

## HMIC Value for Money Profile 2016

### Durham Constabulary

compared with all forces in England & Wales

*The forces in the most similar group can be identified  
in the charts in this section by using the key below*

- a** Durham
- b** Gwent
- c** Humberside
- d** South Wales
- e** Northamptonshire

# Contents

## 3 Introduction

## 7 Section One – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

### Income and expenditure

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| 8 Overview                                | 13 Financing               |
| 9 Spend by function                       | 14 Earned income           |
| 10 Workforce costs - Officers             | 15 Funding trends          |
| 11 Workforce costs - Police staff & PCSOs | 16 Total costs by function |
| 12 Non-staff costs                        |                            |

### Net revenue expenditure by function:

- |                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 17 Summary                       | 30 Investigations - public protection |
| 18 Local policing                | 32 Investigations                     |
| 20 Dealing with the public       | 34 Investigative support              |
| 22 Criminal justice arrangements | 36 Support functions                  |
| 24 Road policing                 | 39 PCC/Local policing bodies          |
| 26 Operational support           | 40 Criminal Justice costs             |
| 28 Intelligence                  |                                       |

### Workforce

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 41 Summary                                | 45 Leavers                                   |
| 42 Officers/PCSOs by rank                 | 46 Joiners                                   |
| 43 Officers/staff by back office function | 47 Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty |
| 44 Workforce numbers by function          | 48 Officers' length of service               |

### Demand/performance

- |                                       |                        |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 49 Crime trends                       | 53 Emergency incidents |
| 50 Crime per visible officers         | 54 Priority incidents  |
| 51 Crime outcome per visible officers | 55 All incidents       |
| 52 999 calls                          |                        |

## 56 Section Two – Offences and outcomes

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 60 Crimes (excluding fraud)     | 76 Crime against children                         |
| 62 Victim-based offences        | 78 Outcome percentage                             |
| 64 Violence against the person  | 80 Charged/Summoned                               |
| 66 Sexual offences              | 81 Out-of-court (formal)                          |
| 68 Robbery                      | 82 Out-of-court (informal)                        |
| 70 Theft offences               | 83 Suspect Identified - No Action Taken           |
| 72 Criminal damage and arson    | 84 Investigation complete – no suspect identified |
| 74 Other crimes against society | 85 Not yet assigned an outcome                    |

## 86 Annexes 1-4

## 95 Outliers

## Introduction

Data about a single force can never reveal all there is to know. Insight comes from putting a force's data side by side with others so that the differences are revealed. No two forces face the same problems, so it makes sense to compare the performance of forces which share similar demographics and are therefore, more likely to have similar problems. For example, there is more value in comparing Greater Manchester Police's crime performance with that of the West Midlands Police and other similar, large urban forces. In fact the Home Office has 'clustered' forces into most similar groups or MSGs, as we refer to them in this document, to produce a standard set of comparison forces to set against your force. We highlight these forces in the bar charts and, where relevant, we also show the most similar group of forces average (or MSG average), represented by a line across the bars in the charts. Forces in the same group as your force are listed on the front cover of this document.

We also show the expenditure for each force (usually expressed as £ per head of population) and compare it with other MSG forces. There are limitations, which you should be aware of. First and foremost, the way the police service is funded is largely based on past expenditure patterns and the ability of forces to raise different levels of income from their council tax base.

Secondly, the financial comparisons used in this document do not adjust for the costs of operating in a particular part of the country. An "area cost adjustment" figure is available from the Home Office, but when we applied it to the data, it made a small difference to some forces close to London, such as Surrey and Thames Valley, and for obvious reasons, a larger difference to the Metropolitan Police. For most forces there was little change, so we decided to present costs without the adjustment. A few forces may want to make some adjustments; but in general most forces are not sufficiently affected.

In any case, users of this information should be looking at larger differences in costs compared with the MSG average, than that represented by the area cost adjustment. Furthermore, it is often the case that the main factors which explain higher costs lie elsewhere. More often than not, the main factor is volume – higher PCSO expenditure is most likely due to having more of them, rather than the average cost of each PCSO. In some areas, such as training, the major factor is the mix of the workforce – a higher percentage of police officers can be expensive. (It may also be more appropriate in some cases.)

The aim of the profiles is to help Police and Crime Commissioners, Police and Crime Panels and force managers identify significant differences, raise legitimate questions, ask for explanations and possibly further investigation. The information draws attention to questions which should be addressed.

Here are some illustrative examples:

- why is it that this force is more able to identify rape suspects and charge them, than others?
- why is it that similar crimes attract different outcomes (such as charges or informal warnings) in different forces?
- is there a relationship between high sickness rates for police officers and the fact that this force has fewer local police officers?
- if more of our incidents are classified as emergencies than other similar forces, is that because we have too few call handlers (classified as dealing with the public) or because more training is required?
- if our information, communications and technology costs are higher, is this helping our force to be more efficient or is it just expensive?
- have major reductions in police staff resulted in more costly police officers doing 'back office type jobs'?

HMIC's Value for Money (VfM) profiles allow you to compare your force's performance, and the costs of achieving it, with that of other forces. The VfM profiles provide an important tool not only to help discover areas of high relative cost or identify differences in performance, but also to identify other forces which are achieving more with less. Although last year's autumn statement changed the financial climate for police forces; it remains challenging. This and a redistribution of the police grant among forces due to changes in the funding formula mean that the profiles continue to be a vital tool.

The VfM profiles are:

- designed for use by force management, police and crime commissioners (PCCs) and local policing bodies as well as HMIC;
- wide ranging, covering a large amount of information in a single, easy to use document;
- presented in a uniform format to allow you to focus attention on the main differences which require explanation and action to improve;
- timely – being published close to the announcement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's autumn statement, when major financial decisions are being taken;
- not league tables or targets – they are designed to raise questions, not make judgments.

Each profile has two parts: a summary (published separately), and this more detailed profile; both are available on our website. They are designed to be investigative tools to draw attention to large, and possibly unexplained, differences in costs or performance. These should be followed up to confirm whether resources are being used efficiently and effectively.

## What changes have been made?

The main changes this year are:

1. There have not been any major changes to the Police Objective Analysis (POA) definitions and categories. However, public protection units have been separated from investigations and are now presented separately as a distinct category (pages 30 and 31).
2. The profiles now provide data on how incidents have been categorised (emergency, priority, scheduled or resolved without deployment) and how this has differed from 2012/13 to 2015/2016.
3. For the second year, the profiles include data covering outcomes associated with recorded crime. The profiles present the data on principle outcomes for each crime category along with the difference from the expected volumes of those outcomes based on the England and Wales average.

## How do I use the profiles?

Most of the data are presented as bar charts so you can see how your force compares with others. Your force is highlighted in black with forces in your 'most similar group' (MSG) shown in teal. MSG forces share similar demographics (more details about MSG forces can be found on page 6). Finally, a horizontal line runs across each bar chart representing the average value across all forces in England and Wales (excluding the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police) unless stated otherwise.

The profiles are presented as 'logic trees' with the data broken down progressively from left to right. By following the branches of the logic tree, you can identify the reason(s) for differences between your force and others. To illustrate, in the example given on page 5 a force could be spending more on police officers because there are more of them (officers per head of population), or because they are more expensive (cost per officer), or because it is spending more on overtime.

Most pages also include tables which lay out the main data presented in the charts as well as some additional comparisons. Typically, from left to right they show:

- a short description the relevant volumes (e.g. staff numbers/total costs/numbers of crimes)
- a ratio for comparison (e.g. staff per head of population)
- the average costs per volumes
- the 'difference' which
  - o for costs shows how much more, or less, it is costing your force than the average;
  - o for crimes/outcomes shows how many more, or fewer, crimes/outcomes your force is recording as a result of the difference from the average; and
  - o for workforce shows how much larger, or smaller, your force's workforce is as a result of the difference from the average.

- chevrons (<<) against the data highlight whether your force is an outlier for this item (whether the force is in the top or bottom 10 percent and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population).

*An example is shown on the following page*

## Note on Crime Data Integrity

In 2014 HMIC completed an inspection into the way police forces in England and Wales record crime data. This report identified serious concerns about the crime recording process and HMIC is now undertaking a programme of inspecting crime data recording across police forces in England and Wales. In response to the findings of both the 2014 report and the inspection programme, many forces have or are in the process of reviewing their crime recording processes. This may have an impact on recorded crime trends although the impact is likely to vary by force.

## Note on Collaboration

For the majority of forces that are not involved in significant or large-scale collaborations, the use of net expenditure provides an adequate comparison. However, as the use of collaboration increases in scale, the way data are collected and presented has adapted. In 2014/15, additional headings were added to the POA, separating out staff and third party costs and income related to collaboration. CIPFA guidance explains how forces should record their collaborations depending on the type of model they operate – As we present costs net of earned income, costs in collaborating forces should be broadly comparable with other forces. The main exception is costs per FTE staff, which can be distorted if the collaboration is reported using the 'lead force' model (where all staff are shown as based in the force providing the service, rather than split across the forces taking part in the collaboration).

## Feedback

Many forces worked with us throughout the development of the VfM profiles, and we are grateful to those that provided us with feedback and comments. HMIC is always keen to hear from users how the profiles can be improved. If you have any suggestions, or any analysis which you think might be useful to include, please contact [HMICProfiles@hmic.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:HMICProfiles@hmic.gsi.gov.uk).

## Guidance page - How to read the profiles



How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much overtime do they receive?

1. The profiles use 'logic trees' break each policing function down (from left to right) into component parts. For each breakdown, you can see how the force (labelled 'a') compares to other forces in its most similar group of forces (labelled 'b - f'), as well as all forces in England and Wales.




2. The force (a) has some of the highest officer costs per head of population nationally...


4. This chart shows a breakdown of the previous branch of the logic tree, revealing overtime has little bearing on officer costs.



3. ...equating to a difference of £15.5m when compared to the national (all) average.



6. The force has more officers per 1,000 population than the national average, equating to a difference in cost of £17.2m (see



7. The cost of individual officers in the force is relatively low.

5. The force spends little (as a proportion) on overtime.

Officer costs	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
All pay exc. overtime	127.7	99.0	121.0	16.0	3.7
Overtime	2.2	3.0	3.4	-0.4	-0.7
Total	129.8	102.0	124.4	15.5	3.0

Officer overtime as a % of total salary costs	% sal	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Total	1.7%	3.0%	2.9%	-0.9	-0.8

Number of officers and cost per officer		Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	2.54	1.93	2.40	17.2	3.8
Cost per FTE (£000s)	50.3	51.3	50.4	-1.4	-0.1

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

N.B Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons, and represent the values that are in the highest and lowest 10% of values across all force and, where appropriate, have a value of more than £1 per head.

## Frequently asked questions

### What is the purpose of the most similar group (MSG) comparison?

The MSG was designed to offer a fairer comparison of levels of crime between forces as they group forces with similar demographics. While MSG comparisons do not take account of the fact that some areas have higher costs than others; they are used here to compare costs since forces in a high crime MSG (such as large urban forces) are likely to have greater resources such as more officers, staff and PCSOs. While most forces share similar demographics with the rest of their group, there are a few that are less closely aligned (the Metropolitan Police Service, Dyfed-Powys Police, Surrey Police and City of London Police). Apart from City of London Police, the remaining forces are still included with a most similar group, but their appearance as an outlier means they should be treated with caution. MSGs were last updated for the 2013 VfM profiles using data from the 2011 Census; this grouping remains the most recent update.

### What checks have been applied to the data?

The data presented in the profiles are subject to a systematic checking process:

- The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) applies arithmetic and reconciliation checks to the financial data from forces.
- Each force is asked to check its statistical outliers (where its costs are significantly different from average and/or from its return for the previous year).
- Each force receives a draft profile to check the figures before publication.

Each year forces identify anomalies or inconsistencies which HMIC attempts to resolve. Forces are able to resubmit data to correct any errors.

### Which workforce figures are used?

The profiles include staff numbers drawn from two data sets: the Home Office annual data return (ADR), which is a snapshot at 31 March each year of full-time equivalent staff in post and the Police Objective Analysis (POA) which counts the average, budgeted, full-time equivalent staff for the financial year. Given the differences between the two, these figures in some cases will not align completely. In general, the profiles use POA budgeted staff numbers to make detailed financial comparisons between forces. However, POA is a relatively recent invention and, prior to 2011/12, it was not validated by HMIC. Consequently, it cannot provide a series long enough to show changing trends over time. In contrast, ADR has been validated over several years so is used to present trends on police officers, PCSO and police staff numbers. It is also used where equivalent data are not available from POA.

### Which population figures are used?

The profiles use mid-2015 population estimates, which are the latest available from the ONS. Please note that the ONS police recorded crime data publication, 12 months to 31 March 2016 (published in July 2016) used mid-2014 population estimates so numbers will not match exactly.

### Which crime figures are used?

The VfM profiles include the crime statistics published by the ONS in for the data for the 12 months to March 2016. The Home Office introduced a new framework to measure outcomes associated with crimes in 2013. Data covering outcomes associated with crimes recorded in the 12 months to 31 March 2016 for all forces are published by the Home Office and updated on 20 October 2016.

### How are averages calculated?

Unless stated otherwise, the simple average of all forces and MSG forces are used. Except for their own profiles, City of London Police and the Metropolitan Police Service are omitted from the averages and the charts because they are outliers in most categories.

### What rule is used to highlight outliers?

The difference is highlighted if the indicator puts the force in the top or bottom 10 percent and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population.

### Where can I find further contextual information to help me understand the data?

Further contextual information can be provided by HMIC, for example the definitions used by CIPFA in constructing the POA dataset.

## Section One – Costs, workforce and demand/performance

This section looks at how a force deploys its workforce and the associated costs for each of the 13 headline categories within the Police Objective Analysis (POA). POA subcategory information on costs is also presented. POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken as a snapshot as at 8 November 2016. Any updates to the data made after this time will not be reflected in the profile. Home Office Annual Data Requirement (ADR) data is used where relevant POA data is not available. Examples include officers by rank, sickness rates, restricted/recuperative duty rates, officers' length of service and leavers/joiners.

With the exception of special constables, workforce data comprises full-time equivalent (FTE) figures. In POA estimates these are calculated as the number of staff budgeted for each staff type. Police workforce figures published by the Home Office are based on those in-post as of 31 March each year. The two sets of figures are not, therefore, directly comparable.

### Key to the data and calculations

- Net revenue expenditure: The profiles use a different calculation for net revenue expenditure to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA); it is calculated as total expenditure minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer.
- Earned income: Where earned income is referred to, this covers partnership income, sales fees charges and rents, special police services, reimbursed income and interest.
- Averages: All averages in this section (unless otherwise stated) are simple, unweighted England and Wales averages, including the force in question. As the Metropolitan Police and City of London Police data distort the chart scales, they have been excluded from all charts and averages except for those in their own profiles.
- Difference to most similar group (MSG) / All force: Differences are calculated using the difference in cost per head. An example calculation is as follows: (Force cost per head - MSG cost per head) multiplied by population = absolute cost of difference.
- Police officer spend as % of gross expenditure: The profiles show the proportion of spend on officers (including overtime) by function. Calculation is as follows: (Police officer spend + Police officer overtime) / Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) = police officer spend as % of GRE.

- National policing: To more accurately compare forces, national policing functions (such as counter terrorism/special branch) is not included in totals of spend and workforce (unless stated otherwise).
- Operational frontline, frontline support and business support: POA data is mapped onto these categories. Since counter-terrorism/special branch is a national policing function, we do not include this as a frontline role (for the reason given above). Due to this, and the previously described differences between the ADR and POA workforce data, the totals and proportions may not match those published elsewhere. The list of POA categories and their classifications are given in Annex 3.

Please note that, throughout the profiles, rounding may cause apparent discrepancies between totals and the sums of the parts.

### How to use this section

Users may wish to focus on those charts where the force is an outlier, i.e. where the force is significantly different from the average. Outliers are highlighted with blue chevrons and indicate that the force falls within the highest or lowest 10% and, where applicable, the financial value is greater than £1 per head. Alternatively users may wish to examine where the force of interest is positioned relative to other forces they think are similarly performing or where they expect that force to be.

Users should consider exploring the reasons for any differences by looking at the force as a whole, using relevant local knowledge. Staffing levels should also be considered in the context of workforce modernisation, collaboration efforts and the outsourcing of services. Please note that in some cases, charts are not given for all breakdowns; priority is given to those areas with the highest costs or levels.

Throughout the profiles the chart scales vary and as a result the differences shown may not be as significant as they first appear.










## Income and expenditure - Overview

How much does the force spend in each area of business compared with others? How much does it earn in income?

### Cost per head of population

The profiles calculate net revenue expenditure (NRE) as total expenditure minus earned income to show the total cost of policing to the taxpayer. Note that this is different from NRE as reported in the raw POA data.

To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions (such as counter-terrorism/special branch) are excluded from the data analysis and charts.



Population		625k			
				Averages	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	Diff* £m
Police officers	62.3	99.7	95.1	103.1	2.9 -2.1
Police staff	25.8	41.3	38.9	41.2	1.5 0.1
PCSOs	4.5	7.3	6.4	8.4	0.5 -0.7
Workforce	92.7	148.3	140.4	152.7	4.9 -2.7
Non-staff costs	25.1	40.1	45.2	46.5	-3.2 -4.0
Earned income	-2.9	-4.7	-8.4	-7.0	2.3 1.5
<b>NRE exc nat.pol.</b>	<b>114.9</b>	<b>183.8</b>	<b>177.2</b>	<b>192.2</b>	<b>4.1 -5.2</b>
National policing**	0.9	1.4	4.3	2.7	-1.8 -0.8
<b>NRE inc nat. pol.</b>	<b>115.8</b>	<b>185.2</b>	<b>181.5</b>	<b>194.8</b>	<b>2.3 -6.0</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Note that national policing has been included in the table only for reference so that the totals reconcile to the financing totals later in this section.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17



## Income and expenditure - Spend by function

What proportion of spend is on the front line or in business support compared with others? What proportion is spent in visible functions?


### Cost per head of population

Police workforce roles are split into three categories: operational front line, frontline support and business support. The front line is further broken down into visible and non-visible roles (see Annex 3 for a breakdown by POA category). These plots show the NRE in each category. To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.




Collaboration and outsourcing affect workforce numbers so costs, rather than FTE figures, are presented.

Note that in *PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)* HMIC define frontline support as *operational support*. Since this is the name of a POA category, *frontline support* is used here to avoid confusion.

NRE per pop (excluding national functions)



	NRE £m	Force breakdown	Averages		MSG Diff** £m
			All	MSG	
Visible	41.0	38.5%	38.2%	38.9%	-0.4
Non-visible	33.5	31.4%	32.4%	32.1%	-0.7
Operational front line	74.5	70.0%	70.6%	71.0%	-1.1
Frontline support	11.3	10.6%	8.7%	9.9%	0.8
Business support	20.7	19.4%	20.7%	19.2%	0.3
Other*	8.4				
<b>Total (NRE)</b>	<b>114.9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	



\* Functions classified as *Other* do not fit into any of the three categories. They include costs associated with the PCC and central costs such as capital financing and pension costs.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in proportion spent in each category compared to the average of MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17




Durham

## Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Officers

How much do officers in the force cost compared with others? How much overtime do they receive?

### Cost per head of population

Police officer costs are split into salary and overtime (OT). OT costs are also shown as a percentage of the overall salary costs (including OT). To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.



**FTE police officers** 1,123 (exc national policing functions)

Officer costs	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
All pay exc. overtime	60.5	96.7	92.3	100.0	2.7	-2.0
Overtime	1.9	3.0	2.7	3.2	0.2	-0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>99.7</b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>103.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>-2.1</b>

Officer overtime as a % total salary cost	% salary	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Number of officers and cost per officer	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTE per 1,000 population	1.80	1.76	1.87	1.2	-2.4
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	53.8	52.5	53.5	1.5	0.4

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Cost excludes overtime.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - Workforce costs - Police staff and police community support officers (PCSOs)

How much do police staff and PCSOs cost in the force compared with others?

### Cost per head of population

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will affect staff costs for certain forces.



### Police staff

**Police staff FTE** 839 (exc national policing functions)

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>Police staff cost</b>	25.8	41.3	38.9	41.2	1.5	0.1

Including overtime costs

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 pop	1.3	1.1	1.1	4.2	3.7 <<
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	30.8	35.2	38.1	-3.7	-6.1 <<






### PCSOs

**PCSOs FTE** 169 (exc national policing functions)

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
<b>PCSO cost</b>	4.5	7.3	6.4	8.4	0.5	-0.7

Including overtime costs

	Force	Averages		Diff* £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
FTEs per 1,000 pop	0.3	0.2	0.3	1.1	0.2
Cost** per FTE (£000s)	26.9	31.7	32.9	-0.8	-1.0 <<



\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Cost includes overtime.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - Non-staff costs

Apart from on the workforce, where else is the force spending money compared with others?

### Non-staff costs as a percentage of workforce costs

Workforce costs include officer, staff and PCSO salary and overtime costs only. Temporary and agency costs are classified as non-staff. To improve comparability between forces, national policing functions are excluded.

Non-staff costs are broken down into specific types of running costs. They are shown as a percentage of workforce costs as many are largely dependent on the size of the workforce.

Note that collaboration, outsourcing and partnership arrangements will affect the data for some forces.








Force workforce costs	£93m					
	£m	% of w'force costs	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Supplies and services**	9.6	10.3%	11.5%	9.3%	-1.1	1.0
Force collaboration payments	1.1	1.2%	5.2%	7.7%	-3.7	-6.1
Premises related expenses	4.2	4.5%	5.0%	4.8%	-0.4	-0.3
Transport related expenses	2.2	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%	-0.1	0.0
Restructure, training and conference	1.5	1.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.9	0.9
Other employee expenses***	2.1	2.3%	2.5%	1.3%	-0.1	1.0
PCC outsource/collab/commission	1.5	1.7%	2.2%	2.4%	-0.5	-0.7
<b>Non-staff costs</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>-5.0</b>	<b>-4.2</b>
Capital financing	2.9	3.1%	3.1%	2.3%	0.0	0.7
<b>Total non-staff costs</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>-5.1</b>	<b>-3.5</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average percentage of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Includes 3rd party payments excluding collaboration.

\*\*\* Including temporary and agency staff, injury and ill health costs.



Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham







## Income and expenditure - Financing

How much money does the local policing body receive in funding compared with others and from where? What is the level of council tax in the force and how does that compare with others?

### Funding per head of population

Central funding is broken down into formula-based funding\*, and government grants, which are not formula based. Local funding is comprised of council tax, use of reserves and council tax support grants.

To show a typical council tax payment in the force, Band D tax rates (from CIPFA estimates) have been included. The yield shows the amount, from every £1 of council tax collected, that goes to the local policing body.



Population		Averages			
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	Diff** £m
Formula funding*	79.7	127.5	107.4	118.1	5.9
Legacy council tax grants	6.1	9.8	6.7	6.0	2.4
Specific grants	1.8	2.8	7.3	6.8	-2.5
<b>Central funding</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>140.1</b>	<b>121.3</b>	<b>130.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>
Council tax	28.2	45.1	58.5	64.1	-11.9
Reserves	0.0	0.0	1.7	-0.2	0.1
<b>Local funding</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>64.0</b>	<b>-11.8</b>
<b>Net revenue expenditure</b>	<b>115.8</b>	<b>185.2</b>	<b>181.5</b>	<b>194.8</b>	<b>-6.0</b>

\* Sum of police grant, non-domestic rates and revenue support grant.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of MSG forces.

Averages		
Band D tax rate	All	MSG
£165.9	£178.4	£196.5

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - Earned income






How much money does the force earn compared with others and from where does it receive it?

### Income per head of population

Earned income is removed from Gross Revenue Expenditure (GRE) in order to calculate NRE and does not include government grants.

To improve comparability between forces national policing functions have been excluded.

Some forces have high earned income related to special functions such as policing ports and airports or policing large events (sports, festivals etc.).



Population		Averages				Diff* £m	
	625k	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
Reimbursed income							
- From collaboration		1.1	1.7	3.0	2.6	-0.8	-0.6
- Other		0.8	1.3	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.2
Sales, fees, charges and rents							
		0.8	1.2	2.7	1.7	-0.9	-0.3
Special police services							
		0.0	0.0	0.9	0.1	-0.5	-0.1
Partnership income							
		0.2	0.3	0.9	1.4	-0.4	-0.7
Interest							
		0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	-0.1	-0.1
<b>Total earned income</b>		<b>2.9</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>-2.3</b>	<b>-1.5</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in earnings to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - Funding trends

How has the local policing body's income changed over time compared with others?

Please note that estimates of reserves are unreliable and that these figures are not adjusted for inflation. The change over time is, therefore, a nominal and not a real change.  
The Band D council tax rates are from CIPFA estimates.


Note that change over time for reserves has not been given due to values crossing zero, with the potential for false negatives.

Note that values for previous years have been adjusted using mid-2015 population figures.

<b>Force £ per 1,000 pop</b>	<b>2012/13 estimate</b>	<b>2013/14 estimate</b>	<b>2014/15 estimate</b>	<b>2015/16 estimate</b>	<b>2016/17 estimate</b>	<b>Change 12/13-16/17</b>
Central funding*	147.3	143.6	146.6	131.1	130.3	-12%
Legacy council tax grants		1.2	0.0	9.8	9.8	
Council tax	47.0	48.1	40.7	42.2	45.1	-4%
Reserves	2.7	2.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>196.9</b>	<b>195.3</b>	<b>188.0</b>	<b>183.1</b>	<b>185.2</b>	<b>-6%</b>

<b>MSG Average £ per 1,000 pop</b>	<b>2012/13 estimate</b>	<b>2013/14 estimate</b>	<b>2014/15 estimate</b>	<b>2015/16 estimate</b>	<b>2016/17 estimate</b>	<b>Change 12/13-16/17</b>
Central funding*	137.7	137.2	135.1	126.0	124.9	-9%
Legacy council tax grants		0.7	2.8	6.0	6.0	
Council tax	60.7	60.6	57.6	60.2	64.1	6%
Reserves	1.3	0.2	1.3	0.7	-0.2	
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>199.7</b>	<b>198.7</b>	<b>196.8</b>	<b>192.9</b>	<b>194.8</b>	<b>-2%</b>

Band D tax rate	£153	£156	£160	£163	£166
All Average	£166	£169	£172	£175	£178



\*Central funding does not include council tax freeze grant.

Source: POA Estimates 2012/13 to 2016/17

Durham



## Income and expenditure - Total costs by function

How does the force apportion its spend across the different functions compared with others? How has this changed since last year?

Population 625k

	Budgeted spend £m	Spend per head £		Diff from*		% of total**		% Officers***	
		Force	MSG Av	MSG £m	Last year	Force	MSG Av	Force	MSG Av
Neighbourhood policing	12.9	20.6	29.0	-5.2	1.2	11.8%	15.6%	67.4%	57.3%
Incident (response) management	19.7	31.4	25.9	3.5	0.3	18.1%	13.9%	99.3%	78.7%
Local investigation/prisoner processing	9.0	14.3	13.0	0.8	-1.1	8.2%	7.0%	95.1%	89.0%
Other local policing	2.9	4.7	5.9	-0.7	-1.3	2.7%	3.1%	48.2%	70.4%
Local policing	44.4	71.1	73.7	-1.6	-0.9	40.8%	39.6%	85.8%	82.0%
Dealing with the public	8.1	12.9	12.3	0.3	0.1	7.4%	6.6%	23.4%	21.1%
Road policing	3.8	6.1	4.7	0.9	-0.5	3.5%	2.5%	91.7%	71.0%
Operational support	2.5	4.0	8.1	-2.6	0.3	2.3%	4.4%	72.7%	77.0%
Intelligence	5.6	8.9	7.4	1.0	0.3	5.1%	4.0%	67.9%	61.1%
Investigation - Public protection	4.8	7.7	7.7	0.0	0.9	4.4%	4.1%	78.4%	75.4%
Investigations [exc local investigation]	3.5	5.6	11.8	-3.9	-1.2	3.2%	6.3%	80.9%	69.9%
Investigative support	2.8	4.6	5.2	-0.4	0.1	2.6%	2.8%	0.0%	6.6%
Custody	4.2	6.7	5.9	0.5	2.0	3.9%	3.2%	58.9%	38.8%
Other criminal justice arrangements	4.5	7.2	6.1	0.7	-1.7	4.1%	3.3%	11.5%	11.9%
Criminal justice arrangements	8.7	13.9	12.0	1.2	0.3	8.0%	6.4%	27.5%	23.2%
ICT	5.4	8.7	9.0	-0.2	0.6	5.0%	4.9%	0.0%	1.7%
Human resources	1.2	1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.1%	1.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Training	2.2	3.5	3.3	0.1	-0.2	2.0%	1.8%	55.8%	37.0%
Other support functions	13.4	21.5	23.9	-1.5	-0.5	12.3%	12.8%	18.4%	16.2%
Support functions	22.2	35.5	38.2	-1.6	-0.1	20.4%	20.5%	12.4%	11.6%
Police and Crime Commissioner	2.3	3.8	5.1	-0.8	-0.1	2.2%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total exc national policing and central costs</b>	<b>108.8</b>	<b>174.1</b>	<b>186.2</b>	<b>-7.6</b>	<b>-0.9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>53.2%</b>	<b>51.8%</b>
National policing	0.9	1.4							
Central costs	6.1	9.7							
<b>Total</b>	<b>115.8</b>	<b>185.2</b>							

Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation' as in POA

\* The difference in spend per 1,000 population and last year values have been adjusted with mid-2015 population figures.

\*\* Percentage of budgeted spend (excluding on national policing and central costs) by function.

\*\*\* Cost of police officers as % of total gross cost by function.

Source: POA estimates 2015/16 and 2016/17


Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Summary

What does the force spend across the different functions compared with others?

National policing functions have been excluded to improve comparability between forces.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing arrangements will affect staff costs for certain forces.




Population	625k					
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Local policing**	44.4	71.1	66.7	73.7	2.8	-1.6
Dealing with the public	8.1	12.9	11.0	12.3	1.2	0.3
Criminal justice arrangements	8.7	13.9	11.2	12.0	1.7	1.2
Road policing	3.8	6.1	4.0	4.7	1.3	0.9
Operational support***	2.5	4.0	7.2	8.1	-1.9	-2.6 <<
Intelligence	5.6	8.9	7.2	7.4	1.1	1.0
Public protection	4.8	7.7	9.4	7.7	-1.1	0.0
Investigations	3.5	5.6	8.2	11.8	-1.6	-3.9
Investigative support	2.8	4.6	4.5	5.2	0.1	-0.4
Support functions	22.2	35.5	36.7	38.2	-0.7	-1.6
PCC/Local Policing Body	2.3	3.8	4.2	5.1	-0.3	-0.8
<b>Tot. exc national pol. &amp; central costs</b>	<b>108.8</b>	<b>174.1</b>	<b>170.3</b>	<b>186.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>-7.6</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' and not 'investigation' as in POA.

\*\*\* Note that this is the POA category, not the workforce descriptor used in *Policing in Austerity: Meeting the Challenge* (July 2014).

Source: POA estimates 2016/17









Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within local policing compared with others?

Note that a chart showing the combined cost of neighbourhood policing and incident (response) management has been included as some forces use the same staff to fulfil both functions.



Population	625k									
					Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	Avg.		
Incident (response) management	19.7	31.4	26.2	25.9	3.3	3.5	99%	79%		
Neighbourhood policing	12.9	20.6	23.4	29.0	-1.8	-5.2	67%	57%		
Local investigation/prisoner processing***	9.0	14.3	11.8	13.0	1.6	0.8	95%	89%		
Specialist community liaison	2.4	3.8	3.4	4.4	0.2	-0.4	37%	63%		
Policing command team & support overheads	0.6	0.9	1.8	1.5	-0.6	-0.4	96%	90%		
Local policing	44.4	71.1	66.7	73.7	2.8	-1.6	86%	82%		
Total exc local investigation	35.5	56.8	54.9	60.7	1.2	-2.5	83%	80%		

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.

\*\*\* Workforce included 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not investigation as in POA.






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Local policing (including local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within local policing compared with others?


Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	710	1.14	1.12	1.19	11	-31
PCSOs	169	0.27	0.20	0.26	43	8
Police staff	41	0.07	0.07	0.07	-2	0

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	38.3	61.2	57.4	61.0	2.4	0.2
PCSOs	4.5	7.3	6.4	8.4	0.5	-0.7
Police staff	1.2	1.9	2.2	2.5	-0.2	-0.4
Non-staff costs	0.8	1.2	1.6	2.2	-0.2	-0.6
Earned income	-0.3	-0.5	-0.9	-0.4	0.2	-0.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>71.1</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>-1.6</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG		
Police officers	£54k	£51k	£51k	1.8	1.8
PCSOs	£27k	£32k	£33k	-0.8	-1.0
Staff	£30k	£32k	£39k	-0.1	-0.4



\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.


Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

### Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	625k		Averages		Diff* £m		% MSG	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Officer**	Average
Central communications unit	7.3	11.6	9.5	10.9	1.3	0.5	23%	20%
Local call centres/front desk	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.1	29%	6%
Command team and support	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	-0.1	-0.2	0%	43%
<b>Dealing with the public</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>






\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.  
 \*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Dealing with the public - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within dealing with the public compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	33	0.05	0.03	0.04	12	7
Police staff and PCSOs	180	0.29	0.24	0.24	31	29

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1.9	3.0	2.1	2.5	0.6	0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	6.2	9.9	8.4	9.7	1.0	0.1
Non-staff costs	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.2	-0.4	-0.1
Earned income	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£58k	£60k	£61k	-0.1	-0.1
Police staff and PCSOs	£34k	£35k	£40k	-0.1	-1.0

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17







Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements

What does the force spend on the different areas within criminal justice arrangements compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 625k

	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
Custody	3.0	4.8	5.2	4.7
Police doctors / nurses and surgeons	1.2	1.9	1.1	1.2
Custody subtotal	4.2	6.7	6.3	5.9
Criminal justice	3.0	4.8	2.6	3.6
Police national computer	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.3
Criminal records bureau	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.2
Property officer / stores	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3
Fixed penalty scheme	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4
Coroner assistance	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2
Command team and support	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
Other criminal justice arrangements subtotal	1.5	2.4	2.3	2.5
<b>Criminal justice arrangements</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>12.0</b>

Diff* £m		% Off**		MSG
All	MSG	Off**	Average	
-0.3	0.0	59%	39%	
0.5	0.4	0%	0%	
0.3	0.5	42%	31%	
1.4	0.8	19%	25%	
-0.1	-0.3	0%	0%	
0.1	0.2	0%	0%	
0.0	0.1	0%	0%	
-0.1	-0.1	0%	0%	
0.1	0.1	29%	6%	
-0.1	-0.1	n/a	27%	
0.0	-0.1			
1.7	1.2	28%	23%	

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure, 'n/a' indicates zero expenditure.






Durham



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Criminal justice arrangements - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within criminal justice arrangements compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	41	0.06	0.05	0.06	11	5
Police staff and PCSOs	171	0.27	0.19	0.19	55	54

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	2.5	3.9	2.9	3.0	0.6	0.6
Police staff and PCSOs	4.5	7.2	5.6	6.2	1.0	0.6
Non-staff costs	2.0	3.2	3.4	3.5	-0.2	-0.2
Earned income	-0.2	-0.4	-0.7	-0.7	0.2	0.2
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£61k	£61k	£53k	0.0	0.3
Police staff and PCSOs	£26k	£30k	£33k	-0.7	-1.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17



Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing

What does the force spend on the different areas within road policing compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing may affect costs for certain forces. - particularly those hosting such arrangements.



Population		625k									
				Averages		Diff* £m		% of which		MSG	
		£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Officers**		Average	
Traffic Units		3.9	6.2	4.3	4.9	1.2	0.8	<< 93%		92%	
Command Team and Support		0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0%		32%	
Casualty Reduction Partnership		-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.1	0.0	100%		33%	
All other road policing subtotal		0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-		-	
<b>Road policing</b>		<b>3.8</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>92%</b>		<b>71%</b>	

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17


Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Road policing - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within road policing compared with others?

Note that collaboration, outsourcing and other partnership arrangements will affect costs and earned income for some forces - particularly those hosting such arrangements.

Earned income will include driver awareness courses and Casualty Reduction Partnerships.







Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	70	0.11	0.08	0.09	23	14
Police staff and PCSOs	11	0.02	0.03	0.02	-7	-4

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG		
Police officers	3.7	5.9	4.1	4.9	1.2	0.6
Police staff and PCSOs	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.9	-0.3	-0.3
Non-staff costs	0.1	0.1	0.8	1.0	-0.4	-0.5
Earned income	-0.2	-0.4	-1.7	-2.1	0.9	1.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>

Cost/FTE		Force	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers		£53k	£54k	£55k	-0.1	-0.1
Police staff and PCSOs		£25k	£31k	£38k	-0.1	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.



Source: POA estimates 2016/17







Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support

What does the force spend on the different areas within operational support compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs. Operational support used here is the POA category, not the workforce descriptor used in HMIC's PEEL: Police efficiency 2015 (October 2015)

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population	625k		Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	Average	
Firearms unit	0.8	1.3	3.3	3.5	-1.2	-1.4	<<	100%	93%
Dogs section	1.0	1.6	1.1	1.5	0.3	0.1		90%	92%
Advanced public order	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.7	-0.6	-0.4		0%	40%
Air operations	0.5	0.8	0.8	1.3	0.0	-0.3		0%	4%
Civil contingencies	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.0	-0.1		70%	68%
Command team and support	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	-0.2	-0.2		n/a	47%
Other functions	-0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.2	-0.3	-0.3			
Operational support	2.5	4.0	7.2	8.1	-1.9	-2.6	<<	73%	77%

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Operational support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within operational support compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	36	0.06	0.11	0.12	-36	-39
Police staff and PCSOs	6	0.01	0.01	0.01	-1	1

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	1.9	3.1	6.5	6.6	-2.1	-2.2
Police staff and PCSOs	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	-0.1	0.0
Non-staff costs	0.6	0.9	1.3	1.7	-0.3	-0.5
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	-1.0	-0.4	0.5	0.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>-1.9</b>	<b>-2.6</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£54k	£56k	£55k	-0.1	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£26k	£37k	£36k	-0.1	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.





Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence

What does the force spend on the different areas within intelligence compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population		625k									
		£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG		
				All	MSG						
Intelligence gathering		2.4	3.9	3.5	3.0	0.2	0.5	83%	71%		
Intelligence analysis / threat assessments		3.0	4.8	3.4	4.3	0.9	0.3	57%	53%		
Command team and support		0.2	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	100%	57%		
<b>Intelligence</b>		<b>5.6</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>61%</b>		

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.


\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Intelligence - Use of resources





How does the force spend its money within intelligence compared with others?



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	80	0.13	0.07	0.09	34	27
Police staff and PCSOs	59	0.09	0.07	0.08	13	9

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	4.4	7.1	4.2	4.8	1.8	1.4
Police staff and PCSOs	1.8	2.9	2.5	2.3	0.3	0.4
Non-staff costs	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.6	-0.3	-0.1
Earned income	-0.9	-1.5	-0.4	-0.4	-0.7	-0.7
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£55k	£57k	£57k	-0.2	-0.1
Police staff and PCSOs	£31k	£34k	£30k	-0.2	0.1



\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.


Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigation public protection

What does the force spend on the different areas within public protection compared with others?



Population		Averages				Diff* £m		% Average	
		£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG	Off**	MSG
Population		625k							
Witness protection		0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	100%	56%
Child protection		1.3	2.0	2.4	1.4	-0.3	0.4	91%	57%
Adult protection		3.3	5.3	6.9	6.0	-1.0	-0.4	73%	73%
<b>Public protection</b>		<b>4.8</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>-1.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>75%</b>

"n/a" indicates zero expenditure

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure





Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigation public protection - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE/ 1,000		Averages		Diff* FTE	
	FTE	pop	All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	70	0.11	0.14	0.12	-19	-7
Police staff and PCSOs	26	0.04	0.05	0.04	-3	-2

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.9	6.2	7.6	6.2	-0.9	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	0.7	1.0	1.5	1.2	-0.3	-0.1
Non-staff costs	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.0
Earned income	-0.2	-0.3	-0.2	-0.4	-0.1	0.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>-1.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£56k	£53k	£51k	0.2	0.4
Police staff and PCSOs	£26k	£32k	£28k	-0.2	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17








Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing)

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigations compared with others?

Note that spend on local investigation/prisoner processing is classified under local policing. Collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.

A new category for cyber crime was added to the POA dataset for 2015, for use when a force has a separate cyber crime unit. Many forces (10) have entered a zero value.



Population 625k

	£m	£/head	Averages	
			All	MSG
Major investigations unit	1.5	2.4	2.9	3.1
Serious and organised crime unit	0.7	1.1	2.3	2.3
Economic crime	0.9	1.4	1.0	1.3
Command team and support overheads	0.4	0.6	0.9	1.0
Specialist investigation units	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3
Cyber crime	0.1	0.2	0.8	3.8
<b>Investigations</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>11.8</b>

Diff* £m		% Average	
All	MSG	Off**	MSG
-0.3	-0.4	90%	67%
-0.8	-0.8	93%	60%
0.2	0.1	55%	51%
-0.2	-0.2	90%	79%
-0.1	-0.2	0%	31%
-0.4	-2.3	100%	73%
-1.6	-3.9	81%	70%

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigations (excluding local investigation/prisoner processing) - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigations compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	42	0.07	0.09	0.09	-13	-17
PCSOs	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Police staff	16	0.02	0.04	0.04	-13	-11

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	3.0	4.7	5.9	8.5	-0.7	-2.4
Police staff and PCSOs	0.5	0.8	1.6	1.7	-0.5	-0.5
Non-staff costs	0.2	0.3	1.4	2.0	-0.7	-1.1
Earned income	-0.2	-0.2	-0.7	-0.4	0.3	0.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>-1.6</b>	<b>-3.9</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£71k	£66k	£91k	0.2	-0.9
Police staff and PCSOs	£34k	£37k	£39k	0.0	-0.1

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17





Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support

What does the force spend on the different areas within investigative support compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population		625k									
	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m		%	MSG			
			All	MSG	All	MSG					
Scenes of crime officers	1.1	1.7	1.4	1.8	0.2	-0.1	0%	7%			
External forensic costs	0.9	1.5	1.1	0.8	0.2	0.4	0%	0%			
Other forensic services	0.3	0.5	1.0	1.4	-0.3	-0.6	0%	7%			
Fingerprint/internal forensic	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.0	-0.1	0%	0%			
Photographic image recovery	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0%	0%			
Command team and support	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.0	-0.1	0%	14%			
<b>Investigative support</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>-0.4</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>			

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Officer salaries and overtime as % of gross expenditure.






Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Investigative support - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within investigative support compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-2	-2
Police staff and PCSOs	61	0.10	0.07	0.08	18	11

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	-0.1	-0.2
Police staff and PCSOs	2.2	3.5	2.7	2.9	0.5	0.4
Non-staff costs	1.0	1.7	2.0	2.5	-0.2	-0.5
Earned income	-0.4	-0.6	-0.4	-0.5	-0.1	-0.1
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>-0.4</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	n/a	£62k	£102k	0.0	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£36k	£38k	£36k	-0.2	0.0

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17











Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions

What does the force spend on the different areas within support functions compared with others?

Note that individual charts for all functions are not included. Priority is given to areas with the highest costs.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.



Population 625k

			Averages		Diff* £m	
	£m	£/head	All	MSG	All	MSG
ICT	5.4	8.7	9.1	9.0	-0.2	-0.2
Estates / central building	4.7	7.6	7.8	7.9	-0.2	-0.2
Fleet services	2.3	3.6	3.1	3.1	0.3	0.3
Training	2.2	3.5	3.5	3.3	0.0	0.1
Performance review	1.3	2.1	2.3	2.1	-0.1	0.0
Administration support	1.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	0.1	0.1
Human resources	1.2	1.9	2.1	1.9	-0.1	0.0
Professional standards	0.8	1.3	1.4	2.1	-0.1	-0.5
Finance	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	-0.1	-0.1
All other support functions	2.3	3.7	4.1	5.5	-0.3	-1.1
<b>Support functions</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-1.6</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17


Durham



## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

How does the force spend its money within support functions compared with others?

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.







Staffing	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	Averages		Diff* FTE	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	42	0.07	0.06	0.07	2	-1
Police staff and PCSOs	258	0.41	0.34	0.36	45	35

Expenditure	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff** £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	2.8	4.5	4.1	4.6	0.2	-0.1
Police staff and PCSOs	7.8	12.4	12.2	12.4	0.1	0.0
Non-staff costs	11.9	19.0	22.0	22.2	-1.9	-2.0
Earned income	-0.2	-0.3	-1.7	-1.0	0.9	0.4
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>36.7</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>-0.7</b>	<b>-1.6</b>

Cost/FTE	Force	Averages		Diff** £m	
		All	MSG	All	MSG
Police officers	£66k	£65k	£67k	0.0	0.0
Police staff and PCSOs	£30k	£36k	£35k	-1.5	-1.2

\* Net difference in the number of staff/officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all/MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.



Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Support functions - Use of resources

These charts provide a detailed breakdown of support service functions as a cost per FTE and a percentage of total NRE.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.

### POA 2016/17 estimates (including national policing functions)

Total FTE*	2,165
Officer FTE	1,151
Total NRE (£m)	115.8











\*Officers, staff and PCSOs

	Cost £m	per FTE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	5.4	£2,513	£2,900	-0.8
Estates	4.7	£2,180	£2,474	-0.6
Training	2.2	£1,005	£1,118	-0.2
Human resources	1.2	£540	£667	-0.3
Finance	0.6	£289	£390	-0.2

	% NRE	All Avg	Diff** £m
ICT	4.7%	5.0%	-0.4
Estates	4.1%	4.3%	-0.2
Training	1.9%	1.9%	-0.1
Human resources	1.0%	1.2%	-0.2
Finance	0.5%	0.7%	-0.2

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17



Durham

## Income and expenditure - NRE by function - Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)/Local policing bodies

What is the expenditure of the local policing body on its own office and non-policing commissioned services?







Broadly, 'Cost of PCC/Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime' includes salary and associated costs (including expenses and training) of the PCC, deputy PCC and any appointed deputies and special advisers. For the Metropolitan Police Service this relates to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and similar staff and costs. PCC salaries are set by the Senior Salaries Review Body.

'Office of PCC/local policing body & other costs' includes salary and associated costs of the Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and any other staff employed to support the PCC/ Deputy Mayor as well as office-running costs. It also includes other local policing body costs such as external audit and council tax leaflets.

PCC Commissioned services includes

- services previously commissioned under the community safety fund grant;
- victim and witness services including restorative justice (RJ); and
- services directly commissioned by the PCC.

The split between Community Safety and Victims/Witnesses/RJ/Other costs is based on percentage of gross PCC Commissioned Services spent on Community Safety.



Population 625k

	£m	£/head	Averages		Diff* £m	
			All	MSG	All	MSG
Community Safety	0.70	1.12	1.36	1.57	-0.15	-0.28
Victims & witnesses, restorative justice & other	0.76	1.21	1.64	1.97	-0.27	-0.47
<b>PCC/local policing body commissioned services</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>-0.42</b>	<b>-0.75</b>
Cost of PCC/Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime	0.09	0.14	0.15	0.26	0.00	-0.07
Office of PCC/local policing body & other costs	0.80	1.29	1.03	1.27	0.16	0.01
<b>PCC/Local policing body cost</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>5.06</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.81</b>

\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG PCCs/local policing bodies.

Data on the office of the PCC should be read with caution as staff numbers will vary according to the local context. Some staff within the OPCC may be providing a dual service to the force, e.g., finance, communications or analysis teams.

Note that HMIC do not inspect expenditure incurred by local policing bodies/PCCs.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham



## Income and expenditure - Criminal justice costs

How much does the force spend per charge compared with others? What is the size of its workforce that deals with criminal justice?

These charts show the NRE cost of criminal justice (as opposed to criminal justice arrangements) per 100 charges.

FTE within the criminal justice function is then shown per 100 charges.

Note that charges data is from 2015/16 whereas FTE and cost figures are from 2016/17 estimates.



Charges		6,994			
	Force	Per 100 charges	Averages		MSG Diff
			All	MSG	
Criminal justice FTE	113	1.6	1.0	0.9	48 *
Criminal justice cost	£3.0m	£43k	£29k	£33k	£0.7m **

\* Net difference in the number of FTEs compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of MSG forces.

\*\* Net cost of the difference in spend compared to the average per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17 (costs/FTE) and Home Office Crime Statistics 2015/16 (charges)

Durham





## Workforce - Summary

How large is the force's workforce relative to its population compared with others? How many officers, staff, PCSOs and special constables do they employ per 1,000 population?

Figures in the charts give the total number (including those within national policing) of FTEs (or head count for special constables) per 1,000 population.

All data is from POA except for contractors - which comes from ADR and is 2015/16 FTE. Special constables data, taken from POA, is average head count across the year.

Note that collaboration/outsourcing will affect staff/non-staff costs for certain forces.



Population 625k

	FTE	FTE/ 1,000 pop	All Avg	Diff* FTE	% of total workforce	
					Force	Avg
Police officers	1,151	1.84	1.83	9	53%	57%
PCSOs	169	0.27	0.20	42	8%	6%
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>1,320</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>64%</b>
Police staff	845	1.35	1.15	125	39%	36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,165</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Special constables **	200	0.32	0.24	47		

\* Net difference in the number of officers compared to if the force had the average number of FTEs per head of all forces.

\*\* Headcount

Source: POA estimates 2016/17, ADR 502 for special constables as at March 2016

Durham






## Workforce - Officers/PCSOs by rank

How are officers in the force split amongst the ranks compared with other forces? What is the supervisory ratio of sergeants to constables (and PCSOs) compared with others?

Charts show the proportion of the total officer/PCSO workforce at each rank. The chart for superintendents includes chief superintendents, and the chart for inspectors includes chief inspectors. National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) are officers above the rank of chief superintendents.

Two further charts show numbers of constables (and PCSOs) per sergeant giving an indication of the average supervision requirement for each sergeant.



Note that this is ADR data for all officers and so totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.



Officers and PCSOs	FTE	%	All Avg
NPCC ranks	3	0.2%	0.2%
Chief superintendents	4	0.3%	0.3%
Superintendents	6	0.5%	0.7%
Chief inspectors	14	1.1%	1.3%
Inspectors	58	4.6%	4.4%
Sergeants	169	13.4%	14.2%
Constables	861	68.0%	69.4%
PCSOs	150	11.9%	9.5%
<b>Force total</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Supervision ratio	Force	All Avg
Constables per sergeant	5.1	4.9
Constables and PCSOs per sergeant	6.0	5.6

### Supervision ratio



Source: ADR 502 March 2016

Durham

## Workforce - Officers/staff by back office function


In functions where officers and staff can fulfil similar roles, what proportion of these functions are made up of police staff compared with other forces? How has that changed?

HMIC split police workforce roles into three categories using the ADR601 functions: operational front line (including visible and non-visible), frontline support\* and business support.

ADR601 categories are mapped to the POA data for use here. For consistency to elsewhere in the profile, counter terrorism/special branch (a national policing function) has been removed from the front line. Due to this, and the fact that ADR601 data deals with officers in post as of 31 March whereas POA data is of budgeted posts for the whole financial year, proportions will not necessarily match to other published figures. Annex 4 shows a list of POA functions and their classification.

Note that PCSOs are not included here as they, almost exclusively, work in visible frontline roles.

\* In PEEL Police efficiency 2015, HMIC define this role as operational support. Since this is the name of a POA category, frontline support is used here to avoid confusion.



	2012/13 Estimates					2016/17 Estimates					Percentage point change in % roles fulfilled by staff	
	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Police officers	Police Staff	% Staff	All Avg	Diff* FTE Off	Force	All avg
Criminal justice	32	87	73%	89%	18	12	102	90%	89%	-1	16.4	0.2
Local call centres / front desk	5	19	79%	92%	3	4	23	85%	98%	3	6.1	5.9
Intelligence analysis	57	49	46%	62%	16	41	48	54%	68%	13	7.6	6.6
Intelligence gathering	10	0	0%	26%	3	37	11	23%	32%	4	23.0	5.3
Scenes of crime officers	0	33	100%	95%	-2	0	27	100%	99%	0	0.0	3.8
Central communications unit	56	131	70%	83%	24	28	157	85%	82%	-6	14.9	-0.7
Custody	30	33	52%	44%	-6	28	32	53%	44%	-6	1.0	0.2
Training	32	24	43%	46%	2	24	18	42%	47%	2	-0.4	1.6
Human resources	3	27	90%	98%	2	0	29	100%	99%	0	10.1	1.4
Administration support	0	44	100%	97%	-1	0	58	100%	96%	-2	0.0	-0.7
<b>Total (of above functions)</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>

\* Net difference in the number of officers if the force had the average proportion of staff of all forces.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17 & 2012/13

Durham

## Workforce - Workforce numbers by function

What are the numbers of police officers, staff and PCSOs across various functions? How has this changed since last year?

Population	625k			
	Workforce FTE 2016/17	Workforce FTE 2015/16	Diff from last year, FTE	% change from last year
Neighbourhood policing	309	297	11	4%
Incident (response) management	374	374	0	0%
Local investigation / prisoner support*	166	180	-14	-8%
Other local policing	71	84	-13	-15%
Local policing	919	935	-16	-2%
Investigation - public protection	96	85	11	13%
Investigations exc local investigations	57	69	-12	-17%
Dealing with the public	213	213	0	0%
Operational support	42	39	3	7%
Intelligence	138	135	3	2%
Investigative support	61	63	-2	-3%
Road policing	81	86	-5	-6%
Custody	60	61	-1	-2%
Other criminal justice arrangements	152	146	6	4%
Criminal justice arrangements	212	207	5	2%
Information communication technology	39	44	-4	-10%
Human Resources	29	28	1	3%
Finance	15	16	-1	-8%
Other support functions	217	227	-10	-4%
Support functions	300	314	-15	-5%
Police and Crime Commissioner**	12	12	0	-2%
<b>Total exc national policing and central costs</b>	<b>2,131</b>	<b>2,158</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>-1%</b>
Central costs	0	0	0	
National policing	34	41	-7	-17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,165</b>	<b>2,199</b>	<b>-34</b>	<b>-2%</b>

\* Note that workforce under the heading of 'local investigation' are included within 'local policing' not 'investigation'.

\*\* Previously called Police Authority/Crime Commissioner in 2012/13 POA.

Source: POA estimates 2016/17, 2015/16

Durham



## Workforce - Leavers

What proportion of the workforce left the force last year and how does that compare with other forces?






These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that left the force between 31 March 2015 and 2016 (using 31 March 2015 totals figures to calculate percentage of workforce).

Officers are broken down into those who transferred or left the service. We have costed the salary impact of the workforce leaving the service to give context.

Note that PCSOs leaving forces may return as police officers.

Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

Note that data for some forces may not match published data sources due to data resubmissions.



	Strength*	Leavers	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,169				
Leaving force		108	9.3%	6.4%	5.8
Transfers		4	0.3%	0.5%	0.2
Officers exc transfers		104	8.9%	5.9%	5.6
PCSOs	157	26	16.7%	14.2%	0.7
Police staff	810	78	9.6%	11.6%	2.4
<b>Force total</b>	<b>2,136</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>8.7</b>

\* as at 31 March 2015

\*\* Salary calculated using leaver FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (leavers): ADR531 (31 March 2015 & 31 March 2016). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2015). Source (salary): POA estimates 2016/17

Durham







## Workforce - Joiners

What proportion of the workforce joined the force last year and how does that compare with others?

These charts show the number and percentage of the workforce (FTEs) that joined the force between 31 March 2015 and 2016 using 31 March 2015 as the baseline.

Note that ADR data is used and totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

Note that data for some forces may not match published data sources due to data resubmissions.



	Strength*	Joiners	% w'force	All Avg	Salary** £m
Police officers	1,169				
Officers exc transfers		55	4.7%	3.2%	3.0
Transfers		1	0.1%	0.6%	0.1
Joining force		56	4.8%	3.8%	3.0
PCSOs	157	24	15.3%	6.7%	0.6
Police staff	810	72	8.9%	10.2%	2.2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2,136</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>5.9</b>

\* as at 31 March 2015

\*\* Salary calculated using leaver FTE multiplied by average officer/staff/PCSO cost excluding overtime (POA data).

Source (joiners): ADR521 (31 March 2015 & 31 March 2016). Source (strength): ADR502 (as at 31 March 2015 ).

Durham

## Workforce - Sickness and recuperative/restricted duty

What proportion of the force's workforce are absent and what proportion of officers are on restricted/recuperative duty? How do these rates compare with other forces?

These charts show sickness broken down into short and medium term (28 days and less) and long term (more than 28 days).

Officers on restricted duties (i.e. officers who, because of a disability or other factors, are unable to undertake the full range of operational duties) and recuperative duties (officers returning to work in a phased way after injury or illness) are included separately.

Note that gaps towards the left of some charts indicate that data is not available or has not been included; zero absence levels have been excluded as it is likely to be due to data inaccuracies.





Note that ADR data is used and workforce totals will not match the POA data given elsewhere.

	Strength	FTE	% of total	All Avg
<b>Officers</b>	1,115			
Long-term sickness		28	2.5%	2.1%
Short/medium sickness		14	1.2%	2.0%
<b>PCSOs</b>	150			
Long-term sickness		2	1.3%	1.8%
Short/medium sickness		2	1.2%	2.3%
<b>Staff</b>	817			
Long-term sickness		7	0.8%	1.8%
Short/medium sickness		11	1.4%	2.0%





Long-term sickness during 2015/16 Q4

	Strength	Head count	% of total	All Avg
<b>Officers</b>	1,115			
Restricted duty		35	3.1%	4.1%
Recuperative duty		42	3.8%	3.4%

Long-term sickness



Short and medium term sickness



Note that ADR 554 figures (restricted and recuperative duty) are headcount not FTE.

Source: ADR 502 (strength and short/medium term sickness); 551 (long term); and 554 (recuperative/restricted duty) - as at 31 March 2016


Durham

Workforce - Officers' length of service

What is the age profile of officers in the force compared with others? How many officers are projected to retire over the next few years and what are the estimated savings from them doing so?


The projected number of retirees is shown for officers with 25-30 years' service.\* The estimated saving of them retiring is also provided, calculated from the average cost of a police officer. This does not take into account replacements. Data is given as a headcount.

All officers



March 2016 Headcount	109	90	329	295	164	145	Total
							1,132

Officers with 25 years' service or more - Projected retirement



March 2016 Headcount	7	23	31	28	38	18	Total
Salary cost**	£0.4m	£1.2m	£1.7m	£1.5m	£2.0m	£1.0m	£7.8m

\* Please note that typically officers cannot retire until they have completed 30 years service.  
\*\* Headcount multiplied by average salary cost per FTE excluding overtime.  
Source (officer head count): ADR582 (31 March 2016 ); Source (salary): POA estimates 2016/17

## Demand - Crime trends



How is the number of crimes and charges per officer changing over time in the force and how does this compare with others?

Total crime (excluding fraud) is included but not broken down into the different crime -types to ensure there is sufficient data to show a robust series.


Note that PCSOs are not included and officer/staff numbers are given in FTEs. This data is from ADR (end -of-year actuals as at 31 March) and so will not match the POA data (estimates) given elsewhere.

Note that recorded crime and charges data on this page is from a live (refreshed) database and therefore will not match the data given elsewhere taken from the March publication snapshot.

The series have been plotted as indices to enable comparison of the change over time in each series.



	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Police officers	1,507	1,431	1,363	1,362	1,288	1,169	1,115
Police staff	920	777	734	734	800	810	817
All crime excl fraud	39,935	36,177	34,952	29,843	32,806	32,924	36,339
Charges*	7,715	7,701	7,589	6,502	7,496	7,616	6,994
Crimes/officer	26.5	25.3	25.6	21.9	25.5	28.2	32.6
All average	31.6	30.9	31.0	28.5	29.0	30.2	33.9
Charges*/officer	5.1	5.4	5.6	4.8	5.8	6.5	6.3
All average	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.1



\*Total charges recorded during the period. Note the charges in section two refer to the number of outcomes for only those offences which were recorded during the period.

Source: ADR 502 March 2016; Home Office (charges) / ONS Crime statistics 2015/16.




Durham

## Demand - Recorded crimes per visible officers

How does the number of crimes per visible police officer in the force compare with others?

While police officers are not just dealing with crime, the numbers of crimes per visible police officer gives some indication of how the measurable crime workload for this force's visible officers compares with other forces.

Note that PCSOs are not included. Visible roles are defined in Annex 4.



Visible police officers	655
-------------------------	-----

Recorded crime	Force	Per vis. officer	Averages All	MSG	MSG Diff*
Victim-based	32,878	50.2	52.7	56.1	-5.8
Other crimes against society	3,461	5.3	6.2	6.2	-0.9
<b>Crimes (exc fraud)</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>-6.8</b>

\* Net difference in the number of crimes per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average number of crimes.

Sources: POA estimates 2016/17 ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16.

Durham






## Demand - Crime outcomes per visible officer

How does the force respond to crimes compared with others?

What are the number of cases with suspect identified, action taken and charges per visible police officer?

Please refer to 'Offences and outcomes introduction' section for the definition of 'suspect identified' and 'action taken'.

This page includes both victim-based crime and other crimes against society.



Visible police officers	655
Crimes (exc fraud)	36,339

	Force	Per vis. officer	MSG Avg	MSG Diff*
Suspect identified	13,510	20.6	31.0	-10.4
Action taken	12,275	18.8	15.8	3.0
Charged/Summonsed	6,727	10.3	10.0	0.3
No action	1,235	1.9	15.2	-13.3
Not charged	5,548	8.5	5.7	2.7

\* Net difference in the number of outcome per visible officer compared to if force had the MSG average.

Sources: Detections: Home Office Outcome Statistics 2015/16, Visible officers: POA estimates 2016/17 Crime data: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16.

Durham


## Demand - 999 calls

What is the level of demands on the force from 999 calls compared with others? How much does dealing with these calls cost compared with others and what is the level of workforce required to deal with them?

Costs and workforce levels are calculated across central communications units (CCU) and also within CCU and front desk combined to account for differences in force structure.

Note that

- for consistency with elsewhere in this section, the horizontal lines in the bar charts represent the average of all forces, not the MSG average.
- staff in CCU and front desk perform a range of functions and may spend differing amounts of their time dealing with emergency calls.
- Collaboration/outsourcing will affect costs for certain forces.






Population	625k
999 Calls received	70,332

FTE workforce	185
Gross cost	£7.3m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.30	0.27	0.24
Calls per FTE	379	513	666
Calls per 1000 pop	113	129	122
<b>Cost per call</b>	<b>£104</b>	<b>£86</b>	<b>£83</b>

### Central communications unit only



LIN = Lincolnshire




CLE = Cleveland

FTE workforce	212
Gross cost	£8.1m

	Force	MSG Avg	All Avg
FTE per 1,000 pop	0.34	0.30	0.27
Calls per FTE	331	468	606
Calls per 1,000 pop	113	129	122
<b>Cost per call</b>	<b>£115</b>	<b>£94</b>	<b>£94</b>

\* Net difference in number of FTEs/999 calls compared to if force matched average of MSG forces

### Central communications unit and front desk



	Diff*
MSG	All
24	43
62	96
-10,222	-5,922

Sources: Calls: ADR 441 2015/16, Cost and workforce: POA estimates 2016/17

Durham



## Demand - Emergency incidents

What is the level of emergency calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?








An emergency response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident and an emergency response is required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 625k

	Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages	
			All	MSG
Crime incidents	5,987	10	9	12
ASB incidents	1,695	3	4	4
Other incidents	19,189	31	32	42
<b>Total emergency incidents</b>	<b>26,871</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>

Differences*		Change in emergency incidents		
All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
203	-1,676	7%	31%	169%
-986	-989	-17%	82%	656%
-941	-6,826	-7%	656%	192%
-1,724	-9,491	-5%	0%	197%

\* Net difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: ADR 342 2015/16

Durham

## Demand - Priority incidents

What is the level of priority calls in the force compared with others? How have these levels changed?








A priority response occurs when the police call handler assesses that there is a degree of importance or urgency associated with the incident but an emergency response is not required.

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.

Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Incidents are separated into anti-social behaviour (ASB) incidents, crimes (notifiable, classified command and control) incidents and other command and control incidents.

The charts on the right side of the page show the percentage change in each type of incident over the past 12 months.



Population 625k

	Force	Incidents per 1,000 pop	Averages		Differences*		Change in priority incidents		
			All	MSG	All	MSG	Force	All	MSG
Crime incidents	6,363	10	13	15	-1,774	-3,189	-6%	-3%	1%
ASB incidents	10,711	17	12	12	3,515	3,328	-20%	-14%	-8%
Other incidents	30,299	48	44	41	2,804	4,527	-10%	-8%	-4%
<b>Total priority incidents</b>	<b>47,373</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>4,545</b>	<b>4,665</b>	<b>-12%</b>	<b>-9%</b>	<b>-5%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of incidents compared to if the force had the average number per head of all/MSG forces.

Source: ADR 342 2015/16

Durham

## Demand - All incidents

How has the categorisation of incidents changed over time and how does the most recent year compare to the MSG?

All police forces record incidents in accordance with the provisions of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). These figures are not subject to the same level of quality assurance as recorded crime data.


Incident counts should be interpreted only as incidents recorded by the police, and may under estimate the true level of incidents.

Large changes between years may be due to the force changing their internal recording categories

Scheduled are appointment where a contact does not require an immediate or priority response but still requires police attendance, it will result in a scheduled response.

Resolution without deployment can occur where the needs of the caller can be adequately met through provision of advice, information, helpdesk or telephone investigation function or signposting to another lead agency/service.

**Breakdown of all incidents per 1,000 population**



	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/16 MSG	Diff %
Emergency	44	44	45	43	58	-26%
Priority	105	96	86	76	68	11%
Scheduled	82	92	90	90	61	48%
Resolved (w/o deployment)	59	65	68	74	70	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>10%</b>

Source: ADR 342 2012/13 to 2015/16

Durham

## Section two – offences and outcomes

This section focuses on criminal offences recorded by each force and resulting outcomes from those offences over the 12 month period to March 2016. These pages use the ONS published data on police recorded crime alongside Home Office data on outcome types. Definitions of offences in each crime category can be found in Annex 1. Data covering all outcome types (1-21) in the new outcome framework are available from 2014/15. This publication uses the outcomes definitions on page 58 below to analyse outcomes. Definitions of outcome type (1-18) in each group can be found in Annex 2.

The following pages present the volumes and changes in recorded crime for top-level crime categories as well as the change since 2014/15. They also present the proportion of recorded crimes where a suspect was identified and where action was taken based the new outcome framework. The following categories from the outcome framework were used to identify if a suspect was identified and or action taken (please see page 58).

- Suspect Identified – is defined as an outcome where an offender is identified enabling actions such as a charge, formal or informal sanction or an offence to be taken into consideration by the court. Also included are outcomes where a suspect is identified but evidential difficulties prevent prosecution or prosecution is not in the public interest.
- Action Taken - Defined as an outcome where an offender receives a charge or summons, an out-of-court formal outcome, an out-of-court informal outcome or who asks the offence to be taken into consideration.

Further analysis on pages 80 to 85 provides the volume of key outcomes for more detailed crime categories and presents the difference from the expected volume of that outcome based on the England and Wales average. Users may want to question why there are differences from the expected volumes, why a force might have higher than expected outcomes for some crimes, or lower than expected outcomes in others.

## Also to Note


- Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015 and outcome 21 "further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest" was introduced from January 2016 (on a voluntary basis). Together, these outcomes account for 0.5% of total offences and have been excluded with these outcomes have been excluded from the pages 60-85 of the profiles. For this reason
- some figures may appear different to those published by the Home Office and HMIC's PEEL reports.
- Pages 60-85 report on the outcomes for offences recorded during the period to 31 March 2016 and will differ from page 49 data on charges, which presents all charges recorded during the period, even if the offence to which it relates was not recorded in the period.
- On pages 80-85 England and Wales percent of outcomes is not provided for broad offence categories (violence against person, sexual offences etc) as the profile of component offence subcategories will differ by forces and comparison would be unreliable.
- Changes over time for crimes are measured against a baseline of 2014/15.
- Crimes against children are included in overall crime data.
- Fraud is excluded from all crime to make comparisons between forces more meaningful. Fraud offences are now recorded by the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau.
- Categories with fewer than 50 cases are not included in analysis such as crime rate or trend as small volumes will not provide robust estimates.
- For recorded crime and outcomes, MSG (simple, unweighted) averages are used. With the exception of pages 80 to 85, horizontal lines in the plots show the MSG.

## Section two - Offences and outcomes

### Introduction

The offences described in this section are presented as a crime tree as shown below. The tree distinguishes between victim based crimes and other crimes against society where there is no victim but a criminal offence has been committed. Fraud is shown separately with a dotted line because a practical and reliable method for collecting force-level data has not been developed. Nevertheless, this profile provides the latest ONS information.


### The ONS crime tree



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

## Crime committed against children


This year, the profiles include a section on crime committed against children and the resulting outcomes. This includes crimes where the victims are specifically stated as children or victims are highly likely to be children (see crime tree below). There are other crime categories that may include child victims, but it is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims (e.g. theft). These categories are not included in this section. Although not a perfect measure, these crimes give a good indication of the scale of crimes committed specifically against children within the force.



Note: Definitions of offences in each category can be found in Annex 1.

## Outcome terminology

The Home Office introduced a new way of classifying the results of police investigations in April 2013. New classifications called 'outcomes' are associated with all recorded crimes, providing a more detailed picture of how the police deal with investigations. The following outcome groups are used in this section:



### Note

Definitions of outcome types in each category can be found in Annex 2.



Outcome 20 "action undertaken by another body/agency" was introduced from April 2015 and outcome 21 "further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest" was introduced from January 2016 (on a voluntary basis). Together, these outcomes account for 0.5% of total offences and have been excluded from the profiles. For this reasons some figures may appear different to those published by the Home Office and HMIC's PEEL reports.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

## Offences and outcomes - Crimes - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for crimes (excluding fraud) in the force and how does this compare with others?

How does the Recorded offence rate compare with last year and how does the change compare with others?





Offences	per 1,000 pop***	MSG Avg	Difference
1,785	2.86	3.04	-113

Fraud data are experimental statistics published as part of ONS crime statistics and are in the testing phase and not yet fully developed.

The figures presented here for police force areas are based on victims' address information. This is in contrast with traditional crimes which are based on where the offence took place (which in the case of fraud is often hard to define).

Offences where the victim's police force area is unknown relate to cases where it has not been possible to attribute offences to a police force area, for example, due to missing address information, or where the offence occurred outside the UK. There were 24,593

Recorded offence rate



Population 625k

	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*
2015/16				
Victim-based crime	32,878	52.6	59.8	-4,493 -12%
Other crimes against society	3,461	5.5	6.9	-826 -19%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>-5,319 -13%</b>

	Offences	% change**	
2014/15		Force	MSG Avg
Victim-based crime	29,580	11%	5%
Other crimes against society	3,344	3%	3%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>32,924</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

\*\*\*Uses the same population figure as the rest of the profile and may not match ONS figures

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham







## Offences and outcomes - Crimes (excluding fraud) - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crimes (excluding fraud) and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences. The proportion of cases which have an identified suspect has not been reported as there is little variation between forces.




	Total offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Victim-based crime	32,878	10,812	33%	45%	9,683	29%	22%
Other crimes against society	3,461	2,698	78%	87%	2,592	75%	64%
<b>Crimes (excl fraud)</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>13,510</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>12,275</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>26%</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for victim-based crime in the force and how does this compare with others?



Population	625k				
2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Violence against the person	9,477	15.2	17.5	-1,432	-13%
Sexual offences	1,124	1.8	1.7	80	8%
Robbery	124	0.2	0.5	-195	-61%
Theft offences	15,102	24.2	29.1	-3,066	-17%
Criminal damage and arson	7,051	11.3	11.1	120	2%
Victim-based crime	32,878	52.6	59.8	-4,493	-12%






2014/15	Offences	% change**	Force	MSG Avg
Violence against the person	6,536	45%	25%	
Sexual offences	979	15%	8%	
Robbery	103	20%	16%	
Theft offences	15,248	-1%	-4%	
Criminal damage and arson	6,714	5%	3%	
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>29,580</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>5%</b>	

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.






\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15




Durham

Offences and outcomes - Victim-based crime - Outcome





What are the outcomes for victim-based crime and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.







Offences	Suspect Identified				Action Taken			
	Force	%	MSG Avg*		Force	%	MSG Avg*	
Violence against the person	9,477	4,454	47%	80%	3,815	40%	30%	
Sexual offences	1,124	213	19%	67%	162	14%	15%	
Robbery	124	41	33%	56%	40	32%	28%	
Theft offences	15,102	4,447	29%	28%	4,181	28%	19%	
Criminal damage and arson	7,051	1,657	24%	30%	1,485	21%	16%	
Victim-based crime	32,878	10,812	33%	45%	9,683	29%	22%	

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

## Offences and outcomes - Violence against the person - Recorded offences


What is the Recorded offence rate for violence against the person in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?

As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.




Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".



Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2014/15



Population	625k				
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
<b>2015/16</b>					
Homicide	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Violence with injury	4,184	6.7	7.8	-694	-14%
Violence without injury	5,293	8.5	9.6	-733	-12%
<b>Violence against the person</b>	<b>9,477</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>-1,432</b>	<b>-13%</b>

	Offences	% change**	
<b>2014/15</b>		Force	MSG Avg
Homicide	2	-100%	-11%
Violence with injury	3,690	13%	10%
Violence without injury	2,844	86%	42%
<b>Violence against the person</b>	<b>6,536</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>25%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.


\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham

What are the outcomes for violence against the person and how does this compare with others?

As homicide numbers are so small, care should be taken when making comparisons between forces. For this reason, a plot has not been included for homicide.







Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for sexual offences in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate for sexual offences compare to last year and how does it compare with others?

Note that due to the complex nature of these crimes, particularly rape, care should be taken when comparing crime rates across forces as there are many factors which can affect the level of recorded crime. For example, victims being encouraged to report crimes or cultural differences.



Population		625k		
	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*
2015/16				
Rape	400	0.6	0.47	107 37%
Other sexual offences	724	1.2	1.20	-27 -4%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>80 8%</b>

		% change**	
2014/15	Offences	Force	MSG Avg
Rape	341	17%	-3%
Other sexual offences	638	13%	14%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham

Offences and outcomes - Sexual offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for sexual offences and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page



Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
	Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Rape	42	11%	102%	37	9%	15%
Other sexual offences	171	24%	62%	125	17%	16%
<b>Sexual offences</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>15%</b>


Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

## Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Recorded offences


What is the Recorded offence rate for robbery in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate for robbery compare with last year and how does this compare with others?

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be suppressed.

Recorded offence rate



Percent change from 2014/15



Population 625k

2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Robbery	124	0.2	0.5	-195	-61%

2014/15	Offences	% change**	
		Force	MSG Avg
Robbery	103	20%	16%

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham




## Offences and outcomes - Robbery - Outcome

What are the outcomes for robbery and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from page 56) for definitions.

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be suppressed.

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken




	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Robbery	124	41	33%	56%	40	32%	28%

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for theft offences in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year?



**Population** 625k

2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Burglary	4,389	7.0	7.8	-498	-10%
Vehicle offences	2,625	4.2	5.7	-943	-26%
Bicycle theft	459	0.7	1.3	-325	-41%
Theft from the person	195	0.3	0.6	-205	-51%
Shoplifting	3,484	5.6	6.3	-481	-12%
All other theft offences	3,950	6.3	7.3	-614	-13%
<b>Theft offences</b>	<b>15,102</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>-3,066</b>	<b>-17%</b>


2014/15	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Burglary	3,925	12%	-1%
Vehicle offences	2,695	-3%	1%
Bicycle theft	573	-20%	-17%
Theft from the person	186	5%	9%
Shoplifting	3,618	-4%	-3%
All other theft offences	4,251	-7%	-10%
<b>Theft offences</b>	<b>15,248</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>-4%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.


\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15



Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Theft offences - Outcome

What are the outcomes for theft offences and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Percentage with Suspect Identified




	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Burglary	4,389	560	13%	15%	526	12%	9%
Vehicle offences	2,625	426	16%	13%	381	15%	8%
Bicycle theft	459	57	12%	13%	54	12%	7%
Theft from the person	195	26	13%	18%	25	13%	6%
Shoplifting	3,484	2,615	75%	65%	2,507	72%	54%
All other theft offences	3,950	763	19%	27%	688	17%	10%
<b>Theft offences</b>	15,102	4,447	29%	28%	4,181	28%	19%


Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Action Taken




Percentage with Action Taken




Percentage with Action Taken




Percentage with Action Taken



Percentage with Action Taken



Percentage with Action Taken




Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Criminal damage and arson - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for criminal damage and arson in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rate compare with last year and how does this compare with others?



Population 625k

2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Criminal damage	6,677	10.7	10.5	94	1%
Arson	374	0.6	0.6	25	7%
<b>Criminal damage and arson</b>	<b>7,051</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>2%</b>

2014/15	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	6,420	4%	2%
Arson	294	27%	19%
<b>Criminal damage and arson</b>	<b>6,714</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16


Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Criminal Damage and Arson - Outcome

What are the outcomes for criminal damage and arson and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see




	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Criminal damage	6,677	1,605	24%	31%	1,437	22%	16%
Arson	374	52	14%	21%	48	13%	10%
<b>Criminal damage and arson</b>	<b>7,051</b>	<b>1,657</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>1,485</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>16%</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Other crimes against society - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for other crimes against society in the force and how does this compare with others? How does the rates compare with last year?



**Population** 625k





2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*
Trafficking of drugs	241	0.4	0.6	-108 -31%
Possession of drugs	950	1.5	1.8	-198 -17%
Public order offences	1,421	2.3	3.0	-441 -24%
Possession of weapons	210	0.3	0.4	-12 -5%
Misc crimes against society	639	1.0	1.1	-67 -10%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>-826 -19%</b>

2014/15	Offences	% change**	
		Force	MSG Avg
Trafficking of drugs	311	-23%	-1%
Possession of drugs	1,118	-15%	-13%
Public order offences	1,152	23%	13%
Possession of weapons	246	-15%	3%
Misc crimes against society	517	24%	16%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,344</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>






\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15



Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15


Durham

## Outcomes - Other crimes against society






What are the outcomes for other crimes against society and how does this compare with others?

The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken



	Total offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg	Force	%	MSG Avg
Trafficking of drugs	241	198	82%	88%	190	79%	82%
Possession of drugs	950	923	97%	98%	902	95%	91%
Public order offences	1,421	940	66%	83%	900	63%	49%
Possession of weapons	210	204	97%	96%	197	94%	82%
Misc crimes against society	639	433	68%	79%	403	63%	44%
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>2,698</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>2,592</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>64%</b>


Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Recorded offences

What is the Recorded offence rate for crime against children in the force and how does this compare with others and with last year?

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".






Population - Child under 16		109k			
2015/16	Offences	per 1,000 pop	MSG Avg	Difference*	
Rape	153	1.4	1.1	37	32%
Sexual offences / abuse	389	3.6	3.1	54	16%
Cruelty / other	133	1.2	0.9	40	42%
<b>Crime against children</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>24%</b>

2014/15	Offences	% change **	
		Force	MSG Avg
Rape	138	11%	4%
Sexual offences / abuse	295	32%	18%
Cruelty / other	130	2%	34%
<b>Crime against children</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>



\* Net difference in the number of offences compared to if the force had the MSG average number of offences per 1,000 population. A negative difference means the force has a lower Recorded offence rate than the MSG average.

\*\*Percentage change from 2014/15 to 2015/16

### Recorded offence rate



### Percent change from 2014/15



Source: ONS Crime Statistics 2015/16, 2014/15

Durham




## Offences and outcomes - Crime against children - Outcome

What are the outcomes for crime against children and how does this compare with others?


The charts show the proportion of crimes recorded in 2015/16 that have a tracked outcome showing that a suspect has been identified and that an action has been taken. Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.

Categories with fewer than 50 cases will not be included in analysis as the results may not be robust and will be shown as "n/a".


Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Action Taken




Percentage with Suspect Identified




Percentage with Action Taken



Percentage with Suspect Identified



Percentage with Action Taken



	Offences	Suspect Identified			Action Taken		
		Force	%	MSG Avg*	Force	%	MSG Avg*
Rape	153	16	10%	68%	14	9%	14%
Sexual offences / abuse	389	102	26%	61%	68	17%	14%
Cruelty / other	133	96	72%	76%	91	68%	43%
Crime against children	675	214	32%	63%	173	26%	19%

\* E&W average for 30 forces that submitted tracked outcome data.

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016

Durham








## Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Victim-based crime

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for victim-based crime and how does this compare with the other forces?

Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions.  
The percentage takes into account the volume difference between crime types.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.
- Suspect identified - no action includes evidential difficulties (victim supports action and victim does not support action) and prosecution prevented or not in the public interest.



Note: It is imperative to look at the allocation of outcomes in their totality to get the complete picture of how a force is handling their crime demand, including crimes which have not yet been assigned an outcome. Forces with high proportions of crimes categorised as 'not yet assigned an outcome' may appear as outliers in the branches of suspect identified and in no suspect identified. A full breakdown of outcomes is available from page 80.

## Offences and outcomes - Outcome percentage - Other crimes against society

What proportion of offences result in each outcome for crimes against society and how does this compare with the other forces?

Please see 'Offences and outcomes introduction' (from pages 56) for definitions. Thirty forces provided tracked outcome data.





The percentage takes into account the volume difference between crime types.

Crimes against society include those with no identifiable victim, such as drug offences. The proportion of cases which have an identified suspect has not been reported as there is little variation between forces.

Note that

- Out of court (formal) includes caution and penalty notices for disorder.
- Out of court (informal) includes cannabis/khat warning and community resolution.

A full breakdown of outcomes is available from page 80.



## Offences and outcomes - Charged/Summonsed



What proportion of offences result in charges and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the charge rates for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's actual charges divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting charges/summons for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	63%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	1,042	25%	21%	889	153
Violence without Injury	5,293	1,011	19%	16%	823	188
Violence against the person	9,477	2,053	22%		1,712	341
Rape	400	36	9%	9%	37	-1
Other Sexual Offences	724	87	12%	13%	91	-4
Sexual offences	1,124	123	11%		127	-4
Robbery	124	39	31%	18%	23	16
Burglary	4,389	411	9%	6%	269	142
Vehicle offences	2,625	282	11%	4%	114	168
Theft from the Person	195	15	8%	3%	6	9
Bicycle Theft	459	34	7%	3%	13	21
Shoplifting	3,484	1,477	42%	31%	1,097	380
Other Theft Offences	3,950	280	7%	4%	168	112
Theft offences	15,102	2,499	17%		1,667	832
Criminal damage	6,677	661	10%	8%	512	149
Arson	374	29	8%	7%	26	3
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	690	10%		538	152
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>5,404</b>	<b>16%</b>		<b>4,068</b>	<b>1,336</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	101	42%	58%	141	-40
Possession of drugs	950	240	25%	32%	305	-65
Possession of weapons offences	210	142	68%	53%	110	32
Public Order Offences	1,421	511	36%	23%	331	180
Miscellaneous crimes	639	329	51%	32%	202	127
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>1,323</b>	<b>38%</b>		<b>1,090</b>	<b>233</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>6,727</b>	<b>19%</b>		<b>5,144</b>	<b>1,583</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (formal)



What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (formal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of out-of-court (formal) outcomes for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's out-of-court (formal) outcomes divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in out-of-court (formal) outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	0%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	384	9%	5%	217	167
Violence without Injury	5,293	448	8%	4%	210	238
Violence against the person	9,477	832	9%		426	406
Rape	400	1	0%	0%	0	1
Other Sexual Offences	724	29	4%	2%	12	17
Sexual offences	1,124	30	3%		13	17
Robbery	124	1	1%	0%	0	1
Burglary	4,389	21	0%	0%	13	8
Vehicle offences	2,625	19	1%	0%	8	11
Theft from the Person	195	3	2%	0%	1	2
Bicycle Theft	459	1	0%	0%	2	-1
Shoplifting	3,484	389	11%	6%	216	173
Other Theft Offences	3,950	114	3%	1%	43	71
Theft offences	15,102	547	4%		282	265
Criminal damage	6,677	308	5%	3%	172	136
Arson	374	4	1%	1%	4	-0
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	312	4%		176	136
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>1,722</b>	<b>5%</b>		<b>898</b>	<b>824</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	79	33%	11%	28	51
Possession of drugs	950	275	29%	24%	226	49
Possession of weapons offences	210	35	17%	10%	21	14
Public Order Offences	1,421	244	17%	6%	87	157
Miscellaneous crimes	639	51	8%	4%	26	25
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>20%</b>		<b>387</b>	<b>297</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>2,406</b>	<b>7%</b>		<b>1,285</b>	<b>1,121</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Out-of-court (informal)



What proportion of offences result in out-of-court (informal) outcomes and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the charge rates for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's actual charges divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting charges/summons for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	0%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	462	11%	5%	215	247
Violence without Injury	5,293	468	9%	5%	240	228
Violence against the person	9,477	930	10%		456	474
Rape	400	0	0%	0%	0	-0
Other Sexual Offences	724	6	1%	1%	7	-1
Sexual offences	1,124	6	1%		7	-1
Robbery	124	0	0%	0%	0	-0
Burglary	4,389	35	1%	0%	11	24
Vehicle offences	2,625	31	1%	0%	6	25
Theft from the Person	195	6	3%	1%	1	5
Bicycle Theft	459	16	3%	1%	4	12
Shoplifting	3,484	451	13%	10%	333	118
Other Theft Offences	3,950	275	7%	2%	83	192
Theft offences	15,102	814	5%		439	375
Criminal damage	6,677	465	7%	4%	244	221
Arson	374	14	4%	2%	6	8
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	479	7%		250	229
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>2,229</b>	<b>7%</b>		<b>1,152</b>	<b>1,077</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	10	4%	1%	3	7
Possession of drugs	950	386	41%	33%	310	76
Possession of weapons offences	210	20	10%	4%	9	11
Public Order Offences	1,421	145	10%	5%	67	78
Miscellaneous crimes	639	20	3%	2%	15	5
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>17%</b>		<b>405</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>2,810</b>	<b>8%</b>		<b>1,558</b>	<b>1,252</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Suspect identified - no action taken



What proportion of offences have not had any action taken and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences of which a suspect has been identified but no action has been taken for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's offences of which no action has been taken divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in no action being taken for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	11%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	256	6%	50%	2,096	-1,840
Violence without Injury	5,293	383	7%	59%	3,110	-2,727
Violence against the person	9,477	639	7%		5,206	-4,567
Rape	400	5	1%	56%	222	-217
Other Sexual Offences	724	46	6%	48%	350	-304
Sexual offences	1,124	51	5%		573	-522
Robbery	124	1	1%	25%	30	-29
Burglary	4,389	34	1%	7%	317	-283
Vehicle offences	2,625	45	2%	5%	143	-98
Theft from the Person	195	1	1%	9%	18	-17
Bicycle Theft	459	3	1%	6%	28	-25
Shoplifting	3,484	108	3%	12%	407	-299
Other Theft Offences	3,950	75	2%	17%	665	-590
Theft offences	15,102	266	2%		1,578	-1,312
Criminal damage	6,677	168	3%	14%	952	-784
Arson	374	4	1%	12%	46	-42
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	172	2%		998	-826
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>8,384</b>	<b>-7,255</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	8	3%	10%	23	-15
Possession of drugs	950	21	2%	8%	71	-50
Possession of weapons offences	210	7	3%	23%	48	-41
Public Order Offences	1,421	40	3%	42%	602	-562
Miscellaneous crimes	639	30	5%	36%	229	-199
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>974</b>	<b>-868</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>1,235</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>9,339</b>	<b>-8,104</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham

## Offences and outcomes - Investigation complete – no suspect identified



What proportion of offences result in no suspect being identified and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences which have no suspect identified for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual % expected plot shows the force's offences which no suspect identified divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are resulting in non suspect being identified for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	2%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	1,853	44%	14%	597	1,256
Violence without Injury	5,293	2,895	55%	13%	675	2,220
Violence against the person	9,477	4,748	50%		1,273	3,475
Rape	400	126	32%	7%	27	99
Other Sexual Offences	724	347	48%	19%	136	211
Sexual offences	1,124	473	42%		163	310
Robbery	124	74	60%	50%	62	12
Burglary	4,389	3,763	86%	82%	3,596	167
Vehicle offences	2,625	2,182	83%	87%	2,284	-102
Theft from the Person	195	165	85%	84%	165	0
Bicycle Theft	459	399	87%	88%	403	-4
Shoplifting	3,484	831	24%	36%	1,268	-437
Other Theft Offences	3,950	3,099	78%	72%	2,848	251
Theft offences	15,102	10,439	69%		10,563	-124
Criminal damage	6,677	5,044	76%	69%	4,636	408
Arson	374	314	84%	74%	277	37
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	5,358	76%		4,913	445
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>21,092</b>	<b>64%</b>		<b>16,974</b>	<b>4,118</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	27	11%	5%	13	14
Possession of drugs	950	21	2%	1%	9	12
Possession of weapons offences	210	6	3%	6%	12	-6
Public Order Offences	1,421	452	32%	20%	278	174
Miscellaneous crimes	639	153	24%	15%	97	56
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>19%</b>		<b>408</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>21,751</b>	<b>60%</b>		<b>17,428</b>	<b>4,323</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham



## Offences and outcomes - Not yet assigned an outcome



What proportion of offences have not yet been assigned an outcome and how does this compare with the other forces?

These charts and tables show the rates of offences which have not yet been assigned an outcomes for all crime types compared with the MSG.

The actual percentage expected plot shows the force's offences which have not yet been assigned outcomes divided by the number the force would expect if it were performing in line with all forces for each crime type. For example, if the number of offences is above/below 100%, more/fewer offences are not yet being assigned outcomes for this force than the average.

	Offences	Outcomes	%	% E&W	Expected	Difference
Homicide	0	0	n/a	24%	0	0
Violence with Injury	4,184	187	4%	4%	169	18
Violence without Injury	5,293	88	2%	4%	234	-146
Violence against the person	9,477	275	3%		403	-128
Rape	400	232	58%	28%	113	119
Other Sexual Offences	724	206	28%	18%	127	79
Sexual offences	1,124	438	39%		240	198
Robbery	124	9	7%	6%	8	1
Burglary	4,389	66	2%	4%	154	-88
Vehicle offences	2,625	17	1%	2%	58	-41
Theft from the Person	195	4	2%	3%	5	-1
Bicycle Theft	459	3	1%	2%	7	-4
Shoplifting	3,484	38	1%	3%	102	-64
Other Theft Offences	3,950	88	2%	3%	136	-48
Theft offences	15,102	216	1%		462	-246
Criminal damage	6,677	28	0%	2%	153	-125
Arson	374	8	2%	4%	14	-6
Criminal damage & arson	7,051	36	1%		167	-131
<b>Victim-based crime</b>	<b>32,878</b>	<b>974</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>1,279</b>	<b>-305</b>
Trafficking of drugs	241	16	7%	14%	34	-18
Possession of drugs	950	6	1%	3%	28	-22
Possession of weapons offences	210	0	0%	5%	9	-9
Public Order Offences	1,421	29	2%	4%	55	-26
Miscellaneous crimes	639	53	8%	11%	69	-16
<b>Other crimes against society</b>	<b>3,461</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>195</b>	<b>-91</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,339</b>	<b>1,078</b>	<b>3%</b>		<b>1,464</b>	<b>-386</b>

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016



Durham

## **HMIC Value for Money Profile 2016 - Annexes 1 - 4**

	page
<b>Annex 1 - Crime codes</b>	87
<b>Annex 2 - Outcome types</b>	91
<b>Annex 3 - POA categories</b>	93
<b>Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories</b>	94

## Annex 1 - Crime Codes

Offences included in each category

### 1. Victim-based crime

#### 1.1. Violence against the person

##### 1.1.1. Homicide

1 Murder

4.1 Manslaughter

4.10 Corporate manslaughter

4.2 Infanticide

##### 1.1.2. Violence with injury

2 Attempted murder

4.3 Intentional destruction of a viable unborn child

4.4 Causing death by dangerous driving

4.6 Causing death by careless driving under influence of drink or drugs

4.7 Causing or allowing death of child or vulnerable person

4.8 Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving

4.9 Causing death or serious injury by driving: unlicensed drivers etc.

5A Wounding or carrying out an act endangering life (outcomes only)

5B Use of substance or object to endanger life (outcomes only)

5C Possession of items to endanger life(outcomes only)

5D Assault with intent to cause serious harm

5E Endangering life

6 Endangering railway passengers (outcomes only)

7 Endangering life at sea (outcomes only)

8F Inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)

8G Actually bodily harm and other injury(outcomes only)

8H Racially or religiously aggravated inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent (outcomes only)

8J Racially or religiously aggravated actual bodily harm and other injury (outcomes only)

8K Poisoning or female genital mutilation (outcomes only)

8N Assault with injury

8P Racially or religiously aggravated assault with injury

37.1 Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking

##### 1.1.3. Violence without injury

3A Conspiracy to murder

3B Threats to kill

8L Harassment

8M Racially or religiously aggravated harassment

8Q Stalking

11 Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)

11A Cruelty to children/young persons

12 Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)

13 Child abduction

14 Procuring illegal abortion

36 Kidnapping

104 Assault without injury on a constable

105A Assault without injury

105B Racially or religiously aggravated assault without injury

106 Modern slavery

### 1.2. Sexual offences

#### 1.2.1. Rape

19C Rape of a female aged 16 and over

19D Rape of a female child under 16

19E Rape of a female child under 13

19F Rape of a male aged 16 and over

19G Rape of a male child under 16

19H Rape of a male child under 13

(cont.)

1.2.2. Other sexual offences			
17A	Sexual assault on a male aged 13 and over	70	Sexual activity etc with a person with a mental disorder
17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13	71	Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
20A	Sexual assault on a female aged 13 and over	72	Trafficking for sexual exploitation
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13	73	Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13	88A	Sexual grooming
22A	Causing sexual activity without consent	88C	Other miscellaneous sexual offences
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16	88D	Unnatural sexual offences
23	Incest or familial sexual offences	88E	Exposure and voyeurism
1.3. Robbery			
1.3.1 Robbery of business property			
34A	Robbery of business property		
1.3.2 Robbery of personal property			
34B	Robbery of personal property		
1.4. Theft offences			
1.4.1. Burglary			
1.4.1.1. Domestic burglary			
28A	Burglary in a dwelling	28D	Attempted distraction burglary in a dwelling
28B	Attempted burglary in a dwelling	29	Aggravated burglary in a dwelling
28C	Distraction burglary in a dwelling		
1.4.1.2 Non-domestic burglary			
30A	Burglary in a building other than a dwelling	31	Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling
30B	Attempted burglary in a building other than a dwelling		
1.4.2. Vehicle offences			
126	Interfering with a motor vehicle	45	Theft from vehicle
37.2	Aggravated vehicle taking	48	Theft or unauthorised taking of motor vehicle
1.4.3. Theft from the person			
39	Theft from the person		
1.4.4. Bicycle theft			
44	Theft or unauthorised taking of a pedal cycle		
1.4.5. Shoplifting			
46	Shoplifting		
1.4.6. Other theft offences			
35	Blackmail	43	Dishonest use of electricity
40	Theft in a dwelling other than from an automatic machine or meter	47	Theft from automatic machine or meter
41	Theft by an employee	49	Other theft
42	Theft of mail	49A	Making off without payment

(cont.)

## 1.5. Criminal damage and arson

### 1.5.1. Criminal damage

- 58A Criminal damage to a dwelling
- 58B Criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling
- 58C Criminal damage to a vehicle
- 58D Other criminal damage
- 58E Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a dwelling (outcomes only)

- 58F Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a building other than a dwelling (outcomes only)
- 58G Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage to a vehicle (outcomes only)
- 58H Racially or religiously aggravated other criminal damage (outcomes only)
- 58J Racially or religiously aggravated criminal damage

### 1.5.2. Arson

- 56A Arson endangering life

- 56B Arson not endangering life

## 2. Other crimes against society

### 2.1. Drug offences

#### 2.1.1. Trafficking of drugs

- 92A Trafficking in controlled drugs

#### 2.1.2. Possession of drugs

- 92C Other drug offences
- 92D Possession of controlled drugs (excl. Cannabis)

- 92E Possession of controlled drugs (Cannabis)

### 2.2. Possession of weapons offences

- 10A Possession of firearms with intent
- 10B Possession of firearms offences
- 10C Possession of other weapons

- 10D Possession of article with blade or point
- 81 Other firearms offences
- 90 Other knives offences

### 2.3. Public order offences

- 9A Public fear, alarm or distress
- 9B Racially or religiously aggravated public fear, alarm or distress
- 62 Treason (outcomes only)
- 62A Violent disorder

- 63 Treason felony (outcomes only)
- 64 Riot (outcomes only)
- 65 Violent disorder (outcomes only)
- 66 Other offences against the State or public order

### 2.4. Miscellaneous crimes

- 15 Concealing an infant death close to birth
- 24 Exploitation of prostitution
- 26 Bigamy
- 27 Soliciting for the purposes of prostitution
- 33 Going equipped for stealing, etc
- 33A Making, supplying or possessing articles for use in fraud
- 38 Profiting from or concealing knowledge of the proceeds of crime
- 53H Making or supplying articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)
- 53J Possession of articles for use in fraud (outcomes only)
- 54 Handling stolen goods
- 59 Threat or possession with intent to commit criminal damage
- 60 Forgery or use of false drug prescription
- 61 Other forgery
- 61A Possession of false documents
- 67 Perjury
- 68 Libel (outcomes only)
- 69 Offender Management Act offences
- 75 Betting, gaming and lotteries (outcomes only)

- 76 Aiding suicide
- 78 Immigration Acts (outcomes only)
- 79 Perverting the course of justice
- 80 Absconding from lawful custody
- 802 Dangerous driving
- 814 Fraud, forgery etc associated with vehicle or driver records
- 82 Customs and Revenue offences (outcomes only)
- 83 Bail offences
- 84 Trade descriptions etc (outcomes only)
- 85 Health and Safety offences (outcomes only)
- 86 Obscene publications etc
- 87 Protection from eviction (outcomes only)
- 89 Adulteration of food (outcomes only)
- 91 Public health offences (outcomes only)
- 94 Planning laws (outcomes only)
- 95 Disclosure, obstruction, false or misleading statements etc
- 96 Wildlife
- 99 Other notifiable offences

(cont.)

### 3. Fraud offences

51	Fraud by company director (outcomes only)	53D	Fraud by false representation: other frauds (outcomes only)
52	False accounting (outcomes only)	53E	Fraud by failing to disclose information (outcomes only)
53B	Preserved other fraud and repealed fraud offences (pre Fraud Act 2006) (outcomes only)	53F	Fraud by abuse of position (outcomes only)
53C	Fraud by false representation: cheque, plastic card and online bank accounts (not PSP) (outcomes only)	55	Bankruptcy and insolvency (outcomes only)

\* At March 2013 ONS publication crime code 53B was categorised under fraud offences.

## Crime committed against children

Offences included in each category

Crime against children

Rape

19D	Rape of a female child under 16
19E	Rape of a female child under 13
19G	Rape of a male child under 16
19H	Rape of a male child under 13

Sexual offences / abuse

17B	Sexual assault on a male child under 13
20B	Sexual assault on a female child under 13
21	Sexual activity involving a child under 13
22B	Sexual activity involving child under 16
71	Abuse of children through sexual exploitation
73	Abuse of position of trust of a sexual nature
88A	Sexual grooming

Cruelty / other

11	Cruelty to and neglect of children (outcomes only)
11A	Cruelty to children/young persons
4.3	Intentional destruction of a viable unborn child
4.7	Causing or allowing death of child or vulnerable person
12	Abandoning child under two years (outcomes only)
13	Child abduction
15	Concealing an infant death close to birth

Other offences against children not included

(It is not possible to distinguish between adult and child victims within these crime types.)

23	Incest or familial sexual offences
86	Obscene publications etc
99	Other notifiable offences

## Annex 2 - Outcome Types

Outcome group / type	
1	<b>Charged/Summonsed</b>
4	<b>Taken into consideration</b>
	<b>Out-of-court (formal)</b>
2	Caution - youths
3	Caution - adults
6	Penalty Notices for Disorder
	<b>Out-of-court (informal)</b>
7	Cannabis/Khat warning
8	Community resolution
<b>Prosecution prevented or not in the public interest</b>	
5	Offender died
9	Not in public interest (CPS)
10	Not in public interest (Police)
11	Prosecution prevented – suspect under age
12	Prosecution prevented – suspect too ill
13	Prosecution prevented – victim/key witness dead/too ill
17	Prosecution time limit expired
15	<b>Evidential difficulties (suspect identified; victim supports action)</b>
	<b>Evidential difficulties (victim does not support action)</b>
14	Evidential difficulties: suspect not identified; victim does not support further action
16	Evidential difficulties: suspect identified; victim does not support further action
18	<b>Investigation complete - no suspect identified</b>
20	<b>Action undertaken by another body/agency</b>

Outcomes 20 (action undertaken by another body/agency) and 21 (further investigation to support formal action not in the public interest) have been excluded.

Source: Home Office Crime Outcome Statistics for year ending March 2016, as published October 2016

### Outcome Types

<b>Outcome 1</b>	Charge / Summons: A person has been charged or summonsed for the crime (irrespective of any subsequent acquittal at Court).
<b>Outcome 2</b>	Caution – youths: A youth offender has been cautioned by the police.
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Caution – adults: An adult offender has been cautioned by the police.
<b>Outcome 4</b>	Taken into Consideration (TIC): The offender admits the crime by way of a formal police interview and asks for it to be taken into consideration by the court. There must be an interview where the suspect has made a clear and reliable admission of the offence and which is corroborated with additional verifiable auditable information connecting the suspect to the crime.
<b>Outcome 5</b>	Offender died: The offender has died before proceeding could be initiated.

(cont.)

<b>Outcome 6</b>	Penalty Notices for Disorder: A Penalty Notice for Disorder (or other relevant notifiable offence) has been lawfully issued under Section 1 – 11 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001.
<b>Outcome 7</b>	Cannabis/Khat Warning: A warning for cannabis or khat possession has been issued in accordance with College of Policing guidance. Note: Khat warnings were introduced from 24 June 2014 and numbers are likely to be small.
<b>Outcome 8</b>	Community Resolution: A Community Resolution (with or without formal (Restorative Justice) has been applied in accordance with College of Policing guidance.
<b>Outcome 9</b>	Not in public interest (CPS): Prosecution not in the public interest (CPS decision). The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) by virtue of their powers under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 decides not to prosecute or authorise any other formal action.
<b>Outcome 10</b>	Not in public interest (Police) (from April 2014): Formal action against the offender is not in the public interest (Police decision).
<b>Outcome 11</b>	Prosecution prevented – suspect under age (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – named suspect identified but is below the age of criminal responsibility.
<b>Outcome 12</b>	Prosecution prevented – suspect too ill (from April 2014): Prosecution prevented – Named suspect identified but is too ill (physical or mental health) to prosecute.
<b>Outcome 13</b>	Prosecution prevented – victim/key witness dead/too ill (from April 2014): Named suspect identified but victim or key witness is dead or too ill to give evidence.
<b>Outcome 14</b>	Evidential difficulties: suspect not identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect not identified. The crime is confirmed but the victim declines or is unable to support further police action to identify the offender.
<b>Outcome 15</b>	Evidential difficulties (suspect identified; victim supports action) (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties named suspect identified – the crime is confirmed and the victim supports police action but evidential difficulties prevent further action. This includes cases where the suspect has been identified, the victim supports action, the suspect has been circulated as wanted but cannot be traced and the crime is finalised pending further action.
<b>Outcome 16</b>	Evidential difficulties: suspect identified; victim does not support further action (from April 2014): Evidential difficulties victim based – named suspect identified. The victim does not support (or has withdrawn support from) police action.
<b>Outcome 17</b>	Prosecution time limit expired (from April 2014): Suspect identified but prosecution time limit has expired (from April 2014).
<b>Outcome 18</b>	Investigation complete –no suspect identified (from April 2014): The crime has been investigated as far as reasonably possible – case closed pending further investigative opportunities becoming available.
<b>Outcome 19</b>	National Fraud Intelligence Bureau filed (NFIB only) (from April 2014): A crime of fraud has been recorded but has not been allocated for investigation because the assessment process at the NFIB has determined there are insufficient lines of enquiry to warrant such dissemination.
<b>Outcome 20</b>	Action undertaken by another body/agency (from April 2015): Further action resulting from the crime report will be undertaken by another body or agency other than the police, subject to the victim (or person acting on their behalf) being made aware of the action being taken. Note: during 2014/15 (and therefore in this publication), these were included within outcome 18.
<b>Outcome 21</b>	Not in the public interest – suspect identified (from January 2016) Further investigation resulting from the crime report that could provide evidence sufficient to support formal action being taken against the suspect is not in the public interest – police decision.



### Annex 3 – POA Categories

POA data are split into 12 categories, which sub-divide into headings as follows:

POA estimates are used for all cost and workforce data unless stated otherwise. These data are taken

- a. Neighbourhood policing
  - b. Incident (response) management
  - c. Local investigation \*
  - d. Specialist community liaison
  - e. Local policing command team and support overheads
- 2) Dealing with the public
- a. Front desk
  - b. Central communications unit
  - c. Dealing with the public command team and support overheads
- 3) Criminal justice arrangements
- a. Custody (*now include other custody costs*)
  - b. Police doctors/nurses and surgeons
  - c. Interpreters and translators
  - d. Criminal justice
  - e. Police national computer
  - f. Criminal record bureau
  - g. Coroner assistance
  - h. Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
  - i. Property officer / stores
  - j. Criminal justice arrangements command team and support overheads
- 4) Road policing
- a. Traffic units
  - b. Traffic wardens / police community support officers - traffic
  - c. Vehicle recovery
  - d. Casualty reduction partnership
  - e. Road policing command team and support overheads
- 9) National policing
- a. Secondments (out of force)
  - b. Counter terrorism / special branch
  - c. NPCC projects / initiatives
  - d. Hosting national services
  - e. Other national policing requirements
- 10) Support functions
- a. Human resources
  - b. Finance
  - c. Legal
  - d. Fleet services
  - e. Estates / central building costs
  - f. Information communication technology
  - g. Professional standards
  - h. Press and media
  - i. Performance review / corporate development
  - j. Procurement
  - k. Training
  - l. Administration support
  - m. Force command
  - n. Support to associations and trade unions
  - o. Social club support and force band
  - p. Insurance / risk management
  - q. Catering
- 5) Operational support
- a. Operational Support Command Team and Support Overheads
  - b. Air operations
  - c. Mounted police
  - d. Specialist terrain
  - e. Dogs section
  - f. Advanced public order
  - g. Airport and ports policing unit
  - h. Firearms unit
  - i. Civil Contingencies
  - j. Event
- 6) Intelligence
- a. Intelligence command team and support overheads
  - b. Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
  - c. Intelligence gathering
- 7) Investigations
- a. Investigations command team and support overheads
  - b. Major investigation unit
  - c. Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
  - d. Specialist investigation units
  - e. Serious and organised crime unit
  - f. Local investigation/ prisoner processing\*
  - g. Cyber crime
- 8) Investigative support
- a. Scenes of crime officers
  - b. External forensic costs
  - c. Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
  - d. Photographic image recovery
  - e. Other forensic services
  - f. Investigative support command team and support overheads
- 11) Police & Crime Commissioner
- a. Cost of the democratic process
  - b. Office of Police Crime Commissioner
  - c. Share of any Formal Shared Service Arrangement
  - d. Commissioned services
- 12) Central costs
- a. Revenue contribution to capital
  - b. Capital financing
  - c. Pensions and exit costs
- 13) Public protection (*previously 7f*)
- a. Witness protection
  - b. Child protection
  - c. Adult protection

\* Local investigation is included under local policing rather than investigations

## Annex 4 - Coding of POA categories

### Local policing

- V Neighbourhood policing
- V Incident (response) management
- V Specialist community liaison
- V Local command team and support overheads

### Dealing with the public

- F Local call centres / front desk
- F Central communications unit
- F Contact management units
- F Command team and support overheads

### Road policing

- V Traffic units
- V Traffic wardens / PCSOs - traffic
- F Vehicle recovery
- F Casualty reduction partnership
- F Command team and support overheads

### Operational support

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Air operations
- V Mounted police
- F Specialist terrain
- V Dogs section
- F Advanced public order
- F Airports and ports policing unit
- V Firearms unit
- O Civil contingencies
- V Events

### Intelligence

- O Command team and support overheads
- O Intelligence analysis / threat assessments
- F Intelligence gathering

### Public protection

- F Witness protection
- F Child protection
- F Adult protection

### Investigations

- F Command team and support overheads
- F Major investigations unit
- F Economic crime (including regional asset recovery team)
- F Specialist investigation units
- F Serious and organised crime unit
- F Local investigation/ prisoner processing\*
- F Cyber crime

### Investigative support

- F Scenes of crime officers
- O External forensic costs
- O Fingerprint / internal forensic costs
- O Photographic image recovery
- O Other forensic services
- O Command team and support overheads

### Criminal justice arrangements

- F Custody
- F Police doctors / nurses and surgeons
- F Interpreters and translators
- F Other custody costs
- O Criminal justice
- O Police national computer
- O Criminal records bureau
- O Coroner assistance
- O Fixed penalty schemes (central ticket office)
- B Property officer / stores
- O Command team and support overheads

### Support functions

- B Human resources
- B Finance
- B Legal services
- B Fleet services
- B Estates / central building costs
- B Information communication technology
- O Professional standards
- B Press and media
- B Performance review / corporate development
- B Procurement
- B Training
- B Administration support
- O Force command
- B Support to associations and trade unions
- B Social club support and force band
- B Insurance / risk management
- B Catering

### Police and Crime Commissioner

- X Cost of police crime commissioner
- X Office of police crime commissioner
- X Other costs

### Central costs

- X Revenue contribution to capital
- X Capital financing
- X Pensions and exit costs

### National policing

- X Secondments (out of force)
- X Counter terrorism / special branch
- X ACPO projects / initiatives
- X Hosting national services
- X Other national policing requirements

V = Visible operational front line  
 F = Non-visible front line  
 O = Frontline support  
 B = Business support  
 X = Excluded (not coded)

\* Local investigation is included here under local policing rather than investigations

## Outliers

This page provides the areas in which the force is an outlier in costs. The force's figures are compared to the spend of other forces. To be flagged as an outlier, the spend must be one of the highest 10% or lowest 10% of any force and the effect of the difference is greater than £1 per head of population. The difference (Diff) calculations are the net cost of the difference in spend to the average per head of all forces.

	£m	£/head	Avg	Diff £m
<b>OVERALL COSTS</b>				
<b>Staffing</b>	<b>FTE (POA)</b>	<b>FTE/1000</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>
Police staff	839.0	1.3	1.1	4.2
<b>Pay</b>		<b>£000/FTE</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>
Police staff		30.8	35.2	-3.7
PCSOs		26.9	31.7	-0.8
<b>Non Staff Costs</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>% staff cost</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>
Restructure, training and conference	1.5	1.6	0.6	0.9
<b>COSTS BY OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£/head</b>	<b>Avg</b>	<b>Diff £m</b>
<b>NRE by objective group</b>				
Operational support	2.5	4.0	7.2	-1.9
<b>Criminal justice</b>				
Criminal justice	3.0	4.8	2.6	1.4
<b>Road policing</b>				
Traffic Units	3.9	6.2	4.3	0.8
<b>Operational support</b>				
Firearms unit	0.8	1.3	3.3	-1.2
<b>Investigations</b>				
Serious and organised crime unit	0.7	1.1	2.3	-0.8