



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CAMBRIDGESHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
ON 21 JULY 2021**

Members Present:	Edward Leigh (Chairperson), Councillors A Bradnam, S Bywater, C Daunton, C Hogg, A Lynn, E Murphy, A Sharp, S Warren and Claire George.	
Officers Present:	Jane Webb Fiona McMillan	Secretariat, Peterborough City Council Monitoring Officer, Peterborough City Council
Others Present:	Darryl Preston Jim Haylett	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner Chief Executive OPCC (Office of Police Crime Commissioner)

1. Election of Chairperson

The Secretariat asked for nominations for the role of Chairperson. Edward Leigh was nominated by Councillor Sharp and seconded by Councillor Bywater. There were no other nominations and therefore Edward Leigh was appointed Chairperson for the municipal year 2021/22.

2. Election of Vice Chairperson

The Chairperson asked for nominations for the role of Vice Chairperson. Councillor Sharp was nominated by Edward Leigh (Chairperson) and seconded by Councillor Lynn. There were no other nominations and therefore Councillor Sharp was appointed Vice Chairperson for the municipal year 2021/22.

3. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Tierney, Collis, and Ferguson. Councillor Murphy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Ali.

4. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were declared.

5. Welcome the Commissioner

Edward Leigh welcomed the new Commissioner, Darryl Preston, to the Panel meeting, along with Jim Haylett – Chief Executive OPCC and Fiona McMillan – Monitoring Officer to the Panel, who were all attending via video link.

6. Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 March 2021

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

7. Panel's Recommendations and MP's Letter

Edward Leigh introduced the MP's letter stating it had been received in response to a letter sent to government ministers raising concerns about funding, virtual meetings and the Police and Crime Commissioner elections.

Members made the following comments regarding the response received from Kit Malthouse MP:

- a) Councillor Murphy asked if the Panel should pursue an attempt to achieve an uplift in funding. The Commissioner explained in relation to the core grant, which was an archaic formula that did not work for Cambridgeshire and other counties, he had already lobbied for this, and was in discussions with both the Home Secretary and the policing minister and there was some commitment with the government to look again at the funding formula. The Commissioner assured the Panel this would be high on his agenda whenever he had conversations with members of parliament or ministers asking for their assistance in lobbying government and agree that the funding settlement was unfair. Edward Leigh stated the Panel would like to offer its assistance in helping the Commissioner enforce the point regarding the funding formula where it could.
- b) Councillor Hogg stated police funding had shifted from the government to the precept received from council tax and therefore could the precept also be added to business rates; on the basis that the business receives the same services from the police as residents. The Commissioner stated this was down to policy and he would take this away and ask the necessary questions.
- c) Claire George asked that given the Commissioner had stated his commitment to partnership working, would there be any opportunities for partnership lobbying for additional funding, including strategic safety partnerships and elected MPs. The Commissioner stated that community safety was not just a role for policing and there were many other agencies involved that would 'shout with one loud voice together.'
- d) Councillor Daunton stated Kit Malthouse's letter mentioned "carefully considering the approach to allocating officer numbers;" previously we have been told we might have an increase in officer numbers but that the funding was not available for those officers (ie no funding for uniforms or lockers) therefore would it be possible to respond to Mr Malthouse stating that giving more officers without lockers or uniforms was not helpful. The Commissioner stated he had not been informed of that issue, but the Panel could be assured that he would make the strongest case for receiving the highest amount possible from central government.
- e) Edward Leigh explained the Panel were looking to the Commissioner to take leadership regarding funding levels and Panel Members were prepared to play their part in reinforcing that message.
- f) Councillor Murphy thought there had been a lack of flexibility at the way funding had been passed down, resulting in measures being taken to balance certain budgets and therefore asked the Commissioner if he would be minded to look for more flexibility to manage cuts to Police Community Support Officers, so that their experience was not lost. The Commissioner stated he was not in the role at the time of that decision but the money from central grant was ring-fenced around the police officer uplift, which was government policy. In relation to the decision around PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers) and other announcements made, these were operational decisions for the Chief Constable; it was for the Commissioner to make resources available and set the strategic priorities. The Commissioner reiterated that he was very keen to ensure that alongside that, the neighbourhood policing model that the Chief

Constable announced was effectively implemented and he would be monitoring that very closely.

The Panel **NOTED** the letter.

8. Public Questions/Statements

Two questions had been received from Nicky Massey who attended the meeting.

Nicky Massey asked the following:

Question **1**

Would the commissioner support 20 is plenty campaign and the campaigning by the Louis Thorold Trust to reduce the speed of Vehicles in urban areas down to 20 mph by including into vision zero and working with other partners to achieve this as soon as possible. The benefit to life is obvious but lowering the number of accidents also has an impact on emergency services including the police.

According to 20 is plenty campaign the number of police recorded casualties on Cambridgeshire roads was 1646, with 648 of those on 30 MPH roads. In Peterborough 629 were recorded with 307 on 30mph roads, totalling 2275 of those 955 on 30mph roads. The cost of these collisions is 148 million for Cambridgeshire and 54.1 million for Peterborough totalling 202.1 million. Of these costs will be police costs of attending the scene and of course a cost to the health system and most importantly people's lives. I would urge the commissioner to add 20 is plenty into vision zero and reach out to all partners including Peterborough council for further support.

Question **2**

The commissioner has implemented his police and crime survey for the public, however notably absent is any reference to Violence against women and girls and domestic abuse as a priority.

How can the commissioner assure the public that these will be one his highest Priorities, while also noting the out pouring of women's triggered reaction to the way the Metropolitan police handled the death of Sarah Everard (by asking women not leave the house at night alone), and the fact that harassment of women and girls is now a live issue that needs to be recognised as such by the police, and not by putting police officers in nightclubs, but by working with night time economy, and by talking to women's services to ask what more could be done to stop the years of abuse and harassment that causes so many women to feel afraid or concerned about walking alone at any time of day or night.

The Commissioner thanked Nicky Massey for two important questions and addressed them as follows:

Question 1 – The Commissioner stated the statistics were shocking; road safety was a priority during his campaign and would continue within his role. The Commissioner personally thought that 20mph speed limits were appropriate in certain circumstances but not in all urban areas, which he believed was in line with the Vision Zero Partnership view which was supportive of the world health organisation recommendations; that 20mph should be the maximum speed in urban areas where vulnerable road users and vehicles mix. The Commissioner stated he would work closely with the Road Safety Partnership, supportive of the Vision Zero Partnership and where there was good evidence to support 20mph speed limits, he would be supportive, but notwithstanding that, the actual responsibility does lie with the local highway authorities, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, who he would work closely with to ensure the roads were as safe as possible.

Question 2 – The Commissioner stated his background was in law enforcement as a police officer and he had worked in many areas having had direct contact in tackling violence against women and girls. It was a national government priority and had been recently consulted on with a strategy being released; it was also a local priority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. There was a local partnership (VAWG) Violence Against Women and Girls strategy which all partners have signed up to. The Constabulary's commitment to tackling VAWG was recently bolstered with the introduction of the Vulnerability Focused Desk which a portion of precept money went towards; this increased the support and direction for frontline officers to be reactive in investigations. The Constabulary also recently led a series of focus groups with third sector services to capture their views on what more could be done to tackle VAWG; this was part of the County's recent bid to the Safer Streets Fund due for next year which worked in partnership with the night-time economy key stakeholders which had been helpful to ensure the views of all services.

9. Police and Crime Commissioner – Oath and Conduct

Edward Leigh explained that both the Acceptance of Office and the Code of Ethics had been brought to the Panel meeting to make the Commissioner's commitment public and to put these commitments into the public domain.

The Commissioner stated that the Acceptance and Oath of Office were both public documents and he was happy to follow the Panel's recommendation. The Commissioner added that he took a further commitment, of which there was no statutory requirement to do so, by signing up to the Policing Code of Ethics. This was a set of disciplines which all police officers and staff sign up to, and he was more than happy to sign this.

Edward Leigh thanked the Commissioner and welcomed the further commitment to high standards in public office through the signing of the Policing Code of Ethics.

ACTION

The Panel **NOTED** the item

The Panel made the following recommendation:

That the wording of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Declaration of Acceptance of Office, and the Policing Code of Ethics be made accessible to the public on the OPCC website, preferably from the Commissioner's biography page

10. Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach

The Panel received a report with an overview of the Police and Crime Commissioner's role, how he intends to take forward his role, and how the Police and Crime Plan will be developed.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner, these included:

- a) Councillor Murphy stated he was encouraged by what he had heard, read, and believed that the Panel had good experience and knowledge to be able help the Commissioner develop the Strategy. He did believe community safety partnerships could be better in terms of engagement and asked what steps the Commissioner may take, with the Panel and others, to engage the hard-to-reach groups? (Elderly, young leaving care, new residents.) The Commissioner responded regarding Community Safety Partnerships stating they were key, key in keeping the communities safe, they varied in how they operated and therefore one of the first tasks the Commissioner carried out was to speak all the Community Safety Partnership (CSPs) Chairs, this

was now diarised and happening shortly. Funding had previously been made available from the Commissioner's office for CSPs and he was keen to see how this could be done in partnership to ensure the CSPs were as effective as possible. New government legislation around Serious Violence Reduction was down the line and CSPs would be an excellent delivery arm for some of the work. The Commissioner reiterated he was keen to support and obtain views from the Panel and other stakeholders. Regarding the hard-to-reach communities; the Commissioner would be asking for help from others, including Members, to reach those people.

- b) Councillor Daunton asked the Commissioner how he would interact with Councillors and would he provide an opportunity for Councillors to meet with him on a regular basis. The Commissioner stated that if any Councillor wanted to meet, he would facilitate it where possible; engagement with councillors was key in keeping the community safe.
- c) Edward Leigh asked to see evidence going forward and the strategy used to reach some of the hard-to-reach groups, (faith groups, minorities, travellers, homeless, victims of crime -domestic, sexual, trafficking; and to understand the problems to which the Commissioner can make a difference and what it is that can make the difference. The Commissioner reassured the Panel that the consultation he had carried out with his team had reached out everywhere and had been ably assisted by councillors who had already had the relevant contacts:
 - a. Faith groups – Peterborough Cathedral, Cambs Central Mosque, Hindu Temple, and Cambridge University Jewish Society.
 - b. Travellers – One Voice for Travellers
 - c. Homeless – Lighthouse Centre - Ely, Light Project - Peterborough
 - d. Victims – Bobby Scheme, Refuge, PWA, Victims & Witness Hub, Family Action
 - e. Rehabilitation (People of multiple disadvantage) – The Sun Network, The Cambridge Co Production Group

The Commissioner thanked his team for reaching everywhere and asked for help from the Panel as there was still two more weeks left on the consultation.

- d) Councillor Lynn asked if the Ferry Project at Wisbech could be added to the list as there was a large homeless issue in Wisbech to which the Ferry Project was working towards. Councillor Lynn also asked if the Commissioner would meet with the CEO of the Ferry Project. The Commissioner agree and asked if Councillor Lynn would pass the survey onto the Ferry Project, and he looked forward to visiting Wisbech in the future.
- e) Councillor Bradnam explained there were several separate groups within the traveller population that may need to be contacted: The Show People, The Irish Travellers and The Local Indigenous Travellers.
- f) Councillor Bradnam also asked for clarification, as to what degree did the Commissioner felt his boundary fell for calling the Chief Constable to account stopped and where the Chief Constable's boundary for being the operational manager started and ended. The Commissioner stated this boundary confused many, and the Chief constable was operationally independent. The Chief Constable must take account of the Police and Crime Plan but for the effectiveness of both the Police force and the commissioner there needed to be a professional relationship; clearly there was a boundary set in law, there was also an ongoing national government review to clarify the position as those boundaries cross and can cause some conflict. The Commissioner stated that he believed this was the start of very professional relationship and gave the example of rural crime as being a priority, but the Commissioner being unable to direct the Chief Constable to increase numbers in the rural crime action team, but the Chief Constable had looked at that priority and found resources to bolster the rural crime action team and alongside prevention work of the Commissioner (Countryside Watch) both worked together.
- g) Councillor Murphy asked if there was scope to include targets within the Plan, e.g., Twenty is Plenty and the need for Highways to be involved; to keep death off the roads, should a target be set for a reduction in the number of fatalities on the roads

and for the police to work with other local authorities to achieve that target? The Commissioner stated he was concerned about adding metrics to the Plan and included in Vision Zero there were aspirational targets within the project, and these would be included within the Plan. If target measuring were shown to make communities safer than the Commissioner stated, he would be open to looking at them but was nervous about adding matrixes in for the “sake of it” but would be happy to continue the conversation.

- h) Edward Leigh questioned the Commissioner about the need to be transparent, accountable, and added that the Commissioner held the Chief Constable to account at the Business Coordination Board (BCB) Meetings which were held in private albeit that the agenda and minutes were published; had the Commissioner had any thoughts about opening the BCB Meetings to the public or allowing Panel Members to attend by invitation. The Commissioner stated he would take this away as a consideration, but he added that he was keen to do public engagement as most issues he received were of an operational nature. The Commissioner stated he had spoken to the Chief Constable (this process has been done elsewhere across the country), whereby they would both visit the districts to hold public events, ideally these would also include local authority leaders, as community safety was not just a policing issue.
- i) Councillor Bywater asked what the Commissioner’s thoughts were with the judicial system and court system regarding repeat offenders being barred from certain areas and then the issues had been continued in another area. The Commissioner stated his role in chairing the Criminal Justice Board would be key in taking that issue forward.
- j) Edward Leigh stated the Panel strongly endorsed the Commissioner’s approach to formulate the Plan.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

- The Panel also wished to take up the offer to engage with the Commissioner directly and arrange dates for informal meetings (ideally one before end of the consultation period, and one in early September).

11. Impact of COVID on Policing in Cambridgeshire

The Panel received a report with an update on the impact of COVID on policing in response to a request from the Panel on the 24th of March 2021 meeting.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner and his staff regarding the impact of COVID on policing in Cambridgeshire, these included:

- a) Councillor Daunton stated that several local government organisations were working on Covid Recovery Plans and asked if he had already been contacted to work on these, if not, would he be prepared to make contact to work on these Plans. The Commissioner stated he would ensure that this would be carried out.
- b) Councillor Lynn stated that although there had been a reduction in calls, he feared this was not because there was less crime but because people were unwilling to report crimes through the fear that they would not be responded to, therefore how did the Commissioner see the way forward in encouraging the public to report crimes. The Commissioner recognised this was an issue and he would be holding the Chief Constable to account in this area, and this would hopefully give confidence and reassurance to residents and business owners to report crimes.
- c) Councillor Hogg stated the 101 calls could take 30mins to receive a response and he feared those calling 101 would give up the call due to the length of time taken and do not bother to report their call going forward. The web service had seen an increase but 101 a decline; was this due to frustration over the poor 101 service and therefore moved to the webchat for a response. The Commissioner stated that the service to

999 calls and the first part of 101 calls were good, but it was the second part of 101 calls, where calls had already been triaged, that struggled. This second process determined what happened next and this was where there were issues, and the Commissioner would be holding the Chief Constable account for improving this as the public needed to have confidence that they could contact the police. This information would be used as intelligence for the police and for data in the spending review.

- d) Edward Leigh added that the public would be unaware that the reporting of crime would be helping in the supply of intelligence as they did not receive any feedback, the public would assume that the information they supplied would disappear into a “black hole” therefore this would be an important message for the police to lead on, to encourage the public to engage with the police. There was also a need to have a careful study of the user experience, as there were numerous faults with the system; 101 did not offer you an expected wait time, the call-back service did not work, and lines were cut-off and if users received a negative experience, then they would not re-use the system and would also inform others not to use the system. Edward Leigh reiterated that he was glad the 101 system was on the Commissioner’s radar as it had been on the Panel’s radar for years.
- e) Councillor Bradnam asked the Commissioner if he gave any priority in feeding back to Councillors. The Commissioner stated this had already been discussed as it sat well with the Local Neighbourhood Policing Teams, and it would be ideal if all Councillors knew who to contact to ensure they could have those conversations about issues in their local communities.
- f) Councillor Lynn stated the Wisbech Local Neighbourhood Policing Team send Wisbech Town Councillors a report every month and there was a section where they could put questions to the Neighbourhood Police who responded for the next meeting.
- g) Edward Leigh stated police officers would have more encounters with the public not wearing masks and were therefore likely to be more at risk of contracting COVID and asked the Commissioner of what measures were put in place to protect officers? Edward Leigh also asked, regarding the following statement: ‘early indication show more complex mental health and vulnerability may be emerging amongst police officers and possibly staff too’ – did the Commissioner have any thoughts on both monitoring and helping the police on both of those issues? The Commissioner stated it was obviously for the Chief Constable as they were his staff, but he cared deeply that police officers were supported because they were keeping the communities safe. The Commissioner stated that the police were members of the public and would therefore mirror the general population with mental health and wellbeing issues.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

12. Police and Crime Commissioner’s Annual Report

The Panel received a report to review the draft Annual Report for the period of the 1st of April 2020 to the 31st of March 2021 issued by the Police and Crime Commissioner (the “Commissioner”) under Section 12 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (the “Act”).

The Commissioner asked to put on record, his thanks to the previous Acting Police and Crime Commissioner, Ray Bisby who was passionately committed to keeping the communities safe. The Commissioner also thanked, on behalf of the residents of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, all the officers, staff and volunteers at Cambridgeshire Constabulary who continued to demonstrate great professionalism, having been out on the frontline, keeping the public safe, when others have not had to and put themselves and their own families at risk.

Edward Leigh echoed the Panel’s thanks.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner and his staff regarding the draft Annual Report, these included:

- a) Councillor Hogg asked how many PCSOs had gone from the force. Jim Haylett stated he would confirm these numbers and update the Panel, but he believed that the figures were correct at the time they were provided (31st March) and added that the Chief Constable stated that the remaining PCSOs would be allocated across all the remaining policing teams.
- b) Edward Leigh stated that with the OPCC having engaged a Clinical Psychologist to support the Victim and Witness Hub and given the growing backlog of Crown Court serious cases and the growing number of victims and witnesses within the system who had not yet reached resolution requiring extended support; what was the Commissioner's observation on the level of resource available to provide that support and did he feel it was sufficient, given the growing demand. The Commissioner stated there had been less court cases, but Edward Leigh was right, in the fact, that there were now longer waiting times, but he had not heard that they were struggling with resources. Jim Haylett added that as the backlog had progressed through COVID and it had become more apparent that it would take some time to reduce, staffing levels were discussed within the Victims and Witness Hub and additional monies had been allocated. The Clinical Psychologist was partly for a training course for staff to help them recognise mental health issues and to advise them in case management.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

13. **DPCC (Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner) and Succession Planning**

The Panel received a letter sent to the OPCC on 9th July 2021 from Kit Malthouse MP regarding **Police and Crime Commissioner Review: deputies and succession planning**.

The Commissioner stated that it was his intention to appoint a Deputy, although this was to become mandatory by the Home Office.

The Commissioner also stated successional planning would be taken up, but in the interim, currently legislation would apply, where precedent has been set that the Chief Executive could take up those duties for a limited period.

The Panel made comment, asked questions, and received responses from the Commissioner and his staff regarding DPCC and Succession Planning, these included:

- a) Councillor Murphy asked that the Commissioner continue to share his thoughts and the thoughts of the OPCC as to how this would progress forward and ask that the Commissioner consider the use of Associates (instead of a Deputy) to progress the work of making the police service even more relevant, efficient, effective, and economic in the way it carried out its duties. The Commissioner stated he would take these comments on board. The Chief Executive added that the legislation indicated that the Panel appoints a member of existing paid staff, the legislation covers for a deputy, if appointed becomes a member of staff, a different employment model to the PCC (Police and Crime Commissioner).
- b) Edward Leigh asked if the Commissioner could make more than one political appointment. Jim Haylett explained the legislation stated that only one political appointment could be made of the deputy with no further provisions.
- c) Edward Leigh asked if the Commissioner was minded in including the Panel in drawing up the job specification and selecting candidates. The Commissioner explained this was a political appointment that he could make but he would take this comment away and update the Panel.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

14. Decisions by the Police and Crime Commissioner

The Panel received a report to enable it to review or scrutinise decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner under Section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Panel was recommended to indicate whether it would wish to further review and scrutinise the decisions taken by the Police and Crime Commissioner taken since the previous Panel meeting.

The Panel **AGREED** to note the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.

15. Task and Finish Group – Next Steps

Claire George, Chair of the Task and Finish Group presented the Outcomes and Recommendations of the Task and Finish Group Scrutiny Improvement Review to the Panel for their consideration; stating that, if the recommendations were agreed, a provisional date was booked for the 27th of September where Ian Parry from the Centre of Public Scrutiny would out carry out a workshop for the Panel to facilitate the recommendations (e.g., Panel protocol, work programming etc).

Edward Leigh asked the Commissioner if had any initial responses to the presentation from the Task and Finish Group. The Commissioner commented that it had been a very comprehensive piece of work that had been carried out and he was very keen to support it going forward to enable both parties to have the best possible relationship and to be able to both fulfil their roles to their full potential and was happy to work with the Panel moving forward.

Edward Leigh stated that the Panel relied heavily on the OPCC staff to produce reports and therefore the Panel were mindful of any forward planning carried out needed to be done in consultation with the OPCC.

Jim Haylett stated he was aware of the resource implications on the OPCC; he added that to operate effectively there was a need to ensure all parties were clear of their roles and responsibilities and he would seek to take this approach when it came to the relationship between the Commissioner and the Panel; but he would wait to see what the Panel's deliberations delivered. Edward Leigh gave the reassurance that the OPCC would be involved in an early point of the necessary discussions.

(THE COMMISSIONER AND HIS STAFF LEFT THE MEETING)

The Panel made comments, these included:

- a) Panel members thanked Claire George for how well she had led the Task and Finish Group and had discussions on the resources issues of the OPCC, their own resource issues, training, panel member skills and venues.
- b) Councillor Murphy stated that zoom facilities should be used for informal work, training etc to be more effective and efficient and to use less resources. Edward Leigh agreed that any informal meetings needed between meetings would be conducted online and an opportunity to include others from other organisations.

The Panel also **AGREED** to the organisation of a training day with on 27th September with the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny. The agenda will include training, drafting a PCC–PCP protocol, and developing a work programme together.

16. Rules of Procedure Update

The Panel **NOTED** that no changes were necessary.

17. Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report

The Chairperson introduced the report which provided the Panel with a draft of the Annual report for consideration and approval.

Councillor Sharp commented that the Fire Authority in terms of the Fire Reform would come forward to the Panel at some point and would need to be brought into the work programme. Edward Leigh stated the issue was discussed regularly between himself and the OPCC and therefore everyone was in a 'holding pattern' as the government was likely to mandate Commissioners to look at this issue at some point but currently there were no rules set yet or amounts of funding available; everything was still unknown. The Panel had previously added an extra meeting in to cover this issue and could reinstate this again, if necessary, with a view that it would give the Panel extra capacity to consider the fire issue.

Edward Leigh stated that as soon as the government set out a timetable and rules then the Panel would need to engage with the Commissioner and the Chair of the Fire Authority to start discussions to ensure the transition is as smooth as possible.

Councillor Bradnam asked if the Panel were able to form their own view regarding fire governance. Fiona McMillan advised that the Panel could do this, but to do this in an informal setting.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

The Panel also made the following recommendation:

- The Panel has an informal meeting to discuss fire governance (Panel may want to invite the Chair of the Fire Authority and the Commissioner to help inform on how to respond at the appropriate time).

18. Administration Costs and Member Expenses

The Panel received a report detailing the budget claimed to support Cambridgeshire's Police and Crime Panel, including the expenses of Panel Members.

Councillor Hogg commented that the costs of printing and sending out of agendas had gone down to zero for the year; and asked if this was set to continue as he felt that the printing and sending out of agendas should be reinstated. Councillor Hogg also questioned the spending of £1787 on equipment to which the secretariat replied that this was for working equipment (laptops, mobile phones etc). Edward Leigh added that the Panel's budget was paid directly by the Home Office and if the budget was not spent then the money would be lost; it was not taking money away from elsewhere in the local authority. A discussion was taken on agendas, and it was determined that the way forward would be that the Panel would continue electronically and if there was a problem then this could be considered to see if any issues could be accommodated.

The Panel **AGREED** to **NOTE** the report.

19. Meeting Dates and Agenda Plan

Forthcoming Meeting Dates:
15th September 2021

27th September 2021 – Workshop
2nd November 2021 – Conference (Coventry)
10th November 2021
2nd February 2022 - Precept
16th February 2022 – if needed
23rd March 2022

Future meeting dates were **NOTED**; live streaming of Panel meetings to be reconsidered when councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have decided on whether to stream their own council and committee meetings

	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Panel's Recommendations and MP's Letter	The Panel NOTED the item.
2.	Police and Crime Commissioner – Oath and Conduct - verbal	The Panel NOTED the item The Panel made the following recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the wording of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Declaration of Acceptance of Office, and the Policing Code of Ethics be made accessible to the public on the OPCC website, preferably from the Commissioner's biography page.
3.	Police and Crime Commissioner's Approach	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report. The Panel also wished to take up the offer to engage with the Commissioner directly and arrange dates for informal meetings (ideally one before end of the consultation period, and one in early September).
4.	Impact of COVID on Policing in Cambridgeshire	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
5.	Police and Crime Commissioner's Annual Report	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
6.	DPCC and Succession Planning – Verbal	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the update.
7.	Decisions by the Commissioner	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report and decisions that had been made by the Commissioner.
8.	Rules of Procedure Update	The Panel NOTED that no changes were necessary
9.	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel Annual Report	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report. The Panel also made the following recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel has an informal meeting to discuss fire governance (Panel may want to invite the Chair of the Fire Authority and the Commissioner to help inform on how to respond at the appropriate time).
10.	Administration Costs and Member Expenses	The Panel AGREED to NOTE the report.
11.	Task and Finish Group – Next Steps	The Panel AGREED to ACCEPT the report. The Panel also AGREED to the organisation of a training day with on 27 th September with the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny. The agenda will include training, drafting a PCC–PCP protocol, and developing a work programme together.
12.	Meeting Dates & (Venues and Streaming)	Future meeting dates were NOTED . Live streaming of Panel meetings to be reconsidered when councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have decided on whether to stream their own council and committee meetings.

The meeting began at 2:00pm and ended at 4:50 pm

CHAIRPERSON