



INDEPENDENT CRIME RECORDING CONFIDENCE PANEL

19 October 2018 12.00pm to 2.08pm
OPCC Meeting Room
Police Headquarters

NOTES

In attendance:

Cate Moore - Chair
George Krawiec - Deputy Chair (Member of the Lincolnshire Police and Crime Panel)
Malcolm Burch (Chief Executive, OPCC)
David Forbes (Chair of the Joint Independent Audit Committee)
Professor Matthew Hall (Professor of Law & Criminal Justice, Lincoln University)
Laura Wint-McKane (Chief Executive Officer, Lincolnshire Rape Crisis)
Nick Gray (Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Northamptonshire Police)
Simon Lovett (Deputy Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Lincolnshire Police)
John King (Corporate Administration Officer, OPCC)

Ref	Item	Action
1.	Apologies Olwen Edwards (Contract Manager, Victim Support)	
2.	HMICFRS Crime Data Integrity Report – Review Force Action Plan Matrix <u>Part 1 – Panel Discussion</u> The Chair welcomed members to the inaugural meeting of the Independent Crime Recording Confidence Panel (the Panel). Their role would be shaped by the Panel's terms of reference, which had been considered and agreed at the informal meeting held on 21 September 2018. The only outstanding issue concerned the appointment of a Deputy Chair. Following a brief discussion, Members agreed that this would be an appropriate appointment. George Krawiec was nominated by David Forbes and subsequently appointed Deputy Chair. Nick Gray (Panel Advisor) highlighted a number of potential areas for discussion, clarification and update during the forthcoming session with the Force Deputy Force Crime and Incident Registrar (the Deputy	All to note

Registrar). A key issue that was drawn to Panel's attention concerned the Force's failure to comply with the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime N100 (*i.e. that all reported incidents of rape or attempted rapes, whether from victims, witnesses or third parties which are not immediately recorded as a confirmed crime (or attempted rape) must be recorded under the N100 classification at the time the report is initially made to the relevant force*). It was noted that for the period 1 January to 18 October 2018, the Force had no completed N100 records. For comparative purposes, Northants had 133 for the same period. The Force practice had been to record all reported crimes of rape, thereby inflating the number of rape crimes. The Force viewed this as a positive outcome for the victim. However when rape crimes were not progressed (for example, due to a lack of evidence) it had the affect of inflating the rape cancellation rate, which was also a matter of public record.

The Chair suggested that the forthcoming session with the Deputy Registrar be used to improve the Panel's knowledge and understanding of the Force response to the issues/concerns identified following the HMICFRS inspection and to avoid 'drilling down' into too much detail. The Panel would be given time to reflect on discussions and consider what key issue areas they wanted to focus on at future meetings, whilst also being alive to the time bands set by HMICFRS for the Force to make progress in implementing recommendations and areas for improvement.

Part 2 – Deputy Registrar (12.35pm)

The Deputy Registrar explained the inspection process and approach adopted by the inspection team to gathering data, including statistical analysis, surveys, field work and listening to tapes of crimes being recorded within the Force Control Room (FCR).

Crime Recording was led by the Force Crime and Incident Registrar (the Registrar), supported by the Deputy Registrar. The Deputy Registrar provided some audit capacity, which was used to audit, advise and direct on the Force's conformity with the National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) and the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). As capacity was limited, it was necessary for the Deputy Registrar to prioritise violence, sexual offences and 'other' crime types. Certain crimes types such as those involving domestic abuse, modern slavery and vulnerable children/adults had not been routinely audited as it was assumed that officers employed within the Domestic Abuse and Public Protection teams were complying with the necessary recording standards.

Following the inspection, HMICFRS estimated that some 9600 crimes had not been recorded by the Force. A significant proportion of that volume related to incidents of violence, rape, and crimes involving vulnerable victims, including victims of domestic abuse. Some examples were provided to help Members understand the reasons why crimes had not been recorded. As a consequence, the Deputy

Registrar was now checking every crime report to ensure that officers were complying with their obligations under the crime recording rules. Whilst the Panel welcomed the positive action that had been taken, the lack of an audit resource was clearly impacting on the ability of the Deputy Registrar to fulfil other aspects of his role.

The Deputy Registrar detailed the main reasons for why recorded crimes of rape were cancelled, namely, that the crime was being transferred as it was committed in another force area, duplicate entries of the same crime had been made, or the crime had been wrongly recorded as rape. Such crimes would only be cancelled if it could be shown beyond all reasonable doubt that this action was warranted. It was noted that the Force had been graded as 'outstanding' in terms of their approach to cancelling rape crimes. However the Force had performed poorly in relation to 'other' crime, as officers had failed to notify victims that crimes were being cancelled. Action had since been taken to ensure that the notification of victims was made an explicit requirement. The Panel was assured that the Force was now 100% compliant in this area.

The Panel moved to consider the Force Action Plan matrix, seeking clarification/information where necessary.

Members questioned why so many officers appeared to have a low level of understanding about crime recording. The Deputy Registrar advised that both he and the Registrar provided inputs to new recruits and to officers newly promoted to the rank of Sergeant. However there was a heavy reliance on officers to keep themselves up to date through e-learning (NCALT). Whilst the Registrar and his Deputy would periodically visit and talk to groups of officers, it was an impossible task to speak to them all. The Panel welcomed action taken by the Registrar to draft/publish regular newsletters for publication on the Force Intranet. However Members were concerned by the apparent lack of a coherent training strategy on crime recording. The Panel was clear that this could not be treated as a marginal issue as the public would expect officers to record crime properly.

It was noted that domestic abuse incidents had provided the inspection team with a rich vein of non-recorded crimes. The Deputy Registrar explained that officers attending domestic incidents were required to complete a Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour Based Violence ('DASH') risk assessment form. This was a national form comprising some 29 questions. Officers would focus on the incident that had led to their attendance and would fail to record other disclosures made during the course of their interview with the victim - such as historical incidents of harassment, stalking and intimidation. Sometimes officers would miss crimes simply because they hadn't sought more detailed information from the victim. The Panel considered that such incidents indicated the need for improvements in training and awareness.

	<p>Members questioned whether any additional support/resources had been provided or requested by the Registrar since the HMICFRS inspection report had been published in June. The Panel was advised that any additional resources were being prioritised for critical areas of Force operations such as Public Protection. However, the Deputy Chief Constable and Head of Crime had both been proactive in messaging, leading to a number of officers, particularly Sergeants, seeking clarification/information about the crime recording rules.</p> <p>The Deputy Registrar identified some of the key issues and concerns he had identified during the audit of crime records. These included a general reluctance on the part of some officers to record crimes allegedly committed by children. In addition, if crimes were not recorded because of a lack of evidence, officers would sometimes fail to record intelligence that might be helpful in dealing with future incidents involving the same child. A further example concerned the non-recording of incidents involving children sending indecent images of themselves to each other. Under the existing rules, such incidents had to be recorded. The Chair recognised that some officers would have a natural bias against (what they viewed as being) the criminalisation of children. Officers sometimes faced such ethical/moral dilemmas, which was one of the drivers for establishing the Force Ethics Panel.</p> <p>The Panel thanked the Deputy Registrar for attending the meeting and requested that an invitation be extended to the Deputy Chief Constable.</p> <p>The Panel Advisor queried whether it would be appropriate for the Panel to make an urgent recommendation for the Registrar to receive some additional audit capacity. This was supported by the Deputy Chair. The Chair suggested that the issue be raised with the Deputy Chief Constable when he attended the next Panel meeting. This was agreed. Malcolm Burch also undertook to make the Police and Crime Commissioner aware of the Panel's concern in this area.</p>	<p>CAO</p> <p>All to note</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>12.00pm on 30 November 2018 in the OPCC Meeting Room.</p>	<p>All</p>