

## Speech to Police Federation annual conference 2016

### Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary Sir Thomas Winsor

18 May 2016

Good morning, and thank you for the compliment of your invitation, and for the courtesy of your attention.

I've been asked to talk to you today about HMIC's annual all-force inspection programme, and I will.

But before I do that, I'd like to give you some reflections. I've just passed the half-way mark of my term of office as chief inspector of constabulary, and, as we all do in every new job, there are things we learn and perspectives we establish which we didn't have at the beginning.

Yesterday, the Home Secretary was asked in the Q&A session what was the most significant thing she had learned in her six years in the job.

At my half-way point, I thought I might share with you one or two of my own reflections.

The thing I'd like to say more than anything is the enormous respect and admiration I have for rank and file police officers and the work they do every day.

This has intensified as I have led HMIC in its work examining how the police do what they do, the can-do culture which impels police officers to get the work done despite the obstacles and frustrations thrown in their way by mis-management by senior ranks, financial limitations and the failures – sometimes chronic and persistent failures – of other public services who know the police will never say no.

But above all, it's through the personal bravery of officers, the fact that every day they go out to face dangers which they can barely anticipate - an angry man with a knife, hardened and ruthless criminals who think nothing of seriously assaulting or endangering or taking the life of a police officer, a person with severe mental illness, or a reckless boy behind the wheel of a powerful vehicle. And the dangers of someone who would throw acid in an officer's face, or attack an officer with an axe.

I attended the funeral in Liverpool of PC Dave Phillips. That was perhaps the most moving and sadly emotional experience of my life, seeing the dignity in profound

grief of his young family, and the many hundreds of police officers from all over the country turned out in number one dress uniforms, marching in perfect formation behind chief constable Sir Jon Murphy, following the hearse sombrelly carrying PC Phillips' body.

As I sat with thousands of police officers and others in that cathedral, listening to the music and the tributes and eulogies to a husband, father, brother and son only 34 years old, whose life was taken so suddenly, so violently, in the line of duty, I reflected on that sacrifice, and on the risks which every police officer willingly takes daily, to protect his and her fellow citizens and bring offenders to justice. And I reflected on the price which some police officers pay, and the price paid by their families and friends every day for the rest of their lives.

Dave Phillips' daughters will grow up without their father; they will be proud of him and his service as a police officer, but their loss is permanent and of the most profound. They will miss him every day, and their life milestones will be passed with his memory, but not with his presence, without all that a father can provide to them and their mother.

Every police officer facing the public takes that risk, and so do their families. That is something which everyone involved in policing needs to keep front and centre in their minds as policy is developed and judgments are made.

And police officers' commitment to public service, to protecting people and communities against some of the most violent, dangerous and corrosive forces in our society, is immense.

I knew these things when I took this job, but my knowledge of them, and my respect and appreciation of these men and women, has increased and intensified very considerably as I have been immersed in the work which HMIC does all over the country.

The public know only part of the debt which they owe to police officers, to men and women like PC Dave Phillips, and to their families and friends who live with the consequences daily. That debt is immense.

Now I will turn to the PEEL programme, and bear in mind if you would that this is an approach to public interest inspection of the police which has as one of its principal objectives making the work of front-line police officers more productive, removing as far as possible the obstacles and frustrations with which your members contend every day.

As you know, PEEL stands for police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy.

It's HMIC's annual all-force inspection programme - examining core policing in every force, every year.

That's what HMIC does - assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the police - and report on it. Yesterday, your chairman Steve White said the police service is crying out for reform to make it more efficient. Well, that's what we're about too.

The PEEL programme is the most radical change and enlargement of HMIC's work probably in its entire history (and that goes back to 1856). We've done it for two years now, and the first full assessment was published in February this year. It rates every force against the three measures of efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy; and by legitimacy we mean how well the police treat people. It rates them according to the four measures – the same ones OFSTED uses – as outstanding, good, requiring improvement and inadequate. So that's 129 judgments - three for each of 43 forces. And they're used by police forces, police and crime commissioners and others to establish best practice and – we hope – bring all forces up to the standard of the best.

I am often startled at how we are asked in police forces: how is it done elsewhere? In fact, we publish it, and of course the College of Policing is doing so much good work in that respect too.

Together with our joint inspection work with the other criminal justice inspectorates for prosecution, prisons and probation, and OFSTED and the Care Quality Commission, and with the thematic inspections we did in matters such as child abuse and sexual exploitation, firearms, stop and search, digital policing, the National Crime Agency, honour-based violence and other crimes against women and girls, custody and so much else, PEEL is what we do most. In all, last year we published 566 reports. And that's a lot.

But PEEL is our base load work; it's what we do most, and it's critical.

But we have to improve how this is done, and so I'd like to tell you about a technique – an instrument - which we're designing.

As many of you know, I used to be an economic regulator. And there are things from the world of economic regulation which I believe can and should be adapted and applied to the police. Please let me explain.

The principles and techniques of economic regulation are applied mainly to safety-critical, essential, asset-intensive monopoly public services. The main ones are energy, telecommunications, water and transport. In each case, the organisations which run those essential services – and especially the networks at the heart of them – have significant obligations to operate those networks as efficiently and effectively as possible in the public interest. People, other public services and businesses depend on them; they can't be allowed to fall over, to be neglected, to get into a condition where they cannot provide essential services to the public.

And so each of them, every year, has to produce and publish a management statement – called a network management statement – which assures everyone that

all is well, and that they're planning properly for the future, to meet all reasonable demands for their services, safely, reliably and efficiently.

The police are the most important safety-critical, essential, asset-intensive, monopoly public service. They're the most important because they're concerned with public safety, without which the economy and society would collapse. And policing affects everyone.

Every well-managed enterprise needs certain information to ensure that it is functioning as well as it can, and that it will be ready and able to do so with the demands of the future.

It needs three things:

- it needs a sound understanding of the nature and volume of the demand it faces today and will face in the years to come;
- it needs to know what its resources – its income – are going to be;
- and it needs to know about the assets it has and will have to meet that future demand.

And in the case of its assets, it needs to know what are their condition, capacity, capability, serviceability, performance and security of supply.

And in the case of the regulated industries, these network management statements need to look forward quite a number of years; in the case of water and transport, it's ten years; in the case of energy, it's seven years.

Now why, you might ask, should the police – the most important safety-critical, essential, asset-intensive, monopoly public service – not do what is done – must be done – in the case of those others?

My answer is that it should.

But policing is a great deal more complicated than energy, water, telecommunications and transport. They're complicated enough, but policing is more complicated.

And that is for three principal reasons:

- what the police do – the variety of things they have to do – is complex;
- measuring demand for policing – future demand in particular – is hard to do; not impossible, but hard;
- the assets of the police are the most complex of all, because they're people, predominantly people. You have some cars, and police stations, and ICT which sometimes works, but mainly they're people.

So this isn't particularly easy to do, but is it worth doing? I think it is.

It is, because we need every police force to know all these things, and to a high standard.

That's not to say police forces do not know a lot of this already, but I suggest none knows it all, and none knows it all to the necessary standard. And yet they need to.

Let me take demand first. It is often said that demand for the police is falling. Well, that depends what you measure and how you measure it. The Crime Survey of England and Wales doesn't measure crimes against businesses. Police-recorded crime is about what the police are told or find out (and of course there have been difficulties about the accuracy of those figures – see HMIC's report of October 2014).

But these measures are about crime. They take no account of the other demands on the time of the police, and get the police face many, many non-crime demands. Surely a well-managed enterprise that is expected to meet that demand should measure and plan for all demand, not just some demand. And I am talking about latent demand, not just patent demand.

That's demand.

Then I turn to the assets. Of course the police have non-human assets – cars, ICT, police premises and so on. But the greatest part are people.

So coming back to the asset measures I mentioned, what would that mean in the case of a police officer or a member of police staff? I mentioned their condition, capacity, capability, serviceability, performance and security of supply.

Condition – matters such as physical fitness and impairments, professional attainments, seniority; and I'd also mention the stress which officers and staff face, and – as you've been discussing this morning – their mental wellbeing as well as their physical condition.

Capacity – what amounts of work is it reasonable to expect a police officer to do?

Capability – what it is police officers can do – their skills, for example response, investigation, roads policing, public order, firearms, neighbourhoods, intelligence and so on and on – and the extent to which those skills are needed in the future, to tackle the demands of the future, for example in relation to crimes against vulnerable people including children, cyber-crime and all the other things that may come along. Policing can't stand still; everyone knows that. But is it planning properly for the demands of the future, the changing nature of crime, the changing public priorities in relation to crime?

Serviceability – what does it take to look after police officers and other assets – their wellbeing – in time, effort and money, to ensure they're in their best practicable condition and operate at their best – for example, their training and professional

development, improvements in skills and resilience, and improvements in supervision and leadership?

Performance – how well do they perform; what measure of productivity can reasonably be expected from police officers?

Security of supply – is there enough resilience in the workforce to deal with peaks in demand?

All this is being designed now. And we call these instruments force management statements. You can read more about them on page 64 onwards of HMIC's annual State of Policing report for 2015. It's on HMIC's website.

This design work is not something which HMIC can do alone.

In view of the fact that these things concern your members – predominantly your members – I wish now to extend an invitation to the Police Federation of England and Wales to play a full part in the design of force management statements. I am especially interested to have the Federation's involvement in the work on wellbeing, condition, capability, serviceability and performance, but your contribution on everything will be welcome. I hope that invitation will be accepted.

There is much else I could say about the PEEL programme and the work we're doing, through inspections, to secure improvements in policing.

We very much wish to have your continued support in what we are doing in this and all other respects.

The beneficiaries of the work of HMIC are predominantly the public and the police, especially the rank and file officers you have the privilege to represent.