GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

DATE: Tuesday, 30th June, 2020
TIME: 1.00 pm
VENUE: MS Teams

AGENDA

1. TO APPOINT A CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2020/21

2. MEMBERSHIP 2020/21

To note the membership for the forthcoming Municipal Year 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Nadim Muslim</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Jones</td>
<td>Bury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Nigel Murphy</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Stephen Williams</td>
<td>Oldham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Janet Emsley</td>
<td>Rochdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Lancaster</td>
<td>Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amanda Peers</td>
<td>Stockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alison Gwynne</td>
<td>Tameside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Graham Whitham</td>
<td>Trafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Anderson</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majid Hussain</td>
<td>Co-opted Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Lawrence</td>
<td>Co-opted Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. APOLOGIES

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of interest in any item for discussion at the

Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed via www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk, please speak to a Governance Officer before the meeting should you not wish to consent to being included in this recording.
meeting. A blank form for declaring interests has been circulated with the agenda; please ensure that this is returned to the Governance & Scrutiny Officer at the start of the meeting.

5. **MINUTES**

To consider the approval of the minutes of the meetings held on 28 and 31 January 2020

6. **POLICE AND CRIME TEAM UPDATE REPORT**

Report of Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice services and Fire

7. **GMCA (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020**

Report of Liz Treacy, GMCA Solicitor and Monitoring Officer

8. **POLICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY - RESULTS FOR THE PERIOD JULY 2019 - MARCH 2020**

Report of Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice services and Fire

9. **GMP - CRIME DATA**

Report of the Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice Services and Fire

For copies of papers and further information on this meeting please refer to the website [www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk](http://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk). Alternatively, contact the following:

Governance & Scrutiny Officer: Steve Annette
IAM steve.annette@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on Monday 22 June, 2020 on behalf of Julie Connor, Secretary to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, Churchgate House, 56 Oxford Street, Manchester M1 6EU
POLICE AND CRIME PANEL – 30 JUNE 2020

Declaration of Councillors’ Interests in Items Appearing on the Agenda

NAME: ______________________________

DATE: ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Item No. / Agenda Item No.</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
<th>Type of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see overleaf for a quick guide to declaring interests at meetings.
QUICK GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

This is a summary of the rules around declaring interests at meetings. It does not replace the Member’s Code of Conduct, the full description can be found in the GMCA’s constitution Part 7A.

Your personal interests must be registered on the GMCA’s Annual Register within 28 days of your appointment onto a GMCA committee and any changes to these interests must notified within 28 days. Personal interests that should be on the register include:
- Bodies to which you have been appointed by the GMCA
- Your membership of bodies exercising functions of a public nature, including charities, societies, political parties or trade unions.

You are also legally bound to disclose the following information called DISCLOSABLE PERSONAL INTERESTS which includes:
- You, and your partner’s business interests (eg employment, trade, profession, contracts, or any company with which you are associated)
- You and your partner’s wider financial interests (eg trust funds, investments, and assets including land and property).
- Any sponsorship you receive.

FAILURE TO DISCLOSE THIS INFORMATION IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE

STEP ONE: ESTABLISH WHETHER YOU HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA
If the answer to that question is ‘No’ – then that is the end of the matter. If the answer is ‘Yes’ or Very Likely’ then you must go on to consider if that personal interest can be construed as being a prejudicial interest.

STEP TWO: DETERMINING IF YOUR INTEREST PREJUDICIAL?
A personal interest becomes a prejudicial interest:
- where the well being, or financial position of you, your partner, members of your family, or people with whom you have a close association (people who are more than just an acquaintance) are likely to be affected by the business of the meeting more than it would affect most people in the area.
- the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest.

FOR A NON PREJUDICIAL INTEREST
YOU MUST
- Notify the governance officer for the meeting as soon as you realise you

FOR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS
YOU MUST
- Notify the governance officer for the meeting as soon as you realise you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>have an interest</th>
<th>have a prejudicial interest (before or during the meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inform the meeting that you have a personal interest and the nature of the interest</td>
<td>• Inform the meeting that you have a prejudicial interest and the nature of the interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fill in the declarations of interest form</td>
<td>• Fill in the declarations of interest form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO NOTE:</td>
<td>• Leave the meeting while that item of business is discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You may remain in the room and speak and vote on the matter</td>
<td>• Make sure the interest is recorded on your annual register of interests form if it relates to you or your partner’s business or financial affairs. If it is not on the Register update it within 28 days of the interest becoming apparent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If your interest relates to a body to which the GMCA has appointed you to you only have to inform the meeting of that interest if you speak on the matter.</td>
<td>YOU MUST NOT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your disclosable pecuniary interest during the meeting participate further in any discussion of the business,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 28 JANUARY 2020 AT CHURCHGATE HOUSE, MANCHESTER

PRESENT:
Councillor Nadim Muslim  Bolton Council
Councillor Sharon Briggs  Bury Council
Councillor Nigel Murphy  Manchester City Council – (In the Chair)
Councillor Steve Williams  Oldham Council
Councillor Janet Emsley  Rochdale Council
Councillor David Lancaster  Salford City Council
Councillor Amanda Peers  Stockport Council
Councillor Warren Bray  Tameside Council
Councillor Mike Freeman  Trafford Council
Councillor Kevin Anderson  Wigan Council
Angela Lawrence MBE  Independent Member
Majid Hussain  Independent Member

ALSO PRESENT:
Baroness Beverley Hughes  GM Deputy Mayor

OFFICERS:
Gwynne Williams  Deputy Monitoring Officer, GMCA
Clare Monaghan  Director Policing, Crime and Fire, GMCA
Laura Mercer  Principal (Victims and Vulnerability), GMCA
Jeanette Staley  Salford City Council & GM Police and Crime Policy Lead
Julie Walker  Civil Contingencies and Resilience Unit
Steve Annette  GMCA Governance and Scrutiny
CS Phil Davies  GMP
PCP/01/20 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillor Paula Boshell, Salford City Council, and Carolyn Wilkins, Chief Executive, Oldham Council and Lead Chief Executive, Police and Crime.

PCP/02/20 CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair announced that as agreed at a previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel, members would receive a progress update on the Information Services Transformation Programme (iOPS) and in addition to this there would be an update on the Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Review.

PCP/03/20 INFORMATION SERVICES TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME (iOPS)

CS Phil Davies, GMP provided a verbal update in relation to the Information Services Transformation Programme, in particular the iOPS products. He reported that significant progress had been made since the Panel received an update at its meeting in November 2019. He reported that as at the beginning of December 2019, GMP formally exited the position of hyper-care with the supplier, which reduced the amount of technical support because a significant number of the high priority defects had been resolved, confidence was improving with the users and some of the efficiencies were being realised. Members were informed that significant ‘patch’ upgrades would be installed soon, that would improve the user experience for police officers, particularly in relation to management intelligence and crime. He added that in relation to call management, the 999 service was reaching national targets and there has been significant improvements in relation to the call management of the 101 service. He added that much effort had been made in relation to the Confidence Plan and that there was a continuing strong focus around training and engagement with frontline users and that the platform was now in place to ensure better data-sharing with partners and making more effective decisions.

There followed a general discussion and members made various comments and asked a variety questions including; that data-sharing was very patchy across the districts and reassurance was sought that this would improve going forward. In response, Chief Superintendent Davies said that he hoped this would be resolved by April. A member said that it was important that data sets were not altered so that meaningful comparisons could be made. Chief Superintendent Davies said that it was a priority for GMP to ensure that all data was aligned and published as longer-term comparisons were vital moving forward.

The Chair thanked Chief Superintendent Davies for his update and the reassurances he had provided. He added that on behalf of the panel, he also wished to thank staff for their ongoing commitment.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the update.
PCP/04/20  DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests in relation to any of the items appearing on the agenda for the present meeting.

PCP/05/20  MINUTES OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2019

The minutes of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 14 November 2019 were submitted.

RESOLVED/-

That the minutes of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 14 November 2019, be approved as a correct record, subject to the following corrections:

Minute Reference PCP/19/37, in relation to the recent passing of Councillor Steven Smith, should read ‘the recent passing of Councillor Steven Murphy, a former Chair of the GM Police Authority’.

Minute Reference PCP/19/39 - Councillor Mike Freeman declared a personal declaration in Item 6 – Police Precept Setting Process, but did take part in the discussion.

PCP/06/20  LEARNING FROM INCIDENTS FROM LOCAL AUTHORITIES – 2019

Julie Walker, Strategic Resilience Lead, Civil Contingencies and Resilience Unit introduced a report that outlined the learning identified from major incidents in Greater Manchester during 2019, and provided a comprehensive update on key areas of activity, including an overview of emergency responses to civil emergencies and events, the Kerslake Arena Review, and local planning, training and exercising.

The Deputy Mayor in welcoming the report said that there was a lot of working happening at local level that was advising and informing the overarching Greater Manchester Resilience Forum that was in the process of developing a GM Resilience Strategy, which it was envisaged would be available for consultation towards the end of March. She added that the learning detailed within this paper would inform that strategy on account of the experiences that we have had and because of the Chief Resilience Officer’s connection to the global resilience cities network. It was noted that the Chief Resilience Officer was also strategic advisor to the Grenfell Enquiry, in recognition of her expertise. It would also provide a close insight to what was coming through the Grenfell enquiry, which will inform our strategy.

There followed a general discussion and members made various comments and asked a variety questions.

The Chair in receiving the report said that it was very pleasing to see that there was a great deal of multi-agency working and shared learning across GM. He thanked Julie Walker for her update and the Civic Contingencies and Resilience Team for all their efforts.
RESOLVED/-

1. To note the learning from local and national incidents and the work being put in place to develop resilience and support the response to future emergencies and planned events in Greater Manchester.

2. To support the development of a protocol for role of Leaders and City Mayors in emergencies.

3. To approve two additional reports in relation to civil contingencies on the development of community resilience in Greater Manchester from the Phase 1 report from the Grenfell Tower Inquiry.

PCP/07/20  STANDING TOGETHER: PRIORITY 3 – STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES AND PLACES

The Deputy Mayor introduced a report that updated Members regarding progress against the commitments under priority three of the Standing Together Police and Crime Plan – Strengthening Communities and Places. She added that it was important to recognise that in achieving the priorities under this pillar, depended crucially on the work within localities and the report provided some examples of how these priorities were being delivered across GM.

Laura Mercer, Principal (Victims and Vulnerability), GMCA provided an overview of progress and activity across GM in relation to each commitment of the priority areas and how working in partnership locally was making a difference in communities.

The Chair said that the report very clearly demonstrated the positive impact made within our communities and suggested that moving forward it would be useful to share this information with scrutiny panels within our respective districts.

A member welcomed the report and said that there were many positive examples highlighted. She added that in terms of her authority it had made great gains through this plan in that it provided a focus on what needed to be done at a local level adding that it was not prescriptive that rather allowed flexibility at a local level to meet those priorities.

A member said that the GMP Travel unit had made a significant difference, and cited problems that had been an issue on the Bury/Altrincham corridor, and which had now been addressed and local residents were noticing the difference and feeling much safer.

The Deputy Mayor said that an event would be taking place on 13 February, whereby community safety managers, elected members and partners would be showcasing and speaking about some of the innovations happening across GM.

RESOLVED/-

1. That the progress made be noted.
DECISSIONS AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE DEPUTY MAYOR

Consideration was given to a report which highlighted decisions made by the Deputy Mayor in the period from 31 October 2019 to 20 January 2020.

The Chair commented that the support given to The Arc project, to continue community support sessions for rough sleepers, had been very beneficial to the other services being provided.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the report.

CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION REVIEW

The Deputy Mayor provided a verbal update in relation to the Child Sexual Exploitation Review. She reported that the GM Mayor had commissioned the review following a television programme in which allegations were made about the failure of authorities and the police to protect mainly young women, and mainly those in the care of local authorities, from sexual exploitation, and failing to pursue perpetrators.

The Deputy Mayor said that the terms of reference for the review consisted of three strands; to look at former GMP officer Maggie Oliver’s allegations in relation to Op Augusta in Manchester; to look at former sexual health worker, Sarah Rowbotham in relation to OP Span in Rochdale, and to look at what matters were like now in terms of the way we respond to allegations of sexual exploitation. She further added that the full scope of the review had not yet been concluded, however the necessary resources would be made available to complete the review.

The Chair and members said that it was important that this panel was kept informed on developments and therefore it should appear as a standing item on the panel agenda moving forward.

RESOLVED/-

1. To note the update.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Friday 31 January 2020
Tuesday 24 March 2020
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MINUTES OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON FRIDAY 31 JANUARY 2020 AT
CHURCHGATE HOUSE, MANCHESTER.

PRESENT:

Councillor Nadim Muslim       Bolton Council
Councillor Sharon Briggs       Bury Council
Councillor Nigel Murphy        Manchester City Council – (In the Chair)
Councillor Steve Williams      Oldham Council
Councillor Janet Emsley        Rochdale Council
Councillor David Lancaster     Salford City Council
Councillor Amanda Peers        Stockport Council
Councillor Warren Bray         Tameside Council
Councillor Mike Freeman        Trafford Council
Councillor Kevin Anderson      Wigan Council
Majid Hussain                 Independent Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Andy Burnham                  GM Mayor
Baroness Beverley Hughes      GM Deputy Mayor

OFFICERS:

Carolyn Wilkins               Chief Executive Oldham Council and Lead GM Chief
                              Executive for Police, Crime and Civil Contingencies
Stephen Wilson                GMCA Treasurer
Ian Pilling                   Deputy Chief Constable
Clare Monaghan                Director Policing, Crime and Fire, GMCA
Jeanette Staley               Salford City Council & GM Police and Crime Policy Lead
Gwynne Williams               Deputy Monitoring Officer, GMCA
Steve Annette                 GMCA Governance and Scrutiny

PCP/11/20 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillor Paula Boshell, Salford City Council, Ian
Hopkins, Chief Constable GMP, and Angela Lawrence Independent Panel Member.
PCP/12/20 ADJOURNMENT

The Chair opened the meeting at the appointed time and members present introduced themselves. It was reported that the Greater Manchester Mayor and Deputy Mayor were en route from a previous meeting, and it was proposed and agreed that the meeting stand adjourned until they arrive

PCP/13/19 RESUMPTION

Business was resumed at 3.30 pm

PCP/14/20 2020/21 PCC COMPONENT OF THE MAYORAL PRECEPT

The Greater Manchester Mayor presented the proposals for the core budget of Greater Manchester Police for 2020/21. He indicated that raising the level of Council Tax was something that had to be approached with consideration of all the pressures that it places upon the local community, but also against the over-riding needs to protect that community. The top priority for the communities of Greater Manchester was to see greater investment in the police service and the Authority had been responding to that call since 2018/19 when additional resources funded from the precept began to allow for the recruitment of additional police officers, a process that had been continued in 2019/20 when funds had been made available to recruit 300 officers. For 2020/21 the budget sought to use the full increase in the precept (£10 for Band D properties) allowed by the Government which would raise £7.6M, but other changes in the Council Tax Base would also lever in a further £2.5M to support of an overall Force Budget of about £50M. 347 new police officer posts would be created in 2020/21, which is our share of the 6,000 that were being recruited in this first phase, not all being recruited nationally this year. He added that overall it is thought that our share would be 1156 officers; however, the Deputy Mayor added that this figure had not yet been confirmed. This would enable a number of things to be done, to make a commitment to the things that that members of this Panel have been calling for, and to allow the Force to begin to make a clearer commitment to the communities of Greater Manchester, part of which would be guarantees -

- that each ward in Greater Manchester would have a named beat officer and a named PCSO
- an allocation of funding to recruit full time school based police officers in schools demonstrating the greatest need; and
- to achieve improvements in 101 service responsiveness by the recruitment of 40 additional call handlers

The Deputy Mayor (Policing and Crime) whilst welcoming the opportunities to begin the process of restoring police numbers, voiced caution that the budget was essentially a flat cash settlement and that in overall terms the settlement failed to match the needs of policing in Greater Manchester without recourse to a precept contribution from local tax payers. There were key elements of the Government’s budget settlement for 2020/21 where a degree of uncertainty remained, in respect of which the constraints of time since the settlement had been received had not allowed for detailed clarifications to be received. The settlement had been received very late due to delays created by the General Election in December 2019, and she paid tribute to the Treasurer for his efforts to construct the budget now before members in the time available since that settlement was notified.
The Treasurer then gave a visual presentation of the budget structure overall. He indicated that the statutory consultation process had been difficult and that in the absence of a government settlement the process had been largely modelled on assumptions. The Settlement received essentially predicates that the maximum precept allowed would need to be used to deliver the necessary resource level for the Force.

Members then posed a number of questions:

**Recruitment target for 2019/20** – a member sought assurances that the targeted budget for the recruitment of 300 additional officers in 2019/20 would be achieved by year-end. Deputy Chief Constable Ian Pilling indicated that the recruitment process was on track to deliver within 10/12 of the 300 target. The Panel was reminded that the recruitment of 300 additional officers was unprecedented and had taken place on top of the 400/500 appointments made annually. The recruitment process could not be looked at in isolation from the need for subsequent training which also placed demands on the Force. The Deputy Mayor indicated that the recruitment process had been rigorously monitored throughout the year, and though it presented real challenges for the organisation, she was confident that the targets would be achieved.

**District establishment** – a member reminded the Panel that there had been agreement that there should be a review of police officer numbers at district level. Deputy Chief Constable Ian Pilling indicated that the review had taken place, and that where areas of inequality had been identified these would be addressed in the allocation of new officers being recruited. A report was requested to a future meeting on where the 300 new officers had been placed and where future officers would be placed.

**Back Office staff** – members were concerned that the increase in the number of police officers was not reflected in back office support staff. The Deputy Mayor indicated that whilst there were no earmarked resources to extend back office support a comprehensive review was taking place under the direction of an Assistant Chief Constable to review where improvements could be made in support service capability and effectiveness.

**School based police officers** – this proposal was broadly welcomed but members sought information about proposed locations. The Deputy Mayor indicated that some school already had part time provision and there were others that had the ability to make a financial contribution to costs. The proposals would need to be firmed up with input from headteachers to establish where the priorities lay.

**Commitment of 2019/20 budget** – in response to questions the Treasurer indicated that the spend pattern as at December indicated that the budget spend profile was broadly in line with that originally set, and that the surplus going forward would be between £1 M to £2 M. A report was requested to a future meeting detailing the spend in relation to the 19/20 budget.

**Community based budgets** – members welcomed the retention of the community led delegated budgets that had resulted in real and tangible impacts on communities. The Deputy Mayor clarified that the Community Safety Grants, the monies to support Safeguarding Boards, support for voluntary organisations and monies for the development of interventions in conjunction with Violence Reduction Programmes had each been reserved in the budget presented.

Welcoming all the comments made and the constructiveness of the meeting, the Mayor said that the budget proposals presented gave us the opportunity to begin to be ambitious again.
in terms of the Force's responsiveness and to send out clear messages to both the communities of Manchester and to criminals about the Force’s ability to respond on each crime committed. The past week had demonstrated there was much still to be done with partner agencies in terms of child sexual exploitation, hate crime, cyber-crime and fraud.

Whereupon -

MOTION MADE AND SECONDED/-

In agreeing to increase the precept, it is frustrating that instead of fairly funding the police directly, the Government has continued to expect the precept to be increased by the maximum amount, despite the inequalities and unfairness of the Council Tax system.

The increase will see the continued investment in neighbourhood policing including a named Neighbourhood Beat Officer and Police Community Support Officer for each ward in Greater Manchester. In addition, GMP will allocate a full time school based officer to schools across Greater Manchester in the greatest need. Investment will be made in new digital recording equipment and in an Interactive Voice Response telephone system that will improve the 101 service.

We welcome the support given to Community Safety Partnerships and voluntary sector organisations giving them additional resources to tackle on a local basis issues including ASB, support victims of domestic and sexual abuse, and work on reducing offending and reoffending, and therefore -

- support the Mayor's proposal to increase the Greater Manchester Police precept by £10 for a Band D property, with effect from 1 April 2020.

- note the budget assumptions relating to the budgets for 2020/21, including the proposals for the Community Safety Fund, and the process and context within which the PCC component of the precept has been proposed.

The Motion then being put and voted upon, it was

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY/-

In agreeing to increase the precept, it is frustrating that instead of fairly funding the police directly, the Government has continued to expect the precept to be increased by the maximum amount, despite the inequalities and unfairness of the council tax system.

The increase will see the continued investment in neighbourhood policing including a named Neighbourhood Beat Officer and Police Community Support Officer for each ward in Greater Manchester. In addition GMP will allocate a full time school based officer to schools across Greater Manchester in the greatest need. Investment will be made in new digital recording equipment and in an Interactive Voice Response telephone system that will improve the 101 service.

We welcome the support given to Community Safety Partnerships and voluntary sector organisations giving them additional resources to tackle on a local basis issues including ASB, support victims of domestic and sexual abuse, and work on reducing offending and reoffending, and therefore -
• support the Mayor's proposal to increase the Police precept by £10 for a Band D property with effect from 1 April 2020.

• note the budget assumptions relating to the budgets for 2020/21, including the proposals for the Community Safety Fund, and the process and context within which the PCC component of the precept has been proposed.
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GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Date: 30th June 2020
Subject: Police and Crime team update report
Report of: Bev Hughes – Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice services and Fire

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an overview and update of work of the GMCA police and crime. This also includes work that is in response to the COVID-19 emergency.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel members are asked to note the information contained in this report.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Clare Monaghan
Director – Police, Crime and Fire team
Clare.monaghan@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This report provides a summary update of several work areas that have been progressed since the onset of the national COVID-19 emergency and follows on from the April 2020 update report.

1.2 In line with government guidance, the GMCA Police and Crime team are working from home and remain focussed on priority work streams. Timescales for previously scheduled reporting have been adjusted and GM commissioned services adapted to reflect needs of vulnerable people.

2. Governance and Accountability during COVID19 lockdown.

2.1 Since 23rd March 2020, the Deputy Mayor has put in place alternative arrangements for holding the Chief Constable to account and overseeing the GMP response to the crisis in GM. A summary of these approaches are set out below:

2.1.1 The daily performance report, covers a range of key organisational, response and COVID-related indicators
2.1.2 GMP Gold meeting report initially every other day and now taking place once a week
2.1.3 Regular phone/video calls with the Chief Constable and other senior officers
2.1.4 Deputy Mayor attends the fortnightly GM COVID19 Emergency Committee. This is a political oversight group chaired by the Mayor, attended also by all the GM political leaders, supported by the Chief Constable and Chief Executives from Health and Local Authorities. The Committee examines all relevant issues including policing and community safety
2.1.5 The Deputy Mayor attends a weekly press conference with the Mayor and fortnightly conference for Greater Manchester MPs
2.1.6 Weekly report to chair of Police and Crime Panel from the Police and Crime Director

3.0 Supporting Victims

3.1 Covid-19 has affected the Strategic Review of Victims Services and the operational delivery of victim services. The Police and Crime Team established weekly meetings with commissioned victim services providers and the focus and benefits of this work was reported to panel members in the April 2020 update report. The provider meetings have developed a risk register which identifies:

- Strategic and systematic risks
- Capability and capacity of the services to respond

3.2 Commissioned Victim services have been reassured that they will continue to be supported and established an escalation route to raise concerns and risks. These services were also encouraged to share learning and diversify if needed. The meetings have been embraced as
a positive development and has spurred the reinvigoration of the Victim Services Digital Programme which will consider how digital approaches can be incorporated into day to day service provision as well as the benefits a broader range of benefits that include data sharing and self/online referral.

3.3 As previously reported to Panel members, Domestic Abuse has been a particular focus due to concerns regarding the home as an unsafe space in lockdown for some people. Referral trends have been monitored to assess the impact on at risk individuals and service delivery.

3.4 An Extraordinary meeting of the Victim Services Improvement Board is to be held in July/August in order to re-start and reassess the strategic review of victims services with lessons learnt from the Covid-19 response. A Demand Modelling exercise has already started, and although the timescales have been impacted, progress will still be made.

3.5 The Domestic Abuse Partnership Board took place on the 9th June 2020. The areas discussed are set out below:

- Levels of domestic abuse incidents reported to GMP and helplines
- Domestic Abuse Communications plan which is now available of the GMCA website
- Hits radio campaign
- Domestic Abuse risk register
- Operation Encompass - consistency of approach and response

3.6 Domestic Abuse VCSE Bids and Funding from the Ministry of Justice

3.6.1 In early-May, the Government announced a £76million package of extra funding to support victims and survivors of domestic abuse (DA), sexual violence (SV), vulnerable children and their families, as well as victims of modern slavery, during the COVID-19 emergency pandemic. £25million of this funding was ring fenced for the “Extraordinary Funding for Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Support Services”, a competitive bid process was launched, which is to be delivered locally by PCCs with oversight from the MoJ. Any registered charity can apply. A summary of the main elements of the process are outlined below:

- Each PCC area received notification of an indicative allocation of funds - for GM this is £952,000
- Only costs that have been/are expected to be incurred between 23rd March and 31st October will be considered.
- PCCs must undertake an assessment of need for COVID-19 related extraordinary funding in relation to both DA and SV support services in their local area.
- 34 funding applications were received totalling £801,645
- Feedback received indicated that the short spending timeframe (October 2020) imposed by the MoJ deterred some organisations from submitting an application.
3.6.2 Following the completion of due diligence checks, all 34 applications were submitted to the MoJ on 11th June 2020.

3.6.3 There are seven thematic areas which can be considered. Further detail under each theme are included at APPENDIX 1.

(i) Business Continuity (Whilst In Lockdown Period)
(ii) Development of Digital Capacities
(iii) Criminal Justice System Demand Curve
(iv) Business Continuity (Post Lockdown)
(v) Communication and Awareness Raising
(vi) Protected Characteristics
(vii) Geographical Area

4. GM Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) – Communication campaign

4.1 The GM VRU continue to press on with broad range of initiatives and developments. Central to the progress of the work of the violence reduction programme is the establishment of the delivery groups. These are split across four specific themes;

- Criminal Justice
- Education
- Health and Wellbeing
- Community-Led Programmes

The work of these groups is also supported by a dedicated Research and Evaluation Group and a VRU Comms Group.

4.2 In the April 2020 update report, information was provided regarding plans to run an airtime campaign delivered by one of our commissioned partners, Hits Radio. The campaign was designed to target families during the recent lockdown period by addressing problematic behaviours that might increase the risk of domestic abuse. Careful language was employed to ensure it was both inclusive and not confrontational in anyway. The themes of the campaign are set out below:

- Cooling Tensions and Taking Time Out
- Thinking about Drinking
- Home Alone- the Child’s Perspective
- Be Kind – Be A Hero

4.4 Hits Radio have provided information regarding the overall reach of the campaign to listeners. The information is very encouraging and, as illustrated below, the campaign adverts were heard over four million times.
4.5 The use of digital media and other technologies have become increasingly important in recent months. Whilst this has been driven by the significant challenges of the COVID 19 pandemic, it has brought in to sharp focus the need to consider a range of opportunities and different capabilities in order for the VRU to be able to diversify and channel both its resources and approaches more creatively.

4.6 The GM VRU aims to build upon this learning and is now planning to further its reach and influence as it works with community groups and partner agencies across GM.

5. **Supporting Vulnerable and Marginalised Women – Whole system approach update**

5.1 Further to the April 2020 report there has been a range of work underway to support Vulnerable and Marginalised Women during and beyond Covid-19.

5.2 The Women’s Support Alliance (the Alliance) continues to accept referrals and support women who are engaging with their local women’s support service. The support is a mix of face to face, (where premises allow this to occur), via doorstep visits and through digital media and telephone platforms. Support includes access to food banks, clothes and sanitary goods, as well as emotional support and assisting women to access other statutory service support offers.

5.3 Feedback from probation colleagues has been extremely positive. Officers report that clients have mentioned on numerous occasions how the support of the women’s centre has been crucial. Many report that it is this support that has got them through lockdown and enabled them to comply with licence conditions or community orders.

5.4 **Accommodation**

5.4.1 Work was undertaken to ensure additional capacity was commissioned to support accommodation offers being developed within localities. The accommodation was commissioned for 12 weeks and designed as a humanitarian response to Covid-19. It focused on women facing homelessness due to the pandemic and women facing domestic
violence. After the initial mobilisation, the accommodation offer was widened to include women with a history of rough sleeping and on-going substance misuse issues.

5.4.2 The contract runs until the end of June 2020. Any women still in this accommodation are being supported into accommodation within their ‘home’ local authority area.

5.5 Future developments

5.5.1 Lessons are being learnt about what has worked during the pandemic and what opportunities there are to incorporate this learning into service delivery in the future. A summary of considerations for the future are summarised below:

- Success of self-support WhatsApp groups and online support sessions
- Reform Investment Task and Finish Working Group has started work to develop a new outcomes-focused model for the service

5.5.2 The Deputy Mayor has written to Police and Crime Lead Elected Members requesting their support for this work and participation in a round table discussion which will take place over the next month to:

- Identify overall view of needs in the locality
- Understand the sense of responsibility in locality
- Understand the view of Women’s service / centre in the locality
- Understand the learning from Covid-19
- Gain a sense of integration
- Seek views of who should pay for it

5.5.3 A health data group has been set up to work with the Alliance to agree a standard minimum health offer, initially focusing on referrals to primary health and mental health and wellbeing services. This will also include a review of the health data collected in order to explore how health needs and outcomes are being supported and enhanced by the Alliance.

6. Child Criminal and Sexual Exploitation, County Lines and online grooming

6.1 The Deputy Mayor, GMP and GM Complex Safeguarding Hub have delivered an awareness raising campaign around exploitation during lockdown. This commenced during the first two weeks (end of March/beginning of April) and considered increased risk and threat not only from increased time online, but also the loss of contact with trusted adults outside of the family such as teachers, to equip and empower children, young people and their families/carers/networks.

6.2 Previously planned school based awareness programmes also need to be re-designed. One such example of this is a planned programme focussing on exploitation, and empowering
children in years 5 and 6 to recognise and report when something does not feel right, which was to be delivered by GW Theatre. The ‘Mr. Shapeshifter’ production and workshop was to be delivered in schools across GM. This is now being re-designed into a home learning resource, with a supported learning package for children and their parents/carers.

6.4 During this period, Challenger has been monitoring national, regional and local trends around exploitation and sharing this intelligence with amongst partners on a weekly/fortnightly basis. Sources for this include:

- National Op Talla (national policing operation to deal with the Covid-19 pandemic) vulnerability reports
- Independent Child Trafficking Advocate national steering group
- National and regional briefing and threat assessment documents
- GM Complex Safeguarding and Exploitation Operational group meetings
- GM Modern Slavery Partnership meeting
- GM Modern Slavery NGO Forum

6.5 Complex Safeguarding teams have continued to deliver services to children and young people during lockdown, both online and where appropriate face-to-face following social distancing guidelines. Teams have reported that in some cases, engagement from the young people they are working with has increased as a result of the move to online and virtual platforms. The benefits of this shift will be examined to identify where it may be appropriate to retain some of this practice in the recovery period.

6.8 Referrals to teams have remained relatively stable during this time period, with an initial decrease immediately after lockdown. The Regional Practice Coordinator has been working with teams across the city region in response to National Referral Mechanism (NRM) submissions for young people subject to criminal exploitation, ensuring there is no break in service provision across the system. This follows some concern in the first few weeks of lockdown regarding small numbers of vulnerable children and young people continuing to go missing for extended periods of time.

7. Reducing Harm and offending

7.1 The Criminal Justice System

7.1.2 Covid-19 lockdown has significantly impacted up on the Criminal Justice System, nationally and locally. The unavoidable need to pause processes and re-engineer approaches in a socially distanced environment, has significantly and primarily affected prosecutions and trials including jury trials at the Crown Court.
7.1.3 Most people who report crime to the police do not go through the entire criminal justice system. The overall prosecution rate sits between 7-9%, as standard. However, those who do go through a trial process, whether at Magistrate or Crown Court level, can be some of the most serious cases affecting our most vulnerable people.

7.1.4 Jury trials were initially stood down at the beginning of the lockdown period by the Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice, until 11th May 2020. Re-starting jury trials is now being tested, with Minshull Street Crown Court Manchester) already re-started and Crown Square (Manchester) and Bolton Crown Court in preparation. However, the re-starting of trials by jury is limited, given social distancing requirements.

7.1.5 From CPS analysis, there is now a ratio of 2 cases being submitted to them for every case being processed through the CJS jointly by the partnership agencies to finalisation, so a current Covid-19 impacted ratio of 2:1. This is against a pre-covid ratio of 0.97: 1. This helps to fully clarify how demand is building up in the system and the extent of the ‘recovery’ challenge.

7.1.6 In response to this situation, the Deputy Mayor convened and chaired a series of extraordinary meetings of the GM Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) to assess the problem, plan a response and establish a Task and Finish Group. Consideration is being given to where demand can be safely reduced for cases before entry into the system as well as those already in the system, to relieve the pressure downstream.

7.1.7 This Managing CJS Demand Task and Finish Group now meets regularly and has identified areas where demand in the system could be reduced or mitigated and this is being worked through. An action plan is in place and the priority areas identified for managing demand are:

- Out of court disposals
- Triage/ case management Magistrates Courts including breach work
- Triage/ case management Crown Courts

7.1.8 The Deputy Mayor, through the Extraordinary LCJB meetings, welcomed the structure that has been put in place with clear activity and timescales. It is recognised that each priority area will likely need to work in a phased approach – e.g. identify the problem, confirm solution, prepare, deliver - with the more significant impact probably to be seen by end of July/ Middle of August.

7.1.9 The Deputy Mayor highlighted the need for each work stream to undertake a review of capability and capacity to deliver against key milestones and to undertake a victim and witness impact assessment. The Deputy Mayor also stressed the importance of timely and accurate communication not only to partners but also to those directly affected. The Crown Court work stream is the most challenging area because of the requirements of jury trials in a socially distanced environment and legal requirements linked to judicial independence.
7.1.10 The longer-term impact is that even if jury and other trials can be restarted – there is unlikely to be enough court capacity and resources to be able to manage pre-Covid standard demand. For example, for one Crown Court trial 2/3 courts are needed. So a different way of operating courts need to be considered including victim/witness video suites/ court streaming; opening hours etc. Resources and capacity implications will need to be considered and this is also being looked at nationally.

7.1.11 The Deputy Mayor held talks with HMCTS and senior Judicial representatives on 16th June, to explore the case for the use of non-court buildings. It is important to ensure that all options are being considered to ease the pressure on the system and the approach from the Judiciary to engage in such matters was welcomed. The LCJB will be asked to explore proactively whether there is an appetite from GM partners to allow access to their buildings in order to support hosting such hearings.

7.1.12 The CJS demand issues were reported to the Mayor’s Emergency Committee on 17th June 2020 by the Deputy Mayor, where the request was raised regarding exploring the potential use of alternative buildings for court business. This is being followed up through the sharing of a specification and coordination support through the CA. The Deputy Mayor will hold a further meeting of the LCJB in July to check on progress.

7.2 Offender Management

7.2.1 Integrated Offender Management has continued to operate as business as usual. GMP have been supporting both the CRC and NPS with doorstep visits to offenders.

7.2.2 GMP Sex Offender Management Unit has put in place an emergency response with video calls and WhatsApp are used where possible and direct visits with PPE. There is a current proposal for a digital solution for sex offenders to apply online to be removed from the register rather than having to physically attend an appointment (COVID-19 positive learning to be taken).

7.2.3 Early Prison Releases: On 24th March 2020 the Lord Chancellor, Robert Buckland attended the Justice Select Committee to discuss Covid-19 implications. The Lord Chancellor said the virus poses an "acute" risk in prisons, many of which are overcrowded. Subsequently a GM Silver Command Group was established to mitigate and manage risk which met each week.

7.2.4 The group formulated key ‘asks’ around potential decision making and risk management – e.g. no early release for those with unsuitable accommodation; use of home detention orders etc. and developed a GM Covid-19 Offender Management Risk Plan with key priorities such as:

- Housing/ Homelessness
- Substance Misuse Services
7.2.5 Due to the lack of releases because of the stringent criteria, the focus changed to Business As Usual releases and dip sampling has been undertaken to feed in to both the GM Strategic Offender Needs Analysis and the response to the probation Dynamic Commissioning Framework.

8. Changing nature of Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) and GM Challenger response

8.1 During lockdown, Challenger has maintained a multi-agency approach to SOC, with weekly virtual meetings with Challenger partners and maintained partnership and tactical meetings virtually. This has highlighted, for example, a shift in focus for Border Force nationally from passenger port entry work towards freight port entry work which has seen some significant seizures of drugs and other commodities. These meetings have also provided opportunities for GMP and partners to link directly into GM based work regarding imports.

8.2 Project Magpie is the Partnership for tackling counterfeiting involving Challenger, Economic Crime, City of London Police, Manchester City Council, and a range of other national and local partners and has been monitoring and responding to the increase in Covid-19 related counterfeiting which has emerged during lockdown. Project Magpie is the only significant shift in SOC that has been identified during the lockdown.

8.3 During this period there has been an overall decrease in reported SOC related activity, which has provided an opportunity for District level Challenger teams to develop awareness and understanding of existing or suspected Organised Crime Groups (OCGs). This has benefitted levels of intelligence and knowledge around OCGs linked to child criminal exploitation in particular, increasing the number of exploitation linked OCGs we have recorded and assessed across the city region.

9. Ageing Hub and Victims of Fraud

9.1 Further to the April 2020 update, the Greater Manchester Ageing Hub continues to host a weekly multi-agency forum in response to the COVID-19 crisis (average of 20-25 participants from across the GM system). Within this context, the Greater Manchester Older People’s Network have reported that many older people feel scared of going out of their homes due to fear of catching COVID-19.
9.2 Mass communication around coronavirus has created confusion amongst older people, particularly as messages have changed through easing of lockdown. This in turn has generated high levels of anxiety amongst this age group, leading to uncertainty, mistrust and suspicion of others, particular for those who live alone. The impact of crime on these groups is likely to be particularly traumatic. In response, the Greater Manchester Ageing Hub are continuing to produce a twice-weekly email digest with information and resources relating to older people and COVID-19.

9.3 Following the pandemic there was an initial resourcing impact upon the Scambuster Scheme due to relocation and redeployment of staff and difficulties in accessing technology solutions remotely. In response, the Scambuster work streams were allocated to police staff and officers from the Economic Crime Hub as well as the appointment of a Volunteer Coordinator.

9.4 As staff to start to return to their substantive roles, a sustainable model will require development, supported by the increase in remote working technology that has been provided to Scambuster volunteers during the pandemic, as well as the ongoing recruitment of volunteers.

9.5 During this period GMP have sought alternative ways of identifying and reaching our most vulnerable, they have initiated several new campaigns which, together with activity and demand information are detailed at APPENDIX 2.

10. Development of a GM Hate Crime Plan

10.1 The COVID-19 outbreak has placed immense strain on communities. However, the crisis has also provided a number of unintended benefits to community cohesion. We have witnessed the residents of Greater Manchester display their appreciation for front line workers by participating in Clap for Carers, volunteer for humanitarian duties and many other acts of kindness. It is important to harness this sentiment and continue to build cohesive links within our communities to tackle hate crime.

10.2 The GM Hate Crime Plan is in the final stages of drafting, with feedback sought from cohesion leads and representatives of GMFRS, GMP and CPS. The Plan is intended to be a brief communication tool, aimed at synthesising existing partner priorities and ensuring collaboration in our approach across GM. The Plan is drawn from all three of the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan, focusing on key elements including: cohesion monitoring and awareness raising; victim support; understanding offender behaviour; developing local plans; and increasing community resilience.

11 Night time economy and future review of Safe Havens
11.1 The night time economy has suffered significant financial losses as a result of the COVID-19 outbreak. However, the ‘United We Stream’ platform has provided support for Greater Manchester’s bars, clubs, pubs, venues, restaurants, performers, freelancers and cultural organisations by streaming live bands, DJs, singers and performers and inviting donations. These donations support Greater Manchester’s usually thriving night time economy and contribute to the fight against homelessness across the city-region.

11.2 In preparation for when licensed and other entertainment venues open, a mapping and analysis exercise is currently in train to assess demand and consider the most suitable placement of Safe Havens. The Village has operated a Safe Haven successfully for a number of years and over the 2019 Christmas period, a Safe Haven was trialled in Wigan with positive outcomes. A number of sites and funding options are under consideration, with a focus on addressing demand for first aid support and provision of a safe space with the most cost effective option. A collaborative approach to capability sharing is being undertaken with staff from St John Ambulance and the LGBT Foundation engaged to offer their expertise on service delivery.

12. **Travel safe advice**

12.1 Despite a reduction in passenger numbers on the public transport network during the COVID-19 outbreak, joint working between TfGM and GMP has continued through Project Servator. This has strengthened the police presence on the network when many police resources were diverted elsewhere due to the pandemic.

12.2 Travel Safe Week launched in the week before the lockdown period. TfGM have continued to release safety messaging over recent months, including more recent communications on the importance of wearing face coverings from Monday 15th June.

12.3 The GMP Transport Unit are now in a position to increase patrols on the road network with speed enforcement and safety on cycle routes a key focus. A number of extra bicycles have been provided to the Unit to increase their mobility and presence. The Unit are also increasing their use of police vehicles and through a communications campaign are promoting safe driving including the wearing of seat belts and targeting drivers that are using mobile phones and/or driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

13 **Safe4Summer**

13.1 Delivered through a partnership of Local Authorities, GMP, TfGM, GMFRS, Health organisations, GMCA and stakeholders within the VCS sectors, the Safe4Summer campaign has been designed to offer children and young people the opportunity to experience fun and exciting activities in their local areas; whilst also delivering messaging on personal safety and promoting social responsibility.
13.2 The COVID-19 outbreak has necessitated a shift in content and approach to the delivery of Safe4Summer. Key messages released in early-June from the Deputy Mayor and GMP encouraged parents and carers to remain aware of their children’s whereabouts and planned activities in line with the Government’s guidance, by maintaining a positive line of communication. Messaging also focused on reducing anti-social behaviour, with GMFRS advising young people how to stay around water and raising awareness of the dangers involved in lighting fires.

14. Drugs and Alcohol

14.1 The police and crime team lead continues to chair GM service provider and commissioner virtual meetings as part of a collaborative response to COVID-19. These meetings are currently focusing on:

- Challenges and contingency planning for ‘test & trace’
- Reacting to a ‘second spike’
- Recovery Planning and potential retention of changes in practice (e.g. prescribing and dispensing, improved virtual access and digital offers)
- Planning for increased demand post-lockdown
- Minimising treatment dropouts
- Improving performance on blood-borne viruses
- A continued emphasis on naloxone (the antidote to heroin overdose)
- Improved multi-agency working and building on pathways developed (with a particular focus on mental health and homelessness)

14.2 Commissioners and providers continue to prioritise working with ‘A Bed Every Night’ service users ensuring continuity of care for those moving on from recently commissioned temporary hotels to more stable accommodation.

14.3 The Deputy Mayor has also agreed to commission a Greater Manchester Emerging Drug Trends Survey which will provide timely intelligence around emerging drug use trends and changes to drug markets. This will help to reduce drug related harm and crime and disorder. The survey will be complemented by regular testing of street drugs for purity and content through MANDRAKE - a joint initiative between Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU).

14.4 The established GM Drugs Early Warning System is already regarded as best practice nationally and Emerging Drug Trends Survey will further enhance the ability to keep professionals and the public well-informed and respond to the threat of new, potent or adulterated drugs.

15. Race and Equality
15.1 Following the murder of George Floyd in the US the elected leaders in GM including the Mayor and Deputy Mayor committed to redoubling their efforts to tackle racism in all its forms. This includes the systemic racism in our society that leads to poorer outcomes and lived experience for our BAME Communities.

15.2 The Leaders have committed to bring forward proposals next month for the formation of a GM Race Equality Panel, strengthen dialogue with our black communities and to work with Operation Black Vote’s Leadership Programme to improve representation.

15.3 To work towards ensuring all of our communities receive equal treatment from GMP the Mayor has committed to working with them to publish a Race Equality Policing report on the use of policing powers. This had previously been agreed with the chief constable.

15.4 In June last year 12 year old Shukri Abdi tragically drowned in a river in Bury. At the time she was with friends of a similar age, though her mother has stated that she did not believe they were Shukri’s friends.

15.5 Allegations have been made that Shukri had suffered racist bullying. GMP carried out an inquiry on behalf of the coroner and concluded that there were no suspicious circumstances. The inquest is currently adjourned.

15.6 The IOPC commenced an investigation into GMP’s inquiry in August last year. Their investigation has been concluded and they have shared their findings with GMP and Shukri’s family. Their report will be published at the conclusion of the inquest.

15.7.1 The Mayor has recently received correspondence from many members of the public expressing their concerns. The Mayor is sensitive to the coronial process and with the Deputy Mayor has written to the coroner pledging support to ensuring that the process is concluded as soon as possible. They have also pledged that at the conclusion of the inquiry they will consider what further action may be required.

16. Operational policing matters

16.1 Taser Incident
On the evening of 7th May an incident occurred in Stretford that resulted on a black man being Tasered by a GMP officer. The man’s young son was present at the time. The man was arrested and subsequently charged with several offences. He was remanded in custody the following day by magistrates and the case is ongoing.

16.1.2 Video footage soon circulated on the internet which showed some elements of the incident including the Taser discharge and the obvious distress of the young child. As a result, The Mayor has received an explanation from the Chief Constable who has commissioned an urgent and independent review by the IOPC.
16.1.3 The Mayor subsequently issued a public statement that day stating that he had requested an urgent and independent review as it wasn’t clear that the level of force used was justified or proportionate.

16.1.4 GMP have voluntarily referred the matter to the IOPC which will carry out an independent investigation into the incident and the Deputy Mayor remains in contact with the IOPC regarding the investigation’s progress and is keen that it be conducted as speedily as possible.

16.1.5 In discussions with the Deputy Mayor, regarding the broader use of Taser, the Chief Constable confirmed that every deployment of Taser, including where it is not discharged, is recorded and reviewed internally in respect of compliance with training, policy, procedure and proportionality. The use of Taser will feature in the Race Equality Policing Report referred to as section 15 of the report.

16.2 Misconduct Panel
16.2.1 On Tuesday 2\textsuperscript{nd} June a Misconduct Panel commenced to hear allegations of gross misconduct against former Assistant Chief Constable Steve Heywood. The three person panel consisted of 3 members independent of GMP and the police service and was convened following an independent investigation by the IOPC. That investigation was launched after the conclusion of the Public Inquiry into the death of Anthony Grainger, where the chair expressed concern about the evidence provided by Mr Heywood. Mr Grainger was shot dead by a GMP firearms officer during a pre-planned operation in Cheshire in March 2012.

16.2.2 On the day of the hearing, following submissions by Mr Heywood’s barrister, GMP requested that the Panel dismiss the charges. The Panel members issued a statement where they reluctantly agreed to GMP’s request and strongly criticised errors made and how the Force had handled the whole matter. The Deputy Chief Constable issued a public statement acknowledging that errors had been made and offered an unreserved apology to the family and partner of Mr Grainger and all other parties involved.

16.2.3 The Deputy Mayor has formally expressed her concerns to the Chief Constable and is awaiting a detailed report from him before considering the matter further.

17. IOPS Update
17.1.1 Progress in developing the iOPS software
A number of upgrades and enhancements have been successfully applied to iOPS since the PoliceWorks 2.6 release in February 2020. This is through a number of patches that have been applied to the PoliceWorks system containing a number of bug fixes in areas of crimes, intelligence and reports.

17.1.2 Some new features that these patches have delivered are:
- Improvements to Stop & Search: If details were refused by a subject that was stopped and searched and a user selects ‘Details Refused’ on the record, a Self-Defined Ethnicity box will now appear on the record.
- Revised Care Plan categories to allow staff to more easily see what was ‘new’ and what was ‘triaged’. Through the iOPS dashboard and reporting functions, the Care Plans that are awaiting triage from a Safeguarding team and those with the initial assessment made, with further safeguarding work to be completed can be seen clearly. This allows for better management of risk, and focussed support for vulnerability teams with higher outstanding demand.

- Enhancements to Victim Support Referrals.

- Improvements to the publish intelligence functionality.

- Improvements to Case and Custody.

17.1.3 PoliceWorks 2.7 is the next major release which is still on track for early autumn 2020. This release will contain a number of significant fixes as well as further functional enhancements, including ‘Soundex’, which will improve the search capability.

17.1.4 Any outstanding issues not included in PoliceWorks 2.7 are currently being reviewed for inclusion in the PoliceWorks 2.8 release, with delivery planned for the end of the year.

17.2 iOPS Mobile Upgrade.
The latest release for iOPS Mobile contained a number of significant upgrades to the user experience.

17.2.1 A new way for officers to understand their workload has been released. This is called ‘My iOPS’ – an officer’s workload in one place. It displays their ‘open crimes for investigation’, their ‘districts missing people’ and their ‘open problems’ for example.

17.2.2 Other functionality that has recently released into iOPS Mobile includes:

- Ability to now create all crimes while mobile
- GMP missing risk assessment
- PNC Arrest & Remand display improvements
- Self-defined ethnicity on Stop & Search events

17.2.3 iOPS Mobile has also launched a new secure messaging system and alert system (BBME and AtHoc). Examples of how these have helped are listed below:
- Response teams circulating pictures and details of Missing from Home reports so that officers can be on the lookout for vulnerable and missing persons. One Response Sergeant was able to spot and recognise a missing person because their details were circulated through the app earlier that day.

- Neighbourhood teams have been sharing information on incidents and crimes to be aware of, such as details of vehicles of interest that are stolen or suspicious.

- Detective Inspectors in the Criminal Investigations Department reported using video calls through BBME to manage two serious incidents. Being able to provide support and advice at the scene from a remote location saves them time and unnecessary travel.

17.2.4 In April, when the Mortuary Co-ordination Unit grew as part of Force contingency plans related to COVID-19, iOPS AtHoc was used to communicate urgent and important messages to team members securely. Dedicated distribution lists were set up for the group’s leadership team, temporary staff and staff with relevant training that were working in other roles. Those working in these teams were from a wide range of districts and departments across the Force. They’d been rapidly assembled, so having the ability to contact them all quickly and receive replies to specific questions like availability was a valuable new capability.

17.3 iOPS Business Confidence

17.3.1 Since the launch of iOPS in July 2019 we have been monitoring the feedback from our districts and branches through ratings of confidence. Our scale is 1 to 5, 1 being very confident and 5 being not confident. Recently we’ve been steadily moving closer to an average rating of 2 overall.

17.3.2 The graph below shows the average business confidence ratings since the version 2.6 system upgrade in February. At present the rating is at one of the highest points since launching iOPS last year.
17.3.3 District and Branch iOPS Bronzes were asked to provide context for their current iOPS confidence scores, with a view to getting support on the issues that they felt were most important for staff.

17.3.4 The collective feedback and key themes from these channels have been incorporated into a revised list of iOPS Top Ten Issues for the team to prioritise.

17.4 HMIC Recommendations

17.4.1 The current position with the HMICFRS iOPS improvement recommendations is:

- Recommendation 1 is currently the only recommendation with work ongoing.
- Recommendations 3 and 5 will be completed when the system upgrade for version 2.7 is applied later this year.
- Recommendations 2, 4, 6 and 9 have completed actions.

17.4.2 Recommendation 1 – Ongoing

The force needs to develop a full understanding of the threat and risk contained within all its backlogs. In particular, it should review all domestic abuse incidents recorded by the force between the launch of iOPS and October 2019 to ensure that an appropriate response has been provided and referral made to the relevant agency.

17.4.3 This refers to 35,107 domestic incidents from the period of July 2019 to February 2020. When reviewed, GMP assessed that 13,463 required a more in-depth review. The update to date is:
- 3,462 incidents have been fully reviewed so far, making up 26% of the total.
- So far the overall compliance rate stands at 96%, which is much higher than expected.
- The review of the remaining 74% is ongoing.

18. RECOMMENDATIONS:

18.1 Appear at the front page of the report
APPENDIX 1

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE DOMESTIC ABUSE FUNDING – THEMATIC AREAS

(i) Business Continuity (Whilst In Lockdown Period):
  • To address increases in demand in the system, directly related to Covid19
  • To help stabilise and support our Sexual Violence and Domestic Abuse Voluntary Community Sector
  • To maintain staffing / capacity levels to ensure consistency of service whilst the lockdown measures are in place

(ii) Development of Digital Capacities:
  • To mobilise the logistics of home-working to ensure remote working is delivered effectively, safely and securely. E.g. purchasing equipment / digital solutions / licenses), office equipment for homeworking
  • To maintain and enhance partnership working (remotely) between agencies whilst services work remotely / adapt to new ways of working.
  • To develop and deliver online training tools to address specific and ongoing training needs and supervision with staff
  • To address digital poverty issues amongst victim services providers and service users
  • To enable providers to ensure digital solutions comply with information governance, confidentiality of service users and improve cyber security

(iii) Criminal Justice System Demand Curve:
  • To maintain ongoing support during criminal justice proceedings
  • To adapt service interventions to respond to changing needs of clients as a result of delayed and postponed trials

(iv) Business Continuity (Post Lockdown):
  • Support business continuity post lockdown
  • To support new ways of engaging with staff and clients remotely ensuring supervision and training continues to take place
  • To address anticipated increases in demand and changing profile of demand in the system
  • To address physical adaptions required to ensure the service is able to be delivered as safely and efficiently as possible. (Adapting to the ‘new normal’)

(v) Communication and Awareness Raising:
  • Communicate and raise awareness of support services available via a range of communication channels
  • Targeted communication campaigns for those with protected characteristics

(vi) Protected Characteristics:
• Providing support to those with protected characteristics that seem to be disproportionately affected by COVID-19.
• To address language barriers / interpreter services

(vii) Geographical Area:
• To ensure an equitable amount of funding amount is distributed across Greater Manchester, in response to the changing needs and demands of the sector.
• To consider those that provide a service across the Greater Manchester footprint, multi areas and single district areas
APPENDIX 2

FRAUD AND CYBER CRIME - GMP campaigns, activity and demand information:

- 2,500 letters warning on COVID-19 scams sent to all previous Cyber and Economic Crime Awareness Service (CECAS) victims.
- 5,000 money mule and COVID-19 booklets designed and delivered to all Manchester food banks to be placed in food packages.
- Posters sent to supermarkets for placement in windows regarding the current voucher scam.
- Ongoing work with Sainsbury’s who are delivering food to the most vulnerable and a number of booklets delivered so they can be placed with food parcels.
- Messaging on local radio stations warning of current scams.
- Economic Crime Hubs released messaging in local newspapers warning of current scams and provided updates on the recovery of over £1.6 million for victims of crime, this year.
- Several daily protect messages released on the @gmpfraud social media page.
- Manchester Evening News reporting on the ‘Scam of the Week’.
- Daily scripts transferred to all local partners including victim support, victim services, GMCA, Ageing Hub, banks and retailers.
- CECAS and triage team allocated all fraud victims and are making calls to provide prevent/protect advice and to warn in relation to COVID-19 scams.

Below is an overview of activity seen in the Economic Crime Unit:
This reflects the increasing upward trend, priority contacts reduced March, April and May as people had reduced access to banks and shopping. This is why there appears to be a slight drop from Feb to March and April.

The following tables illustrate where GMP staff have completed lower priority victim contacts and the initial work that is usually conducted by the Scambusters.

Additional new victims
The table below represents new victims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>New Victims</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three monthly re contacts (please note no contacts in February 2020 due to re processing of systems, no contacts in March as Scambusters were stood down and re-established in April). The table below represents the re-contacting of known victims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number of Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Date: 30 June 2020

Subject: Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020

Report of: Liz Treacy, GMCA Monitoring Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel of the implications of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Panel is requested to note the report.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Name: Gwynne Williams
Position: Deputy Monitoring Officer, GMCA
E-mail: williamsg@manchesterfire.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

- The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011
- The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Transfer of Police and Crime Commissioner Functions to the Mayor) Order 2017
- The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) Order 2017
- Draft statutory instrument – the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) Order 2017 (the Fire Order) came into force on 8 May 2017, it conferred fire and rescue functions on the GMCA which are exercisable by the Mayor.

1.2. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Fire and Rescue Functions) (Amendment) Order 2020 (the Amendment Order) was laid before Parliament on 4 June 2020. The Amendment Order was scheduled for consideration in the House of Lords on 17 June 2020 and the motion passed; debate in the House of Commons has yet to be scheduled at the time of writing this report.

1.3. The Amendment Order will come into force the day after it is made.

1.4. The Amendment Order will allow the Mayor to make arrangements for fire and rescue functions to be exercised by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

1.5. The Amendment Order also amends the remit of the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken in connection with the discharge of fire and rescue functions:

1.5.1. by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority
1.5.2. the Mayor
1.5.3. the deputy mayor for policing and crime
1.5.4. any other person in the exercise of fire and rescue functions pursuant to arrangements made under section 107D(3) of the 2009 Act (officer delegations).

2. FIRE AND RESCUE FUNCTIONS

2.1. The principal fire and rescue service functions are contained in —

2.1.1. section 6 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004; (fire safety);
2.1.2. section 7 of that Act (fire-fighting);
2.1.3. section 8 of that Act (road traffic accidents);
2.1.4. any order under section 9 of that Act (emergencies) which applies to the GMCA;
2.1.5. section 2 of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, and
2.1.6. the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (protection)

2.2. The “local risk plan” is a document which is prepared and published by the GMCA in accordance with the Fire and Rescue National Framework; and sets out (i) the GMCA’s priorities and objectives; and (ii) an assessment of all foreseeable fire and rescue related risks that could affect its community.
2.3. The “fire and rescue declaration” is a document which is prepared and published by the GMCA in accordance with the Fire and Rescue National Framework; and contains a statement of the way in which the GMCA has had regard to the Framework and to the local risk plan i.e. an annual assurance statement.

2.4. The Fire Order requires the Mayor to exercise certain functions personally which are –

2.4.1. The power to enter into arrangements under sections 13, 15 and 16 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 (reinforcement schemes etc)

2.4.2. Appointing, suspending or dismissing the Chief Fire Officer; approving the terms of appointment of the Chief Fire Officer; and holding the Chief Fire Officer to account for managing the Fire and Rescue service

2.4.3. Approving the local risk plan

2.4.4. Approving the fire and rescue declaration

2.4.5. Approving Business Continuity Management plans

2.4.6. Approving any arrangements with Category 1 and Category 2 under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

2.5. In addition, the functions in relation to the setting of the GMCA budget for the Mayor’s general functions (including Fire), as provided for in the Combined Authorities (Finance) Order 2017 cannot be delegated.

3. GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (GMPCP/the Panel)

3.1. GMPCP is a joint committee of the 10 districts. Membership of the GMPCP comprises of 10 elected backbench members of the 10 constituent councils and 2 mandatory co-opted members.

3.2. The arrangements have been reviewed in anticipation of the Amendment Order coming into force. No significant revisions are required as a result of the Amendment Order.

3.3. The Panel will be renamed the Greater Manchester Police Fire and Crime Panel.

3.4. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 imposes an objective on the districts and the Panel such that members of the panel (when taken together) have the skills, knowledge and experience necessary for the panel effectively to discharge its functions. A footnote is added to reference the need to include “fire and rescue expertise”.
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3.5. A report on revisions to the Panel Arrangements is to be considered by AGMA Executive on 26 June 2020 and will be referred to the constituent councils for approval.

3.6. The new panel arrangements will be reported to the Panel at its next meeting.

4. FIRE AND RESCUE OVERVIEW FUNCTIONS OF THE PANEL

4.1. In addition to the general review and scrutiny of decisions referred to in paragraph 1.5 above, the Panel has the following specific functions.

4.2. Scrutiny of the local risk plan

4.2.1. The Panel is a statutory consultee on the development of the priorities and objectives of the local risk plan, or a variation of them. The Panel must be given a reasonable amount of time to consider the draft priorities and objectives, or draft variation, and to produce its report or recommendations.

4.2.2. The Mayor must have regard to any report or recommendations made by the Panel in relation to the draft priorities and objectives, or the draft variation of them.

4.2.3. The Mayor must give the Panel a response to any such report or recommendations, and publish the response.

4.3. Scrutiny of the Fire and Rescue Declaration

4.3.1. The Mayor must produce annually the fire and rescue declaration, about the exercise of fire and rescue functions and the progress made in meeting the priorities and objectives in the local risk plan.

4.3.2. The declaration must be sent to the Panel for consideration. The Panel must arrange a public meeting of the Panel and require the Mayor to attend the meeting to present the fire and rescue declaration and answer questions about it. The Panel must review the declaration and make a report or recommendations to the Mayor.

4.4. Scrutiny of the Proposed Allocation of Budget

4.4.1. The Mayor must, in each financial year, notify the Panel of the Mayor’s proposed allocation of the draft budget for fire and rescue functions for the following financial year. The Panel must be notified before the GMCA determines whether to approve the Mayor’s annual budget for that year, and the Panel must have a reasonable amount of time to complete its review before the GMCA makes its determination.

4.4.2. The Panel must review any proposed allocation of budget and must make a report to the Mayor. The Mayor must have regard to the report and to any recommendations made in it; and provide the Police, Fire and Crime Panel with a response to the report and any recommendations.
4.5. **Scrutiny of the Appointment of the Chief Fire Officer**

4.5.1. The Mayor must notify the Panel of any proposed appointment of a chief fire officer.

4.5.2. The Mayor must also notify the Panel of –

4.5.2.1. the name of the person whom the Mayor is proposing to appoint (“the candidate”);

4.5.2.2. the criteria used to assess the suitability of the candidate for the appointment;

4.5.2.3. why the candidate satisfies those criteria; and

4.5.2.4. the terms and conditions on which the candidate is to be appointed.

4.5.3. The panel must review the proposed appointment and make a report to the Mayor on the proposed appointment. The panel must hold a confirmation hearing before making a report to the Mayor in relation to a proposed appointment, before making a recommendation or before vetoing an appointment.

4.5.4. A decision to veto an appointment requires the vote in support of at least two-thirds of the members of the Panel.

4.5.5. In the event of the veto of an appointment of a Chief Fire Officer, the Mayor must propose a reserve candidate. A similar process is to be followed save that the Panel cannot exercise a right of veto for a second time.

4.6. **Scrutiny of Suspension and Dismissal of the Chief Fire Officer**

4.6.1. The Mayor must notify the Panel of the suspension of a Chief Fire Officer.

4.6.2. The Mayor must not dismiss a Chief Fire Officer until the end of a statutory scrutiny process has been reached.

4.6.3. The end of the scrutiny process is reached when either –

4.6.3.1. a period of six weeks has ended without the Panel having given the Mayor any recommendation as to whether or not the Mayor should dismiss the chief fire officer; or

4.6.3.2. the Mayor notifies the Panel whether or not the Mayor accepts the Panel's recommendation in relation to the proposed dismissal.

4.7. The Panel must be provided with –

4.7.1. the views of the chief fire and rescue inspector for England in writing;

4.7.2. a copy of the reasons given to the Chief Fire Officer by the Mayor; and

4.7.3. a copy of any representations from the Chief Fire Officer
5. THE PANEL’S PROCEDURE RULES

5.1. The Panel’s procedure rules will require revision once the Amendment Order comes into force. New procedure rules will be presented to the Panel for consideration and approval at its next meeting.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Recommendations appear at the front of this report.
GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Date: 30th June 2020

Subject: Police and Community Safety Survey – results for the period July 2019 – March 2020

Report of: Bev Hughes – Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice services and Fire

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Policing and Community Safety Survey results for July 2019 – March 2020 are summarised in this report and accompany a more detailed presentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel members are asked to note the information contained in this report.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Clare Monaghan
Director – Police, Crime and Fire team
Clare.monaghan@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 In March 2018, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) launched ‘Standing Together’, the Police and Crime Plan for Greater Manchester, which has three overarching priorities: keeping people safe, reducing harm and offending, and strengthening communities and places.

1.2 The success of the Police and Crime Plan will be judged using an outcomes framework that contains a number of specific indicators. To support the outcomes framework, the GMCA commissioned DJS Research to conduct research to understand public perceptions of personal and community safety.

1.3 This report contains the results from the first three waves of research with a representative sample of 9,750 Greater Manchester residents aged 16 years and older. This section of the report outlines the key top-level findings from this research, based on the combined results from the first three waves (July – September 2019, October – December 2019 and January – March 2020).

1.4 All district and GM level information is also available to community safety partnerships through the online portal.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESULTS

2.1 Feelings of Safety

2.1.1 The majority of respondents (87%) felt safe in their local area. The main reasons cited for feeling safe were quiet/pleasant neighbourhoods (21% of those feeling safe), lack of personal experiences of problems (21%) and a sense of community in the local area (17%).

2.1.2 The main reasons for respondents not feeling safe in their local area were an awareness of ASB (40% of those who felt unsafe) and an awareness of crime (31%).

2.1.3 Place of study

2.1.4 Nine in ten respondents felt safe at their place of study (93%). The main reason for feeling safe was that their place of study felt secure/there were security guards or other security measures (28% of those who felt safe).

2.1.5 Place of work

2.1.6 Nine in ten respondents who work in Greater Manchester felt safe at their place of work (91%). The main reasons for feeling safe whilst at work were due to workplace security

---

1 Note that, regarding Wave 3 data, the majority of interviews were conducted before the national lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which began on March 23rd, 2020.
measures including generally secure buildings/carparks (22% of those who felt safe) and specific measures such as security guards (18%).

2.1.7 When socialising
2.1.8 Four in five respondents (81%) felt safe when socialising in their local authority area. The main reason respondents felt safe when socialising was because they had not personally experienced any problems (21% of those who felt safe).

2.1.9 The main reason for not feeling safe when socialising in their local area was due to an awareness of ASB (40% of those who felt unsafe).

2.1.10 Behavioural changes in the last 12 months
2.1.11 Seven in ten respondents (72%) had not changed their behaviour or taken any action in the last 12 months as a result of feeling unsafe in Greater Manchester.

2.1.12 For the respondents who had taken action or changed their behaviour, avoidance tactics were the actions most commonly cited, including being more cautious/careful (5%) and going out less in the evening (5%).

2.2 Confidence in Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and the Community Safety Partnership (CSP)
2.2.1 Confidence in GMP in an emergency
2.2.2 Three in five respondents (62%) were confident that they could get help from GMP in an emergency, while three in ten respondents (30%) were not confident.

2.2.3 The main reason respondents felt confident was that they were sure that the police would respond in an emergency situation (29% of those who felt confident), followed by positive first-hand experiences (9%).

2.2.4 The main reasons for not feeling confident were the perception that the police lack resources (27% of those who lack confidence), followed by lack of police presence (24%) and a general lack of confidence in the police (20%).

2.2.5 Confidence in GMP in a non-emergency
2.2.6 Two in five respondents (39%) felt confident that they could get help from GMP in a non-emergency situation. The main reasons respondents felt confident was that they were sure that the police will respond (25%) and due to positive first-hand experiences (12%).

2.2.7 Almost half of respondents (47%) were not confident that they could get help in a non-emergency. The main reasons for a lack of confidence were the perceived lack of police funding/resources (27% of those who were not confident), lack of police presence (18%) and experience of crimes not being attended/being ignored/only given a reference number (17%).
2.2.8 Agreement that the CSP is dealing with community safety issues in the local area

Two fifths of respondents (41%) agreed that the CSP is dealing with community safety issues in their local area. Over a third (37%) either did not know what the CSP was or did not know how they would rate the CSP’s activities.

2.2.9 Of those who agreed, many could not give a specific reason why they agreed (23% of those who agree) or they agreed due to a very general sense of being safe (18%).

2.2.10 The main reasons for disagreement were the lack of evidence that issues were being dealt with (21% of those who disagree), lack of police presence (18%) and being unsure about the CSP’s role (15%).

2.3 Contact and satisfaction

2.3.1 Experienced one or more community safety issues

Two fifths of respondents (40%) had experienced a community safety issue in the previous 12 months.

2.3.2 The most common community safety issues experienced were being witness to a crime/ASB or disturbance (17%), being concerned for someone’s safety or about something suspicious (16%), and being a victim of a crime/ASB or disturbance (15%).

2.3.3 Contact relating to community safety

Just under three in ten respondents (27%) had had contact with any community safety organisation in the previous 12 months. One fifth of respondents had had contact with GMP (20%).

2.3.4 Reasons for not making contact

Some respondents who had had a community safety experience had not made contact with any community safety organisation, including GMP. The main reasons for this were because someone else had already made contact regarding the issue (16%), a lack of confidence in the organisations (15%), or because respondents did not feel their issue was serious enough to warrant intervention by GMP/other CSP organisations (14%).

2.3.5 Satisfaction with most recent contact – GMP

Of those whose most recent contact was with GMP in the previous 12 months, just over half (53%) were satisfied with the service they received, while three in ten respondents (31%) were dissatisfied with the service.

2.3.6 The main reasons for dissatisfaction with the service received from GMP were experience of crimes not being attended/beings ignored/only given a reference number (32%), poor/lack of resolution (21%), poor communication (18%).

2.3.7 Satisfaction with most recent contact – local council regarding a community safety issue
2.3.12 Of those whose most recent contact was with their local council in the previous 12 months, half (49%) were satisfied with the service they received, while over a third (37%) were dissatisfied.

2.3.13 **Satisfaction with most recent contact – housing provider regarding a community safety issue**
2.3.14 Of those whose most recent contact was with a housing provider in the previous 12 months, two in five respondents (42%) were satisfied with the service they received from a housing provider regarding a community safety issue, and a similar proportion (39%) were dissatisfied.

2.3.15 **Satisfaction with most recent contact – community/voluntary organisation regarding a community safety issue**
2.3.16 Of those whose most recent contact was with a community/voluntary organisation in the previous 12 months, two in three respondents (67%) were satisfied with the service they received from community/voluntary organisation regarding a community safety issue. A small minority of respondents were dissatisfied (9%).

2.4 **About the local area**
2.4.1 Over seven in ten respondents agreed that their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well (72%) and agreed they were proud of their local area (71%); they felt a strong sense of belonging (71%) and that their local area was a place where people looked out for each other (71%).

2.4.2 Just under two thirds of respondents also believed that their local area was well maintained (64%).

2.4.3 Just over a third of respondents believed that they had a say about what happens in their local area (36%).

3. **RECOMMENDATIONS**
3.1 Recommendations are on the front page of the report
Police and Crime Panel
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Dr Sarah Barnes – Principal Research, Police, Criminal Justice and Fire, GMCA

Lisa Lees, Strategic Planning Manager, GMCA

Dr Peter Langmead-Jones – Head of External Relations and Performance Branch, GMP
Respondent profile

### Gender
- A man: 48%
- A woman: 51%
- Non-binary: <1%
- Transgender: <1%
- Other: <1%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

### Age
- 16-29: 24%
- 30-44: 25%
- 45-60: 26%
- 61+: 24%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

### Religion
- Buddhist: <1%
- Christian: 51%
- Hindu: 1%
- Jewish: 1%
- Muslim: 6%
- Sikh: <1%
- Other: 2%
- No religion: 36%
- Prefer not to say: 3%

### Disability
- Learning disability: 2%
- Mental ill-health: 6%
- Mobility disability: 9%
- Sensory disability: 2%
- Other disability: 3%
- Prefer not to say: 2%

### Sexuality
- Bisexual: 2%
- Gay or lesbian: 3%
- Heterosexual: 91%
- Other: <1%
- Prefer not to say: 4%

### Ethnicity
- White: 87%
- BAME: 12%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

Source: S03 – What is your gender? S04/A – What is your age? C04 – What is your religion? C05 - Do you consider yourself to have a disability? C06 - How would you describe your sexuality? S05 – How do you describe your ethnic group?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (9750)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
### Respondent profile

#### Working status
- Employed full-time: 39%
- Employed part-time: 13%
- Self-employed: 6%
- In education: 8%
- Unemployed, looking for work: 5%
- Permanently sick/disabled: 3%
- Retired: 23%
- Looking after the home: 4%
- Volunteering: 1%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

#### Financial status
- I can afford luxuries as well as essentials: 22%
- I can afford essentials and occasional luxuries: 53%
- I can afford essentials but nothing else: 14%
- Sometimes I can’t afford all essentials: 5%
- I can rarely afford essentials: 3%
- Don’t know: 1%
- Prefer not to say: 3%

#### District socialise in most
- Bolton: 8%
- Bury: 6%
- M’cr: 30%
- Oldham: 6%
- Rochdale: 5%
- Salford: 6%
- Stockport: 9%
- Tameside: 6%
- Trafford: 7%
- Wigan: 8%
- None of these: 7%
- Don’t know: 2%

Source: C01 – What is your current employment status? C03 – Which of the following statements best describes your current circumstances…? C09 – Thinking of the different districts that make up Greater Manchester, which area do you socialise ‘most often’ in?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (9750); C09 All respondents who socialise in Greater Manchester (9549)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Have any of the following happened to you in the past 12 months within Greater Manchester?

- Been a witness to a crime / antisocial behaviour or disturbance / online crime: 17%
- Been concerned for someone’s safety, or something suspicious: 16%
- Been a victim of a crime / antisocial behaviour or disturbance / online crime: 15%
- Been involved in or witnessed a road traffic collision or other traffic related incident: 11%
- Any other community safety issue: 3%
- Been stopped and searched by the police: 2%
- Been arrested or detained by the police: 1%
- None of these: 60%

Total number of responses = 12,228

Source: Q17 – Have any of the following happened to you in the past 12 months within Greater Manchester?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (9750)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Have you had any contact relating to a community safety issue with any of the following organisations within the last 12 months?

- Greater Manchester Police: 20%
- Local council relating to a community safety issue: 5%
- Housing provider relating to a community safety issue: 3%
- Victim support: 2%
- Community/voluntary organisation relating to a community safety issue: 2%
- Other police force: 2%
- Crimestoppers: 1%
- Offender Services: 1%
- Another organisation relating to a community safety issue: 2%
- None of these: 71%
- Don't know / Can't remember: 2%

Total number of responses = 10,746

Source: Q16 – Have you had any contact relating to a community safety issue with any of the following organisations within the last 12 months?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (9750)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Why did people not report incidents?

40% of respondents had one or more community safety experience, but only 29% had one or more contact with a community safety organisation

Top 10 reasons that victims or witnesses of crime did not make contact with the police or another community safety organisation

- Someone else contacted/would have contacted GMP/CSP
- Lacks confidence in GMP/CSP /in getting response
- Issue not serious enough/did not need intervention by GMP/CSP
- Situation already attended or resolved/being resolved
- Didn't want to get involved
- Issue was sorted by another group/organisation
- Didn't want the police involved
- Didn't have enough details/evidence to report
- Police/ CSP lack resource to attend/ resolve issue
- Not relevant
- Tried to contact but got no answer
- Unsure who to contact

(n=1246)
Filter:
Base: All answering
Feelings of Safety
How safe do you feel when in your local area; place of study; place of work; and socialising in your district?

NET: Very / fairly safe – In your local area: 87%
NET: Very / fairly safe – At your place of study: 93%
NET: Very / fairly safe – At your place of work: 91%
NET: Very / fairly safe – When socialising in your district: 81%

Source: Q1 – How safe do you feel when in your local area? By “local area”, we mean the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home.

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above).

Source: Q3 – How safe do you feel at your place of study?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester who study at a location in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

Source: Q5 – How safe do you feel at your place of work?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester who work away from their home at a location in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above).

Source: Q7 – How safe do you feel when socialising out anywhere in your local authority area of [DISTRICT]?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester who socialise in their local district (as shown in brackets above). *Respondents who said ‘Not applicable’ (n=1,447) at Q7 are not included in the base for this chart

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
How safe do you feel when in your local area?

Greater Manchester (GM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significantly higher than previous wave
- Significantly lower than previous wave

Source: Q1 – How safe do you feel when in your local area? By “local area”, we mean the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home.

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly **safe** when in your local area?

**TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel safe**

- Quiet area/ nice area: 21%
- No personal experience of problems: 21%
- Community - friendly/ everyone knows everyone/ good neighbours: 17%
- Lived there long time/ whole life/ knows area very well: 11%
- Unsafe: Aware of antisocial behaviour: 7%
- Historically low crime area: 7%
- Unsafe: Aware of crime in area: 6%
- Varies by time of day: 6%
- Changed behaviour/ Taken steps to improve security: 3%
- Good maintenance of area - including street lighting, roads, pavements: 3%

Source: Q2 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly **safe** when in your local area? 

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly safe. Greater Manchester (8484) 

Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. 

Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q01 - How safe do you feel in your local area?: Very safe, Fairly safe
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly **unsafe** when in your local area?

**TOP 10 reasons shown:** Results are based on all who say that they feel **unsafe**

- Aware of antisocial behaviour: 40%
- Aware of crime in area: 31%
- Lack of police presence: 11%
- General anxiety about crime/ sense of crime on increase: 8%
- Victim of crime (recent or past): 7%
- Witness of antisocial behaviour: 7%
- Varies by time of day: 5%
- Some parts of local area are felt to be unsafe: 4%
- Poor maintenance of the area - including street lighting, roads, pavements: 4%
- Victim of antisocial behaviour (recent or past): 3%

**Source:** Q2 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly unsafe when in your local area?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly unsafe. Greater Manchester (1,178) multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.

**Top 10 answers only shown here.** Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q01 - How safe do you feel in your local area?: Fairly unsafe, Very unsafe
How safe do you feel in your local area? By demographic

Overall, the vast majority of GM respondents feel safe in their local area and at work.

Older respondents tend to feel safer in their local area than younger residents.

BAME respondents tend to feel less safe.

Feelings of safety decline with levels of financial hardship.

Those who have been a victim or witness of crime feel less safe than those who have not.
How safe do you feel at your place of study?

**NET: Very/ fairly safe over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Sep 2019</td>
<td>Oct - Dec 2019</td>
<td>Jan - Mar 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>(387)</td>
<td>(480)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Q3 – How safe do you feel at your place of study?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester who study at a location in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | S08 - And do you currently study at a location in Greater Manchester? This does not include courses which are online only, or home study only: Yes
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly **safe** when at your place of study?

**TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel safe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property is secure/ security guards / checks</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community - friendly/ everyone knows everyone</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No personal experience of problems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy area/ always people about</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet area/ nice area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels supported by college/ university</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows area very well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe: Aware of crime in area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels safe in town/ city centre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents can give multiple answers

Total number of reasons = 1,091

Source: Q4 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly safe when at your place of study? Respondents to this question: All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly safe. Greater Manchester (1,213) Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q03 - How safe do you feel at your place of study?: Very safe, Fairly safe
**How safe do you feel when at your place of work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Source:** Q5 – How safe do you feel at your place of work?
- **Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester who work away from their home at a location in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)
- **Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | DS07 - And do you currently work from home all of the time, some of the time, or never?: Some of the time, Never
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly safe when at your place of work?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel safe

- Workplace is secure/ CCTV/ secure car park: 22%
- Workplace has security guards / security checks: 18%
- No personal experience of problems: 12%
- Community - friendly/ everyone knows everyone: 8%
- Busy area/ always people about: 7%
- Quiet area/ nice area: 6%
- Knows area very well: 2%
- Unsafe: Aware of antisocial behaviour: 2%
- Unsafe: Aware of crime in area: 2%
- Unsafe: Workplace open to public: 2%

Source: Q6 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly safe when at your place of work?

Respondents to this question: All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly safe. Greater Manchester (1944)

Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.

Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q05 - How safe do you feel at your place of work?: Very safe, Fairly safe
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly **unsafe** when at your place of work?

**TOP 10 reasons shown:** Results are based on all who say that they feel unsafe

- **Aware of crime in area** 19%
- **Aware of antisocial behaviour** 18%
- **Feels unsafe in Manchester city centre** 8%
- **Poor security at workplace** 6%
- **Witness of antisocial behaviour** 6%
- **Victim of crime (recent or past)** 6%
- **Victim of antisocial behaviour (recent or past)** 5%
- **Feels unsafe in other area** 5%
- **Workplace open to public** 4%
- **Witness of crime (recent or past)** 3%

**Source:** Q6 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly unsafe when at your place of work?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly unsafe. Greater Manchester (133)

**Multicode:** Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.

Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q05 - How safe do you feel at your place of work?: Fairly unsafe, Very unsafe
How safe do you feel when socialising out anywhere in [DISTRICT]?

- Wave 1: Jul - Sep 2019
  - GM: 81% (2743)

- Wave 2: Oct - Dec 2019
  - GM: 79% (2776)

- Wave 3: Jan - Mar 2020
  - GM: 82% (2784)

Significantly higher than previous wave
Significantly lower than previous wave

Source: Q7 – How safe do you feel when socialising out anywhere in your local authority area?

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester who socialise in their local district (by district, as shown in brackets above). *All respondents who said ‘Not applicable’ at Q7 are not included in the base for this chart.

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q07 - How safe do you feel when socialising?: Very safe, Fairly safe, Fairly unsafe, Very unsafe, Don't know
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly **safe** when socialising out anywhere in [DISTRICT]?

**TOP 10 reasons shown:** Results are based on all who say that they feel **safe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No personal experience of problems</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe: Aware of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community - friendly/ everyone knows everyone</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows area very well</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy area/ always people about</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral: Stays alert/ aware of surroundings</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed behaviour/ Taken steps to improve security</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet area/ nice area</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe: Feels unsafe at night/ after dark</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels safe during day/ daylight</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Q8 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly safe when socialising out and about anywhere in [DISTRICT]?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly safe. Greater Manchester (2972)

**Multicode:** Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.

Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q07 - How safe do you feel when socialising?: Very safe, Fairly safe
Why do you say that you feel very/fairly unsafe when socialising out anywhere in [DISTRICT]?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel unsafe

- Aware of antisocial behaviour: 40%
- Aware of crime in area: 18%
- Feels unsafe at night/after dark: 11%
- Lack of police presence: 9%
- General anxiety about crime/sense of crime on increase: 8%
- Feels unsafe in town/city centre (other than Manchester city centre): 8%
- Feels unsafe in Manchester city centre: 6%
- Neutral: Stays alert/aware of surroundings: 5%
- Some parts of local area are felt to be unsafe: 4%
- Witness of antisocial behaviour: 4%

Respondents can give multiple answers
Total number of reasons = 887

Source: Q8 – And why do you say that you feel very/fairly unsafe when socialising out and about anywhere in [DISTRICT]?

respondents to this question: All respondents who say that they feel very/fairly unsafe. Greater Manchester (628)
multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.
Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both safe and unsafe reasons. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

inter: Wave: 1, 2 | Q07 - How safe do you feel when socialising?: Fairly unsafe, Very unsafe
Overall, the vast majority of GM respondents feel safe in their local area and at work.

Female respondents tend to feel less safe socialising.

Older respondents tend to feel safer socialising in their local area than younger residents.

Feelings of safety decline with levels of financial hardship.

Those who have been a victim or witness of crime feel less safe than those who have not.
In the past 12 months, have you changed your behaviour or taken any action because you felt unsafe in Greater Manchester?

**TOP 10 reasons shown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I have not changed my behaviour/ taken any action</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More suspicious/cautious/careful in general</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go out less at night/in the evening</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid going out alone</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased home security (alarms/locks/CCTV etc)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Manchester city centre</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed travel route/method</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t go out as much</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid other areas (other than city centre)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid certain types of people</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Q9 – In the past 12 months, have you changed your behaviour or taken any action because you felt unsafe in Greater Manchester?  
Respondents to this question: Greater Manchester (9750)  
Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses.  
Top 10 answers only shown here. Figures are % of all respondents. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.  
Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Confidence and Satisfaction
Confidence in getting help from Greater Manchester Police (GMP), and the extent to which the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is dealing with community safety issues

NET: Very / fairly confident – In getting help from GMP in an emergency: 62%
NET: Very / fairly confident – In getting help from GMP in a non-emergency: 39%
NET: Strongly / tend to agree – The CSP is dealing with community safety issues in your local area: 41%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence in getting help from GMP in an emergency (9750)</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>38%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Confidence in getting help from GMP in a non-emergency (9750) | 13% | 26% | 24% | 23% | 10% | 4% |

| The CSP is dealing with community safety issues in your local area (9750) | 12% | 29% | 13% | 9% | 15% | 22% |

Source: Q10 – How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it, firstly in an emergency?
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

Source: Q12 – And how confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it, in a non-emergency situation?
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

Source: Q14 – Community Safety is not solely the responsibility of the police. Other organisations work with the police as the “community safety partnership”. This partnership includes the local Council, Offender Services, housing providers, and community and voluntary organisations. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the community safety partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

Filter: Wave: 1; 2; 3
How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it *in an emergency*?

**Source:** Q10 – How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it, firstly in an emergency?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3

**GM NET: Very/ fairly confident over time**

- **Wave 1** Jul - Sep 2019: 59%
- **Wave 2** Oct - Dec 2019: 62%
- **Wave 3** Jan - Mar 2020: 65%

- Significantly higher than previous wave
- Significantly lower than previous wave
Why do you say that you are *very/fairly confident* that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police *in an emergency*?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident in police/that police will respond</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral: No first-hand experience</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive first-hand experience</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick/efficient response (first-hand experience)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Police lack resources/funding</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible police presence in area</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Slow response times (first-hand experience)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Efficient only in emergencies</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone contact is easy/effective</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Lacks confidence in police/that police will respond</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Q11 – And why do you say that you are very/fairly confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in an emergency?

Respondents to this question: Respondents who say that they are very/fairly confident. Greater Manchester (1977)

Multicore. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. Q11, Q13, and Q15 were randomly rotated so that each respondent answered one of these three questions. Top 10 answers only shown here. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q10 - How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in an emergency?: Very confident, Fairly confident
### Why do you say that you are not very/not at all confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in an emergency?

**TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel not confident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police lack resources/funding</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of police presence/local station</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks confidence in police/that police will respond</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow response times (first-hand experience)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes not attended/ignored/only receive a reference number (first-hand experience)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General negative first-hand experience</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative word-of-mouth</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties contacting police (first-hand experience)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient only in emergencies</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes police are untrustworthy</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of reasons = 1,515

---

**Source:** Q11 – And why do you say that you are not very/not at all confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in an emergency?

**Respondents to this question:** Respondents who say that they are not very/not at all confident. Greater Manchester (1001) multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. Q11, Q13, and Q15 were randomly rotated so that each respondent answered one of these three questions. Top 10 answers only shown here. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q10 - How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in an emergency?: Not very confident, Not at all confident
How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it, in a non-emergency?

**GNET: Very/ fairly confident over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Sep 2019</td>
<td>Oct - Dec 2019</td>
<td>Jan - Mar 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM (3250)</td>
<td>GM (3250)</td>
<td>GM (3250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significantly higher than previous wave
- Significantly lower than previous wave

**Source:** Q12 – And how confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police if you needed it, in a non-emergency situation?

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3
**Why do you say that you are very/fairly confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in a non-emergency?**

**TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel confident**

- Confident in police/that police will respond: 25%
- General positive first-hand experience: 12%
- Neutral: No first-hand experience: 9%
- Visible police presence in area: 5%
- Negative: Police lack resources/funding: 5%
- Negative: Emergencies are prioritised (negative): 5%
- Phone/101 contact is easy/effective: 3%
- Negative: Slow response times (first-hand experience): 3%
- Negative: Lack of police presence/local station: 2%
- Negative: Lack confidence in police/that police will respond: 2%

*Source: Q13 – And why do you say that you are very/fairly confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in a non-emergency? Respondents to this question: Respondents who say that they are very/fairly confident. Greater Manchester (1245) multi-code. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. Q11, Q13, and Q15 were randomly rotated so that each respondent answered one of these three questions. Top 10 answers only shown here. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal. Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q12 - How confident are you that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in a non-emergency situation?: Very confident, Fairly confident*
Why do you say that you are not very/not at all confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in a non-emergency?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they feel not confident

- Police lack resources/funding 27%
- Lack of police presence/local station 18%
- Crimes not attended/ignored/only receive a reference number (first-hand experience) 17%
- Slow response times (first-hand experience) 15%
- Lack confidence in police/that police will respond 14%
- Emergencies are prioritised (negative) 13%
- General negative first-hand experience 8%
- Negative word-of-mouth 7%
- Difficulties contacting police (first-hand experience) 6%
- Negative experience of 101 5%

Source: Q13 – And why do you say that you are not very/not at all confident that you could get help from Greater Manchester Police in a non-emergency? Respondents to this question: Respondents who say that they are not very/not at all confident. Greater Manchester (1573) Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses. Q11, Q13, and Q15 were randomly rotated so that each respondent answered one of these three questions. Top 10 answers only shown here. A full list of responses can be found within the Tables section of the portal.
Confidence in the police by demographic

Overall, 61% of GM respondents are confident could help in an emergency and 38% in a non-emergency.

Women tend to feel more confident in both emergencies and non-emergencies.

Younger respondents had more confidence than older respondents (45+).

BAME respondents were more confident in a non-emergency.

Feelings of confidence decline with levels of financial hardship, particularly in an emergency.

Those who have previously been a victim or witness of crime feel less confident.
To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Community Safety Partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?

**Q14 – Community Safety is not solely the responsibility of the police. Other organisations work with the police as the ‘community safety partnership’. This partnership includes the local Council, Offender Services, housing providers, and community and voluntary organisations. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the community safety partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?**

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester (as shown in brackets above)

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3

**Greater Manchester**

- **Wave 1** (Jul - Sep 2019): 40% (3250)
- **Wave 2** (Oct - Dec 2019): 42% (3250)
- **Wave 3** (Jan - Mar 2020): 40% (3250)

- Significantly higher than previous wave
- Significantly lower than previous wave

**Source:** Q14 – Community Safety is not solely the responsibility of the police. Other organisations work with the police as the ‘community safety partnership’. This partnership includes the local Council, Offender Services, housing providers, and community and voluntary organisations. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the community safety partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?
Why do you say that you strongly/tend to agree that the Community Safety Partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they agree

- General sense of being safe in local area: 20%
- Neutral: No first-hand experience: 9%
- Visible police presence in area: 9%
- General positive first-hand experience: 6%
- Neutral: Not sure what they do/who they are: 5%
- Self/family member/friend is/was in police force/CSP organisation: 5%
- Aware of Neighbourhood Watch: 4%
- Positive media/social media: 3%
- Negative: Organisation(s) lack resources/funding: 3%
- Negative: Lack of police presence/local station: 3%

Respondents can give multiple answers.
Why do you say that you strongly/tend to disagree that the Community Safety Partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?

TOP 10 reasons shown: Results are based on all who say that they disagree

- No evidence to show safety issues are being dealt with: 23%
- Neutral: Not sure what they do/who they are: 20%
- Lack of police presence/local station: 11%
- Times not visited/are ignored/ Only receive reference number: 11%
- Lacks confidence in organisation/in getting response: 7%
- General sense of being unsafe in local area: 6%
- General negative first-hand experience: 5%
- Too little correspondence/communication: 5%
- Organisation(s) lack resources/funding: 4%
- Poor management/funding choices: 4%

Source: Q15 – And why do you say that you strongly/tend to disagree that the community safety partnership is dealing with community safety issues in your local area?

Respondents to this question: Respondents who say that they strongly/tend to disagree. Greater Manchester.

Multicode. Coded from spontaneous responses. Total does not sum 100% due to multiple responses.

Q11, Q13, and Q15 were randomly rotated so that each respondent answered one of these three questions.

Top 10 answers only shown here. Note: some respondents provided both positive and negative reasons.
Do you agree that the Community Safety Partnership is dealing with community safety issue in your local area by demographic?

41% of GM respondents agree that the community safety partnership is dealing with local safety issues.

36% said they didn’t know, further analysis indicates that a large portion is this is those who don’t know who the CSP are.

Those aged 45-60 were least likely to agree, and those aged 16-24 most likely.

BAME respondents were more likely to agree.

The most financially challenged were least likely to agree.

Those who had been a victim or witness of crime were less confident.
Do you agree that the Community Safety Partnership is dealing with community safety issue in your local area by demographic?

Even though older respondents feel safer in their local area, they are less likely to agree that the CSP is dealing with community safety related issues.

The more people rate that they can afford, the more likely they are to agree that the CSP is dealing with community safety related issues.

Respondents who had been a victim and/or witness to a crime were far less likely to agree.
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service that you received from the organisation you were last in contact with?

**Source:** Q16C – Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service that you received from [the organisation you were last in contact with? 

**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester who last had contact with an organisation in the last 12 months (see brackets) 

**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3

*Results are not shown due to small base size*
Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service that you received from Greater Manchester Police?

**Source:** Q16C – Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service that you received from GMP?  
**Respondents to this question:** All respondents in Greater Manchester who last had contact with an organisation in the last 12 months (see brackets)  
**Filter:** Wave: 1, 2, 3 | Q16b - And which of those organisations were you in contact with most recently?: Greater Manchester Police

- **Wave 1** (Jul - Sep 2019): 53%  
- **Wave 2** (Oct - Dec 2019): 52%  
- **Wave 3** (Jan - Mar 2020): 55%

**Note:** The graph shows the percentage of respondents who were very or fairly satisfied over time.
About the local area
How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not applicable in my area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My local area is a place where people with different backgrounds get on well together</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My local area is a place where people look out for each other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging in my local area</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a say about what happens in my local area</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my local area</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My local area is well maintained</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (9,750)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
“My local area is a place where people with different backgrounds get on well together”

Greater Manchester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly higher than previous wave

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area...? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
“My local area is a place where people look out for each other”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
<td>(3250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significantly higher than previous wave
- Significantly lower than previous wave

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Feelings about local community by demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Financial Situation</th>
<th>Victim or Witness of Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of GM respondents feel that people of different background get along in their area and that people look out for each other.

Agreement with these statements is lower with higher levels of financial hardship.

Older respondents tend to agree more that people look out for each other.

Victims / witnesses are less likely to agree with comments about their local area.
"I feel a strong sense of belonging to my local area"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 (Jul-Sep 2019)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 (Oct-Dec 2019)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 (Jan-Mar 2020)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter)
Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
“I have a say about what happens in my local area”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>36% (3,250)</td>
<td>35% (3,250)</td>
<td>37% (3,250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter)
Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Feelings of belonging and having a say by demographic

The majority of GM respondents feel a sense of belonging, but only a third feel their have any say on what happens in their area.

Older respondents tend to feel more belonging than younger residents.

Feelings of belonging and feelings of having a say are both lower among those experiencing more financial hardship.

Those who have been a victim or witness of crime agree less with both of these statements.
“I am proud of my local area”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater Manchester

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)
Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter)
Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
“My local area is well maintained”

Greater Manchester

Source: Q19 – How strongly do you agree or disagree with each statement about your local area…? (the area within about 5 minutes walking distance of your home)

Respondents to this question: All respondents in Greater Manchester (by district, as shown in brackets above for latest quarter)

Filter: Wave: 1, 2, 3
Feelings of pride and living in a well-maintained area by demographic

The majority of GM respondents are proud of their local area and feel it is well maintained.

Older respondents tend to be more proud of their local area.

A smaller proportion of BAME respondents feel proud of their local area.

Feelings of pride and living in a well-maintained area are both lower among those experiencing more financial hardship and those who have been a victim or witness of crime.
Feelings of safety by feelings about the local area

Those with a more negative perception of their local area also feel less safe.

This is consistent across all measures of feeling about the local area.

The largest difference is for those who do and do not feel proud of their local area.

The smallest difference is for feelings of having a say about their local area.
Cross Cutting Insights

Better financial situation is associated with higher feelings of safety, higher confidence and higher satisfaction.

Better views of local area is associated with higher feelings of safety, higher confidence and higher satisfaction.

BAME respondents have lower confidence, lower satisfaction and feel less safe.

Being a victim and/or witness of a crime is associated with lower feelings of safety and lower confidence.
Issues arising from Wave 4 and Implications for future Waves
## The Survey During the COVID19 Lockdown

The vast majority of interviews for Wave 3 were conducted pre-lockdown, no changes to methodology or survey were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Wave 4</th>
<th>Impact on survey</th>
<th>Changes made for Wave 4 survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All face to face interviews stopped</td>
<td>• Lower response rate from:</td>
<td>• Buying in additional targeted mobile phone numbers (no additional cost to GMCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• younger age groups (both 16-29 and 30-44)</td>
<td>• Reducing time limit for resurveying from 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BAME</td>
<td>• Asking respondents if another person in the household might be interested in taking part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some LAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockdown has restricted socialising</td>
<td>Socialising questions not currently relevant</td>
<td>Questions about socialising removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockdown has significantly impacted on people’s working life</td>
<td>‘Safety at work’ may no longer be relevant</td>
<td>Additional question added to understanding changes to working arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockdown has significantly impacted on people’s studying</td>
<td>People are no longer going to a place of study</td>
<td>‘Safety at place of study’ question removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications for Wave 5 (due to start Jul 20)

Unlikely that face to face interviews will be possible

Working with DJS and colleagues from the university and Comms / Engagement team to consider alternatives to achieve the required sample within current budget

Propose to remove the “how safe do you feel at place of study?” question

- Question around “how safe do you feel when socialising in your district?”
  - Reintroduce as in Waves 1-3
  - Continue to omit as in Wave 4
  - Replace with a modified question e.g. “How safe do you feel away from your home?”
Thinking about your business, how concerned are you about community safety, security, crime, or disorder in the vicinity of your business premises?

- Very concerned
- Fairly concerned
- Not very concerned
- Not concerned at all

Base size: 534
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PURPOSE OF REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to inform the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel of the recorded Crime, in Greater Manchester, in 2019, when compared to the previous year, 2018. This recorded crime data is produced from the iOPS Data Warehouse.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel members are asked to note the information contained in this report.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

ACC Sykes – Chris.sykes@gmp.police.uk
iOPS Performance Tools:

iOPS consists of a number of products, designed to work together, to support operational policing. The data presented here has been extracted from iOPS Cognos.

iOPS Cognos is our strategic reporting tool.

iOPS Cognos is based on the IBM Cognos product and runs off a data warehouse to give us access to a large data set and a range of analytical tools that extract the data, providing reports for the organisation and its partners.

We can analyse this data in iOPS Cognos itself or we can extract the data to Excel or other statistical tools such as SPSS for further insight. We are also able to extract large data sets to share with our academic partners such as Manchester Metropolitan University and their data centre and they use this to give us strategic insight into our data by comparing it with partner and open source data.

In addition to iOPS Cognos, we also have a dashboard of performance sourced straight from our core systems, but presented in an easy to view way – the iOPS Dashboard. This displays how many incidents, crime and care plans we currently have open and is a very useful visual representation of demand.

For tactical reporting we have PoliceWorks and ControlWorks reports which come straight out of our command and control, records management and our call handling systems. These allow us to see up to the minute demand data such as how many people are in a custody suite, or how many calls we have.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime type</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total crime</td>
<td>334,544</td>
<td>306,663</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim based crime</td>
<td>272,797</td>
<td>255,561</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>30,146</td>
<td>27,670</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>7,649</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle offences</td>
<td>31,658</td>
<td>31,146</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic abuse</td>
<td>45,718</td>
<td>41,017</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall in 2019 total crimes fell by nearly 28,000 or 8% when compared to the total...
in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in August 2019 with 23,410 and the highest month of crime in 2019 was March with 28,644.

Overall in 2019 victim based crimes fell by just over 17,000 or 6% when compared to the total in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in August 2019 with 19,875 and the highest month of crime in 2019 was March with 23,386.

Overall in 2019 burglary crimes fell by nearly 2,500 or 8% when compared to the total in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in June 2019 with 2,055 and the highest month of crime in 2019 was January with 2,676.

Overall in 2019 robbery crimes fell by just over 660 or 9% when compared to the total in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in June 2019 with 472 and the highest month of crime in 2019 was April with 654.

Overall in 2019 vehicle crimes fell by just over 500 or 2% when compared to the total in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in June 2019 with 2,312 and the highest month of crime in 2019 was November with 2,850.

Overall in 2019 domestic abuse crimes fell by just over 4,700 or 10% when compared to the total in 2018. The lowest monthly volume of crime was in September and the highest month of crime in 2019 with 2,754.
2019 was March with 3,924.

2) A Brief History.

**National Crime Recording Standards**

In August 2016 HMICFRS published a report in which it judged the compliance by Greater Manchester Police with National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) as inadequate, estimating that GMP failed to record **38,000 reported crimes a year**, including violent and sexual offences. That year GMP recorded 230,000 crimes.

Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) are based on legal definitions and stipulate how multiple crimes should be counted and recorded; officers are also required to correctly apply the principle crime rule.

In response to the Report, GMP devised and implemented Operation Octopus to address the issues raised. Gold meetings and Tactical meetings were convened to devise and implement GMP’s strategic responses to HMICFRS’s Report and to monitor progress.

**Crime Progression teams**

Operation Octopus took a system-wide approach to examining and tackling the issues raised by the HMIC report. This led to some restructuring of resources at local level, with the introduction of Crime Progression Teams (CPT) in June 2017. The role of the CPT being to provide robust interrogation of each new crime, by trained crime evaluators, to identify missing or incorrectly classified crimes under NCRS and HOCR rules, missing flags and qualifiers and to quality assure the initial investigation assessment against the PIP1 Crime Management Standard. At the end of the investigation, the CPT hold responsibility for ensuring that correct outcomes are applied, Victims Code of Practice (VCOP) is complied with as well as a final quality assurance process.

GMP has implemented specific training packages to improve NCRS and HOCR. All GMP Neighbourhood Patrol and Beat Officers and Sergeants have undertaken training and this is now a mandatory training requirement for all newly appointed officers and newly promoted Sergeants.

Equally there has been significant investment in training new crime evaluators and the Continuous Professional Development of those in role since 2017.
It is interesting to note that although the HMICFRS assessed that 38,000 crimes were under recorded in 2016/17, that the following year GMP recorded an additional 110,000 crimes to circa 340,000.

3) Crime Standards/Governance.

In subsequent HMICFRS inspections and indeed GMP internal audits it was noted that GMP are still under-recording crime on occasion but equally, over recording was also taking place. Thus, re-iterating the point that NCRS and HOCR are inherently complicated.

It should be noted that there has been a significant improvement in overall crime standards in GMP. In 2018 the PIP1 and Supervisory Effectiveness audit was implemented with a compliance rate of 50%. A significant training programme was delivered to all frontline staff leading to improved performance and cultural change. Around 20,000 crimes have now been audited and scrutinised, identifying trends and rectifying them quickly, hence there has been a discernible rise in quality of crime records in latest audits compared to 2017.

Current overall compliance is 81%, highlighting the significant improvements made.

4) To Summarise

When comparing 2019, to 2018, our total crimes recorded fell by nearly 28,000 or 8%.

Crime recording standards in GMP have significantly improved from 2018 to 2019 and continue in an upward trajectory. Although overall crime is down, in line with National findings, it is accepted that continued improvement is required to ensure crime data is accurate and in line with NCRS requirements.

To this end, GMP have invested extensively in dedicated resources at all ranks and roles, to improve crime recording and NCRS compliance and the new centralised Crime Recording and Resolution Unit will undoubtedly assist in this regard, using specially trained staff to record crime at the first point of contact in Greater Manchester.

GMP’s commitment to improving NCRS, HOCR, Crime Data and Standards sees the launch of the new Crime and Incident Recording Centre of Excellence on Monday 4th May, involving the re-alignment of specialist teams under a Force Crime Lead. This team will deliver an end to end co-ordinated approach to make improvements at the Centre and on Districts in all aspect of crime and incident recording.
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