



MEMORANDUM

To:
DCC Rolfe

Ref:

From:
CI Ditta

Ext:

Date:

SUBJECT:
FSU: Hospital watches and scenes

Ma'am

The following report outlines identified staffing and demand challenges with regard to the current structure of the Force Support Unit. The report will be broken down into the following sections

- Design and implementation of FSU
- Hospital Watch and Scene Management
- The FSU Service Offer
- Options Moving Forward
- Recommendations

Design and implementation of the Force Support Unit

The Force Support Unit (FSU) was implemented at Transition State 1 (TS1). It is designed to deliver against a service catalogue derived from functions previously delivered by local response, CAPT and LPT functions on LPUs.

Key responsibilities for FSU are

- Providing the national public Order mobilisation capacity
- Scene management
- Managing PICs outside the custody environment
- MOE and enhanced search capability (but at a level below dedicated OSU search capability)
- BASS trained staff
- Support for NTE policing
- Support to offender management
- Support to Local Policing objectives

FSU is a 24/7 function. It is established with five teams of 2 Inspectors, 6 Sergeants and 60 Constables.

Our **design** minimum staffing levels are 1 Insp, 4 Sgts, 42 PCs.

FSU is based in six locations: Wolverhampton, Brierley Hill, Bournville Lane, Newtown, Chelmsley Wood, and Coventry Central.

The design principles outlined an approximate 60/40 split of officer time between reactive and proactive work.

A lack of reliable data meant that some of the service catalogue demand could not be modelled. Hospital watches and scenes being the least well understood.

Since TS1, FSU has been 10-15% under strength. In recognition of this, the minimum staffing level was set at 1 inspector, 4 sergeants and 38 constables.

Hospital watches and scene management

Prior to TS1, scenes and watches were the responsibility of the local LPUs. Invariably PCSOs would be assigned to scenes, performing the dual functions of maintaining the integrity of the scene as well as reassurance and visibility for their communities.

Hospital watches would be managed through the DMM process and a risk assessment would be done locally to determine what, if any, resource would be assigned to manage the PIC.

Because these activities were recorded within OASIS logs for the incidents that necessitated them, or not recorded at all, an understanding of the requirements for a force function was “best guess”.

Since TS1 the situation all watches and scenes are the responsibility of FSU after a two hour window has passed. In reality, it is still a regular occurrence for Force Response to have to maintain scenes and watches when FSU are depleted and unable to respond, or when CTAC have identified higher priority incidents for FSU to deal with.

Information regarding demand has improved, but is still a work in progress. CTAC is responsible for allocating and managing FSU assets across the force. Obtaining performance data is challenging with the present IT systems and internal processes.

Since TS1, it has become clear that the design estimate of demand for scenes and watches had been somewhat conservative.

To illustrate the issue, CTAC have provided a snapshot of one 30 day period of typical reactive FSU activity. This estimate does not include any proactive work, back filling of Force Response, MOE and search deployments, public order requirements, NTE deployments, DA arrests, OM activity or out of force transport requests.

Even this is a conservative estimate, due to the recording methods, but it is at least a reasonable accounting of how FSU time is being spent on a handful of activities.

The FSU service offer

The FSU provides 912 hours of constable activity every 24 hours. This is WMPs “Account” and it can be spent on any activity that Mission Support has prioritised on behalf of the force. In the 30 day period, FSU provided 27,360hours of officer activity.

In our example 30 day period the FSU carried out the following functions. The hours are the sum total of officer hours.

Activity	Hours	Cost
Hospital watches	5616	£ 131,134
Murder scenes	824	£ 19,240
Other scenes	3184	£ 74,346
Cannabis factories	464	£ 10,834
Custody watches	1096	£ 25,592
Total	11,184	£ 261,146

Cost is based on a PC hourly rate of £23.25

How many individual watches and scenes is not available with the current data.

As can be seen, almost half of FSU resource is dedicated to these functions. This is a conservative estimate.

When backfilling Force Response and other reactive duties are taken into account, it is not at all surprising that FSU struggles to provide a meaningful pro-active service to WMP.

This is also far more expensive than pre-TS1. Below is the same activity, but at the standard rate for a PCSO. Hospital watches have remained a PC activity.

Activity	Hours	Cost
Hospital watches (Unchanged)	5616	£ 131,134
Murder scenes	824	£ 12,261
Other scenes	3184	£ 47,378
Cannabis factories	464	£ 6,904
Custody watches	1096	£ 16,308
Total	11184	£ 213,985

Based on PCSO rate of £14.88

This is assuming that the activities were carried out in the same manner pre-TS1, which we know is not the case.

Pre-TS1 there was a strong incentive for local commands to expedite scenes and watches in order to free up their staff for their core roles. This incentive has been considerably weakened now that the service is centrally provided. Consequently, anecdotal evidence suggests that the level of scrutiny is not applied to scene watch and custody watch requests.

Options moving forward

It has become apparent that the FSU service catalogue requires a mixture of warranted and non-warranted assets if it is to be delivered in the most cost effective way, as well as maximising the use of warranted staff for pro-active deployments to support force priorities.

Also apparent is a need to codify a consistent approach to risk managing PICs in hospital environments. Currently, the model is a rigid "2 constables per PIC" minimum. This is to allow staff to take comfort breaks. FSU supervisors and managers currently apply common sense when managing these risks, challenging where appropriate, the need for officer supervision based on the mobility of the PIC, risk and ability to reacquire absconder PICs.

Appendix A outlines a proposal, based on current working practices, for managing PICs in a consistent, defensible manner, taking into account relevant risk factors and applying a common set of tactics.

The FSU is a mixed economy service catalogue with a monoculture delivery. This is inefficient. Aligning the staffing mix with the service catalogue will provide best value and free warranted officers to do the job they are desperate to do: proactively support the force's objectives.

How best to deliver this mix is described in the following options

- **Do nothing**
 - Maintain the current establishment of the FSU and prioritise bringing strength up to establishment.
 - Invest in CTAC to ensure that each team has sufficient staff to manage requests for service, applying the prioritisation model appropriately
 - Empower and require Mission Support to actively scrutinise requests for scene and hospital watches, and follow up with SIO/OICs to ensure that scenes are held for only as long as required

- Pros
 - Requires no further investment in FSU
 - MS scrutiny and challenge should affect demand at the margins
 - FSU would have greater capacity if deployable strength and establishment were aligned
- Cons
 - Does not address the inefficiencies of using warranted officers for scene management
 - Identifying where the additional officers would come from would be challenging
 - MS are stretched with their current workload and current IT systems and processes are insufficient to support MS information requirements in real time, making additional scrutiny problematic
 - Without the ability to draw on appropriate staff, policies around PIC watches will be mostly ineffective.
 - Will not make significant difference to the supply side of summer demand picture
- **Uplift FSU with non-warranted, designated staff**
 - Implement a new FSU Support role.
 - Increase FSU establishment by 10-20 FSU support staff.
 - Proposed role profile included **Appendix B**
- Pros
 - FSU establishment would be more closely aligned with our better understanding of demand
 - Staffing mix would provide staff with powers and training commensurate to activity
 - Better value for money than using warranted constables for all activity
 - Designated staff can carry out a wide variety of tasks, when demand for scenes and watches is low, they can still be usefully deployed
 - High visibility patrol
 - Supporting NTE deployments
 - Offender management
 - Supporting constables in pro-active deployments, subject to risk assessment
- Cons
 - Requires a wholesale creation of a new role
 - Requires an investment in additional staff
 - A 24/7 role: potentially more expensive than warranted staff at the bottom of the pay scales
 - Would not be implemented in time to make any difference to the supply side of the summer demand issue
- **Transfer PCSO staff to FSU**
 - Transfer a significant number of PCSOs into FSU (75 is the suggested number, based on demand)
 - 75 PCSOs would translate to 10,800 hrs of activity. Given that 11000 hrs were spent on watches and scenes, this is a reasonable estimate.
 - Implement proposed hospital watch protocols to make more use of PCSOs to support warranted staff in managing PICs
- Pros
 - PCSOs are available to be transferred. Solution could be implemented relatively quickly
 - PCSOs are paid according to hours worked and do not incur significant bonuses for unsociable hours.
 - Current establishment of PCSOs are additional to the NGLP design. NGLP service catalogue was signed off with an expectation of fewer than 100 PCSOs force-wide. NGLP should be able to still deliver against service catalogue as this proposal would still see them with far more PCSOs than expected in the design phase.

- Anecdotal evidence from Staff Associations suggests an appetite for the role from PCSOs themselves.
- **Cons**
 - The removal of PCSOs from NGLP would reduce the Connect & Engage capacity at the local level.
 - Current events nationally have highlighted the need for neighbourhood based policing to be continued and progressed.
 - This would be a hard sell to our communities and could damage our relationships
 - We have insufficient PCSOs at level 3 (24/7) to provide the required numbers. There are 38 level 3 PCSOs and 76 vacancies.
- **Transfer responsibility for Scenes to local commands**
 - NPUs to take responsibility for scene management between 0700-2200hrs
 - FSU manage scenes between 2200-0700
- **Pros**
 - No requirement for FSU uplift
 - Model resembles pre-TS1 arrangements. PCSOs would, in all likelihood be posted to scenes by local NPU commands.
 - As Pre-TS1, PCSOs could still maintain their reassurance and contact with their communities whilst performing scene duties
 - FSU staff would be free to provide greater proactivity for force priorities
- **Cons**
 - NPUs are much smaller, staffing wise, than pre TS1. The additional requirements might critically denude their effectiveness
 - Does not address hospital watches, which is the greater call on FSU assets
- **Increase numbers of DEOs in CJ**
 - CJ increase their establishment of DEOs to a level sufficient for them to manage both their demand for in custody watches, and PICs at hospital
- **Pros**
 - Eliminates the use of warranted FSU and Force Response officers for custody watches
 - Ensures that there is consistency throughout the PIC custody cycle. CJ would own the process from beginning to end
 - Relieves pressure on an already stretched Force Response
 - Frees FSU staff to support pro-active priorities
- **Cons**
 - DEOs are “single function” staff. At times of low demand they would be underutilised and could not be deployed to other tasks
 - DEO function would have to be redrawn, with potential cost implications for the additional responsibilities
 - DEOs would require PPE and training for dealing with potential risks away from the custody environment
 - DEOs, unlike PCSOs, attract various enhancements to pay based on shifts worked, etc. This makes them considerably more expensive than PCSOs or outsourced staff
 - There would be a non-negligible number of DEOs who are either unsuitable, or unwilling to take on a role with responsibilities outside custody and requiring powers of detention and use of force
- **Outsource Scene watches**
 - Implement a regime similar to Avon & Somerset
 - Transfer scene watches of all types to an external provider

- Pros
 - A consistent provision of scene management that is not dependent on force assets
 - Less expensive than using constables
 - Contractual recourse to the provider in the event of poor service provision
 - Clarity and accountability from the SIO requesting the service due to consistent and documented requests, rationale and reporting
 - Absolute clarity on the cost of scene management
- Cons
 - More expensive than using PCSOs
 - WMP would still have to cover the first 4 hours of any scene
 - Does not address the issue of hospital watches

Comparative costs of scene watches

Activity	Hours	Cost PC	Outsource	PCSO
Hospital watches	5616	Not In scope	Not In scope	Not In scope
Murder scenes	824	£ 19,240	£ 15,656	£ 12,261
Other scenes	3184	£ 74,346	£ 60,496	£ 47,378
Cannabis factories	464	£ 10,834	£ 8,816	£ 6,904
Custody watches	1096	Not In scope	Not In scope	Not In scope
Total	11184	£ 104,420	£ 84,968	£ 66,543

Based on £19 per hr rate for A&S contract. Unable to deduct costs for 4 hour initial callout as it is unknown how many individual watches are included in the above sample

Recommendation

It is my recommendation that the solution be broken into two parts

- What do we need to get through the summer demand period?
- What do we need for the future resilience and effectiveness of the FSU?

FSU are currently implementing the Hospital Watch triage as far as staffing permits. In order for that set of principles to embed I would seek exec sign off in order to ensure that all functions, not just FSU, apply those principles in a consistent manner, and, of course, police staff to allow for a more nuanced staffing solution.

With regard to DEO powers, that is currently being worked through with legal services.

The outsourcing options would take at least 6 months to run through our procurement process. We could step outside the process and appoint Securitas, either as an interim or full term solution, but this carries legal risks that would have to be further scoped with Leigh Jones.

My recommendation is that we transfer 60-75 PCSOs to FSU, strictly as a short term measure, in order to maximise the effectiveness of the FSU during the peak demand period and to scope out the requirements, in terms of skills and numbers, for a potential role of Force Support designated officer.

I would recommend that, during this period, the deployment of FSU assets be subject of a more detailed reporting and recording regime, to fully understand the effect of the additionality and the costs and benefits.

At the end of the summer demand period we would be in a better position to make recommendations moving forward as to what external provision/ mix of staffing is required.

Submitted for your consideration

CI Ditta

SLT Lead: Force Support

Ops