

RCB UPDATE PAPER JULY 2014

REGIONAL UNDERWATER SEARCH AND MARINE UNIT (USMU)

REPORT AUTHOR: Inspector Mark Bishop

INTRODUCTION

This report update is submitted as a consequence of discussions at the previous RCB in May 2014 where further detail in relation to demand data for all four Forces going back 5 years was requested.

In addition North Yorkshire Police also requested an outline business case with an indication of their return on investment.

This update to the original report will provide the data that is still available and will attempt to apply some basic analysis to demonstrate the returns versus costs, with particular focus on the detail required by NYP.

Research

It was noted from the outset that demand data for the full five years for all forces would be difficult to obtain and this has proved to be the case. Five years takes us back to 2009 when all contributory forces (except NYP) had their own teams who were part time.

Significant and detailed analysis of demand and costs were undertaken for the original business case that resulted in the set up of the team in September 2012. This data was used to establish the whole of the financial regime for the new team including the PAYG agreement with NYP. This demand data ran from 1/11/09 to the 31/10/10.

Unfortunately it has not been possible to obtain reliable and comparable data between November 2010 to September 2012 when the current team was established. However, data since September 2012 up the present day is extremely well recorded.

This report will therefore examine data going back as far as 1/11/09 up to the present day but its analysis is limited by a gap of some 21 months.

Analysis

In being able to draw any meaningful analysis from the data it is necessary to compare like with like. The problem with analysing the data with regard to specific services provided by the team e.g. dives, wades, boat searches, body recovery etc. is that the categories of data collected between 2009 and 2010 were different to categories used since Sept 2012. A like for like comparison, therefore, cannot easily be made using this method.

The most straightforward way to compare is to look at the total number of requests for all services (dives, wades, boat searches, body recovery) by each force for each period. Figure 1 below provides this data. These figures have been drawn from detailed and accurate records from a variety of sources.

Figure 1

<u>Numbers of Deployments of Underwater Search and Marine Unit assets</u>				
	<u>10/09 – 11/10</u>	<u>09/12 – 12/12</u>	<u>01/13 – 12/13</u>	<u>01/14 – 06/14</u>
	<u>12 months</u>	<u>4 months</u>	<u>12 months</u>	<u>6 months</u>
<u>HumberSide</u>	112	79	110	51
<u>WYP</u>	94	44	117	51
<u>SYP</u>	114	2	13	25
<u>NYP</u>	23	7	17	28
<u>Total Deployments</u>	343		257	310
<u>Cost per deployment</u>	£3244		£2774	£2300

The following comments on the above table are provided for clarity:

1. Deployments in the first column were prior to the set up of the regional team and at that time WYP were meeting the requests made by NYP. It is interesting to note that figures available from WYP show that in one month (April 2009) they provided NYP with 15 deployments in relation to just one enquiry – Claudia Lawrence.
2. The figures in the second column only relate to the first 4 months of the new regional team. Whilst they are accurate they do need to be viewed with some caution due to the bedding in period of the new service structure. For this reason they have not been extrapolated to give an indication of yearly demand or costs per deployment.

The final row of the table provides a basic indication on the costs of delivering the service per deployment over time and demonstrates that the service is offering increasing efficiencies. This figure has simply been obtained by dividing the total budget (for the relevant year) by the total number of deployments.

Comparison regarding Pay as you Go

In order to further demonstrate the value for money and business case for a team fully engaged and supported by all Forces it is perhaps useful to demonstrate the costs that could be incurred on a PAYG basis for each Force.

The following table takes the service provided so far this financial year (from 1st April) to each Force and uses the current PAYG charging structure to suggest the total costs to each Force of receiving the service on that basis for the whole year. The table assumes that service demand continues at the same rate.

Figure 2

	Humberside	West Yorkshire	South Yorkshire	North Yorkshire
Costs so far on PAYG	£48,500	£83,000	£41,000	£24,500
Extrapolated for year	£232,000	£398,000	£196,000	£117,000

It can be seen that all Forces (save for Humberside) would incur significantly higher costs under the PAYG charging formula currently used by NYP than they do at present.

It is accepted that this analysis is crude as it assumes that requests for services are constant in an area of business where we know there is a significant amount of discretionary demand. However, two points made in the earlier report to RCB in May are worthy of further emphasis here -

- *A PAYG approach can make requests for service particularly difficult to contemplate, often at times when pressure for results are high as NYP have found with recent missing from home cases.*
- *Full partner status means you can make as many requests as you need and all of them will be prioritised and serviced by the team.*

Return on investment for SYP and NYP.

The previous report to RCB in May put forward a number of options for the financing of the team. Those proposals are repeated below for SYP and NYP but have been amended slightly to show the indicative costs per deployment for each financing option based on the demand data for this year (so far) taken from the third column in Figure 1.

These indicative costs per deployment for each Force for each finance option are shown in brackets.

Figure 3

	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
	Cost & %	Change	Cost & %	Change	Cost & %	Change	Cost & %	Change
SYP	£112,654	£22,816	£106,000	£29,470	£106,950	£28,520	£184,167	£48,697
	16%	Saving	15%	Saving	15%	Saving	26%	Increase
	(£2,253)		(£2,120)		(£2,139)		(£3,693)	
NYP	£59,535	£23,535	£96,000	£60,000	£92,690	£56,690	£97,110	£61,110
	8%	Increase	13%	Increase	13%	Increase	14%	Increase
	(£1,063)		(£1,714)		(£1,655)		(£1,734)	

