



INDEPENDENT CRIME RECORDING CONFIDENCE PANEL

30 November 2018 12.00pm to 2.05pm
OPCC Meeting Room
Police Headquarters

NOTES

In attendance:

Cate Moore – Panel Chair
George Krawiec – Panel Deputy Chair (Member of the Lincolnshire Police and Crime Panel)
Malcolm Burch (Chief Executive, OPCC)
Olwen Edwards (Contract Manager, Victim Support)
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 – Panel Advisor (Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Northamptonshire Police)

Craig Naylor (Deputy Chief Constable)
Andy Carr (Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Lincolnshire Police)
Simon Lovett (Deputy Force Crime and Incident Registrar, Lincolnshire Police)

John King (Corporate Administration Officer, OPCC)

Ref	Item	Action
1.	Apologies None.	
2.	Notes of 19 October 2018 meeting The Chair asked whether the minute relating the Force's non-compliance with the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime N100 accurately reflected the discussion. Members were content with the minute and agreed that it would be a matter for the DCC to explain and justify the approach to N100. The notes were agreed.	

3.	<p>Action Log</p> <p>Progress with the Action Log was noted.</p>	
4.	<p>HMICFRS Crime Data Integrity Report – Force Action Plan Matrix</p> <p><u>Part 1 – Panel Discussion</u></p> <p>In addition to non-compliance with N100, the provision of audit capacity was also highlighted as a key line of enquiry for the next session. The Panel’s Advisor was clear that this was likely to be an area of focus for HMICFRS as part of the re-inspection. Members wanted to tease-out the DCC’s reaction to the report and get a senior level perspective on what improvements needed to be made to the Force’s crime recording arrangements. The Panel also wanted to understand what consequences (if any) there would be if the Force failed to implement all of the recommendations made by the Inspectorate.</p> <p><u>Part 2 – DCC, Registrar and Deputy Registrar (12.30pm)</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the DCC, the Force Crime and Incident Registrar and his Deputy to the meeting. She began by inviting the DCC to comment on the Force’s non-compliance with N100. He highlighted an inaccuracy in the relevant minute, which referred to the Force’s practice of <i>‘recording all reported crimes of rapes’</i>. This should have read <i>‘reported incidents of rape’</i>. He described the current N100 process as <i>‘flawed and failed’</i> as it effectively said to victims that they were not believed. The Chief Officer team had taken an ethical view, which was to record all reports of rape as a crime at the first point of contact with the victim, thus placing victims at the heart of crime recording decision-making. It was confirmed that the Force had written to the National Crime Registrar to explain their approach, but there was clearly no appetite nationally for changing the existing process. Members queried whether the consequences of refusing to follow existing crime recording rules had been evaluated. The DCC had made his views known to HMIC and whilst the Inspectorate would expect to see a positive response to the recommendations, the Force would not be asked to comply with N100. However it would be surprising if the Force did not receive some adverse comment from the Inspectorate for the stance it had taken. Members were concerned that negative press in this area could have damaged public confidence and the willingness of victims to come forward and report incidents of rape. Laura Wint-McKane stated that the impact on her organisation, Lincolnshire Rape Crisis, had been greater than when the television programme, ‘Eastenders’ had run a rape story. The DCC acknowledged the impact of press reports, which was why the Force had strongly objected to some of the wording used in the Inspection report, particularly around the improper recording of rapes. The Chair suggested that the way in which the Inspectorate wrote their reports and made recommendations might be an issue to explore with HMICFRS when they attended a future Panel meeting. The Panel</p>	

Advisor queried whether the Force needed to explain its approach to the public more clearly to avoid the perception that it was cancelling a lot of rape crimes. The Registrar pointed out that Lincs was 12th in the table for the number of cancelled records (i.e. where crimes had been created in error, or as a duplicate of an existing crime), which he considered was a defensible and ethical position. The DCC was also clear that if there was positive evidence that a crime had not been committed (as opposed to a lack of evidence) then it would be cancelled either by the Registrar or his Deputy.

Members asked the DCC for his perspective on what the key issue areas were for Lincs. The DCC explained that crime recording was an overly complex function, which was poorly supported by an archaic non-Windows based Command and Control system (although this situation was expected to improve once the newly procured C&C system was implemented). The Crime recording functionality of Niche RMS had been set-up some 5-6 years ago and was not an easy system to navigate/manage. However work was progressing to get rid of waste in the system and to improve performance (and culture) around the finalisation of recorded crimes. The Force had been making strides over the last few years to try and minimise demand and focus resources where they were needed. When incidents were reported to the police it was essential that every aspect was recorded to assist with determining the level and timeliness of response, particularly in relation to reports of domestic abuse. Officers attending such incidents were required to complete a 'DASH' risk assessment form. However, officers would often fail to record other offences disclosed to them during the course of their interviews with victims. This was being addressed through training, raising awareness and audit work. Members queried whether the DCC was confident that when the Force was re-inspected, HMICFRS would find that substantial progress had been made in implementing recommendations. The DCC had already responded to the Inspectorate and given that assurance. However, there were still some challenges that needed to be overcome, such as designing and building an on-line learning package. Once in place (which was likely to be February 2019) all officers and staff up to including the Chief Constable would be mandated to complete the course.

The Registrar briefed on a new audit methodology developed by Merseyside police, to assist with calculating rates of compliance in recording offences. This was being used by Lincs to assess their level of compliance in high risk categories, such as rape. The Deputy Chair raised the issue of audit resource and queried how this function could be further supported. The DCC explained that there were demands being made on resources in a number of areas, including IMU and CMB. Audit time was therefore focussed on those high risk areas that the Force had to get right. When crime and incident reports were amended in response to audit findings, the officers concerned would be provided with advice and support. Inspectors were also dip sampling at least 5 calls per-operator per-month within the FCR. Members suggested that the Inspectorate would want to see evidence

	<p>of a sustainable audit resource to deliver the Force’s crime and incident audit programme. The Chair requested that the Panel be provided with a copy of the current audit programme.</p> <p>Members recognised that there were some real differences between the Force and HMICFRS in relation to aspects of the inspection report, which the Panel would want to explore with the Inspectorate. The DCC warned against becoming too absorbed with only 20% of the report, when 80% of issues had been successfully addressed. Prof Hall (Univ. of Lincoln) offered to try and analyse the statistical model that had been applied by the Inspectorate. This was welcomed by the Registrar.</p> <p>The Panel Advisor raised the possibility of creating a regional audit team as a possible longer term solution to meeting the Force’s audit needs and undertook to raise the idea with his regional colleagues. The DCC greeted the idea with interest and suggested it would be something to consider.</p> <p>The Chair requested that HMICFRS be invited to attend the next Panel meeting in February 2019.</p>	Registrar CAO
5.	<p>Youth Produced Sexual Imagery</p> <p>The Chair circulated copies of a presentation on youth produced sexual imagery developed by D/S Steve Bruce of Derbyshire Constabulary. She explained that whilst the presentation was due to be discussed at the next meeting of the Force Ethics Panel, it also raised some relevant issues around crime recording. Inconsistencies in the way forces dealt with consensual child on child behaviour had led to some children becoming criminalised for consensual events whilst others received no sanction. The introduction of Outcome 21 had allowed forces to deal with sexting offences proportionately without criminalising children and young people. The Deputy Registrar explained that having some form of record was helpful to the police in terms of building-up an intelligence picture e.g. character, patterns of behaviour, aggravating circumstances, etc. More information about the Force’s approach was contained within policy PD222 – Consensual Child on Child Sex Offences. The Chair requested that copies of the document be circulated to Panel members.</p>	CAO
6.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>12.00pm on 1 February 2019 in the OPCC Meeting Room.</p>	All