

SPECIAL CLEVELAND POLICE AUTHORITY EXECUTIVE

A meeting of Cleveland Police Authority Executive was held on Tuesday 15 June 2010 in the Media Briefing Centre at Police HQ.

PRESENT: Councillor Caroline Barker, Councillor Barry Coppinger, Councillor Paul Kirton, Councillor Mary Lanigan, Councillor Ron Lowes, Councillor Dave McLuckie (Chair), and Councillor Hazel Pearson OBE

Independent Members

Miss Pam Andrews-Mawer, Mr Chris Coombs, Mr Ted Cox JP, Mr Geoff Fell, Mr Peter Hadfield, Mr Mike McGrory JP and Mr Peter Race MBE

OFFICIALS: Mrs Julie Leng, and Mrs Caroline Llewellyn (CE)
Mr Sean Price, Mr Derek Bonnard, Mr Dave Pickard, Mrs Ann Hall, Miss Kate Rowntree, Mr Michael Porter and Insp Dave Sutherland (CC)
Mr Glenn Gudgeon, Mr Steve Sugden and Mr Rob Beattie (Project I Evaluation Team)
Mr David Cunningham (Eversheds)

15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

16 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Members queried if they were required to declare an interest in relation to the Teesside Pension Scheme. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that this was not necessary as the issue in relation to the Teesside Pension Scheme was specifically in relation to the Terms and Conditions of those staff who would transfer if Members agreed to the outsource proposal.

17 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

ORDERED that pursuant to the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

18 PROJECT I – FINAL DECISION

Superintendent Gudgeon outlined the various stages of the

competitive dialogue process that Cleveland Police had undertaken since September 2008. The report outlined the procurement process and highlighted key outcomes and issues from the final two bidder solutions. More detail was contained within the appendices document and full copies of the proposals had been made available for Members reference.

Both proposals were economically advantageous and improved service to our communities.

The report did not name the two bidders and the evaluation and commentary were anonymised. The bidders were referred to as bidder A and bidder B. Both bidders and their solution had been assessed by internal service unit experts, external legal and commercial consultants and independent moderators.

Both bidders had agreed to conform to TUPE attain Admitted Body Status to the Teesside Pension Scheme and commit to no compulsory redundancies for ten years linked to the release of officers from back office posts.

Dependent on which bidder, if any, was chosen, their proposal would result in the TUPE transfer of between 472 and 474 staff.

The full scoring matrix was attached at Appendix 5 to the report and a summary of the scores achieved by the two bidders against the evaluation matrix was detailed at paragraph 1.8 to the report.

Both of the bids provide excellent value for money, they would both contribute significantly to the financial challenges that the Authority, along with the majority of other public sector organisations, will face over the next few years by generating both cashable and non cashable savings. These savings would be delivered as would improved service with a significantly better underlying technological base that would provide the Authority with the ability to adapt to future change in a more planned and coordinated way.

This partnership proposal would see the Authority entering into a partnership that would improve services, deliver savings and protect jobs at a time when the majority of other public sector organizations would be facing cuts in service and job cuts.

Both bidders had clearly taken full cognisance of the challenges set by the Information Systems Improvement Strategy (ISIS) when selecting technology, infrastructure and operating

procedures.

Both bidder solutions had been assessed in many areas as exceeding Cleveland Police's solution requirements. Bidder A's proposal was the Most Economically Advantageous Tender.

Members Questions:-

Reference paragraph 6.21 – proposals from the new Government to give power back to Officers to enable them to issue charges against low level offences – what impact would this have? It was confirmed that the proposal to re-instate charging of low level offences back to Custody Sergeants would not impact on the scheme.

Commitment to maintaining frontline officers – how many officers would that be? The DCC confirmed that this would equate to 1400 Officers dedicated to frontline duties.

Callback provision – this could lead to an increase in complaints? This is a risk when taking a pro-active approach but it was hoped that any genuine areas of concern would be addressed appropriately. The callback provision would also be a way of providing feedback to the public and provide updates.

Bond process, is there one in place and what are the terms? The Project Team confirmed that there was a £2.5 m bond provision incorporated within the contract that would enable them to terminate at will or in relation to contract issues.

Would the successful provider recognise trade unions? It was confirmed that both bidders would recognise trade unions and that both bidders had communicated and consulted with both the Federation and Unison throughout the process, including their attendance on external site visits with members of the Project Team and Authority.

Risk perspective – managing relationships and the readiness to be up and running. It was confirmed that both bidders had plans in place for the transition phase, the client side was in place as was the accommodation. A Strategic Board had been introduced to deal with all the high level management and monitoring issues.

Restrictive duty officers – 24 affected by this proposal – how would they be dealt with? The DCC confirmed that he already has monthly review meeting to manage each of the restricted

duty officers and he was confident that they could be managed through the process and confirmed that we would remain committed to looking after officers who require recuperative duties.

Have all the risks been captured and added to the risk register? Yes all risks as identified had been added to a separate risk register maintained throughout the process.

Paragraph 6.1 – Technology updates – would they be kept up to date? What if technology was imposed? ISIS would be the major impact and was the initial key driver for Project I, therefore both bidders are contractually obligated to technology that is ISIS compliant.

Paragraph 6.18 – 284 call backs per day equates to 23 calls an hour – this is a large commitment – is it achievable? The call back system would not only be quality checks, but would also be a feedback mechanism to update anyone who had placed a call or provided information with a progress update.

Had external stakeholders been consulted – i.e. Criminal Justice Service? Both bidders had engaged with CJS and conducted impact assessments on new technology, both bidders have made recommendations on how they could help them improve their technology, there was no negative impact.

Appendix 5 – reference to the 70 staff surplus to requirements? The Project Team explained that the 70 police staff would be placed into back office roles as they became vacated through moving officers to front line duties – maintaining and initially increasing the number of front line officers.

What does Alcatel period of 10 days mean? This is a stand still period of 10 days to allow the unsuccessful bidder(s) to receive feedback and to ensure there is no challenge prior to signing the contract.

ORDERED that:-

1. Having considered the proposals within the report, members unanimously agreed to outsource services.
2. Bidder A be appointed as the successful bidder for the provision of services outlined within the report.

Members were then advised that Bidder A was Steria.

3. The decision to appoint Bidder A was subject to the 10 calendar days Alcatel standstill period.