatch
  - DMU
  - Response
  - Local Investigations (React)
  - Safeguarding (Investigation)

- **SCRO Uplift:**
  - P/Cs and P/Ss in the PAP Hub support Neighbourhood officers with specialised knowledge of crime prevention, ASB and problem solving. Officers are required to upskill in stakeholder and partnership engagement, building relationships and acting as a point of contact for problem solving advice.

- **DWOs will be ring-fenced, increasing time spent in their communities, as opposed to backfilling ERPTs and being responsible for the investigation of PIP1 level crimes.**

- **Response teams will work over a larger geographical area with MetCC deploying the nearest and most appropriate unit.**

- **Response team officers will hold all PIP1 level crimes from cradle to grave, employing the principle of ‘get it right first time’.**

- **LIT officers will be given investigative priorities and will be able to manage their time, using mobile technology to directly attend crime scenes and take ownership of investigations.**

- **Response officers will be issued with tablets, enabling them to work in a more agile manner. Information is more readily available, and officers can check information and upload files whilst they are on patrol.**

- **ITM replaces the outdated MST system.**

- **Officers to be upskilled so that they can give a more complete service to the public by holding on to crimes.**

- **SCO17 moving to BCUs to form Safeguarding Units with existing CSU teams.**

- **The Leadership Design will provide a greater degree of uniformity to SLT structures, with workloads being more balanced throughout.**

- **Presence in the Operations Room will allow sharing of expertise and enables Strand to deal with identified priorities.**
PART C: Benefits

This section examines the progress of pathfinders towards demonstrating the benefits and efficiencies that can be released from the BCU, whilst maintaining investment in priority areas such as Neighbourhoods and Safeguarding. It also provides an assessment of wider learning about benefits that can be drawn from pathfinder experience. This is intended to provide context to consideration of performance data – given that this provides information on changing resourcing levels in the pathfinder BCUs.

18. BCU Pathfinder Benefits, Efficiencies and Savings

As set out in the SLP Full Business Case, the SLP Programme is expected to deliver a reduction of 1583 officer posts, realizing savings of £99m against the design baseline and £73m of cashable savings.

Pathfinder Baseline Position: Police Officer posts were baselined for the BCU Pathfinders in November 2016. At this time total police officer posts (all ranks) in both sites were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCU</th>
<th>Ch. Supt</th>
<th>Supt</th>
<th>Ch. Insp</th>
<th>Insp</th>
<th>D/Insp</th>
<th>Sgt</th>
<th>D/Sgt</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers include as part of the baseline the SC&O17 posts devolved to the BCUs – 89 to EA, 64 to CN.

A key objective of the pathfinder was to test the efficiencies available within the model – and the ability to reinvest in priority areas such as ring fenced DWOs in Neighbourhoods and Safeguarding.

This work does not just look at a simple reduction in posts but on the rank and capability mix in a BCU. This is critically important as headcount reduction within BCU is, obviously, ultimately based on the cashable value of those posts. Retaining a higher number of supervisors will have a dis-proportionate impact on the number of PC/DC posts that need to be saved.

Pathfinders were therefore aimed at testing a more efficient distribution of supervisors at every rank and that local policing was making best use of front line officers. This was also intended to test the cashable benefits of operating at a large scale - which should see larger more resilient teams operating at higher and more consistent supervision ratios.

Original modelling: the initial intention on the pathfinder sites was to retain the same number of posts during transition period – and to realise benefits once the model had stabilized. These take account of efficiencies from operating at BCU scale (reduced SLT and increased supervision ratios) and from channel shift. The SLP business case included additional efficiencies to be drawn from mobile working and the issue of tablets/laptops.

It should be noted that the modelling of BCU strengths across London has also taken into account of demand – which means that the expected levels of reductions will be different in each BCU.

Initial projections of the total number of posts for the Pathfinder BCUs were:
Current Target (April 18): previous numbers represent the posts based on savings of 1021 posts across local policing. The current budget establishment for local policing in April 2018 required further savings to be made from BCUs (a total of 1583 posts across London). On this basis, headcount, by rank, in pathfinders will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCU</th>
<th>Ch. Supt</th>
<th>Supt</th>
<th>Ch. Insp</th>
<th>Insp</th>
<th>D/Insp</th>
<th>Sgt</th>
<th>D/Sgt</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Realisation of Cashable Benefits: MPS workforce planning is progressively reducing officer number in order to deliver 2018/19 savings. This means that all Boroughs and the pathfinder BCUs have been experiencing increased vacancy rates against their established numbers. Police Officer posts were baselined for the BCU Pathfinders in November 2016. The table below sets out baseline posts and “actuals” (the number of officers physically available) in this month. It then sets out the original headcount reductions expected (Nov 17) and the current target (April 18).

Both BCUs have already exceeded the original expectations and are now working towards their contribution to reductions in headcount required by April 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go-Live (Nov 16)</th>
<th>Initial Target</th>
<th>Current Target (Apr 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>Actuals</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By April 2018, the pathfinder reductions against the design baseline will be 91 and 73 posts for CN and EA respectively. This equates to savings of between approximately £4.5m (CN) and £3.5 (EA) - against the original design.

As illustrated above in the posts by rank, a third of these posts (53 out of 164) come from a reduction in supervisory posts as a consequence of re-structuring within the BCUs. This both increases the overall savings to the MPS and assists in protecting front line PC and DC posts.
In the course of pathfinder transition, both BCUs have already been reducing actual headcount and are now, physically, operating with 30 (CN) and 41 (EA) fewer officers than in November 2016.

Of note is that the reductions on each BCU have not yet been supported by the full range of interventions planned for Local Policing. This includes both the delivery of mobile technology and the realization of the full benefits of channel shift. This is significant given that the current expectations are that 25% of the efficiencies in April 18 are to be drawn from efficiencies generated by smarter/mobile working.

The issue of mobile equipment is scheduled to begin in both pathfinders in January 2018. This will provide additional support to officers, reducing workload and enabling them to focus on delivering improved outcomes for investigative activity and victim support. This gives additional confidence that the performance currently seen across both pathfinders will continue to improve.

An additional benefit of BCUs is to provide a foundation for further change, based on more consistent operating practice and structures across local policing. This has already been evidenced during work to meet the revised budget challenge for 2018/19. New interventions, focusing on proactive policing and offender management (and which are in addition to measures originally proposed within the pathfinder) will enable both BCUs to operate within their 2018/19 establishment. The consistent organizational structure and working practices provides an essential platform for meeting further financial challenges.

Both pathfinders are providing significant learning for the MPS in an increasingly challenging financial environment. They have tested a leadership and supervision model which, whilst it has required amendment, has still provided evidence that policing can reduce supervisory numbers. This has supported maintenance of PC/DC numbers at as high a level as possible.

It should not be forgotten that the pathfinders, despite the financial pressures on the MPS, invested in Neighbourhoods, Safeguarding and Offender Management.

Whilst there has been significant focus on headcount and vacancy levels throughout the pathfinders, delivery of BCUs is not solely aimed at delivery of cashable savings for the MPS. Following the original assessment of where the MPS needed to improve, there are other non-cashable and qualitative benefits which are intended to be delivered through this programme. These include:

- Increase in the rate or number of appropriate criminal justice outcomes
- Improved public confidence in local policing
- Improved offender management outcomes
- Reduced levels of repeat victimization
- More efficient use of officer time
- Improved problem solving of local priorities
- Improved safeguarding of vulnerable adults and children

Delivering improvements in these areas has been an existing performance challenge on Boroughs – and the changes in organizational structures and working practice within a BCU are aimed at assisting the required improvement.

With structures and resources now in place, developing and further improving organizational capability is now the primary challenge within pathfinders. This includes further developing investigative capability within Response, Safeguarding and CID as well as improved delivery of problem solving, community engagement and prevention within Neighbourhoods. This is medium / long term work that has been started within the initial transition period but which will now need to be maintained through day to day management and leadership.
Pathfinders have delivered a complex transition and headcount reduction in a tight timescale – with all the associated performance challenges that such a change brings. The initial challenges of response policing, now largely resolved, diverted energy away from wider skills development. This situation has now changed and both pathfinders are now concentrating on the delivery of improved outcomes through team and individual performance management structures.
Part D: Pathfinder Implementation Approach

This section describes the testing strategy and principles that were adopted for the BCU Pathfinders Delivery - Implementation Plan.

19. Testing

The BCU pathfinders were intended to provide a test of the full BCU design, agreed at high level by the SLP Programme Board in September 2016. The BCU Pathfinder sites worked through the detail of this design in the course of November 2016 developing blueprints for each pathfinder BCU that were agreed at SLP Programme Board on 28 November 2016.

The BCU pathfinders were then intended to provide the first “full system” test of a BCU way of working – building on testing activity that had taken place previously on critical areas within the model. Previous “sub-system” tests included an examination of functional and streamlined leadership (Westminster), crime investigation by response teams (Southwark) and joint MASH/CAIT referral desks (Lambeth).

One of the key issues in changing local policing is to understand both the benefits across all functions as well as the multiple dependencies that exist across all local policing services. It was therefore essential to look at the whole model to ensure the designs can be implemented effectively and to give greater understanding and confidence in our assumed benefits.

There was discussion during summer 2016 as to whether testing should take the form of a single BCU pathfinder or whether there should be two. It was confirmed in October 2016 that two pathfinder sites should be established. This was to ensure that the model was tested in different policing environments (inner and outer London) but also to understand the different issues involved in bringing two or three boroughs within a single policing command. The tests were intended to be run in line with a set of four principles.

These principals were:

- Only test in location(s) where there is sufficiently strong agreement to proceed from the Local Authorities affected and where they are willing and able to participate in the governance.
- Use a collaborative joint partnership approach to test design, implementation and evaluation processes, with leadership buy-in at senior level - Leaders and Chief Executives working with MPS chief officers and borough commanders.
- The impact of the changes will be evaluated in a way that is transparent at both BCU level and borough level so that resourcing and service delivery impact can be assessed in relation to the individual boroughs involved.
- Ensure all elements are reversible to provide confidence that those involved in testing are not committed to a new structure in the event it is not applied more widely.

The two BCU pathfinders selected were Central North (comprising Camden and Islington) and East Area (comprising Barking & Dagenham, Redbridge and Havering).

The discussion with stakeholders and partners, in line with the above principles, meant that activity to initiate the development and preparation of the BCU pathfinders did not start in earnest until late October 2016.
20. Delivery Strategy and Approach

The implementation of BCU pathfinders followed a standard approach described below:

- **Blueprint**: establish the detailed design for the new command units.
- **Change Impact Assessment (CIA)**: map out the implications of that design for the current way of working.
- **Change Readiness Plan**: establish a plan that deal with the challenges identified within the CIA – and assess readiness as required.
- **Go-live**: when readiness is at an appropriate state, take the go-live decision and transition to the new way of working.

The approach in both BCU pathfinders was to adopt a phased rather than a “big bang” delivery. This originally entailed three phases of change to fully implement the BCU pathfinder:

- **Phase 1** (Jan 2017): BCU SLT and Neighbourhoods roles go live – providing both early leadership of the BCU and ring fenced officers to start work with local communities and provide a “quick win” in terms of local impact.
- **Phase 2** (February 2017): Response and CID go-live – with a shift to Mi-Investigation and a single BCU response function.
- **Phase 3** (March 2017): Go-live of the new safeguarding function.

A fourth phase was established in April 2017 – the ‘go-live’ of technology changes that underpin the new response function – following work undertaken to develop the required changes, and taking into account the lead in time to make them.

The phasing of go-live in this way was intended to both build momentum, whilst providing more time for the necessary cultural and business change in more challenging areas (e.g. safeguarding). Phasing was also aimed at managing operational risk by providing a more graduated transition to the full BCU.

21. Internal and External Engagement

Considering the scale of change being proposed, and the amount of stakeholders who were to be impacted by the changes, it was recognized as critically important to consult widely and openly on the potential future model, and to communicate progress and decisions in a timely manner. Good communication and engagement were seen as key to changing behaviours and getting staff on board to be part of making the changes work.

Planned external consultation and communication activities included:

- Governance structure set up for the BCU full concept test, including Borough delivery boards (project boards) and steering group to involve local partners.
- Continuing discussions with MOPAC on the potential changes.
- Briefing existing London and Borough forums (e.g. Safer Neighbourhoods Boards)
- Holding SLP Programme consultation events with a range of stakeholders.
- Direct engagement with selected Borough partners (particularly those affected by testing).

There was a comprehensive internal engagement activity, including Borough Senior Leadership Team (SLT) Focus Groups, face to face briefings with affected staff to provide updates, answer questions and gain views, online forums and Q&A sessions to generate discussion and address ‘hot’ topics.
There was ongoing use of our corporate communication channels including regular updates on the intranet, staff blogs, The Job, Commissioner’s conference calls, and MetBats (a daily briefing tool for all MPS officers) to provide updates and address issues.

Local change teams at Borough/OCU level were used to act as a channel for communication consultation and transacting tactical changes with Local Implementation Boards.

22. Programme Governance

Establishing clear and effective organisation was critical to programme success. For the SLP programme, a three tier approach to governance was implemented.

**Tier 1:** Strategic overview of the deliverables and tracking against programme objectives was the responsibility of the Strengthening Local Policing Programme Board. This board was be chaired by the programme’s SRO.

**Tier 2:** To execute the work and support the Programme Board, two key groups were established during implementation to help mobilise the work: BCU Project Boards and Local Implementation Delivery Groups. These meetings (particularly the Project Board) functioned to provide opportunities for internal and external consultation and engagement for stakeholders, to help shape and validate the design and implementation processes.

**Tier 3:** During implementation stages an Implementation Delivery Group was established to assist with planning, dependencies management and sequencing of activities during delivery. This was chaired by the SLP Programme Manager and involved all internal enablers.
The BCU pathfinder governance structure and process is set out in the below diagram:

The detailed role of each meeting was as follows:

- **Programme Board** - this meeting held the holistic overview of the design and implementation process and had overall accountability for the realisation of benefits. The board was responsible for the outcome of the deliverables and tracking against programme objectives. The board was responsible for managing and risks and issues escalated by project boards. There was one programme level board that met monthly.

- **Oversight Board** – these meetings were small forums whose purpose was to engage with senior local authority partners (leaders and chief executives) during the design and implementation phases and to provide strategic guidance and ensured any unforeseen consequences are proactively managed. It provided an opportunity to ensure key senior stakeholders had their voices heard. There was one board for each BCU which met monthly.

- **Project Boards** – these meetings were the forums by which various internal and external stakeholders came together to contribute towards shaping the design as they developed. The benefits and risks or the design and implementation process were assessed to test their operational sustainability. The group was responsible for identifying risks and issues and supporting the implementation.

- **Local Implementation Boards** - this meeting managed the day to day technical and operational deliverables of the implementation process, ensuring the end state design was aligned to the programme/corporate strategy and was operationally viable. Local planning was a key driver for
the board which sought to bring together the component parts of the project to proactively manage dependencies, linkages and business change activities. **Risks and issues** were managed by the board and escalated to the programme board where necessary. There was one board for each BCU which met weekly.

- **Implementation Design and Delivery Group**. This meeting ensured all implementation plans held by key stakeholders (e.g. Property Services, HR, and Digital Policing) which were managed through a single framework. It aligned each plan to establish sequencing and critical paths, whilst holding enablers to account. Critical risks were escalated to the project and/or programme board. There was one programme level meeting, meeting monthly or fortnightly.
### Part E: Implementation Learning

**BCU Pathfinder Learning**

This section identifies the lessons to be learnt from the pathfinder implementation and business change process. This is drawn both from an internal, MPS perspective and input from partners. The feedback is drawn from workshops, feedback/learning reports, meetings and individual contacts from across pathfinder sites and enablers.

The feedback is set out in 7 thematic areas – with a description of lessons for future roll-out at the end of each section. The themes are as follows:

- Consultation and engagement
- Communication
- BCU Blueprinting
- Implementation, phasing and Cultural Change
- People (HR process and skills development)
- Performance, stabilisation and continuous improvement
- Leadership & Governance

### 23. Consultation & Engagement

**Feedback**

Whilst key enablers have been part of programme governance for a considerable length of time, including both Programme and BCU pathfinder project boards, there is nevertheless consistent feedback on the lack of sufficient engagement in advance of delivery - and that this inhibited early identification of risks and issues during implementation.

**Directorate of Media & Communications (DMC).** DMC felt they could have been more engaged during the strategic design phase of pathfinder development and therefore the Communications strategy, was not as effective and timely as it could have been. Key learning was that the communication activity needed to be strongly linked to key milestones – improving capability to increase both local and MPS wide understanding of the progress of pathfinders.

**Human Resource (HR):** from an HR perspective, the time frames surrounding decisions on BCU pathfinder site selection and blueprinting, coupled with phased implementation and late changes in approach, generated significant challenges. Provision of detailed information necessary to support EOI processes needed to be more consistent and there needed to be improved governance and communications with those involved to raise and address problems at the necessary speed.

**SC&O22 (MPS central resource management department):** SCO22 need to be involved as early as possible in implementation planning – particularly given the very tight timescales involved in pathfinder delivery. The design/blueprint needs to be as stable as possible to avoid continual changes in the data coming to SC&O22. Ongoing changes increase the workload on SC&O22 staff and make it challenging to meet necessary deadlines that provide the right notice to BCU officers.
**Capacity**: during critical phases of BCU pathfinder preparation (Nov 16 – Feb 17) both internal enablers, BCU and programme staff needed additional capacity to manage dependencies and ensure effective communication. It was however noted that at later stages of delivery, particularly during work on the technical design and associated operational issues in April and September 2017, there was much more extensive engagement with relevant business partners.

**Lessons for Future Roll-Out:**

1. Key enablers to continue to be fully involved within programme/project delivery. Attendance at these meetings is essential for the communication process and setting expectations. The expectations and decisions incumbent upon those who attend must be well understood and documented to provide accountability and corporate memory. Ongoing planning must be complementary to minimize the impact on the front line.

2. Re-issue internal governance processes to provide clarity on how enablers receive should engage and receive information from SLP.

3. Enablers to be included as early as possible within each BCU’s Blueprint and implementation planning. This will help ensure requirements and constraints are fully understood and taken into account. This should include greater involvement in strategic discussions to ensure up to date communications and risk analysis.

4. Milestones to be agreed early on with the SLP SLT to enable the communications to be developed in line with the delivery/implementation plan and go live dates. Early engagement with the future BCU SLT at the Blueprint stage will also enable effective message delivery both externally and internally in partnership with programme communications officer(s).

5. Enabler capacity and resource constraints to be considered at Programme level – and work undertaken to provide additional support during period of high demand.

**24. Communications**

**Feedback**

For the BCU pathfinders, a cascade model of communication was used between OMM and the BCU. This did not adequately manage the different expectations of DMC, portfolio/programme business change and the boroughs. This challenged the ability to communicate smoothly during important phases of implementation.

The role and responsibilities of the BCU in delivering BAU and local change communications was subject to considerable discussion during the BCU pathfinder. This is now subject to a DMC led review as to what local support should consist of and how it should operate.

During pathfinder delivery, the communications link between the OMM Business Change strand, the SLP programme and DMC was not as effective as it needed to be. This made it challenging to maintain co-ordination of the communications strategy and tactical delivery of messaging. There were particular difficulties in distinguishing responsibilities for local internal, MPS and external communications.

Pathfinders failed to use the full range of communication channels to address the local community and maintain a link to an overall communications strategy.

Inconsistent and irregular messaging made the work of both local SLTs and OMM more challenging – and allowed too much speculation and rumour mongering to take place.

Internal communications between pathfinders and OMM was sometimes too general in nature and not targeted to the right audiences.
The BCU SLT leads need to be a part of strand specific communications. This is particularly relevant for officers transferring from SCO17 (now CASO) who are need an integrated communications plan ahead of moving from central to local management.

Communications need to emphasise the benefits of the model and how changes will make life better for staff and communities. Quick wins and good practice needed to be celebrated more visibility to bust some of the myths about BCUs and encourage buy-in.

**Lessons for Future Roll-Out**

1. Revised roles and responsibilities are required for DMC, SLP and local communications leads. This should be aimed at ensuring more comprehensive communications planning alongside consistent corporate messaging, developed and delivered within set time frames.

2. Ensure that all strands of the programme are aware of and adhere to the communications strategy and key message summary and their responsibility in delivering communications (e.g. providing information, sourcing blogs etc.)

3. Internal BCU communications must ensure clear messaging about particular themes and involve the relevant internal partners, particularly HR. These themes should include:
   - Publicity of the PCP priorities to get buy in and understanding across all functions.
   - Detail on EOI process to give clarity regarding roles, shift patterns and expected working locations.
   - Regularly updated FAQs, briefings and on line material to support the change.
   - Emphasis on BCU model benefits
   - Publicity of quick wins.

4. To promote effective external communication, BCUs to consult with DMC regarding use of non-police channels to spread key messages (e.g. local authority mailing lists, communications platforms) and ink into overall communications strategy.¹⁴

**25. BCU Blueprinting**

**Feedback**

The final BCU blueprint needs to be approved and locked down in advance of the EOI process. The decisions within the BCU blueprint underpin subsequent implementation, posting decisions and operational delivery and any further change should only be made by exception and after change approval via the Programme Board. This will provide greater clarity to all staff involved in the change and minimise the destabilising effect of continual adjustments.

While design principles are fixed, the SLTs need to have flexibility to meet local operational need, address staff concerns and, where desirable, partnership priorities and expectations.

The rationale for change, indicators for success and evaluation criteria need to be clearly articulated to staff and partners at an early stage in order that they fully understand the MPS strategic intentions, their own progress, and to identify where delivery is at risk.

---

¹⁴ Public Attitude Survey result for Q1 2017-18 shows declining levels of public knowledge of contacting DWOs despite the uplift in resources – compared to Q1 2016-17. Source MOPAC Neighbourhood Perception and Crime Comparator (https://maps.london.gov.uk/NCC/)
An early agreed BCU structure will assist in clear internal and external communication of the set up and purpose of the BCU, clarify responsibilities of the MPS and partners and will assist in the “people” change elements.

Whilst the MPS is adopting a BCU model, partners remain borough based for many functions. This creates a complicated partnership environment to operate in as there is clearly no ‘one size fits all’ approach to partner engagement and relationships. This complexity is exacerbated in a BCU involving 3 or more boroughs.

At a SLT level, the merger has introduced a significant increase in partnership meetings. Some are borough level requirements and cannot be merged. There is potential for some Neighbourhoods meetings to be combined and this would need to be agreed in early consultation with partners, however there is value in keeping the majority of safeguarding meetings separate, despite a duplication. Even where councils are closely aligned, there are significant differences in demographics and lifestyle that demand more specific solutions.

Governance is a wide reaching theme, covering operational delivery and performance, through to oversight, and roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and partners. Early establishment of the Oversight and Project Boards is desirable to support partner engagement and consultation. This will ensure partners feel fully engaged with the change process, clarify ownership, clearly articulate the points at which changes will be reviewed and define lines of accountability.

Increasingly, there are mid-level meetings between local authority boards and Superintendent level to work through the problems. Solutions are then fed into Oversight Board as a fully formed idea. This is replicable in other BCUs if effective early engagement occurs.

Lessons for Future Roll-Out:

1. The BCU Commander needs to be seen to be clearly and visibly seen as the lead for BCU implementation and the focus of the change process

2. Early establishment of SLTs to prepare for change is critical and SLTs need to have time to understand the BCU model and benefits if they are to lead their staff through the implementation and go-live phases. They are likely to have legitimate challenges to the model and time needs to be allowed to explain the rationale of the design and, where possible, to incorporate feedback.

3. The BCU SLT (BCU commander and HQ Superintendent as a minimum) should be appointed at the earliest possible point to instigate partner and staff engagement, and commence the Blueprint process. This will join up delivery and manage expectations. This should be on a collegiate level to enable broad understanding of why decisions are being made and how these are communicated out across strands.

4. The rationale for change, indicators for success and evaluation criteria need to be clearly articulated to partners and staff from the outset

5. The EOI process requires the BCU Blueprint to be as detailed as possible, down to position level, including Line Management structures. The Blueprint, once delivered must locked down. To ensure control and stability of the change, any further amendments must be ratified through relevant Oversight and Programme Boards.

6. Early engagement with partners is critical to scope their requirements, allow feedback and, where possible, for partnership views to be incorporated into BCU design.

7. Establishment of revised partnership and community meeting structures is necessary to ensure that both the BCUs and Boroughs operate effectively (e.g. Safer Neighbourhood Boards, Child Safeguarding Boards, MARAC, and Stop & Search). This includes ensuring

   a. Appropriate seniority of police representation at meetings and general SLT access and availability.
b. Identification of and linking of partner’s assets into the BCU tasking process.
c. Ensuring that the BCU Safeguarding Referral Hub, working practices, co-location and effective technology in line with individual local authority preferences.

26. Implementation, Phasing and Cultural Change

Feedback

Cultural change runs through the entirety of the BCU process - from the Mi Investigation work within ERTPs, to the effective integration of CASO staff and the deployment of incident response cars from CID units. Consistent leadership, communication and briefing are necessary to deal with these challenges.

There was a perception from both supervisors and front line staff that the pathfinder process has been driven from outside the BCUs - and was something that staff have been “done to” rather than “involved in”. This had an impact on morale and was seen as a contributing factor to sickness levels and lower productivity. As time has passed, whilst challenges remain there is evidence that staff are accepting changes to working practices and that these are becoming seen as business as usual15.

For the BCU pathfinders it was originally planned that a team of “floor walkers” would be available and embedded with teams to support the change. As described in the earlier section on operational context, this was never realised due to the pressures on the detective skills needed elsewhere in the MPS. Ultimately, the resources supplied to support implementation were limited in terms of both the number and the skills. This, coupled with the pace of implementation led to poor delivery of some of the business change.

Demand reduction did not take place as originally planned, placing additional workload on officers during key stages of transition. This made it more difficult for officers to take the time necessary to refine and develop the skills.

The impact of SCO17 officers moving into a BCU should not be underestimated. Changes of role, location and a removal of an SCO identity have an additional impact on the officers/staff moving onto the BCU. Staff engagement at an early stage by the Safeguarding Superintendent and team leaders and greater involvement in local training and workshops and will assist in easing this transition.

Similarly, the connection of staff within the BCU pathfinder to their pre-existing Borough should not be underestimated. Where staff have worked, often for many years, the apparent loss of identity and change to the “working family” involved in this change needs careful management. The impact of this change can be exacerbated by decisions which, while small in themselves, can contribute to a perception that one borough is being favoured over another rather. Decision on the location of particular BCU functions (SLT, Ops Room, Training etc.) has a particular impact.

The ability of the SLT to be visible and to project themselves across the BCU has a significant effect during transition – and is pivotal in supporting a successful change.

Welfare, morale and fatigue are cited as factors that have also affected effective delivery of performance. As the BCU pathfinders are progressing, however, there is an acceptance of change and this is having a positive effect on performance. In addition, the ability to learn a new ‘ground’ has been a progressive experience for many.

15 Observations from pathfinder SLTs and SLP SRO.
Whilst different views have been expressed, some feedback has indicated that the impact of Mi-Investigation on ERPT appears to have caused an increase in officers looking for an investigative career. Crime Assessment principles have had a positive impact on workloads, releasing pressure on ERPT by providing a solid framework to deal with investigations. With increased skills, some officers are starting to develop confidence in their power to make decisions about which crimes require further investigation.

**Lessons for Future Roll Out.**

1. **Ownership of Change:** it is imperative that the change process is owned and driven by the BCU themselves. This starts with the SLT, through middle management to frontline practitioners. As far as possible, it must be locally owned – and involving local officers and staff and partners in key decisions. The importance of being consulted, informed, involved and listened to is key in how our staff perceive the changes affecting them and important in securing morale and workforce motivation. This can be achieved through early briefings, explanation of the need for change and showing overt support for staff learning new skills and roles. Clear and transparent lines of communication to raise queries and concerns are critical to securing staff buy-in to the change.

2. **Leadership:** there have been several examples of strong and sometimes outstanding leadership of change within the BCU pathfinders. All SLT and supervisory ranks will need to demonstrate transformational leadership and recognise their unique position to lead the change. A key element of this is to communicate and explain the rationale for the change and decisions to affected staff. All in leadership posts should fully participate in the Leading for London Programme. This offers the opportunity to develop exactly the behaviours and skills required to support these changes.

3. **Local Change Network:** early Identification of local change champions and Local Change Network to support process of change is critically important. A strong Local Change Network (LCN) is needed to support the BCU SLT while they are leading change activity at the same time as maintaining core local delivery. Early establishment of these LCNs is essential.

4. **Preparatory Work:** several examples have been cited of activity that should be undertaken (preferably by the LCN) to prepare Boroughs for future change – and which would have a positive effect on the transition. These actions (varying from locker audits to action to reduce outstanding caseloads to skills / HR audits) should form a key part in the implementation plan of any future BCU.

5. **Enabling Technology:** the roll out of supportive technology should be aligned with or in advance of BCU roll out to allow efficiencies to be realised at the outset. Where possible, other OMM programmes should seek to link their own phases of change with the BCU rollout where that change would be beneficial to the BCU implementation to reduce multiple changes in a single business area in close proximity.

6. **Briefing and Communications:** briefing sessions and associated products should be timetabled in advance of any changes taking place, to allow understanding and practical demonstration of new skills prior to go live. This prepares staff for change and mitigates concerns.

---

7. **Testing**: transition should be eased through table top or other exercise to ensure that all officers have worked through and tested local systems to deal with typical operational scenarios.

8. **Peer Group Learning**: the programme should make use of beneficial staff experiences from the BCU pathfinder project to enable peer to peer learning during the implementation phase of a new BCU to accelerate the journey around the change curve.¹⁷

---

### 27. People – HR process and skills development

**Feedback**

**Expression of Interest Process**: the staged approach to the EOI process, coupled with changes to some roles whilst the process was running, led to confusion during implementation. This increased the work required in subsequent LRPMs. This made communication about the process more challenging – and this needs to be consistent to avoid unhelpful rumour and unhelpful speculation. These difficulties, at the outset of implementation, damage staff confidence in both the process and the wider programme. It was felt that this process was particularly difficult for officers who were moving from SC&O17/CASO to the BCU.

**Resource Picture**: HR data on corporate systems needs to be of a high quality to support an accurate, current resource analysis. This is the basis of both EOI and posting processes. Improving the quality of this data is essential in order to understanding the resourcing picture with regard to skills, vacancies and deployable officers and to ensure that the BCU LRPM take an effective approach to workforce planning on the BCU.

**Adjusted Duties**: there must be a clear strategy in place for the deployment of officers on adjusted or recuperative duties within the BCU. This is in the process of being addressed within the MPS – but this should be recognised as a critical issue when deploying officers within a BCU model that has a relatively small % of posts that are suitable for officers on adjusted duties.

**Vacancy Rates**: vacancy factors across the BCU need to be addressed through a workforce planning strategy in line with BCU priorities.

**Annual Leave**: the go-live period is inevitably challenging – and this pressure can be amplified by the impact of pre-booked A/L from individuals moving into new units. This is particularly difficult during peak holiday periods. Early management of A/L and other abstractions during transition is essential to minimise the challenges that this poses.

**Skills Management**: the EOI process should be as simple as possible. Officers with certain skills (as identified through the skills audit) should be eliminated from applying outside of their specialism, where their key skills will be most required from the outset. This would be across all strands, from drivers and Taser operators to specialist investigators. Career development opportunities can still exist as part of regular LRPM business as the BCU pathfinder progresses.

**Training**: briefing/training sessions need to be delivered as early as possible within the implementation and go-live phases. Sufficient time needs to be allowed for learning prior to

---

officers taking on responsibility for new tasks. The quality of this training is a critical factor in ensuring necessary increases in skills and capability. This should be delivered by individuals with both the necessary experience and skill. This is particularly the case for Mi-Investigation and problem solving.

- **Mi-Investigation**: is a critical area for skills development – amongst both officers and supervisors. Early investment and training is essential to ensure teams are confident at go-live. This can be dealt with through both formal briefing / training inputs but also by increasing peer group support and advice.

- **BAU Training Provision**: go-live of BCUs needs to be supported by access to suitable training courses. The BCU model requires officers in some roles to have access to existing BAU courses (*e.g.* Safeguarding, CAD). Implementation planning should take particular account of these requirements.

Where there are expectations of self-service by officers on existing corporate systems (*e.g.* DWOs showing their activity correctly on CARMS), this should be supported by additional training/ briefing inputs.

**SC&O22 Workload**: roster/Duties processes are heavily regulated with regard to timeframes and these need to be adhered to during the implementation process. Late changes create significant extra work/ re-work within SC&O22.

**Lessons for Future Roll Out.**

1. **EOI Process**: the core HR requirements and dates for future implementation and EOI process should be signed off by the SRO and Programme Board in advance of any HR process beginning. The initial LRPM process needs robust support from HR colleagues as well as local expertise in maintaining ongoing posting records, monitoring strengths, abstractions and providing accurate data on skills (through a skills audit). BCU Commanders should work to an agreed set of principles so that all BCUs implement the change in a consistent manner.

2. **SC&O 22**: sufficient time should be provided to SC&O22 to prepare for the launch of new BCUs (estimated at 26 weeks) – taking into account that additional BCUs launching at the same time will require a longer lead time. This will enable BCU merger work to be delivered without a negative impact on business as usual.

3. **Vacancy and Abstraction Management**: there should be an established BCU strategy on where vacancies will be held. This should also include consideration of where vacancies, recuperative and restricted staff will be across the strands. Federation and PCS should be a key component of all posting related meetings and discussions and they are a critical part in delivery of a successful posting process. Within this strategy there should be particular consideration of DC posts as well as ERT, DWO and Safeguarding roles.

4. **Annual Leave During Go-live**: a 2 week period of Annual Leave Lockdown should be implemented across all strands on the BCU post go live to ensure minimum strengths are upheld (existing processes apply for special leave etc.).

5. **Training**
   - **BCU access to additional bespoke and BAU training**: ‘BCU ready’ skills should be prioritised within the central training requirement. This should ensure that relevant skills are embedded before the transition and includes, in particular, courses to develop competency in Safeguarding and, in particular, Mi-investigation.
• **Skills development:** should begin at the earliest opportunity to give officers/staff more time to develop expertise before taking on increased responsibilities

• **Support for supervisors:** input needs to be provided as early as possible to supervisors to ensure they are equipped for the change and are able to coach and support their team as necessary.

### 28. Performance, Stabilisation and Continuous Improvement

**Feedback**

**Performance impact:** the implementation of the BCU destabilised operational delivery and had an initial impact on several areas. BCU pathfinders have shown where the risk of these impacts is most acute enabling amendments to the BCU design and implementation process. As training and experience beds in, there has been a discernible performance improvement across the BCU. Some indicators, however remain high (ONS, VCOP compliance) and this has identified where additional training is still needed.

**Performance management arrangements:** while operating at a larger scale, there remains a need for both functional, Borough and team level data and performance processes. This is needed to support both senior and junior leaders on the BCUs. On a similar theme, partnership requirements need to be scoped and met so that partners are informed about the areas of interest – particularly with regard to Borough rather than BCU level data.

**Stabilisation and success criteria:** BCU need clear criteria to define what success and stabilisation looks like. This is required both to ensure that BCUs deliver against agreed priorities but also so that the transition from a BCU "in transition" to "business as usual" is a structured process.

**Continuous Improvement:** the pathfinders have not waited until the current learning process to make necessary changes – but have done so at the earliest appropriate moment. This experience is likely to be repeated on every BCU – and so a structured and controlled approach to learning, that takes into account both local and pan-London requirements is essential. This will both ensure the Pathfinders return to business as usual in a structured way and that BCUs, moving forward, are able to continue to learn and evolve.

**Lessons for Further Roll-Out**

1. **Managing performance dips at transition:** transition to a new way of working is a high risk period in terms of performance. This is, typically, a period in which the depth and severity of this dip is dependent on the scale and complexity of change. There is a recognition of this challenge corporately, however the implementation planning and preparation for transition must do everything possible to mitigate this risk. This includes, in particular, ensuring effective business change through strong design, planning and local ownership of the change taking place. It also includes having a strong set of contingency plans to deal not just with falls in day to day performance but also to deal with surges in demand caused by unforeseen trends and events.

2. **Stabilisation criteria:** there should be agreed stabilisation criteria that each BCU should work to. This should also set out how progress will be monitored and over what length of time stabilisation must be demonstrated. This should be accompanied by a defined exit strategy to return the BCU to BAU governance once stabilisation has been achieved.
3. **Partnership data:** the current performance pack for Oversight Board or future structure should be reviewed for context and relevance. It should contain detail specific to each BCUs PCP priorities and also contain detail as to progress towards stabilisation.

4. **Continuous Improvement:** the learning gathered in the course of this report suggests not only that there are changes to be made as a consequence of the BCU pathfinder experience, but that it is highly probable that changes will continue to be made. As a consequence, a structured approach to gathering ongoing learning should form a key part of any further roll-out. This requires further engagement with MPS/ MOPAC units already engaged in improvement activity – and engagement with the emerging MPS Executive structure that is likely to include “Heads of Profession” for local policing functions.

29. **Leadership and Governance**

**Feedback**

**Senior borough point of contact:** the provision of a senior point of contact for partners on each borough has not worked as effectively as it needs to. This has particular implications during the transition from Borough to BCU working and the partnership engagement that this requires. Within a “two borough” command (such as CN) it may be more feasible for the BCU commander to maintain strong relationships with senior stakeholders – though concern about the resilience of the BCU Commander in these circumstances has been raised. This is likely to be far more challenging in a command, such as EA, that contains three or more boroughs.

**Appointment of Leadership teams:** the learning from the pathfinders has illustrated how critical the early appointment of BCU leadership teams is for successful delivery. Many of the problems worked through with partners have stemmed less from specific design issues associated with a new way of working and more from the lack of time to develop new relationships, and build a shared understanding of how to operate. A particular challenge in pathfinder sites has been the requirement of local teams to deliver change at a pace that limited their ability to develop local design and thinking in conjunction with partners. Future implementation planning is based on the early appointment of leadership teams within the BCU, enabling them to own and manage the business change and transition.

**Local Operating Environment:** the value of conducting pathfinders in two very different areas is that it has made clear the difference of the challenges being faced in different operating environments, and the need for adjustment to meet local needs. In this context the challenge of bringing 3 rather than 2 Boroughs together was a significant factor in ensuring effective implementation – but it is also apparent that every BCU is likely to face different challenges that need to be addressed. As above, the early appointment of BCU Leadership teams and engagement with partners is to be built into the delivery plans.

**Pathfinder Governance:** each Pathfinder BCU SLT were part of the “Implementation, Design and Delivery Group” and held weekly Local Implementation Meetings on their respective BCUs which included enablers and the opportunity to influence ongoing implementation. In addition, in advance of go-live, each BCU SLT and enablers took part in discussion and completion of Change Impact Assessments, a detailed Readiness Assessment and ownership of a local risk register. These meeting ran slightly differently on each pathfinder and with varying degrees of formal project management.

Pathfinder delivery included the added dimension of involving senior partnership leads in two new monthly boards (Oversight and Project boards). These boards added an important element to
pathfinder delivery – and had the potential to unlock significant collaborative working from supportive partners.

However whilst the governance arrangements were potentially effective, the pressure of supporting a complex network of this meetings was intense. Through these arrangements, each BCU pathfinder was being overseen by 3 monthly boards (programme, Oversight and Project board) as well as its weekly Implementation board. There were insufficient resources to support these boards with these terms of reference and at this frequency. As a consequence the governance of key decisions proved difficult to negotiate.

The pressures of operating at speed through complex governance arrangements meant that some decisions had to be taken without working through full governance process. This in turn made the communication about decisions and their rationale more difficult and led to a lack of transparency in what was happening. The combined effect of the above inhibited SLP ability to communicate confidently with partners and stakeholders about direction or solutions at important times.

**Lessons for Further Roll-out:**

1. **Leadership Capacity**: the design has been amended to include an additional superintendent as part of the BCU Command team, and six chief inspectors per BCU. This may be varied further depending on the local challenges. This change requires some growth in the SLP posts but will provide an appropriate level of senior management within each BCU – and will provide increased capacity to work with partners.

2. **Single Point of Contact**: Future BCUs will involve the identification of officers at Supt rank who will provide a Single Point of Contact for each Borough within that BCU. This will be over and above the functional points of contact at BCU level for Safeguarding and other BCU functions. The increased resilience in the senior leadership team by the provision of a fifth superintendent will be supported by a revised role specification for the borough lead aspect of their role.

3. **Appointment of Leadership Teams**: any future implementation plan for BCUs will recognise the importance of the early appointment of both the BCU Cmdr. and their SLT – and will make this happen at the earliest possible point.

4. **Governance of Change**: revised change governance processes should be established alongside support arrangements from SLP, BCUs and Partners. These arrangements should provide clarity of accountability for key decisions – which should normally rest with BCU Cmdr. or SRO. However, there should be explicit reference for the requirement to consult with key colleagues on decisions affecting partnership working. Terms of reference for key meetings, including attendees, should be refreshed. Communication planning should take account of the key meetings and ensure that regular updates are provided to internal and external stakeholders on decisions being made and issues being considered.
Part F: Partner and Community Feedback

This section describes the key themes from the feedback received from partners and community.

30. Partner Feedback

Partner and community feedback has been embedded throughout this learning report – and has been taken account of the recommendations made. This section sets out specific points made within the feedback received from workshops on each pathfinder and from individual submissions from Local Authorities, Chairs of Children’s Safeguarding Boards and Safer Neighbourhoods Board.

It was recognised from the outset that changes within a complex organisational, partnership and community environment are challenging at the best of times. When conducted within tight timeframes this creates tensions across the individuals and groups involved. The continuing willingness of all involved to work collaboratively to ensure effective policing – including the provision of important and challenging feedback – is both welcome and a strong foundation for moving forward.

Within the feedback there has sometimes been a wide range of different views on similar subjects. Whilst there are some generic themes (as set out below), both positive and negative, the role of individuals in delivering a new way of policing has a significant impact on how the changes are implemented, how they operate and how they are perceived. In many respects, this reflects current challenges in policing but this becomes a key factor to be taken into account during a period of transition.

Summary of Learning

The most significant lessons learned in the implementation may be classified into three areas:

a. Communications – Communications were raised as a significant issue throughout the BCU process. This included internal communications, communication by front line officers, communications with partner agencies and at a political level and communications with the wider community. Key learning was that:

   I. Partners should be consulted early in transition on the development of communications strategies. Communication should take into account the context of broader change in policing in London (e.g. public access, closure of front counters) and not just BCU delivery - and there should be more recognition of the value that partners could bring. (A more sophisticated and multi layered plan drawing on political, operational and community elements could have supported the pathfinders much more powerfully)

   II. MPS Change teams must be far more proactive in communicating with officers and staff, partner agencies and in particular, the community.

   III. These teams should be prepared and briefed on the local political, partner and community context to enable them to better manage key relationships with stakeholders and community groups.
IV. Future changes should make particular effort to be clear on performance metrics, officer numbers and issues being encountered during the change process. This is particularly important when the transition encounters difficulty. (Inconsistent and poor communication on these subjects and during these periods can lead to perceptions of a lack of transparency)

V. There should be a single point of contact for communications within the BCU to support work with partners and the community – and roles and responsibilities in this area should be clear from the outset.

VI. More extensive use should have been made of social media to make sure that messages reach as many individuals from diverse cultures and backgrounds as possible.

VII. BCU “naming” (e.g. “Central North”) should be reviewed to ensure the new brands for local policing relates as effectively as possible with local people.

b. Collaboration & engagement: it was recognised by partners that change is a challenging process – but that building and maintaining relationships throughout and beyond transition is a critical factor in making the change effective. It was noted that the trust of partners is easy to lose if the change is started in the wrong way and substantial effort is then required at all levels to recover lost ground. The MPS needs to recognise the early symptoms of this kind of strain on working relationships and address them. Key learning here is

I. MPS Change teams need to ensure that they consult with partners, establishing and using relationships to influence planning and identify the best approach. (‘One size does not fit all” and it is critically important that local needs are factored in and that best practice is identified and incorporated into the design and delivery)

II. Officers who are new in post as a result of the implementation must be clear on their roles and responsibilities and must be given (and take the) time to build relationships – especially with boroughs with whom they do not already have a relationship. (Some partners were very keen to support an ‘induction’ process for current and new officers as they arrive in post)

III. Effective operational delivery, long term, will rely on continuing collaboration rather than the MPS ‘doing BCUs to’ partners and communities. To maintain this collaborative approach there should be as much engagement as possible prior to implementation. This should be coupled with a recognition of the differing local authority/partner needs and ways of working

IV. Collaborative working should include involvement of SNBs (who have felt that they could have been more productively involved in developing and testing the pathfinders and that they should be involved as early as possible in any future changes).

c. Planning: the limited time for run-in to the implementation meant that there was limited opportunity to ensure that there was a real understanding of the design, that new roles and responsibilities were understood and to really understand the local variations in terms of ways of working, needs and political nuances. Key learning in this respect was that:

I. Plans need to be clear, consistent and communicated.
II. Partners need to be involved in their development to ensure that plans take local needs into account – and give partners the opportunity to align their own plans.

III. Where issues arise, plans need to be adjusted to ensure the pace of delivery is adjusted to provide time to address them.

IV. Policing priorities need to be clear, especially during the implementation and stabilisation periods when new ways of working and structures may introduce additional difficulties.

V. Issues with headcount shortages and/or skills gaps need to be identified and addressed in advance of implementation.

VI. Given the nature of the changes involved, operational delivery will take considerable time to bed down and the long term implications of this should be recognised and catered for.

d. Leadership: there was wide recognition of the pressure on leadership roles and the importance of both having the right calibre of individuals in these roles, clear definition of roles and responsibilities and making sure that there was appropriate support available to them. Key learning was:

   I. It is critically important that senior partners and stakeholders have confidence in the senior leadership team on a BCU – and that time is spent in developing and maintaining key strategic relationships

   II. There needs to be investment in freeing up the BCU commander to deliver their role. (It is unsustainable for a BCU commander to try and be the borough commander for all boroughs in the BCU).

   III. Within each BCU, there needs to be a designated senior contact at a borough level, who understands the breadth of what is happening on an individual borough and has the ability to take decisions to resolve issues.

   IV. This designated senior contact and functional leads must invest time in developing local relationships within and across boroughs. (There is concern that the pressure on senior leaders will result in less time spent on engaging with partners and the community)

   V. Leadership teams should be as stable as possible during and after transition (continuing churn of senior leads undermines work to build effective working relationships).

e. Design of Local Policing: many areas of the new design were supported (see positive comments below) but there were specific concerns about some aspects of the design:

   I. Each BCU should have a look at how meetings are rationalised, carefully considering what will be effective locally. (Simply rolling up multiple boroughs into a single meeting is not necessarily effective.) Consistent attendance at these meetings is crucial – with the right level of seniority at key meetings such as Children’s Safeguarding Boards and Safer Neighbourhood Boards

   II. When moving teams within a BCU, attention should be paid to the impact that this has on working relationships and to make sure that a service is both delivered and seen to be delivered evenly across the whole BCU. (Teams and leaders should be aware of
and deal with the perception that a borough hosting a particular team will get a better service – and that, if a team moves away, then that borough gets a lower quality of service.)

III. Continuing attention should be paid to the workload of officers – particularly within response teams. This is both because of the effect on the officers involved but also because of the need to make sure the connection between response teams and other BCU units (particularly neighbourhood teams) remains strong.

IV. The development of BCUs should be used as an opportunity to strengthen some areas that are not explicitly within the SLP scope but which would add a significant benefit to partnership working – specifically intelligence and intelligence sharing.

Positive experiences to build on:

Although in both reviews there was an understandable focus on issues and things that could have gone better, there were also positives drawn from the experience. These are summarised as follows:

a. Design: whilst there has been continuing work to refine and improve the design of local policing and there have been different views expressed by different individuals, there have been positives observations on the design, highlighting what should be retained going forward

The four strand model of local policing works and placing safeguarding on an equivalent level to the other strands was seen as particularly helpful

Consolidation of safeguarding services at a borough level (as opposed to being split between boroughs and HQ) is considered to be a very positive step that is proving to enable a significantly improved level of service to vulnerable members of the community

The retention of the safeguarding resource and the return of Dedicated Ward Officers returning to normal duties after the difficult initial transition has been welcomed. The additional partnership and schools officer are considered to be a positive step forward

Joint Tasking arrangements have been re-established across EA and Local Authority experience with joint tasking arrangements could be used to build on this. (The quality of the supporting intelligence products remains an issue – as mentioned above).

b. Leadership: there was clear commitment from individual leaders and officers, despite the difficulties during implementation and subsequent stabilisation – “individuals made it happen”. Particular reference was made to the part played in CN by the BCU Commander. The level of input from senior Met officers when issues arose during stabilisation was very well received. The Met is perceived to have learned much about managing the political dimension of such changes.

c. Collaboration between Partners: the collaborative approach from councils has been maintained throughout the implementation and stabilisation period – with relationships between partner organisations considered by some to have to have improved as a result of the process. A strong theme within feedback was the continuing desire on the part of partners to be engaged and work collaboratively to address issues and optimise the level of service provided. It was made clear that councils want and need this to work as much as the Met and are very willing to collaborate
d. **Communication**: although several issues have been highlighted above, positive comments were received from SNBs in the North about the initial briefing on the nature and rationale for changes within pathfinders.

**Next Steps:**

Over and above learning on how further BCUs should be rolled out, several comments reflect a desire to build on current arrangements. There are several strands on which police and partners could continue to work together, including improving the visibility of police officers by single patrolling alongside local authority enforcement officers. Carrying out highly visible activities, for example, with police dogs and horses in high footfall areas could help.

There is now a regular meeting with the Council’s Communications team and the MPS which is progress, but more work needs to be done to make this fully effective.

Pathfinders should establish an action plan to deal with any outstanding issues and concerns and to enable the “pathfinder” set up to transition to business as usual.
PART G: CONCLUSIONS

31. Conclusions

This section brings together the information from various sources, as documented throughout this report, and sets out the overarching conclusions and recommendations in relation to Pathfinder learning.

This document is a review of the key lessons learned through the implementation of the pathfinders. These lessons have been identified through extensive interactions between OMM and the staff and leaders of the pathfinder, staff associations & PCS Union and with key internal and external partners. These interactions have taken many forms, from corridor conversations, site visits, workshops, focus groups, formal structured interviews, surveys, e-mail boxes and the Intranet forums.

These changes to local policing involve many stakeholders, many dependencies and significant cultural and business change.Whilst there are detailed conclusions and recommendations throughout this document, this section identifies the primary themes and makes recommendations as to the way ahead.

The Context in which Pathfinders are operating has fundamentally changed: when work on the BCUs and, subsequently, the pathfinder sites began, it was not clear what the financial pressures facing the MPS were likely to be over the next few years. As a consequence, the focus of effort was on ensuring both cashable and non-cashable benefits – with some ambiguity about the nature of the financial challenge.

It is now clear that the MPS must make considerable savings - with a reduction to approximately 30000 posts by April 2018 and, in all likelihood, further significant reductions by 2021. Given the size of the current establishment, a significant proportion of these savings will come from local Policing. In this respect the context in which the pathfinders are operating has fundamentally changed.

The effect of this level of reduction will be to put the resilience of current Borough structures under increasing and unsustainable pressure. In this context, operating at an increased scale becomes an inevitability if the MPS is to make best use of its officers, staff and leadership teams. There are particular pressures in areas where specialism is required (safeguarding, offender management) and where, without the move to operate at a greater scale, teams would become increasingly small and lacking in resilience.

This change means that the focus on the pathfinders has moved from whether and when they should be rolled out across London to a focus on how we can ensure that the BCUs operate as effectively and efficiently as possible – taking into account learning that enables the MPS to retain and build on areas of strength.

In the context of reducing numbers, the ambition must be to maintain Performance: whilst the ambition of policing must always be to find ways of improving what has gone before, in the current policing environment, sustaining performance with a significant reduction in staff remains a critical first step. Both Pathfinders have suffered a performance dip – with the East BCU initially
dealing with a significantly deeper and more intense decline than the North. The subsequent recovery to performance levels that are at least on a par with other Boroughs has been a hard fought achievement – and has had the knock effect of soaking up the capacity of local leaders when they would have wanted to be move and focus on other areas of BCU delivery and partnership working.

This performance has been delivered whilst headcount has been reducing – and without the delivery of some of the changes that were intended to support increased efficiency (such as mobile technology)

In this context, delivery of current level of BCU performance with the further support and improvements still to be made, should give increased confidence that the revised model provides the right foundation for policing in London. This remains a risk to be managed in any further roll-out.

Local Ownership: the pathfinders were, overtly, an effort to test specific new ways of working on behalf of the organisation. On occasion, this limited local flexibility and impacted on the sense of local ownership. Moving forward, it is critical that both in pathfinders and other BCUs, there is an increasing sense of strong local ownership albeit within a single strategic framework for London. This applies not just internally but also for work with external partners. This will undoubtedly remain an area of tension as it would not be true to say that there are no constraints on how BCUs can operate in a pan-London setting – but the design, implementation and transition process must, as far as possible, remain locally owned and locally led.

Local Leadership: A further and key piece of feedback has been that leaders, both at SLT and other levels, must have sufficient time and support to get used to their new roles and responsibilities and to genuinely be able to own the transition in their own way. The early appointment of leadership teams is pivotal to enabling ownership of the change and to build operational teams at every level. Given the level of change involved, this takes time and as much time as possible should be built in to the roll out of BCUs. Local leadership roles should take account of the need to ensure that Boroughs have clear points of contact for individual policing functions (such as Safeguarding) but that there is also a designated point of contact for wider, more general partnership issues at both a strategic and day to day level.

One Size Does Not Fit All: as part of this localism, the pathfinder experience has pointed to the different challenges faced by different BCUs – whether this be the number of Borough Partners involved or the specific operational challenges facing particular BCUs (such as central London). The blueprinting process is a fundamental building block for transition and one that will set both clear objectives and tone for the remainder of the implementation. This process must also help define any differences in how an individual BCU will operate – so that, from the outset, the BCU can be clear on both the wider framework within which it must operate and the bespoke elements of local design.

BCU Design: as set out above, the original BCU design was largely implemented as planned (with some notable exceptions such as BCU HQ and some elements of safeguarding). This design has already evolved. This has happened most obviously in Response, with changes to the despatch/radio arrangements and with leadership (the introduction of a 5th Superintendent and re-introduction of Chief Insp roles). Whilst the detailed design has been reviewed and agreed – it will continue to evolve. There is work ongoing to deal with CID/Safeguarding response and to improve CID/Safeguarding shift patterns. There are also additional efficiencies that must be considered to deal with savings targets in future years and there are design changes that will be required from other programmes (most notably due to changes to local despatch functions and specialist crime).
To remain operationally effective the design must continue to evolve – and the key challenge is to ensure that any further changes are subject to suitable control and communication. Some of these changes are likely to occur during any wider roll out of BCUs – so strong co-ordination and control is needed as part of programme delivery.

**Communication and Engagement:** there has been continuing feedback, externally and internally, reflecting the need for sustained and consistent communication and engagement – both during and following any transition. Whilst a large part of this activity must rest with those in leadership roles, the resources and skills that are essential to support this work have also been in short supply. Both within the pathfinders and in any further roll out, sustained investment in the planning and delivery of communication and engagement activity is essential.

**Partnerships:** a striking element of feedback from pathfinder partners is that the BCUs could have worked more collaboratively, been more challenging and obtained more support from local partners. Part of the challenge is to support leaders to engage in building external relationships whilst also negotiating changes in their own role and those of their teams under tight time constraints. Given the increasing stabilisation of Pathfinders, it is expected that collaborative relationships will now continue to develop and strengthen. However, it is crucial within any future roll-out that relationships are built at the earliest stage and that development of BCU working is as collaborative as possible.

**Timescale:** a consistent theme across internal and external feedback has been the difficulties generated by the speed of pathfinder transition – and the impact that these pressures had on effective planning and delivery. Internally, this generated significant pressure on both enabling functions (such as HR, SC&O22) as well as on business change activity (which limited the time available for individuals and teams to fully understand new roles, responsibilities and to develop skills). Externally, this did not allow sufficient time for partners to develop an understanding of the change across their own complex organisations or provide an input to some of the changes being planned – resulting in a sense that this was being imposed on them rather than worked through with them.

Any further roll-out needs to allow as much time as possible for a controlled work through key processes (such as HR ad business change) and to allow the earliest possible involvement of partners.

**Business Change:** clarity of design, an understanding of the impact of that change and a structured readiness plan that focuses on priority areas are pivotal to ensuring effective business change. However, it is also apparent that whilst this approach will launch the BCUs in an appropriate way, several functions will take a considerable time to fully bed in and deliver the benefits expected. For example, whilst there are some early signs that the working practices involved in mi-investigation and safeguarding are being seen in a more positive light, it is also likely to take considerably longer before this way of working is fully embedded and with a depth of expertise to manage the day to day delivery challenges. This requires a readiness to maintain the strategic direction for the long haul – and build a framework for local policing that can support and consolidate the changes required.

**Organisational Readiness:** many officers and staff have found the pathfinders a difficult experience – sometimes because of how the changes have been implemented and sometimes because of the nature of the changes implemented. This is apparent from local feedback from officers and partners and from staff surveys and MPS Forums. This reflects the genuine difficulty that some individuals have found with both Pathfinder and wider change.

The increasing visibility of the financial challenge is starting to shift perceptions about the need for the MPS to change but, to reflect the staff concern, an essential attribute of any future change
must be a readiness to listen and respond to issues raised. There is balance to be had when receiving feedback on agreed organisational plans, but there should be a framework in place that enables changes to be made to either designs or plans when appropriate.

However, an additional factor is that relatively few officers in the MPS have experienced change in which officer numbers have been significantly reducing – and this pressure will provide a leadership challenge of the highest order and will require additional development and support across the MPS to address it. (Although it is worth noting that this is mainly a police officer experience as police staff colleagues have been dealing with similar challenges for the last 5 years).

**Resources to Support Delivery:** several pieces of feedback relate to support either not provided or provided to an inconsistent/poor quality. As noted earlier, the pathfinders were established during a period in which the MPS Portfolio has been in transition and in which, on a practical level, some support functions were (and are) still in development. There remain significant resource pressures within programme teams across the Transformation Directorate.

Given headcount reduction across the MPS, resources to support change will continue to be a challenge – as will balancing the demand of operational delivery and change management. Failure to provide or maintain sufficient skilled resources to manage any further roll-out will threaten the effectiveness of delivery. This includes both central, programme resources, but also covers the new Local Change Networks who are likely to shoulder the twin burden of operational and change responsibilities in a BCU setting.

**Governance:** revised governance processes should be established alongside appropriate support arrangements from for the SLP Programme, BCUs and Partners. These arrangements should provide clarity of accountability for key decisions in the transition – which should normally rest with BCU Cmdr. or SRO. However, there should be explicit reference for the requirement to consult with key colleagues on decisions affecting partnership working. A forum should remain that enables the relevant Council Leaders and Chief Executives to be provided with an insight into proposed changes and to provide comment and views on BCU implementation.

**Pathfinder delivery against objectives:** the following sets out delivery against the original objectives:

To enable more effective and efficient delivery of policing across London:

- Key elements of the design have been delivered as planned – with minor exceptions.
- Changes have been made to aspects of the model that did not run as planned initially to enable original benefits to be delivered.
- The model has delivered expected efficiencies and has also demonstrated the potential to deliver additional savings/reinvestment opportunities.
- Current indications are that performance is recovering at Borough as well as BCU level, despite initial issues in some areas.

To enable the MPS to deliver the Mayor's Police and Crime 2017-2021:

- Performance is broadly tracking MPS levels – with acceptable performance being delivered in most areas (as defined by whether there are statistically significant differences between MPS and BCU delivery)
- There are particular performance areas which have seen significant increases. Analysis indicates that where this has happened (eg burglary), the crime trends form part of wider national/London trends and is not directly attributed to BCU working.
- Victim satisfaction has fallen. Whilst this is associated with the initial fall in response performance other factors are involved. The mitigation put in place together with
improvements in the response model there is increasing confidence that the quality of service will recover.

To support delivery of strategic objectives through effective partnership engagement and joint working:

- There has been positive feedback on elements of the model, particularly within safeguarding.
- There have also been significant concerns raised by partners and SNBs. This has been a challenging area for all involved – and one in which significant learning has been gathered and which will be taken into account in plans for further roll-out.
- The MPS is confident that further change will be able to deliver a more collaborative approach based on the lessons learned and changes to the implementation plan.

**MPS readiness for roll-out:** as a consequence of considering delivery, the learning drawn from Pathfinders and wider developments in the MPS, the MPS is in a position to continue roll-out. This conclusion is drawn on the following basis:

a. The pathfinder experience has been a difficult experience for many of those involved – but through their efforts the model has stabilised across both sites and performance, with reduced numbers, is now at an appropriate level.

b. The learning that has been gathered has been used to inform the implementation approach and forward plan articulated in the SLP Full Business Case. This approach addresses many of the points highlighted above – and specifically those relating to planning, organisation and resources to support the change.

c. Organisational and Leadership readiness are being addressed both through pan-London forums such as Senior and Extended leadership events as well as through the new “Leading for London” programme.

d. The Transformation Directorate – and the support and skills it offers – is significantly more mature than at the start of the 2017 and provides a far stronger framework to systematically manage the change and dependencies involved in full roll-out. Whilst resourcing remains a challenge, the priority to be accorded the roll-out of SLPs has been recognised and forms part of the requirement agreed within the FBC.

e. The BCU design has already evolved to take on board the learning from pathfinder delivery. Systems are now in place to manage some of the remaining challenges but also to manage the introduction of other changes required either by further savings requirements or through dependencies with other programmes of work.

f. Definition of key steps in delivery – blueprinting, change impact and change readiness plans – is significantly more advanced than 12 months ago. Current plans take account of the length of time needed to ensure effective delivery of each of these steps and also to ensure strong and effective local ownership.

g. Changes to the BCU design – particularly to emergency response – coupled with increasing focus on developing investigative skills will support BCUs to maintain performance throughout the transition period. These changes, coupled with a revised readiness assessment and go-live decision making process, provide strong grounds for confidence that performance challenges can be minimised during the transition period.

Of particular note is that the revised design and approach will minimise any short term impact on victim satisfaction and set the foundation for the realisation of the longer term benefits to victims that BCUs will provide.
h. Whilst recognising that the pathfinder process has been a difficult one for partnerships – and that there remain some issues to be addressed on both sites – there is also a willingness to develop strong and effective partnership working and to work collaboratively with the MPS to resolve issues.

i. Outstanding issues on the Pathfinders, including work to meet further headcount reduction, should be dealt with in the form of a close down "Action" plan, agreed with partners, to ensure that any outstanding issues with implementation and BAU delivery on both pathfinders are recognised and addressed to the satisfaction of both the MPS and key stakeholders.