

**T R I B A L**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**Comprehensive Spending Review  
peer review report**

**Home Affairs**

**26 August 2010**

**States of Jersey**

**Contact Address**

**87-91 Newman Street, London, W1T 3EY**  
**T: +44 (0) 207 323 7100, F: +44 (0) 207 323 7210**

*This report is for the benefit of States of Jersey only and has been released to States of Jersey on the basis that it shall not be copied, referred to or disclosed, in whole or in part, without our prior written consent. We have not verified the reliability or accuracy of any information obtained from third parties in the course of our work. Any party that obtains access to this Report or a copy (under Freedom of Information Act 2000 or otherwise) and chooses to rely on this Report (or any part of it) does so at their own risk. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Tribal do not assume any responsibility and will not accept any responsibility in respect of this Report to any party other than the original addressee. Clients should note that Tribal are not tax advisers, financial advisers or lawyers and do not assume any responsibility or accept any liability for any tax, financial or legal advice that may be given by or on behalf of Tribal. If such advice is required, advice from a relevant professional adviser should be sought.*

*Tribal Consulting Limited. Registered office: 87-91 Newman Street, London W1T 3EY. Company registered in England and Wales No. 4268468.*

---

# Contents

1. Police peer review: Executive summary.....	2
2. Police peer review: overall findings.....	3
3. Police peer review: Major review of the law enforcement and public protection services .....	28
4. Police peer review: Additional opportunities.....	32
5. Police peer review: Recommendations .....	33
6. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: overall findings .....	35
7. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: Additional opportunities .....	42
8. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: Recommendations .....	49
9. Jersey Prison peer review: Overall findings .....	52
10. Jersey Prison peer review: Additional Opportunities.....	54
11. Jersey Prison peer review: Recommendations .....	58

# 1

## Police

The following section contains the findings from our peer review of the States of Jersey Police's CSR proposals

# 1. Police peer review: Executive summary

The States of Jersey Police and Home Affairs have arrived at a series of sensible and reasonable savings proposals that, in our opinion, could deliver the targeted CSR savings for the SOJP.

These proposals are comprised of three elements:

- Part 1 (2011) savings
- Part 2 (2012) savings
- A proposed major review into law enforcement to delivered savings in 2013

The proposed savings are as follows:

Description	Savings proposed		
	2011	2012	2013
Part 1 savings	£481,000		
Part 2 savings – evaluated		£332,000	
Part 2 savings – indicative		£315,000	
Major review into law enforcement			£1,118,000
<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>£481,000</b>	<b>£647,000</b>	<b>£1,178,000</b>
<b>Total (% of 2010 budget<sup>1</sup>)</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>

The initial stage of the CSR process was characterised by some miscommunications between SOJP, Home Affairs and the CSR team and was not helped by the lack of oversight, due to the late establishment of the steering group. However, all parties have worked tremendously hard over the last month to ensure that the proposals are realistic and will deliver targeted savings that will minimise the impact on operational policing.

This peer review has made recommendations on how the major review could be conducted, including our view on the objective, core principles, delivery plan and delivery team. Our proposed objective for the review is:

*To increase the capacity, capability and resilience of Jersey's law enforcement and public protection service, enabling it to maintain delivered outcomes whilst operating with a significantly reduced budget from 2013.*

We have identified a small selection of other potential opportunities for savings, but understand that most of these are covered by other major reviews being conducted in the CSR.

We would finally note our real concern at the imminent departure of the current Chief of Police. Under his recent command, SOJP has shown a proactive approach to identifying performance improvement and cost reduction opportunities. Anecdotally, all parties we spoke to have reported that he has made considerable improvements in the culture of the organisation and its relationship with partner agencies. We are confident that under his guidance the SOJP would successfully deliver the savings proposed.

<sup>1</sup> The 2010 budget for SOJP is £23,075,000

## 2. Police peer review: overall findings

The CSR activities undertaken by the States of Jersey Police (SOJP) and Home Affairs have arrived at a series of sensible and reasonable savings proposals that will deliver 50% of the targeted CSR savings for the SOJP. The remaining 50% of the targeted savings should be delivered through a major review into law enforcement that is detailed later in this peer review.

All parties are to be commended for their considerable efforts in identifying these savings, especially over the last few weeks, once some initial issues in the CSR process had been resolved.

### 2.1. Introduction

The States of Jersey initiated a CSR which will analyse all areas of States spending to identify ways to save money, to understand the implications of any proposed savings and also to target improvements.<sup>2</sup>

Within the CSR a number of major reviews have been undertaken, one of which was to be conducted by SOJP. Following further scoping, it was agreed that the single SOJP major review would be divided into two separate reviews, namely:

- Modernisation of law enforcement and policing<sup>3</sup>
- Elimination of duplication between Customs and Police

The terms of reference for these reviews is provided in the next section.

Tribal have been engaged to peer review the outputs of these two reviews with the aims of this peer review being to assess and challenge:

- The rigour of the process;
- The detailed work programme;
- The potential to deliver efficiencies and improve effectiveness of service in accordance with the overall scope and objectives;
- The appropriateness of outcomes.

Given the tight timescales in which this review has been conducted, it was agreed with the CSR team that as part of the engagement principles for this peer review, Tribal would attend the Home Affairs steering groups in August 2010 during which progress towards the terms of reference would be reviewed and follow up actions would be recorded. Tribal were asked to prepare and present progress reports at this steering group.

---

<sup>2</sup> CSR Terms of reference

<sup>3</sup> In Section 1.3 further comment is made on the title of this review

In addition to the conducting a peer review on the SOJP major reviews, Tribal have agreed to also peer review the whole range of Part 2 CSR proposals.

## 2.2. Terms of reference for the major review

As previously noted, the major review to be conducted by SOJP was split into two separate reviews. The terms of reference for these reviews were as follows.

### 2.2.1. Modernisation of law enforcement and policing

**The objective of the review is to ensure that the organisation and processes supporting law enforcement in Jersey are efficient, effective and whilst compare with best practice elsewhere, are the best fit for Jersey.**

The review will encompass work already identified by the States of Jersey Police and includes:

- Re-visiting and implementing the findings of the internal organisation structure of the Police Service and resource allocation review completed in 2009
- Identifying the long term resource requirements necessary to meet the demands of policing Jersey
- Increasing operational capacity of the Police by streamlining and rationalising current work practices
- Examining opportunities presented by workforce modernisation ensuring the workforce mix of police officers and staff is efficient, effective and sustainable
- Developing a human resources strategy designed to maintain a motivated and flexible workforce, equipped with the right mix of skills to deliver a truly professional policing service
- Identifying opportunities for support partnership working across the public sector (including the Parishes) to help ensure corporate efficiency across the States and greatest impact on community safety
- Reviewing offender management and the needs of victims and witnesses
- Reviewing capacity to identify, assess and manage strategic and operational risks
- Re-assessing/re-affirming long-term accommodation requirements prior to the finalization of any redevelopment plans, which should also take into account any related recommendation from Part (ii) – ‘Eliminate duplication between Customs and Police’ and 1.2 (Joint control room)

It should be noted that much of this terms of reference was taken from the SOJP Policing Plan 2010 (‘Making Jersey Safer’).

### 2.2.2. Eliminate duplication in Police and Customs

Review the law enforcement elements of the Customs and Immigration Service and the Police Service to assess any opportunities to avoid duplication of effort or resources and streamline processes, particularly with regard to intelligence and border control.

### 2.2.3. Major review timescales

The terms of reference stated that the timescales for these major reviews were as follows:

*“These reviews will be expected to deliver initial recommendations by the end of August 2010. In particular assessment of any savings, invest to save or growth implications will need to be identified in time for the Part 2 (2012/2013) Business Plan submissions (end of August).”*

## 2.3. The approach undertaken for the CSR

In this section, we have attempted to provide an overview of the approach taken as we understand it. In order to do this, we have grouped the activities undertaken into four areas that are defined by the outputs produced.

### 2.3.1. Part 1 CSR submissions

In April 2010 the SOJP made their CSR submission for 2011 savings, to the total of £481,000, which equates to 2.1% of their 2010 budget of £23,075,000.

These savings were approved in May 2010 by the Council of Ministers and are not subject to this peer review.

### 2.3.2. Initial Part 2 submissions, that exclude the outcomes of major reviews

In May 2010 the SOJP started work to identify how they would deliver the further 8% of savings targeted in the CSR (3% in 2012, 5% in 2013). At this point in time they were asked to assume that the major reviews would not contribute to these savings and the 8% would have to be found over and above the major review.

In preparation for the Home Affairs steering group on the 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010, SOJP submitted a report on how these savings would be delivered. In addition, Home Affairs performed a RAG rating on each proposal, and several of the proposals were rated as Amber or Red. These savings and the RAG rating assigned by Home Affairs are listed in the two tables below:

**Table 1: 2012 savings proposed by SOJP**

Description	Saving	RAG
Loss of CID allowance	£50,000	
Vehicle fleet budget	£20,000	
Recruitment and advertising	£18,000	
Reduction in policing of special events	£20,000	
Further reduction in police overtime <sup>4</sup>	£80,000	
Loss of road safety officer post	£57,000	
Loss of Scenes of Crime Officer post	£57,000	
Loss of post in Joint Financial Crime Unit	£57,000	
Loss of post in Public Protection Unit	£57,000	
Loss of 2 posts in Crime Support Team	£114,000	
Loss of 2 Civilian Support Officers	£72,000	
Loss of post in Offenders Management Unit	£57,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£659,000</b>	

Source: Draft Part 2 submission by Home Affairs

**Table 2: 2013 savings proposed by SOJP**

Description	Saving	RAG
Loss of 20 Police posts	£1,140,000	
Additional loss of 8 Police posts <sup>5</sup>	£456,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,596,000</b>	

Source: Draft Part 2 submission by Home Affairs

Each item proposed was supported by a brief impact statement, and clearly the loss of posts was identified as potentially highly damaging for SOJP.

The report provided only an overview of each discrete proposal, and did not include explanation as to how each discrete figure was derived. The Chief of Police was able to provide further details at the steering group into the non-staff savings.

The general feeling of the steering group that a significant number of these proposals were undesirable, especially those rated as red and would almost certainly be rejected by the Minister.

<sup>4</sup> A reduction in overtime of £50,000 was agreed for 2011

<sup>5</sup> All service heads were asked to identify an additional 2% savings in 2012 and 2013 so that the Departmental Management Board (DMB) and Minister could take a view over how to balance savings across all services rather than imposing pro rata cuts to all.

The Chief of Police was clear that the proposals to cut up to 37 posts over 2012/13 was a 'worst case' scenario and would anticipate that other proactive programmes already in place (e.g. review of records management, review of some business processes) would lead to savings that would offset the need to make these staff cuts. It must be noted that some of these changes are already being implemented.

Whilst this point was generally accepted, the 2013 savings proposals were rejected by the steering group and SOJP were asked to identify alternative options for savings, which could include the outcomes of the major reviews.

Furthermore, the Chief Executive stated that due to the lack of time to complete a more comprehensive analysis, he was prepared to receive indicative savings of alternative options.

### 2.3.3. Major reviews

In this section we outline the progress made in the two major reviews that involved SOJP.

The SOJP produced four Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for major reviews. These were:

- **May 2010** – Workforce modernisation
- **May 2010** – Police training
- **July 2010** – Review of Force Medical Examiners (FMEs)
- **July 2010** – Elimination of duplication between Police and Customs

Although the reviews into police training and FMEs were not originally in the terms of reference, they were provided to the CSR team to indicate other work that was being undertaken. These two reviews have been progressed to some extent in the intervening period and are included in the final Part 2 submission, but are not being considered by this peer review as formal major reviews.

The PIDs for the other two major reviews were focussed on addressing the major reviews outlined in the Home Affairs terms of reference, albeit with a slightly modified set of objectives. The progress made on each review is outlined below.

#### **Workforce modernisation**

In 2009 the Chief of Police produced a paper titled 'Workforce Modernisation' that outlined a business change programme to introduce new ways of working coupled with a change in workforce mix. The report noted that '*workforce modernisation takes time to implement properly and requires up front resource investment...*'.

The report recommended that a more detailed business case be developed as part of the 'fiscal stimulus' programme that was being undertaken, but the SOJP submission to the fiscal stimulus programme was turned down.

Whilst this report was not part of the CSR process, it is useful context for the activities carried out as part of the major review.

The Workforce Modernisation PID stated the following as its objectives:

To explore any potential savings that could be made through workforce modernisation.

The PID also outlined the tasks that would be conducted as part of the major review, as follows:

- Prepare report detailing potential options for workforce modernisation

The work as described in Stage 1 was conducted and a report was produced. The report was based upon the proposal that twelve police officer posts would be replaced by twelve civilian investigators and concluded that this had the potential to save in the region of £22,000.

However, a subsequent Hay evaluation has established that a civilian investigator should be a grade 9 civilian worker (and not at grade 8 as assumed in the report). Consequently, the savings potential is negligible.

With regards to the activities outlined for Stage 2 of the review and in the context that SOJP were already undertaking other performance improvement and cost reduction activities, the SOJP determined there would be insufficient time to complete these within the CSR timescales. A progress report submitted on the 21<sup>st</sup> June noted:

*“There is scope for workforce modernisation, however these can not be realised within the CSR timescales. An in-depth study will need to be completed to realise the potential of a workforce modernisation programme in the long term.”*

On commencing this peer review, Tribal met with the Chief of Police on the 12<sup>th</sup> August. The Chief of Police expressed misgivings into the original terms of reference for the major review specifically around three key areas:

- The use of the phrase 'modernisation', which he considered to be a much misunderstood descriptor<sup>6</sup> and which did not accurately reflect what was outlined in the terms of reference. He felt that the title 'Review of law enforcement' would be a more apt title.
- That they had already stated that the terms of reference could not be completed in the CSR timescales (as described above).
- That a lot of the activities outlined in the terms of reference were determined before the CSR (as laid out in the policing plan), and should be considered as 'business as usual' rather than wrapped into the CSR process, especially as the policing plan sets out activities to be commenced during a twelve month period.

Tribal verify these points as being accurate and our experience with workforce modernisation would wholly endorse the second point about timescales.

Consequently, the Home Affairs steering group has accepted the points made by the Chief of Police and is recommending a major review into law enforcement is commenced as soon as possible, with the intention that it will deliver significant savings in 2013. The savings associated with this review are outlined in Section 1.3.4 and a detailed requirement for this review is provided in Section 2.

### **Eliminating duplication between Customs and Police**

The PID produced for this major review stated the following objective:

To review the law enforcement elements of JCIS and SOJP to assess any opportunities to avoid duplication of effort or resources and streamline processes, particularly with regards to intelligence and border control.

The PID also outlined the following tasks to be conducted by the major review:

- a) Compare work streams to identify areas of overlap
- b) Assess opportunities to combine/share resources by undertaking cost benefit analysis and legal or logistical barriers
- c) Drafting of review report
- d) External peer review

A draft report has been provided to Tribal and a finalised report is in the process of being completed.

JCIS and SOJP have conducted the first of the tasks outlined and have identified a series of areas where there is duplication between the services.

<sup>6</sup> Tribal concur with this point, and have been regularly frustrated in our work with police forces in the UK by the connotation often stated that workforce modernisation is purely a civilianisation programme with a fancy name

The following table is a high level summary of the 15 discrete activities that there was acknowledged duplication.

**Table 3: Activities that are duplicated between JCIS and SOJP**

Activity
1. Serious Organised Crime Investigation (SOCl)
2. SOCl intelligence gathering and management
3. Border controls (Special Branch and Frontiers)
4. Use of drugs dogs
5. Surveillance
6. Covert Human Intelligence Sources (CHIS) management
7. Crime analysis
8. Covert equipment and deployment
9. Financial investigation
10. Communications data acquisition
11. Scenes of Crime Officers (SOCO)
12. Custody
13. Criminal Justice Unit
14. Covert training
15. IT systems management

Source: *Draft report into eliminating duplication between JCIS and SOJP*

The working group then used a common framework to evaluate the opportunities for eliminating duplication, by testing each area against the following questions:

- Would the merger of this area result in improved results or performance?
- What are the potential cost benefits of such a merger?
- What are the potential resource benefits of such a merger?
- What are the potential difficulties of such a merger?
- What are the legal and legislative issues associated with a merger?
- Would the potential differences in procedures be an obstacle?

The summary of findings presented by the working group is that there are no financial savings to be made in merging roles where there is acknowledged duplication.

We believe that there could be the opportunity for savings. Whilst the 'costs' have been identified for removing each area of duplication, there is little or no acknowledgement about the performance or financial benefits of merging operations in these areas.

This peer review is not going to provide comprehensive details on the rationales provided for not removing duplication in each of the 15 areas, but a series of themes emerged in the report as reasons for why savings couldn't be generated. These themes are:

- That the resources delivering the duplicated activity on both sides had other responsibilities and it would not be possible to 'unbundle' the duplicated tasks from these other duties.
- That recent infrastructure investment would essentially be wasted if its use was ceased (e.g. the intelligence facility at Maritime House and the JCIS intelligence system).
- That whilst the activities were similar the resources from each organisation lacked the appropriate powers to take on the whole range of duplicated activities (e.g. at border control).
- That to effectively carry out the activity on behalf of the other organisation would mean working with other areas of that organisation, which would be difficult in practice.
- A lack of trust in the other organisation to manage the activity on behalf of both parties (e.g. CHIS management).
- Inappropriate facilities (e.g. SOJP custody not being equipped to handle some customs detainees).

It should be noted that the summary of findings also states that:

*"The opportunity for efficiency savings by sharing existing capabilities was explored and immediate agreement reached in several areas which will potentially result in future administration savings",*

It is not immediately apparent which capabilities were being referred to and what these future savings may be. Anecdotally, both organisations have acknowledged that their professional relationships have improved over recent months and they wish to continue and increase cooperation between the organisations.

It was agreed by the Home Affairs steering group that the outputs of this review and any ongoing work will be subsumed into the proposed new major review into law enforcement (as outlined in Section 2). As such, a more detailed peer review of the report and its findings has not been conducted, which would have sought to put a quantum against the opportunity.

### 2.3.4. Final Part 2 submissions

Following the Home Affairs steering group on the 12<sup>th</sup> August where part of the initial submission was rejected, it was agreed to hold an interim Steering Group on the 18<sup>th</sup> August, specifically to agree how the Part 2 savings would be reconstructed.

At this meeting it was agreed that a major review should be commissioned to establish a single law enforcement and public protection service in 2013, with the target of delivering savings of a minimum of £1.5million. This review would subsume the major reviews outlined for SOJP on modernisation and eliminating duplication between SOJP and JCIS.

On the basis that this review will cover both SOJP and JCIS, it should be noted that the £1.5million equates to 5.1% of the combined 2010 budgets of SOJP and JCIS. The pro-rated amounts are:

- **SOJP:** £1,178,000;
- **JCIS:** £322,000;

It was agreed that Tribal would include in this peer review our independent view on how this review should proceed, including indicative costings, team formation and delivery plan. This is provided in Section 2.

Tribal provided a first draft of the review objectives, core principles, delivery plan and delivery team to the Home Affairs steering group on the 24<sup>th</sup> August and the comments from the steering group have been reflected in this peer review.

With the major review accounting for 5.1% savings and the Part 1 savings accounting for 2.1%, this left SOJP needing to identify a minimum of £646,100 (or 2.8%) of savings from their 2010 budget.

With the original Part 2 savings providing a total of £659,000 in savings that were RAG rated as Green or Amber the steering group was confident that SOJP would be able to propose a minimum of 10% savings for the CSR.

However, this submission still included the loss of nine posts in 2012 and SOJP acknowledged that there were other savings opportunities that were not included in their original Part 2 submission. The most notable of these were in the areas of Force Medical Examiners and Training.

As such, SOJP have revisited their Part 2 savings proposal so that it includes all known opportunities and minimises the number of staffing cuts. The Tribal peer reviewer provided some support to SOJP in order to conclude this exercise.

SOJP presented their updated Part 2 savings to the Home Affairs steering group on 24<sup>th</sup> August. Some of the opportunities submitted are highly indicative, whereas others have been more fully evaluated. The following table presents the opportunities – the opportunities highlighted in yellow are those

that are indicative. It is proposed that these savings are realised from 2012 onwards.

**Table 4: A summary of the Part 2 proposals, with savings to be realised in 2012**

Opportunity	Description of savings opportunity	Financial Impact	Impact on staff numbers	Impact on service delivery	Invest to save	Actions	Risks
<b>Loss of CID Allowance</b>	Historic allowance paid to detectives for incidental expenses associated with community intelligence work which is now a regulated function.	£50,000	None	None	None	Consultation has been undertaken with Police Association	Employee relations may suffer
<b>Create vehicle pool</b>	Creation of vehicle pool has reduced vehicle requirement and facilitated reduction in budget	£20,000	None	None	None		None identified
<b>Reduction recruitment advertising campaign</b>	Reduce advertising for job vacancies. Advertising will be done via SOJP website	£18,000	None	None	None		None identified
<b>Reduce Policing of Special events</b>	Historically a high Police presence at these events, which have increased significantly in number and size in recent years. This can be reduced particularly as the onus is increasingly placed on organisers to provide stewarding, etc at events such as the Battle of Flowers, Jersey Live	£20,000	None	Managed and minimal effect because of joint planning with organisers	None		None identified
<b>Further reduction in Police Overtime</b>	Realignment of shift patterns in specialist departments, closer management of operations through tasking and coordinating groups. Crime screening process enables appropriate allocation of resources to meet demand. Different ways of working	£80,000	None	Service delivery sustained through different ways of working	None		None identified
<b>Review Force Medical contracts</b>	Current FME contracts believed to be significantly more expensive. Demand hasn't changed in recent years but costs have escalated dramatically. Whilst difficult to define savings, aspiration is to cut these costs through alternative service provision and revised charging arrangements	£100,000	None	None	Possible Procurement exercise required	1. Review of user requirement 2. Review of contracts 3. Consider alternative service provision	Withdrawal of services by current provider- Unable to secure new service provider
<b>Training</b>	Fundamental review of the way the Service provides probationer training and professional development. Work has already begun on collaborative working with Guernsey. Consideration also given to outsourcing more training and e-learning. Opportunities to deliver a different mix of staff in the Police training dept including civilianisation	£100,000	Potential reduction in posts within the training dept or savings through civilianisation and outsourcing (most of whom are police officers)	None	None	Training needs analysis/ Skills audit Outsourcing probationer and other training Working more closely with Guernsey Police and other partner agencies Development of training plan Greater use of E-learning	Unable to secure cost effective services within timescale

Opportunity	Description of savings opportunity	Financial Impact	Impact on staff numbers	Impact on service delivery	Invest to save	Actions	Risks
<b>Court Security/ Prisoner transport</b>	This is not a core policing function but historic attempts to move the function to responsible depts or an external contractor have been resisted by the other agencies concerned.	£75,000	Potential reduction in posts	None	None	Secure agreement with partner agencies for new service Procure contract	No agreement from partners Employee relations Revenue budget Ongoing contract costs
<b>CCTV</b>	Investing in wireless technology will enable significant savings on fibre optic line rentals to existing camera sites and will facilitate greater flexibility in the deployment of CCTV to intermittent hotspots. If the status quo was maintained, the move to a new Police HQ will entail significant investment in rerouting existing CCTV networks and some equipment is due for replacement. Taking these impending costs into account will offset the investment required in new technology. Savings accrued on operating costs and increased operational efficiency make this a viable option	£40,000	None	None	Estimated £150,000 Some of this investment will be absorbed in the Police HQ project costs	Opportunity for sponsorship/ funding by Parish of St Helier	
<b>Loss of road safety officer</b>		£57,000	1 FTE	Road safety education activities will cease. This is not a core policing function.			
<b>Loss of Scenes of Crime Officer post</b>		£57,000	1 FTE	Reduced capacity to conduct forensic examination of crime scenes which will mean reduced service to victims of crime and non attendance at some volume crimes i.e. (taking and driving away motor vehicle and malicious damage)			
<b>Total</b>		<b>£647,000</b>	<b>Minimum 2 FTE</b>				

Source: SOJP Part 2 CSR submission

This Part 2 submission by SOJP does not take into account the outcomes from other major reviews (e.g. Terms and Conditions, Court and Case costs and Joint Control Room).

The overall Home Affairs Part 2 submission includes indicative savings in two other major reviews that may increase the savings potential for SOJP:

- Criminal justice processes = £100,000
- Staff medical, optical and dental benefits<sup>7</sup> = £130,000

### 2.3.5. Total CSR savings

SOJP have identified savings in excess of the 10% that is the target for CSR. The proposals are summarised in the following table.

**Table 5: Summary of proposed SOJP savings**

Description	Savings proposed		
	2011	2012	2013
Part 1 savings	£481,000		
Part 2 savings – evaluated		£332,000	
Part 2 savings – indicative		£315,000	
Major review into law enforcement			£1,118,000
<b>Subtotal (£)</b>	<b>£481,000</b>	<b>£647,000</b>	<b>£1,178,000</b>
<b>Subtotal (% of 2010 budget<sup>8</sup>)</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
Criminal Justice review			£100,000
Medical, optical, dental benefits			£130,000
<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>£481,000</b>	<b>£647,000</b>	<b>£1,408,000</b>
<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>

<sup>7</sup> This does not cover the whole scope of the major review into Terms and Conditions.

<sup>8</sup> The 2010 budget for SOJP is £23,075,000

## 2.4. Peer review on the approach taken

SOJP have successfully identified savings opportunities in excess of the target that was set by the CSR programme and in doing so have produced a series of proposals that avoid the 'salami-slicing' of posts that is the course of action often taken when faced with significant budget cuts.

In the following section we will review the feasibility of the savings proposed, but before that we present our peer review on the approach taken to arriving at the proposals.

Before doing so it is important to be clear that this peer review does not cover the process undertaken and the proposals made for the Part 1 (2011) savings.

We have split this review into two elements. The first is a series of observations about the approach. The second is a series of conclusions that we have made based upon the information gathered during our peer review and the meetings (informal or otherwise) that have taken place during the peer review with staff from SOJP, JCIS, Home Affairs and the CSR team.

The observations and conclusions presented are designed to be constructive so that lessons can be learned and applied to the next stage of the CSR programme.

### 2.4.1. Observations

- The majority of the terms of reference for the major review into 'modernisation of law enforcement' was taken from the SOJP Policing Plan 2010 without directly consulting SOJP. The steering group on the 7th July approved the terms of reference, however there was no representation from SOJP at this meeting. In light of the fact that Chief Officer Warcup's Workforce Modernisation paper demonstrates that SOJP understand what this work would entail and that SOJP stated back in June that they couldn't complete the work, it is surprising that no further effort was made to redraft the CSR terms of reference into something more feasible.
- SOJP produced a series of PIDs (Workforce Modernisation, FMEs, Training, Duplication between SOJP/JCIS) that outlined what they intended to do in the timescales. Although it should be noted that some of the work outlined in the PIDs has not been completed (e.g, process mapping, exploring new pay structures, and building new optimal capabilities as outlined in the Workforce Modernisation PID), it is clear that SOJP have continued to be proactive in terms of identifying opportunities for delivering savings.
- The original submission for Part 2 savings contained some very sensible cost cutting measures, but the majority of savings were assigned to blanket cuts in police posts. These proposals were unlikely to be approved by the minister and whilst it is useful to spell out the worst case impact it seemed

inevitable to us that other savings would need to be identified and submitted. Indeed, at that stage SOJP were already aware that there were potential savings around FME and training costs, but these were not included in the original Part 2 submission (lack of quantification being the reason given).

- Indeed, SOJP were confident that their 'business as usual' activities would yield savings that would mean not all staff cuts would be necessary but felt that they couldn't include these in the CSR submission as the savings associated with this work could not be quantified. We believe that these activities should have been acknowledged more strongly in the original CSR submission and SOJP should have worked with the CSR team and Home Affairs to identify indicative savings.
- The pro-forma associated with the Part 1 submission was deemed overly complex and time consuming to complete. However, the original Part 2 submission needed more detail to enable an effective peer review of the proposals.
- There were no savings identified in the review of duplication between JCIS and SOJP. The process for identifying duplication of effort was thorough and a sensible set of evaluation criteria were established for a cost/benefit analysis. However, when the analysis was conducted it seems to have focussed on the 'costs' associated with removing the duplication and very little effort was made in identifying the 'benefits'. Indeed the report did not contain one single quantum of benefit (whether that be in improved performance or in cost savings).
- We believe that the terms of reference were structured in such a way that it enabled SOJP/JCIS to conclude there were no savings opportunities. It is our opinion that that the cost/benefit analysis would have been more complete if the working group had been told they had to save a minimum amount of money through this review?
- A final observation to make is that the lack of date marks on many of the documents submitted made the peer review more complicated than otherwise necessary.

## 2.4.2. Conclusions on the approach taken

We have based these conclusions upon the information gathered during our peer review, the meetings (informal or otherwise) that have taken place during the peer review with staff from SOJP, JCIS, Home Affairs and the CSR team and our observations on the approach.

- All parties (SOJP, CSR team, Home Affairs) must be commended in having made considerable effort in the last few weeks to develop a realistic set of Part 2 proposals, that will mean any loss of police posts will be carefully managed and will have minimal impact on the operational capability of SOJP.
- However, until this recent period communications between the SOJP, Home Affairs and the CSR team were not especially effective and there was a clear misunderstanding between what the CSR team were expecting from the major review and the activities being conducted by SOJP.

We do note that a change in the CSR team in July, annual leave and the sudden illness of the original peer reviewer will not have helped the situation.

- The steering group was established far too late in the process to affect the course of the major review. Even then, it took until the third steering group on the 12<sup>th</sup> August before it was clear that SOJP were not conducting the major review into modernisation of law enforcement.
- SOJP are well aware of the financial pressures they will be under and set out clear steps in their Policing Plan 2010 on how they would improve the cost effectiveness of the service. The fact that they deemed these activities as not worthy of putting forward for the CSR is explained by the fact that these activities did not have a determined savings associated with them.
- We have a lot of sympathy with the position that SOJP hold that they would have made every effort to make savings during 2011/12 that would have avoided blanket staff cuts. In the UK, Police forces have a track record of operating within their budgets, unlike similar NHS and other public sector organisations, and we are confident that the worst case scenario would not have been realised.
- We concur with SOJP that workforce modernisation is a highly time consuming process and would not have been completed within the CSR timescales. That does not however explain why all parties did not make more effort in June 2010 to redraft the terms of reference for the major review into something more realistic (perhaps a high level feasibility study around modernisation of law enforcement) that could have made a positive contribution to their CSR submission.
- Even if a realistic terms of reference had been agreed upon, we would challenge whether SOJP would have had the capacity to take on the

review as they are currently operating with a 10% shortfall of police officers against their 2010 budget<sup>9</sup>.

- With regards to the review undertaken into duplication of effort between SOJP and JCIS, we would commend the rigour taken to identify a comprehensive list of duplicated activities. However, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than there being little willingness for either service to hand over responsibilities for these activities to the other party. Indeed, we would challenge the strength of some of the arguments put forward when faced with the very real need to make savings in each service. The report will prove to be very useful starting point for the proposed major review into law enforcement. Whilst this peer review must ideally avoid basing its conclusions on anecdotes, it is worth noting that several parties have commented that relationships between SOJP and JCIS have significantly improved in recent months and both services are actively cooperating with each other in a number of areas.
- The final conclusion that we have reached is that we do not believe that SOJP have the current capacity to take the programme of work associated with the savings forward. We would also question whether SOJP has the experience and capability to lead the programme, although we do not doubt that they will positively engage with the work.

## 2.5. Peer review on the proposed savings

The peer review of the savings proposed will focus on three categories of savings:

- a) Part 2 savings that have been evaluated by SOJP (2012);
- b) Part 2 savings that are indicative (2012);
- c) The proposed savings for the major review (2013);

This peer review will not evaluate the savings proposed for the Part1 submission or those associated with the Criminal Justice review or the medical, optical and dental benefits.

---

<sup>9</sup> 12 new officers start with SOJP in September 2010

## 2.5.1. Evaluated Part 2 savings

The following table is a reminder of the savings that have been evaluated by SOJP and which are earmarked for delivery in 2012.

**Table 6: Summary of evaluated Part 2 savings**

Opportunity	Description of savings opportunity	Financial Impact	Impact on staff numbers	Impact on service delivery
<b>Loss of CID Allowance</b>	Historic allowance paid to detectives for incidental expenses associated with community intelligence work which is now a regulated function.	£50,000	None	None
<b>Create vehicle pool</b>	Creation of vehicle pool has reduced vehicle requirement and facilitated reduction in budget	£20,000	None	None
<b>Reduction recruitment advertising campaign</b>	Reduce advertising for job vacancies. Advertising will be done via SOJP website	£18,000	None	None
<b>Reduce Policing of Special events</b>	Historically a high Police presence at these events, which have increased significantly in number and size in recent years. This can be reduced particularly as the onus is increasingly placed on organisers to provide stewarding, etc at events such as the Battle of Flowers, Jersey Live	£20,000	None	Managed and minimal effect because of joint planning with organisers
<b>Further reduction in Police Overtime</b>	Realignment of shift patterns in specialist departments, closer management of operations through tasking and coordinating groups. Crime screening process enables appropriate allocation of resources to meet demand. Different ways of working	£80,000	None	Service delivery sustained through different ways of working
<b>Loss of road safety officer</b>		£57,000	1 FTE	Road safety education activities will cease. This is not a core policing function.
<b>Loss of Scenes of Crime Officer post</b>		£57,000	1 FTE	Reduced capacity to conduct forensic examination of crime scenes which will mean reduced service to victims of crime and non attendance at some volume crimes i.e. (taking and driving away motor vehicle and malicious damage)
<b>Total</b>		<b>£332,000</b>	<b>2 FTE</b>	

Source: SOJP Part 2 CSR submission

With regards to these proposed savings we would make the following observations:

■ **Loss of CID allowance:**

- This will only affect a small pool of officers and equates to a drop in salary of £60. Whilst we would expect them to be disappointed we are led to believe that a proper consultation has been undertaken and these staff have been aware of this change for a period of time.
- If the consultation has already taken place, we believe this saving be brought forward to 2011.

**■ Create a vehicle pool:**

- This is a reasonable and justified saving.
- We believe this saving be brought forward to 2011.

**■ Reduce recruitment advertising campaign:**

- This is a reasonable and justified saving. Indeed, with the budget reductions on the horizon, it is unlikely that there will be many recruitment activities being undertaken over the next few years. It is also reasonable to expect individuals who are genuinely interested in a role with SOJP to look at the SOJP website.
- We believe this saving be brought forward to 2011.

**■ Reduce policing of special events:**

- This saving is predicated on the view that at present SOJP deploy too many officers at these events. We can not validate this point of view, but do agree that the cost and organisation of security of such events should be borne by the event organisers and not SOJP.
- We would expect that this proposal may incite adverse comment within the local press, especially if there were an unexpected and serious incident at an event in the future.
- On face value, this is a reasonable saving.
- We would recommend that SOJP are proactive in approaching event organisers at an earlier point in time than previous years to develop a security and safety plan based on reduced policing.

**■ Further reduction in Police overtime:**

- Reducing overtime is an activity that all Police forces in the UK are currently undertaking so this a reasonable proposal.
- However, the very nature of police overtime means that it can not be wholly controlled and exceptional events may cause the saving delivered to fall short of this target.
- By the same token, it is possible that the saving may exceed the target.
- The steps proposed for different ways of working are reasonable and are likely to cause a reduction in overtime.
- A reduction in overtime has been proposed in the Part 1 submission for 2011, so this is an ongoing piece of work. It may be that some of the savings allocated for 2012 are realised in 2011.
- The recruitment of a new business manager should support this proposal.

**■ Loss of road safety officer:**

- This is a reasonable and justified saving, although we understand that the role may transfer to another States department so it may not be an overall saving for the States.
- We believe this saving be brought forward to 2011.

■ **Loss of Scenes of Crime officer:**

- Any reduction in officer numbers is undesirable, but SOJP are confident that with changed ways of working this role can be cut.
- It should be noted that this is the only discrete loss of an operational police post that is being proposed outside of the major review.

It is our opinion that this range of savings are realistic in terms of the quantum of the savings, are achievable in the timescales proposed (indeed some of the savings could be made earlier than proposed) and will have minimal, if any, impact on the service delivered by SOJP.

## 2.5.2. Indicative Part 2 savings

The following table is a reminder of the savings that have been identified by SOJP but which have not been wholly evaluated. These savings are earmarked for delivery in 2012.

**Table 7: Summary of indicative Part 2 savings**

Opportunity	Description of savings opportunity	Financial Impact	Impact on staff numbers	Impact on service delivery
<b>Review Force Medical contracts</b>	Current FME contracts believed to be significantly more expensive. Demand hasn't changed in recent years but costs have escalated dramatically. Whilst difficult to define savings, aspiration is to cut these costs through alternative service provision and revised charging arrangements	£100,000	None	None
<b>Training</b>	Fundamental review of the way the Service provides probationer training and professional development. Work has already begun on collaborative working with Guernsey. Consideration also given to outsourcing more training and e-learning. Opportunities to deliver a different mix of staff in the Police training dept including civilianisation	£100,000	Potential reduction in posts within the training dept or savings through civilianisation and outsourcing (most of whom are police officers)	None
<b>Court Security/ Prisoner transport</b>	This is not a core policing function but historic attempts to move the function to responsible departments or an external contractor have been resisted by the other agencies concerned.	£75,000	Potential reduction in posts	None
<b>CCTV</b>	Investing in wireless technology will enable significant savings on fibre optic line rentals to existing camera sites and will facilitate greater flexibility in the deployment of CCTV to intermittent hotspots. If the status quo was maintained, the move to a new Police HQ will entail significant investment in rerouting existing CCTV networks and some equipment is due for replacement. Taking these impending costs into account will offset the investment required in new technology. Savings accrued on operating costs and increased operational efficiency make this a viable option	£40,000	None	None
<b>Total</b>		<b>£317,000</b>		

Source: SOJP Part 2 CSR submission

With regards to these proposed savings we would make the following observations:

■ **Review Force Medical contracts:**

- The cost of force medical contracts seems very expensive and the contract would appear to be weighted in the favour of the medical examiners. We are not aware of the full detail, but understand that when the Prison need to bring in medical assistance that it is significantly cheaper.
- We are concerned in comments that only one of the FME has undertaken the required training, especially considering that an element of the payments made to the FME is to undertake this training. We would recommend investigating further with consideration of punitive measures (e.g. withholding payments).
- Given that the cost of FME is a contracted cost, it will require a renegotiation of contract to bring down the cost. If the present suppliers are unwilling to negotiate their fees down then there is a risk that no cheaper alternative is found.
- We do not know whether this is practical, but it would seem sensible to explore the possibility of collaborating with the Prison and/or Health & Social Services with regards to commissioning medical support.
- The saving opportunity is reasonable and should be pursued, the timescale (2012) is realistic, but we can not validate that the saving proposed is achievable.

■ **Training:**

- There are clear opportunities for bring down the cost of training and SOJP have identified several options.
- We would recommend a full cost/benefit analysis and options appraisal is conducted to determine the best course of action.
- The saving opportunity is reasonable and should be pursued, the timescale (2012) is realistic, but we can not validate that the saving proposed is achievable.

■ **Court security and prisoner transport:**

- SOJP are quite right in putting this forward as a saving opportunity, although the cost of prisoner transport and court security will still need to be borne by the States.
- Outsourcing prisoner transport is an option, but the contract provider will still need to pay for staff and vehicle costs. We are not convinced this is going to be significantly cheaper than the police doing so – although the cost will not be borne by SOJP.
- With regards to court security, we concur that it is inappropriate in most cases for SOJP to be providing this service. We would recommend that SOJP and the courts investigate the option of risk assessing court cases and calling on SOJP to provide court security when it is deemed necessary. The UK Border Agency have to make similar decisions on a

daily basis, when they have to determine whether an immigration offender being removed from the country just requires escorting to the plane or whether they need to escort the offender all the way back to their country of origin.

- The opportunity for reducing the SOJP costs associated with prisoner transport and court security is reasonable and should be pursued, the timescale (2012) is realistic, but we can not validate that the saving proposed is achievable.

■ **CCTV:**

- This is a sound and sensible proposal, but we would have expected to see a more detailed breakdown of the costs and savings associated with this proposal and how these could be offset by the move to the new Police HQ. On that basis we can not validate that the saving of £40,000 is realistic, although we have no reason to doubt that the calculation has been made.
- We would recommend investigating options around commercial funding and/or seeking some funding from the parish of St Helier (where the majority of CCTV is located).
- This saving is intrinsically linked with the move to the new Police HQ, but decisions about this technology will need to be made as soon as possible so that they can be planned into the refurbishment of the facility.

It is our opinion that these proposals are genuine opportunities for savings, but more work will need to be undertaken to produce saving projections that can be validated. We believe the savings are achievable in the timescales proposed with the exception of the CCTV saving that is linked to the new Police HQ. Furthermore, the proposals will have minimal, if any, impact on the service delivered by SOJP.

### 2.5.3. Major review savings

In Section 2 we have provided a detailed requirement for the major review into law enforcement. Half of the proposed savings are associated with this review and whilst there is unanimous expectation in the steering group that these savings can be realised, we have provided some evidence below to justify our stated position in the steering group that saving 5% of costs is achievable.

The following table outlines three projects that Tribal have worked on in the last three years with law enforcement organisations, where the minimum savings was 13% of the budget in scope of the review.

Table 8: Examples of Tribal projects where we have helped law enforcement organisations save

Client	Scope of work	Budget in scope	Savings	Savings as % of budget
<b>National Policing Improvement Agency</b>	Customer Facing Directorate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organisational re-structuring</li> <li>Streamlining processes</li> <li>Optimising staff numbers and mix</li> </ul>	£30m (circa 600 staff)	<b>£4m</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Rural County Police Force</b>	Corporate Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streamlining processes</li> <li>Reducing duplication</li> <li>Reducing procurement spend</li> <li>Removing unnecessary posts in line with a rationalisation of area command units</li> </ul>	£10m	<b>£1.3m</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Urban Police Force</b>	Detainee Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rationalising custody facilities across the force</li> <li>Streamlining processes</li> <li>Optimising staff numbers, allocation and mix</li> </ul>	£14m	<b>£7m</b>	<b>50%</b>

In addition to these projects that Tribal have delivered, there is broader evidence that the application of such methods as Lean Thinking, Business Process Reengineering and Workforce Modernisation can be successfully applied in law enforcement organisations.

In the UK, two national programmes have demonstrated that the application of these methods can deliver cashable savings and/or significant improvements in performance. These programmes are the Home Office's QUEST programme<sup>10</sup> and the NPIA's Workforce Modernisation programme<sup>11</sup>.

The following table presents a small selection of case studies from these two programmes. It should be noted that both programmes were operated in a period where cost savings were a by-product of the work and not a core objective.

<sup>10</sup> Tribal (in partnership with PA Consulting) have just been appointed by the Home Office as one of two consultancies that will operate the successor to QUEST, which is currently operating under the working title of the 'Continuous Improvement in Policing' programme.

<sup>11</sup> Tribal were lead advisors to the Workforce Modernisation programme, providing training and mentoring to eight of the pilot forces within the programme.

Table 9: Examples of QUEST and Workforce Modernisation projects

Police force	Programme	Areas included in the work	Outcomes achieved
West Yorkshire	QUEST	Crime recording, investigation and Criminal Justice Department	<p>Crime recording and investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing the average time taken for crime to be dealt with from 47 to 7 days.</li> <li>A 92% reduction in crime incorrectly screened in for investigation</li> <li>67% reduction in Neighbourhood officer workload</li> </ul> <p>Criminal Justice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the quality of files submitted to the CPS and a reduction in the number returned for re-work</li> <li>Fewer adjournments and witnesses being cancelled</li> <li>Court availability to trial reduced from over 100 days to 45</li> </ul>
Lancashire	QUEST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End-to-end deployment processes including call handling to re-engineer operational activities to improve value for money outcomes and productivity.</li> <li>Further applied to crime investigation and defendant management processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efficiencies in excess of £500,000 were identified within the pilot area in 2007/08 by the selection and delivery of five specific options to reduce staff deployments.</li> <li>Deployments were reduced by over 40 per cent with customer satisfaction increasing to 98 per cent.</li> <li>The changes were implemented across all six BCUs from April 2008 and it is anticipated that this will deliver annual efficiencies across the Force of between £2 million and £4 million.</li> </ul>
Northumbria	Workforce modernisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation</li> <li>Response</li> <li>Intelligence</li> <li>Neighbourhood policing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement in efficiency by 26%</li> <li>Statistically significant rise in arrests (70 more per month)</li> <li>Shortened the average length of investigation from 41 – 21 days.</li> <li>A measured improvement in customer satisfaction and public confidence</li> </ul>
Staffordshire	Workforce Modernisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CID - Investigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Predicted £395k costs saving over 5 years, which is on track after year 2</li> <li>No change in efficiency</li> </ul>

Police force	Programme	Areas included in the work	Outcomes achieved
Surrey	Workforce Modernisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation (CID)</li> <li>Response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>42% increase in efficiency in CID</li> <li>Savings of £1.2million over 5 years predicted – the project has already secured these savings in years 1 and 2.</li> <li>14% improvement in efficiency in response with savings of £695k predicted in the business case expected to be exceeded</li> <li>Statistically significant rise in sanctioned detections (from 24-26%)</li> <li>Increase in response rates to grade 1 and grade 2 incidents within the target time</li> <li>Measured improvement in customer satisfaction</li> </ul>

Sources: *Police Professional, Engineering Efficiencies, 20 June 2010*; *Audit commission review of QUEST*; *Deloitte National Workforce Modernisation Programme: Evaluation of the Demonstration sites, March 2010*.

On the basis of these benchmarks, we are confident that the major review has the potential to deliver more than the required 5% of savings.

We would therefore recommend that any savings made over and above the 5% are reinvested into SOJP (assuming the Part 1 & 2 savings have been realised) with expectation that this will have a direct and positive impact on the outcomes achieved by SOJP.

## 2.6. Conclusion

It is our opinion that the CSR proposals for SOJP are feasible, realistic and achievable. With a small exception any reduction in police officer posts will be the outcome of the major review and not blanket cuts in police numbers. We are therefore confident that the proposals will not have an operational impact on SOJP.

This places a lot of expectation on the major review, in that it delivers the required savings without degrading the outcomes achieved by SOJP. We are confident that if the review is effectively managed, properly resourced and allowed to operate within appropriate timescales that these dual objectives can be realised.

The approach taken in arriving at these proposals was less than ideal but considerable effort has been made to get the process on track. Until recently, SOJP, the Home Affairs department and CSR team did not demonstrate that they were operating with a common understanding. The matter was not helped by an initial lack of oversight in the form of a steering group.

The next steps are to deliver these savings. This programme of work will have to operate under a consistent governance and oversight structure and each party must make every effort to ensure that all expectations are established and maintained throughout the programme.

### 3. Police peer review: Major review of the law enforcement and public protection services

The major review into the ‘modernisation of law enforcement and policing’ as planned for the CSR was deemed too complex to complete within the CSR timescales. As such, it has been agreed to develop a detailed requirement for a major review to evaluate and establish a new single law enforcement and public protection service – this will be used by the States of Jersey to plan approach....

#### 3.1. Introduction

The evolution of crime in the last 10-20 years is bringing new challenges to all law enforcement agencies. Criminals and their activities have increased in sophistication. Their ability to travel and communicate across the globe with relative ease means that all nations and jurisdictions are influenced by their activities and as such have an international role to play in law enforcement. With its position as a preeminent financial centre within the global economy, Jersey presents a law enforcement landscape that is highly diverse, requiring the ability to investigate complex international financial offences, whilst at the same time policing a relatively benign and peaceful local population, albeit one that is blighted by the same instances of anti-social and alcohol-influenced disorder experienced across the British Isles. Jersey therefore requires a police, customs and immigration services that understand these changing demands, are agile enough to change itself to meet these demands, but are sufficiently resilient to effectively respond to a major incident upon the island.

This section outlines what we believe is a realistic requirement for a major review into law enforcement services on Jersey.

## 3.2. Objective statement

We believe the objective of the major review should be:

To increase the capacity, capability and resilience of Jersey's law enforcement and public protection service, enabling it to maintain delivered outcomes whilst operating with a significantly reduced budget from 2013.

In doing so, the major review should:

- in the first instance, to evaluate the establishment in 2013 of a new law enforcement and public protection service;
- identify how this service can deliver minimum savings of £1.5million;
- ensure that operational outcomes are at least maintained at 2010 levels;
- identify how to remove any duplication of effort and other inefficient practices;
- create a flexible, resilient and agile organisation focussed on meeting the needs of the people of Jersey in 2013 and beyond.

## 3.3. Rationale

The review presents a significant strategic opportunity for the States of Jersey, but it is not a trivial exercise and is not without risk. It is therefore essential that a clear and realistic rationale is established that articulates the case for change.

It is our opinion that this rationale should be based upon the following factors:

- It is evident that the provision all public services provided by the States of Jersey will need to operate within budgets that are less than those presently in place. A comprehensive review of policing, customs and immigration services, will ensure that any savings identified are based upon through evidence and analysis. Furthermore, the option of creating a single organisation has the potential to leverage economies of scale that would otherwise not be available to JCIS and SOJP as individual organisations.
- At the same time, pressure will be placed upon these services to at least maintain, if not improve the levels of service delivered and outcomes achieved. The clear way to achieve this is to ensure that service delivery is not wasteful. A detailed review of operational processes should help with the identification and removal of inefficient practices (many of which will not be evident). Typical types of waste within service organisations include:
  - duplication of effort;
  - unnecessary movement (e.g. journeys performed by warranted officers that could be undertaken by other staff);
  - poor or unclear communication;
  - redoing activities that were not performed effectively in the first place;

- unnecessary activities that add no value;
- delays waiting for people, information or materials;
- It was acknowledged in the introduction that the nature of criminal activity has evolved over the last 10-20 years. It is probable that the pace of change will not slow down over the coming years and the law enforcement services must be sufficiently agile and resilient to respond to the changing demands on their operations.

### 3.4. Core principles

The major review will not be straight forward and it is expected that it will meet resistance from some critical stakeholders. In order to mitigate this resistance we would propose that the major review is established with some core principles that guide how the review is conducted. These will need to be agreed by all of the main stakeholders from the outset and used to arbitrate if/when differences of opinion prevail.

We would propose the following principles for consideration:

1. The design of the new services should be based upon the present needs of the people and state of Jersey. These needs can only be established by consulting with the main stakeholders, including but not limited to the organisations involved (SOJP & JCIS), state assembly members, public representatives, the court service and other criminal justice organisations.
2. Staff must be fully consulted throughout the review and their employment rights respected accordingly.
3. There are no sacred cows within any of the present services.
4. Equally, this review is not about change for change's sake.
5. The review should not be constrained by:
  - a. current organisational structures;
  - b. the current structure of powers available to police, customs and immigration officers;
  - c. current infrastructure (including ICT and estates);
  - d. current legislation;
6. The functional structure of the organisation (i.e. what it does) should be determined before the organisational structure of the organisations (i.e. who does it).
7. The service that is delivered must maintain or improve upon current outcomes.
8. An infrastructure for continuous improvement should be embedded within the organisations, ensuring that the service can evolve to meet the changing needs of the state of Jersey.
9. The major review must be properly managed, working within realistic timescales and with an appropriate amount of resource working within the project team.

3.5. At the request of Tribal, this section has been redacted prior to publication as it contained commercially sensitive information relating to Tribal.

## 4. Police peer review: Additional opportunities

In addition to the opportunities for savings presented to the CSR, we consider there are some other opportunities for savings that could be explored.

This peer review has focussed on the CSR proposals that have been submitted. As stated, we believe that the proposals are realistic and achievable, but would also urge the SOJP and States of Jersey to consider the following opportunities for delivering costs savings.

These proposals are based upon our own experiences of delivering costs savings in the public sector and have not been validated with SOJP or researched in detail.

- The Policing Plan for 2010 indicates that the HR and Finance functions for SOJP are provided by the Home Affairs department. Consideration should be given as to whether some of the other support services could be shared with other public sector organisations, for example – procurement, catering, building maintenance, vetting, systems development and public relations.
- Collaboration with Guernsey on areas other than that being explored around training, e.g. vehicle and uniform procurement.
- The creation of a single custody facility (although this should be explored in the proposed major review).
- A single emergency control room (although this is being looked at elsewhere within CSR).

## 5. Police peer review: Recommendations

SOJP have identified significant opportunities for savings. To successfully deliver these savings will not be straight forward and we would make the following recommendations for consideration.

- SOJP should make every effort to wholly evaluate the Part 2 savings that have been identified as indicative (FMEs, training, Court security and prisoner transport, and CCTV).
- SOJP should look to deliver some of the 2012 savings in 2011. If this Consideration should be given to taking these savings made against the 2012 budget and offsetting them against the cost of the major review.
- SOJP should endeavour to identify what savings are delivered through their 'Business As Usual' activities and these should be fed into the CSR programme, either to offset CSR savings that have fallen short of the predicted level or to offset the cost of the major review.
- The States of Jersey should work with SOJP to identify if there are any gaps in their capacity and capability to deliver the proposed savings and the major review. Where gaps are identified, both parties should identify appropriate resources to fill these gaps.
- The core principles proposed for the major review should be reviewed and amended or added to as necessary. They should then be formalised and placed at the centre of the terms of reference for the major review.
- All parties involved in communicating the major review MUST avoid using phrases such as 'merger' or 'integration' as they are highly emotive and do not represent the proposed objectives and principles for the major review.
- The major review should be commenced as soon as practically possible in order to meet the timescales for reviewing, redrafting and proposing new legislation.
- The States of Jersey must ensure that an effective oversight committee are in place from the start of the major review and that all members fully understand the terms of reference for the review.
- The States of Jersey must ensure that the selection process for the new Chief of Police acknowledges the existence of the major review and ensures that the appointee is fully signed up to delivering the review.
- Given the scope of the major review, we believe that string consideration should be made towards JCIS considering Lime Grove as their preferred option for relocation.

# 2

## Fire and Ambulance merger

The following section contains the findings from our peer review of the States of Jersey Fire and Ambulance Services' review of the potential for merging

## 6. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: overall findings

This report sets out the results of our peer review of the work carried out by the major review assessing the potential of the Fire and Ambulance services to merge. It is one of the Home Affairs major reviews conducted as part of the States of Jersey 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review.

The Fire and Ambulance services should be commended on their joint working to develop the Report, particularly given the difficulty that the subject matter poses. This is representative of a good working relationship between the Services from Chief Officer level down, already evidenced in the joint operational control room used by the two Services. The Report identifies a number of areas for joint working and provides a strong basis for future collaboration between the two services. It is the recommendation of Tribal that this is developed further in a full business case with several options fully explored for costs and benefits.

### 6.1. Scope of the Report

The aims of the Jersey 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review programme (CSR) are clearly stated at 1.3 of the final report:

*To explore whether a merger of management structures and other common functions of both services would improve their efficiency, effectiveness and resilience.*

To achieve this, the States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service (FRS) and Ambulance Service (AS) (henceforth “the Services”) have produced a joint report (“the Report”) which tests the potential for merging the structures and functions of these services.

Although this forms a part of the Home Affairs major review, as the Report recognises in Section 2.1, the Services currently report to different departments: FRS to the Home Affairs, and AS to Health and Social Services.

## 6.2. Terms of Reference for this peer review

The principles of this peer review are stated in section 1.6 of the Report, which recognises the aim of the peer review to assess and challenge:

- The rigour of the process;
- The detailed work programme;
- The potential to deliver efficiencies and improve effectiveness of service in accordance with the overall scope and objectives;
- The appropriateness of outcomes.

Given the tight timescales in which this review has been conducted, it was agreed with the CSR team that as part of the engagement principles for this peer review, Tribal would attend the working groups through which the majority of the joint analysis of the Services has been undertaken.

This has allowed Tribal to peer-review the joint working undertaken by the FRS and AS in order to maximise value for money in the peer review process and the detailed work programme for the States of Jersey.

This peer review is intended to challenge not only the final recommendations of the Report but also the process by which they were delivered.

Through our attendance at the working groups and Project Review Team meetings, it is appropriate that we briefly comment on the approach taken and outline recommendations for the progression of the next stage of this work.

### 6.3. The Services' approach to the CSR

The analysis of the potential to merge the FRS and AS was undertaken by the Services through a staggered approach which is detailed in section 1.5 of the Report and is repeated underneath for simplicity:

**Table 14: Project Initiation Document deliverable stage structure**

Stage and purpose	Activities and outputs
1. Work through previous reviews & recommendations of both Services: To identify current strengths and weaknesses of both Services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Summarise the drivers &amp; requirements for the review</li> <li>■ Review all previous individual Service Reviews</li> <li>■ Review benchmarking</li> <li>■ Summarise conclusions &amp; recommendations</li> <li>■ Feed outcomes into review</li> </ul>
2. Research current best practices in UK and other Countries: To identify how the Islands emergency services could be delivered by a single organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identify arrangements for Fire and Ambulance in UK.</li> <li>■ Identify combined Fire &amp; Ambulance Services in other countries.</li> <li>■ Examine the effectiveness of combined Fire &amp; Ambulance Services.</li> </ul>
3. Assess opportunities for dual roles and review operational synergy between the services: To identify similarities and crucial differences between the Services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identify the Strategic fit and synergy between the Services.</li> <li>■ Identify opportunities for dual role.</li> <li>■ Identify how this can increase in the level of Service or lower the cost</li> <li>■ Identify the HR and training issues.</li> <li>■ Identify barriers and risks.</li> </ul>
4. Assess the potential for a single command/control and management structure: To examine whether a single command/control and management structure could be introduced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Management structures in both Services and its effectiveness.</li> <li>■ Examine the different command/control structures.</li> <li>■ Examine how a single management structure can be used.</li> <li>■ Opportunities for introducing a single command &amp; control structure.</li> </ul>
5. Assess the potential to share administrative and support services functions: To identify and examine what admin/support functions be shared/merged to improve efficiency and/or save costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identify similar support services/administration and their manpower requirements.</li> <li>■ Identify how States shared services are delivered in each service</li> <li>■ Examine what functions could be merged/shared to lower costs or deliver increased support.</li> </ul>
6. Assess the potential to share resources/accommodation: To identify and examine what resources could be shared/merged to improve efficiency and/or save costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Identify what similar resources are used by both Services.</li> <li>■ Examine what resources could be shared/merged.</li> <li>■ Make recommendations regarding the future accommodation requirements.</li> </ul>

Stage and purpose	Activities and outputs
7. Identify Lessons Learnt from other States mergers: To ensure that all previous lessons learnt are incorporated in the review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Combined Fire and Ambulance Emergency Control Centre Merger</li> <li>■ Customs and Immigration Services Merger.</li> <li>■ Summarise lessons learnt and feed conclusions into review</li> </ul>
8. Drafting of Review Report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Combined the outcomes of the tasks above, identify efficiency savings and service benefits arising and all of the feedback from the consultation to produce report.</li> </ul>
9. Peer Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ External peer review</li> <li>■ Oversight and challenge of the process and the final recommendations.</li> </ul>

*Source: FRS and AS CSR report*

Tribal's peer review role is recognised as the final stage of this structure, yet in practice (and with the agreement of the CSR team) this review role has been undertaken throughout the process in order to peer review it effectively (see section 5.2 above). In delivering the rest of this staged approach, the project activities are structured into two strands briefly summarised and reviewed below.

### 6.3.1. Project Review Team (stages 1, 2, 7 and 8)

The CSR project was coordinated by the Project Review Team, the constitution of which is outlined in section 1.4 of the Report. In addition to this membership, a Tribal representative attended Project Review Team sessions from June onwards.

Stages 1 and 2 of the Services' approach had concluded prior to Tribal's engagement and yielded some impressive analysis of relevant international good practice, which informed the subsequent analytical stages. This is evidenced in sections 2, 3 and 4 of the Report.

Stage 7 of the Services' approach was conducted throughout by the attendance of the senior Customs and Immigration officer at project review team meetings.

Stage 8 of the approach has been the product of the Project Review Team's work, and this team should be recognised for the considerable effort that has been made to complete this review in the tight timescales outlined.

#### **Tribal review of the Project Review Team approach**

The steering process for the project worked well and provided clear leadership, though one of our observations of the Report development process worth noting was that the HR representation from Home Affairs appear to be limited in the latter stages of the Report's construction - although Tribal acknowledge that their input may have been included in the report drafting stage. Additional input at this stage of the project may have been valuable.

Overruns in two of the working groups and the project's conclusion over the August holiday period resulted in some challenging timescales for the production of the final report. The process of the Report's production may have benefitted from an earlier steer on the desired final content and format of the report from the CSR team. The Project Review Team has produced a feasibility study which should be used as the basis of a business case to develop any options which the CSR process selects for progression.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. In progressing the options outlined in the Report, the Services may wish to consider greater operational involvement of HR representation covering both Services.
2. Two of the seven other projects identified as having an impact on this review in section 12.3 of the Report are property related. Given this overlap and the impact that appropriate co-location could have on the collaborative future of the Services, the Services may wish to consider greater involvement of the Jersey Property Holdings at a steering group level in progressing the options outlined in the Report.

### 6.3.2. Working group analysis (stages 3, 4, 5 and 6)

Stages 4 - 6 used a working group approach to examine the potential to share certain functions that the Services currently possess independently. These working groups provide the bulk of the analytical content of the Report.

14above summarises the working groups in relation to the Report sections they inform. The review in 5.4 below is structured around the presentation of these savings in the Report.

#### **Tribal review of the Working Group analysis**

These working groups were established and operational prior to Tribal's engagement and offered a good basis for the analysis between the Services. The initiation controls for each of these working groups were generally well established. The terms of reference and required outputs delivered suitably and in some very tight timescales.

Each working group was chaired by Chief Officers of the Services, which resulted in a clear commitment and steer from the senior leadership of both Services.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. Considerable detail was covered in the working groups and the Report would benefit from including the summary of findings from the four working groups as appendices to the final Report.
2. The analytical process would have been helped by having a distributed and clearly understood template for the final deliverable of the project – i.e. the final Report, so that there was clarity about what the end outputs should look like.

3. In progressing the options outlined in the Report, the Services may wish to consider greater delegated authority and occasional attendance by Chief Officers since the analytical process was time-consuming for senior leadership.

## 6.4. Savings identified

The Report is comprised twelve sections and nine appendices. Section 11 of the Report presents three options of increasing levels of co-involvement of the two Services:

- A. Retain the status quo
- B. Progress a partial merger
- C. Progress a full merger/combination

In Appendix E of the Report an indicative and weighted evaluation of these options against the following criteria is provided:

- Feasibility
- Net Saving after five years
- Non-cashable benefits
- Delivery Time Scales
- Scale and Breadth of Impact
- Achievability – Technical/Professional (Feasibility/Capability/Capacity)
- Achievability – Authority (likelihood of political approval)
- Alignment with CSR objectives

### **Tribal review of the savings identified**

The summary tables at 11.3.1, 11.3.2 and 11.3.2 and the analysis at 11.4 suggest ways in which the Services may be merged, and a series of benefits that each of these options might achieve. This peer review is limited in the extent to which it can assess these options as the Report does not detail what the options actually consist of or how they would function.

Moreover, the Report does not present a rationale about how the components that comprise the two merger related options outlined in 11.3.2 and 11.3.3 were constructed.

There are also some issues about how the options have been defined:

- Option A is entitled 'status quo' yet it suggests a greater level of collaboration than currently exists and identifies associated benefits, without actually stating what this collaboration involves.
- Option B outlines a back office merger in which resources and management are shared but the emergency service capability of each service is retained. There is an assumed element of co-location.

- Option C presents a high level picture of a fully merged and combined service, citing good practice and lessons learned from international examples. However, it does not outline what this service is in any detail beyond indicating that it will involve dual role staff.

In 11.4 the Report recommends option B as the way forward. In 11.5 it estimates a one-off implementation cost of £30k to deliver an estimated £114k saving per annum and a headcount reduction of 1.5 FTEs.

It is recognised that front line service delivery options remain a priority and these savings are initial estimates. However, it is the assessment of Tribal that this is a conservative assessment of possible savings, representing 1.3% of the combined 2009 budgets of the FRS and AS (in 2.4), whilst expectations of the cost savings that can result from a merger are traditionally between 5-10%.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. It is Tribal's assessment that the CSR project would benefit from greater assessment of the desirability, achievability and compatibility of the individual components of the working group analysis.
2. It is recommended that if any of the work here is progressed that a clear articulation is developed of what the "to-be" service/s should look like, how it/they would function, what benefits this will deliver and how these will be achieved.

## 7. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: Additional opportunities

This section probes the work done by the working groups to identify ways in which the proposals outlined in the Report can be taken forward to deliver greater efficiencies, reduced costs and a more effective service.

The working group analysis provides detail of how a collaborative or integrated service might function. This is contained in sections 5 to 10 of the Report which outline the analysis of the working groups, and in some instances conclusions.

To provide a peer review of the CSR project's stated aims, this report will briefly replicate and comment on sections 5 to 10 of the Report. Section 6.1 will analyse the feasibility of the savings proposals generated in working groups.

Where gaps are identified and Tribal believe there to be additional opportunities, they will be presented at the end of each section.

### 7.1. Further review

Sections 5 to 10 of the Report assess the analysis presented against 4 assessment criteria:

- The benefit to the service
- The operational/financial efficiency
- The implementation costs
- The risk of this change

The table below matches the tasks identified in the PID (presented in Table 14) with the sections in the Report in which the results of this work are presented.

**Table 15: PID stage plan comparison with Report structure**

PID stage reference	Report section	Content	Conducted by
1	• 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous reviews</li> <li>• Strategic context</li> <li>• Review benchmarking</li> </ul>	• Services' Chief Officers
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.6</li> <li>• 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK and international good practice review</li> </ul>	• Services' Chief Officers

PID stage reference	Report section	Content	Conducted by
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4</li> <li>• 8</li> <li>• 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic fit between the Services</li> <li>• Potential for dual role development</li> <li>• Operational synergy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 3</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6</li> <li>• 11.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single command/control structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 4</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4</li> <li>• 5</li> <li>• 11.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single management structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 5</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 11.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative and support functions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 6</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4</li> <li>• 9</li> <li>• 11.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing premises and accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 6</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4</li> <li>• 7.2.1 - 7.2.2</li> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 11.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing vehicles and equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Working Group 6</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12.4</li> <li>• 12.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons from other states of Jersey mergers</li> <li>• Alignment with other projects and reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> <li>• Customs and Immigration</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services' Chief Officers</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11.6</li> <li>• This report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tribal peer review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tribal peer review team</li> </ul>

### 7.1.1. Potential for a single management structure

Although there is no detailed break down of the “as is” picture in the Report, detail is provided of the “to be” picture in the organisational diagram in Appendix I.

The Report identifies a saving of £90,000 from removing a management post. The long-term feasibility of any change needs to be tested by conducting a detailed impact assessment. It should be noted that the post of Chief Ambulance Officer is currently vacant and being filled in an acting capacity. This saving currently assumes a lack of implementation costs.

The benefits and risks described appear feasible and seem to offer most benefit to the Ambulance Service which only possesses a single senior manager, the capacity issues of which were apparent in the process of writing the Report. The longer term impact of this on recruitment and career progression within the Ambulance Service should also be considered to be risks.

**Tribal recommendations**

1. Establish a more detailed picture of the size of Ambulance Service that can be compared with the size of the FRS (at present the Report does not compare the Services in a 'like for like' way), and carry out a more detailed assessment of where the duplication mentioned in Section 5.5 exists.  
This will help provide more clarity about the potential savings that can be achieved through removal of this duplication.
2. Identify the impact and any dependencies of this action, particularly in relation to command and control structures.
3. Establish the senior management staffing requirements of both services and an impact assessment of the removal of this post. This assessment should consider the impact of removing 25% of the senior management capacity at a time when there may be other changes in the Services which require strong leadership.
4. Add the new risks that have been identified to a project level risk register for any further progress on the Fire and Ambulance merger.

### 7.1.2. Potential for a single command and control structure

This section identifies a commonality amongst the approaches towards incident management in FRS and AS, although it does not draw attention to how and why the Incident Command Structure (ICS) used by the FRS and the Major Incident Medical Management System (MIMMS) used by the AS may differ.

It is not clear from the Report how a single command structure at the silver/tactical command management level would function, or what timeline would be required to move from the recommended independent responses to the possible joint command.

The National Incident Management System (NIMS) used in the US may provide an example although the working group recognised the contextual differences between the privatised emergency services in the US and those in Jersey.

No mention is made of combining gold/strategic command structures in the two services. The risks are accurate though the implementation cost of £30k would need to be substantiated with a rationale and identified as a one off-cost or an ongoing expense.

**Tribal recommendations**

1. If this option is to be taken forward, clear acceptance criteria, situation handling protocols and a timetable for the adoption of a single silver command structure should be developed.
2. Identify the impact and any dependencies on this action, particularly in relation to any progress towards a single management structure.

### 7.1.3. Potential to share administrative/support functions

This section outlines the administrative and operational support that both Services currently have. There is a good level of detail on where the support comes from. The FRS possesses a greater in-house capability than the AS which relies on its parent department for much of the corporate support functions. Furthermore the AS derives a greater degree of support from the Health and Social Services department than the FRS does from the Home Affairs department.

The Report identifies “other support functions” that FRS conducts including statutory fire inspections, workplace fire safety training and community fire safety. These functions are about *conducting* elements of the FRS stated purpose rather than *supporting* it. As such, it is Tribal’s assessment that these should be considered operational roles rather than support roles.

The Report identifies a deficit of a fleet manager in the FRS but does not state what effect this has had. It outlines some service benefits from extending the way finance functions are provided to the FRS to the AS. The Report recognises time savings from combining the business partner model that both Services currently use separately for IS support, HR and Finance functions. It also identifies a £12,000 saving from a 0.5 FTE reduction in an admin post.

None of the support currently provided is costed in the Report and the required level of provision is not stated. Therefore it is difficult to assess the efficiencies that might be made from combining these functions. However it is Tribal’s assessment on the evidence provided that the savings identified here seem incredibly cautious given the level of overlap and could be expanded upon.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. Cost the current levels of provision and establish what the required service levels across the service categories below. Identify where there is a specialism in relation to either Service that can only be provided within that Service, for example performance monitoring of specialist vehicles may be such an area.
  - a) General administration
  - b) Fleet procurement
  - c) Fleet management
  - d) Fleet maintenance and servicing
  - e) Fleet performance monitoring
  - f) Human Resources services
  - g) Recruitment
  - h) Training and development
  - i) Information Systems provision
  - j) Financial management processing and support

If any of this detail is already contained in the summary of findings from Working Group 5 it should be attached as an appendix to the Report.

2. A more detailed options appraisal around how this collection of corporate services might be fulfilled by a single corporate support services model across both Services should be undertaken.
3. It is Tribal's assessment that this is an area which should be developed to identify greater efficiencies. Dependent on the outcomes of other major reviews, there may be opportunities to generate even more significant savings by changing the way that corporate services are provided across the whole of the States of Jersey. Providing these functions using a shared service centre or business partner model across the States of Jersey or contracting out provision and managing it using service level agreements should be considered, though there does not appear to be the evidence yet to recommend either of these options.

#### 7.1.4. Potential to merge operational roles

The Report identifies the progress made towards combining the emergency response functions of both Services that has already been made in the combined control centre.

The Report briefly mentions the benefits of a new operational model identified in Dublin and Guernsey and proposes a four level operational role model for application to Jersey. It conducts an analysis of responses over a 24 hour period which recognises that AS responds to approximately four times the number of incidents than the FRS does. This indicates that the two – three Ambulances on call responded to around 6000 incidents in 2009 compared to around 1500 incidents for the two fire appliances. The peak demands for each service occurred at different times of the day but showed some commonality. This warrants further analysis before any conclusions about the structure of operational responses can be determined.

The Report highlights that both services are under performing against targets. In 2009, the FRS operated at the minimum required crewing level on 62.6% of occasions and did not meet its target of reaching 80% of property fires within 8 minutes, instead achieving 70.1%. In the same year, the AS which aimed to attend 75% of all Cat A life threatening emergencies within 8 minutes underperformed by only achieving 58%.

The report identifies a possible saving of 1.5 – 2 FTEs worth around £47k from revised night-time service staffing. It also emphasizes the increased risk to public and staff that this would present. It also identifies £500k implementation costs to train all fire-fighters to Ambulance Technician standards, though it does not conduct sufficient analysis on the desirability feasibility of this from a learning and development perspective, how these new staff would be deployed operationally. These savings are not part of the recommended option savings at 11.5.

Understandably this is the area where both Services are most sensitive about integration. It is Tribal's assessment that the Report rightly identifies that "a merger of operational roles would have to be a gradual and longer term aim". Furthermore there is not sufficient evidence in the Report to indicate that a

sufficient analysis of how combined operational Services would function has taken place in the tight timescales in which this work has been undertaken. For example, there is no analysis about incident response to which the Services actually respond by frequency and type, or analysis about incidents to which they both respond.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. The Report has focused its attention on the merger of operational roles, rather than a merger of operational services. If the option of identifying how combined operational services or an integrated single service might function is taken forwards for further investigation, it is recommended that the aim should be to clearly identify how this might improve the performance of the FRS and AS.
2. Develop and maintain a comprehensive risk register to capture the risks of the operational merger proposals against.
3. Tribal recommends that the relevant operational elements of this review with regard to AS are aligned with the review of Patient Transport Services being conducted as part of the Health and Social Services CSR review.

### 7.1.5. Potential to share premises/accommodation

This section of the report evidences some good analytical detail and impressive qualitative study of international good practice about how combined premises might be constituted and function. It also highlights the inadequacies of the facilities of both Services which presents a compelling case for investment and redesign.

The report notes some integrated service provision already with the single combined control room and the FRS' Western Fire Station houses the AS Major Incident Vehicle, which it notes is important to meeting response times for rapid intervention requirements such as heart attacks.

The headline proposals for a combined facility are identified as costing £8.6m and are recognised as £925k cheaper than the development of separate new facilities. An ongoing £7 per annum saving is identified in the running costs of a combined service which is built into the £114k savings recognised at 11.5 of the report. The realisation of this saving from 2012 is optimistic as it is presumably dependent on a new combined, single premises and no timeline for development is stated.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. Tribal's peer review endorses the recommendation in 9.3 of the Report that the next stage of the premises proposal should be to undertake a full feasibility study and concept design of a combined station. The Report's initial indications of the cost savings that this would generate are feasible, although a more detailed and robust cost savings analysis should be a part of this study. This feasibility study should investigate further options around where the capital funding to achieve this new build would be sourced. A

Private Finance Initiative is briefly mentioned in 9.3 of the report; this should be one of the options considered.

2. Tribal recommends that the review about the future of the FRS' Western Fire station be brought under the scope of this review.
3. Tribal recommends that the feasibility study of a single emergency control room is dependent on the assessment of combining the FRS and AS.
4. The needs analysis of both Services identified in the summary findings of Working Group 6 should be incorporated as an appendix to the Report.

### 7.1.6. Potential to share vehicles/equipment

This section identifies the current fleet of vehicles that the FRS and the AS possess and recognises that both fleets are composed of vehicles designed to perform specific and specialist emergency response tasks. This informs an analysis that identifies "limited opportunity" for sharing vehicles and arrives at a £5k saving through combined use of a single Major Incident Vehicle.

The only analysis around the procurement of equipment other than vehicles is around the procurement of uniforms. There is no investigation or analysis on whether there would be any savings in these areas, although it is noted that a joint procurement of a single uniform "might" result in savings.

The use of patient transport vehicles (which are subject to a separate review) in major incidents to transport priority 3 patients and staff is noted.

The analysis of the working group in this area is difficult to peer-review as only the results are presented in the Report. Given the specialist nature of the emergency response capability of both Services the limited opportunity for multi-use/cross role vehicles is feasible. However, since the vehicular and equipment demands of the Services depend on the operational nature of the Service/s provided (which is also under review) these demands should be recognised dependent on these elements of the review.

#### **Tribal recommendations**

1. Recognise any progress in this workstream as dependent on the results of two other parts of this review:
  - 1) The outcomes of the potential to merge operational roles identified above at 7.1.4.
  - 2) The outcomes of any work to review the fleet support functions identified above at 7.1.3.
2. Tribal recommends that the relevant operational elements of this review with regard to AS are aligned with the review of Patient Transport Services being conducted as part of the Health and Social Services CSR review.

## 8. Fire and Ambulance merger peer review: Recommendations

The report on the potential to merge the fire and ambulance services is reasonable and both Services should be commended on the responsiveness, commitment and joint working that they have evidenced conducting this work.

The Report indicates several areas which should be investigated further and provides a rationale for prioritising these. However, the limited time available to conduct the review and the initial uncertainty about whether it was aimed at achieving better service provision or at delivering cost savings have contributed to some stated figures not being thoroughly evaluated. These should be developed further in the next stages of the CSR process.

In addition to the detailed recommendations in the report above, Tribal's peer review recommends a prioritised approach to developing and potentially implementing a change programme to achieve a greater level of collaboration and integration between the two Services.

The projects that emerge from this initial review can be grouped into a phased programme that contains three separate stages. These have increasing levels of complexity and require increasing levels of work to identify exactly what should be done, how it should be done and the value of any cash releasing efficiency savings and service improvement benefits they would yield.

The stages are summarised below:

1. Identify the options in combining management structures, corporate support and administrative services.
2. Conduct a review of premises. It is recognised that there are constraints outside of the capability of FRS and AS senior management to control. The dependency on vacation of the current Police premises on the Rouge Bouillon site is noted here.

A combined approach covering the future location of the police premises, the review to assess the feasibility of a single emergency control room and the full inclusion of Jersey Property Holdings is essential to the success of this workstream. This potentially requires considerable capital investment.

3. The third phase of work is around developing a view of how operational service delivery (rather than operational roles), incident command and vehicle and equipment support might be adapted to meet the demands on the services.

To achieve this phased programme a wider change management perspective and programme management structure needs to be implemented. Tribal identifies the key elements of this to be:

- The replacement of the dual reporting model to Home Affairs (HA) and Health and Social Security (H&SS) departments with a single governance model to which the two Services can report.
- The implementation of a comprehensive risk methodology. This should capture the good work done by his review on identifying the risks around changing the Services, and use this to inform future decisions on which components to progress.
- The development of business cases to deliver cash releasing efficiency savings. This should be tempered by the critical need to provide high quality emergency services. This should lead to the development of a cost reduction change programme with the clear aim of realising achievable benefits.
- An effective programme management capability within the Chief Minister's office that can provide oversight of these two areas alongside the dependencies identified in wider HA and H&SS review areas. This should clearly articulate a deliverable savings target.

### 8.1.1. Conclusions

- The States of Jersey' report into the potential to merge the Fire and Ambulance services presents a credible programme of action and identifies what Tribal believes to be a conservative estimated annualised saving of £114k. This equates to a 1.3% saving of the two services 2009 budgets.
- It is Tribal's assessment that this figure lacks robustness, but that the programme of work identified in the report offers a number of achievable projects which if implemented could produce cash-releasing operational savings whilst also improving the service delivered.
- We recommend that more work be undertaken to construct a business case that will clearly state what the destination is for Fire and Ambulance services in Jersey, quantify the savings to be generated and prioritise how they should be taken forward.

# 3

## Prison

The following section contains the findings from our high-level review of the States of Jersey Prison Service's CSR proposals

## 9. Jersey Prison peer review: Overall findings

This is a high level review of the cost drivers and proposed financial savings for the Jersey Prison service. It should be noted that this assessment has been undertaken with limited time, and therefore with limited engagement with local stakeholders in Jersey. The purpose of this review is to provide an analysis of cost drivers and savings opportunities for the prison as an initial appraisal to determine the feasibility of an alternative provider. This based an assessment of the annual budget and proposed savings schedule for the CSR provided by the Prison.

### 9.1. Review of options for savings identified by the Prison Service

#### 9.1.1. Staff

Analysis of the accounts for 2009 and 2010 indicate that the most significant cost driver is staff costs which account for approximately 80% of total budget for the prison. Of this approximately 70% is for Prison Officer basic pay. During 2010 there appears to be a considerable reduction in staff overtime from 2009 levels, which resulted in an overspend of £243,000 in 2009. This is undoubtedly due to the increase in staff numbers that was agreed as part of 2010 plans. The savings plan proposes an amalgamation of current prison officer and operations group grades. This may provide for more efficiency and improved job satisfaction however the ability to release the financial savings may be limited in the near term due to the likely timescale to implement the change. The proposed savings are planned for 2012, which appears challenging.

#### 9.1.2. Utilities

Engineering is the largest cost driver within non staff costs accounting for approx 32% of this budget. The most significant elements of this cost is for Electricity and Heating Oil both of which are expected to exceed their 2010 budgets by 25% and 20% respectively. It is unlikely that alone the prison would be able to negotiate improved financial terms with providers, due to the limited competition for those utilities however working across several agencies (e.g. alongside the health services, home affairs) there could be greater potential to agree longer term fixed tariffs for utilities. At present this has not been included by the service as a potential saving.

### 9.1.3. Education

The majority of proposed financial savings identified are aimed at reducing the costs of the education and rehabilitation budget however these are unlikely to have an impact on the Prison Officer pay as the savings identified will have limited impact on those costs. There has been a recruitment campaign for prison staff over the last year so any alterations to the number or profile of these staff now would be an immediate change of policy.

The planned reduction of the education and activities will go against one of the key findings of the latest HM Chief Inspector of Prisons report (2005), which stated 'there was very little in the way of education or training, to try to provide prisoners with the skills they might need to gain employment on release, and to reduce the likelihood of reoffending<sup>12</sup>. Undoubtedly the regime at the prison has changed significantly during the past five years however the delivery of education and rehabilitation appears to be a considerable risk in the current proposals to reduce Horticultural activities as well as education sessions.

### 9.1.4. Reduction in overseas population

The Prison has identified that 40% of the population is made up of foreign nationals (with large proportions from Portugal and Poland). The repatriation of these prisoners would reduce the population of the prison and therefore impact on the level of staffing.

Establishing the legislative framework through a Repatriation Act to reduce foreign nationals is unlikely to be a quick process however would have a positive impact for the financial position as well as the prisoner population. This should be viewed as a priority activity.

### 9.1.5. Juveniles

One of the biggest savings options is to commit juvenile prisoners to Greenfields. This may be a cost saving for the Prison but for the overall Home Affairs budget this but appears to be a cost transfer rather than a saving.

---

<sup>12</sup> Page 5 Report on an announced inspection of La Moye Prison, Jersey; 27 June 0 1 July 2005 by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons.

## 10. Jersey Prison peer review: Additional Opportunities

There are several additional options not currently included in the Service's savings plans which we believe could be considered through CSR.

### 10.1. Outsource options

The Criminal Justice sector in the UK, and the prison service in particular, has recently contracted out many functions that are delivered in the prison environment. These functions range from outsourcing entire prisons through Private Finance Initiative, to contracting out specific education services such as substance misuse programmes. As with any other public sector organisation with limited financial resources this option does exist for the Prison of Jersey.

There are a wide range of services that could be contracted out based on experiences on the UK mainland and some of these are outlined in the box below. However it is very important that all options are fully considered before any decision is taken. Specific issues that should be recognised and assessed in particular for Jersey include:

- Staffing
  - The Prison has only recently conducted a recruitment process, where (it is understood) recruiting appropriate staff has not been straightforward
  - Staff costs on Jersey are relatively high compared to UK mainland which might impact on the attractiveness of the opportunity to potential providers
  - The workforce is part of a Trade Union, who must be consulted as part of any future plans.
- Size of the opportunity
  - The type of the establishment on Jersey may not be attractive to the market as it is a single prison, but there is a range of provision required for adult men and women and young offenders. This option could be made more attractive by considering a joint outsourcing arrangement with Guernsey, if possible.
- Requirement for investment
  - The current estate is considered poor for the optimum provision for services, in terms of prisoner welfare and management of the facilities. Any provider would be required to operate within a limited financial envelope without significant new investment beyond any savings that can be derived through the contract

- Supply market
  - The geographical position of Jersey means that the local supply chain is very different from other prison circumstances. Many services on Jersey are more expensive than the mainland (e.g. Food) and others have very limited competition for their services (e.g. utilities), which result in higher costs for the prison. The Prison should think of itself less as a discrete entity and more to consider options for procuring jointly with other services e.g. procure food jointly with the Hospital, all public services should procure utilities from a single contract

### **Outsourcing Service options**

Separate functions within the prison could be outsourced however the market size might limit the interest of providers. In their report 'The procurement of goods and services by HM Prison Service' (July 2008) the NAO identified potential for savings in expenditure on Works Services and Buildings Services. In the same report the UK Prison Service were quoted as considering 'that one way to identify the scope for more substantial savings in the future is to consider outsourcing part of its procurement function, in particular transport and logistics'.

Healthcare provision – several Primary Care Trusts on the UK mainland have recently sought to market test the provision of healthcare in prisons. In some instances this has been through the creation of integrated healthcare services across several establishments (3 Prisons in Doncaster region and 3 Prisons in Buckinghamshire) or specific services for individual establishments, for example primary medical services (including assessment of newly received prisoners requiring treatment for substance misuse) to the prison population at Bullingdon Community Prison and Huntercombe Young Offenders Institution. Several PCTs have commissioned services for individual Prisons that are applicable to the Jersey location for example Feltham Young Offenders Institution or HMP Leicester.

Catering - An NAO report in March 2006 (Smarter food procurement in the public sector) found that Five prisons which used outsourced catering firms in 1998 have since taken their catering in-house however there are still examples of prisons contracting out provision. HM Prison Barlinnie, Glasgow has recently issued a tender for catering services that are inclusive of the Staff Facility, Prisoner Visits Facility and Hospitality Services. Historically, total net sales for these three areas have been in the region of £250,000 per annum (Staff Facility - 20 %, Prisoner Visits Facility - 75 % and Hospitality Services - 5%).

## 10.2. Education and rehabilitation

As identified above, the majority of proposed savings are expected to be delivered by reduced the level of education and activities provided to prisoners. This is likely to be detrimental to the prisoners as well as the prison itself as people become disaffected and frustrated with limited stimulation.

Identifying how education and activities are provided to the prisoners in the most cost effective way will support future financial savings. There are several examples where projects have been established using external providers, at a lower cost to prison staff (who can be freed for other duties), can have a greater impact on prisoner behaviour and their likelihood of re-offending.

The consortium responsible for healthcare in HMP Wandsworth (Secure Healthcare) takes a "Managed Care" approach. Rather than "sharing" a client between services, the consortium, is intended to take ultimate responsibility as "gatekeeper" for all aspects of the individual's wellbeing, making prison healthcare less fragmented. They seek to involve prisoners in their own care, encouraging self-management, promoting user choice, and seeking to educate and promote health in the fullest sense of "total physical, mental and social wellbeing".

Such projects can provide support in the following areas:

- Education, training and employment - Half of all prisoners do not have the skills required by 96% of jobs<sup>13</sup>
- Healthcare - Young people in prison have an even greater prevalence of poor mental health than adults, with 95% having at least one mental health problem and 80% having more than one (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health)
- Of prisoners aged 16-20, around 85% show signs of a personality disorder, 10% of a psychotic illness<sup>14</sup>
- Children and families - Two fifths of boys and a quarter of girls in custody say they have experienced violence at home<sup>15</sup>
- Attitudes, thinking and behaviour - Surveys indicate 30% of people released from prison will have nowhere to live (Revolving Doors Agency)

<sup>13</sup> Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Social Exclusion Unit, *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*, July 2002.

<sup>14</sup> Singleton et al 2003, *Psychiatric Morbidity in Young Offenders in England and Wales*

<sup>15</sup> Prison Reform Trust; Bromley Briefings Prison Factfile (June 2008)

### 10.3. Procurement categories management

Currently the States of Jersey makes use of the HMPS national category management approach for the procurement of goods and services such as food, stationary and photocopying. The impact of this approach is not clear in terms of whether it takes account of the additional costs inherent in the Jersey location or use of the local supply chain. Greater understanding of the opportunities to maximise the local supply chain or again operating in a joined up manner with Jersey agencies may provide greater financial savings rather than being aligned to the UK prison procurement approach.

## 11. Jersey Prison peer review: Recommendations

We have identified several recommendations which believe should be considered to help ensure that the Prison service is identifying and considering the full range of savings open to it.

Explore opportunities to commission education and rehabilitation programmes to deliver services for prisoners.

Conduct a full feasibility study of the potential to outsource functions of Jersey Prison. This should explore the following:

- a) Contracting out
  - i) Individual Functions (e.g. healthcare, catering, education, back office)
  - ii) Full Prison provision
  - iii) Elements of cross service (e.g. prisoner transport, custody, across all Jersey agencies)
- b) Financial assessment
- c) Impact on staff and Union consultation
- d) Market testing of potential providers to gauge interest

Explore the timescales and due process to establish a Repatriation Act

Conduct an opportunity assessment of categories to understand fully the ability to make savings across cost centres within the prison. Seek to align this to categories across Jersey agencies.

Consider piloting use of community provision through initiatives such as electronic tagging working closely with the probation and police service.