



Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board

Monday 25 March 2013 at 7.30 pm

Council Chamber, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley,
HA9 9HD

Membership:

Members Councillors:	Representing	First alternates Councillors:	Second alternates Councillors:
Jones	LB Brent	Powney	Beswick
Hashmi	LB Brent	Brown	CJ Patel
Baker	LB Brent	BM Patel	HM Patel
Hall	LB Harrow	Mithani	
O'Dell	LB Harrow	Dhamarajah	
Ferry	LB Harrow	Maru	

For further information contact:

(LB Brent) Lisa Weaver, Democratic Services Officer

0208 937 1358 lisa.weaver@brent.gov.uk

(LB Harrow) Miriam Wearing, Senior Democratic Services Officer,

020 8424 1542 miriam.wearing@harrow.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit: **www.brent.gov.uk/committees**

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Election of Chair for the meeting (from amongst the Brent members)

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Item	Page
1 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on this agenda.	
2 Minutes of the previous meeting	1 - 6
3 Matters arising	
4 Deputations (if any)	
5 Trading standards budget for 2013/14	7 - 10
This report provides Members with the latest information concerning the Trading Standards budget for 2013-14, together with the implications on service delivery.	
Contact Officer: Nagendar Bilon, Trading Standards Tel: 020 8937 5500 nagendar.bilon@brent.gov.uk	
6 Trading standards work plan for 2013/14	11 - 24
This report provides Members with information concerning the Trading Standards work plan for 2013-14.	
Contact Officer: Nagendar Bilon, Trading Standards Tel: 020 8937 5500 nagendar.bilon@brent.gov.uk	
7 Date of next meeting	
The next scheduled meeting of the Trading Standards Joint Advisory Board will be held at Harrow Civic Centre (date tbc).	

8 Any other urgent business

Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager (London Borough of Brent) or his representative before the meeting in accordance with the constitutions of both councils.



Please remember to ***SWITCH OFF*** your mobile phone during the meeting.

- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
- Toilets are available on the second floor
- Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near The Paul Daisley Hall
- A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank

TRADING STANDARDS JOINT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

22 MARCH 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors: * Susan Hall London Borough of Harrow
* Ajay Maru (2)

† Eddie Baker London Borough of Brent
* Sami Hashmi
* Lesley Jones

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member
† Denotes apologies received

1. Election of Chair

RESOLVED: That Councillor Ferry be appointed as Chairman for this meeting.

2. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting Held on 28 November 2011

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2011, be taken as read and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- the attendance at page 1 of the minutes be amended to indicate that Councillor Maru was in attendance as an alternate for Councillor O'Dell;
- the duplication of the meeting closing time and Councillor Jones' name be deleted.

4. Matters Arising

Agenda

Members of the Board commented that the agenda had not been circulated in good time to Harrow Councillors. Members commented that it would be a good suggestion for officers from Brent and Harrow to work on a system to ensure that the agendas were placed in the courier service for Harrow Councillors, so that they received it in good time.

Members also commented that there were a few errors on the agenda, which were required to be amended for the next time meetings were held at the Harrow Civic Centre.

Proceeds of Crime Act

A Member commented that in relation to the previous request of the Board for Trading Standards to ensure that the legal services in Brent and Harrow appreciated the capacity of work relating to the proceeds of crime, the legal services within Harrow were currently expanding and taking over other legal services of another borough.

In response to a query on whether officers had identified commissioning officers in other London boroughs with a view to marketing the trading standards services to them. The Head of Consumer and Business Protection commented that the Assistant Director of Policy and Regulation was currently in discussions with other boroughs about shared services. The Member commented that Harrow Council's Chief Executive had agreed to sign a letter to be sent out on this subject, so it was important that the services were marketed as soon as possible.

The Head of Consumer and Business Protection commented that the Trading Standards service was currently dealing with cases referred by the Planning departments at both Harrow and Brent Councils relating to the Proceeds of Crime. They were also dealing with a case referred from Environmental Health in Harrow. It was difficult to estimate or rely on income generated from obtaining Proceeds of Crime money as this depended on each individual circumstance. A Member commented that if Trading Standards took on work from other authorities, certainty of income became higher.

RESOLVED: That the matters arising be noted.

5. Trading Standards Budget for 2012/13

The Head of Consumer and Business Protection reported to the Board that the budget for the 2012/13 financial year was exactly the same as it was for the previous financial year.

During the course of the presentation the Head of Consumer and Business Protection commented that the team were performing at their maximum capacity and were always looking for additional national or local revenue streams which could be utilised.

During the discussion on this item, Members of the Board made a number of comments as follows:

- it would have been helpful if the budget had been clarified by Brent Council as planning was required;
- more clarification should have been sought by officers on the budget. Members of the Board had to be aware if any difficulties were encountered within the budget so lobbying could be performed if necessary;
- the Commissioning officers from Brent and Harrow should have confirmed once the budget was finalised and agreed;
- as part of the budgeting process, it was prudent that any monies received resulting from Proceeds of Crime should not be taken into account as these were difficult to predict and forecast;
- it was important to recognise that staff would be placed under increasing pressure during the Olympics and there had to be an onus on retaining jobs over this period. The officer responded by commenting that in the current climate, financial cuts were required, so prioritisation was a key factor in determining the future work of the service;
- the amount of pressure on the Trading Standards service was increasing and the number of statutory requirements in this area was always increasing.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

6. Trading Standards Work Plan for 2012/13

The Head of Consumer and Business Protection introduced the report providing the Board with information concerning the Trading Standards Work Plan for 2012/13.

The Officer reported the following:

- the Trading Standards service had recruited Mr Paul Walker who was responsible for organising enforcement work in relation to the Olympics. This post was being funded by the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) to ensure co-ordination relating to enforcement during the Olympic Games;
- it was anticipated that there may be some issues for Trading Standards to deal with during the Olympics. These included a potential increase in crime along the respective high streets, ticket touting and bogus bookings websites;
- one new area of work for the Service would be the operation of the Primary Authority Scheme with local and national businesses. The main aim of this scheme was to provide one point of contact within one Local Authority for all the regulators to refer issues to. These were then raised with the relevant company concerned and solutions developed. This helped businesses in a number of ways including access to robust and reliable advice, the introduction of nationwide inspection plans and avoidance with repetition;
- the Trading Standards service had conducted a presentation for businesses in Brent and Harrow, where they had attempted to discuss the advantages of the scheme and offers its services to act as the point of contact for these businesses. It was hoped that 5 or 6 businesses would sign up with the Trading Standards Service;
- a charge could be made for offering the Primary Authority Scheme service and this could be used to employ more officers to deal solely with this service.

During the discussion on this item, Members of the Board raised a number of queries which were responded to by officers as follows:

- the work plan was similar to last year. However there were a number of tasks which the service could no longer afford to perform including toy testing. The service was moving towards being much more reactive than proactive due to the current financial climate. Everyone was working at their maximum capacity but there were limited resources;
- the ODA had provided the Trading Standards Service with approximately £30,000;
- there was already a similar scheme to the Primary Authority Scheme in existence. However this did not have a statutory basis. The advantages of this scheme included resolving issues promptly. Any charge made under this scheme could not generate a profit, it could only cover expenses incurred. The Primary Authority Scheme would not mean that officers would have to travel nationally to the various branches of one company. It would simply set up inspection plans and work with other authorities to ensure checks were conducted and issues were resolved;

- this form of better regulation to a similar scheme already in existence, could assist businesses in a balanced way;
- whilst concerns raised about the scheme were noted, if the service did not bid for this scheme, there could be opportunities missed. In London some authorities had already marketed themselves which meant that there would be strong competition.

During the discussion on this item, Members of the Board made a number of comments as follows:

- whilst the benefits of the Primary Authority Scheme were clear for businesses, it was not so clear what the benefits were for Local Authorities;
- Brent and Harrow Trading Services had an excellent reputation and it was important to market this appropriately.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.31 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

London Boroughs of Brent and Harrow Trading Standards

Joint Advisory Board – 25th March 2013

Report Number. 01/13 of the Head of Trading Standards

For Information

TITLE OF REPORT: **TRADING STANDARDS BUDGET FOR 2013-2014**

1.0 **Summary**

- 1.1 This report provides a briefing to Members on the 2013-14 Trading Standards budget and the implications of any future funding reductions and the potential decline in income from the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) 2002.

2.0 **Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Members consider this report and comment where appropriate.

3.0 **Financial Considerations**

- 3.1 The whole report relates to the finance of the Trading Standards Service.
- 3.2 Although this report does not itself have financial implications, it reflects the position of the Trading Standards budget for 2013-14 following the budget making process in both Brent and Harrow Councils.

4.0 **Background**

- 4.1 Table 1 below shows the annual budget for the provision of Trading Standards services since 2008/2009 along with the surpluses that were generated at the end of each year and the income derived from POCA. The table also shows the net budget for each year which reflects the true cost to each borough.

Table 1

BRENT					HARROW			
Year	Operating budget	Surplus	POCA	Net Budget	Operating budget	Surplus	POCA	Net Budget
2008/09	£956K	£52K		£904K	£816K	£50K		£768K
2009/10	£886K	£52K		£834K	£816K	£51K		£768K
2010/11	£845K	£63K		£782K	£828K	£58K		£770K
2011/12	£649K	£0	£25K	£624K	£625K	£0	£25K	£600K
2012/13	£649K	£0	£50K	£599K	£625K	£0	£50K	£575K

- 4.2 Insofar as the current financial year is concerned, the Trading Standards Service budget is unlikely to show any further surpluses other than the total of £100K which is being returned to Brent and Harrow Councils.
- 4.3 The implications of the reductions in the budget are highlighted in Table 2 are as follows :-

- Since 2008/9 there has been a 30% reduction in the Brent budget.
- Since 2008/9 there has been a 25% reduction in the Harrow budget.
- Since 2008/9, the Trading Standards staff establishment has decreased from 31.5 fte to 19.5 fte which represents a 30% decrease in staffing levels.
- Despite the above reductions in budgets, the Trading Standards Service has continued to generate the same level of surpluses thus reducing the net cost to the respective boroughs whilst continuing to provide a better value for money service.

4.4 Examples of work that has been reduced or is no longer carried out include:- underage sales, product safety investigations, inspections of trade premises, investigations of consumer complaints, maintenance of approved trader schemes, consumer advice and education, community projects, rapid response to doorstep crime, assisting consumers with their civil claims, formal enforcement actions/prosecutions, partnership working and a decrease in e-crime investigations.

4.5 Table 2 below shows the impact of the net budget reductions since 2009/10. As can be seen there has been a corresponding reduction in the amount of work that is now carried out by the Service, particularly in relation to the number of complaints that have been investigated and the number of prosecutions undertaken which have dropped by 29% and 42% respectively. However, it should be noted that the reason that the number of inspection visits and reports have risen in 2012/13 is due to the additional temporary staff employed by the Service as a result of the funding received by the Brent Trading Standards team for the Olympic Games.

Table 2

Year	Complaints	Inspection Visits	Underage Test Purchases (Sales)	Reports	Prosecutions	Costs Awarded
2009/10	3362	1624	400 (20)	130	46	£35K
2010/11	3281	1427	381(35)	118	75	£125K
2011/12	3005	1124	383(40)	71	34	£25
2012/13	2393	1771	327(22)	85	27	£21

4.6 The reduction in the Trading Standards budget has led to a decrease in work outputs and could lead to potential risks for both Brent and Harrow Councils, namely:- increase in injuries and death from unsafe products, increase in health issues and anti-social behaviour amongst the young from increased sales of age restricted products. According to a recent Unison report on the provision of Trading Standards services, the current austerity measures have resulted in more illicit goods such as tobacco and spirits being sold to consumers which, amongst other things, creates an unfair trading environment for *bona fide* traders and leads to difficulties in attracting legitimate businesses to the area.

4.7 As a result of the previous budget cuts, the Trading Standards Service has become a reactive organisation and the ability to carry out proactive work or conduct complex cases has been greatly reduced. Example of complex work not undertaken include traders that sell counterfeit goods from Wembley Market, doorstep crime

initiatives, proactive investigations into car traders, one day sales, etc. These types of investigations have traditionally have been the source of financial investigations that lead to seizure of assets under the Proceeds of Crime Act. In addition to this, training that is normally provided to staff in order to maintain their competency levels have had to be curtailed and, in some cases, completely stopped. The medium/long term impact of this could be that the Trading Standards Service will not be able to meet the Council's statutory obligations due to a lack of suitably trained and qualified staff.

- 4.8 Table 3 below provides details of the potential income that was forecast in November 2011 from POCA. However, that was based on the establishment that existed at the time and if we are to achieve the income from POCA, then it is essential to ensure that we maintain the level of investigatory resource and prosecutions so that we have a flow of POCA cases to pursue.

Table 3

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Net Savings - Brent	£25K	£50K	£75K	£100K
Net Savings - Harrow	£25K	£50K	£75K	£100K

5.0 2013-14 Budget Proposals

- 5.1 LB of Brent have agreed to maintain the existing Trading Standards budget for 2013-14 i.e. £649K. However, the LB Harrow recently indicated that they are seeking a further reduction of £140K from its 2013/14 base budget of £625K in addition to the £75K from POCA which would leave a net contribution of £410K. This would result in a reduction of 35% from Harrow's Trading Standards 2012-13 budget and a 50% reduction since 2009-10.

5.0 Staffing Implications

- 5.1 The proposed reduction in the 2013/14 Harrow Trading Standards budget would lead to the deletion of at least 3 front line posts. If these further cuts were to be realised, then the implication will be to totally stop or further reduce some of the abovementioned activities. It will also result in the Trading Standards team only being able to provide a fragmented low level reactive service and without the ability to conduct large scale investigations which provide the source of the POCA incentivisation monies. In addition to this, there has been a distinct lack of referrals from the Harrow Planning Department for financial investigations which I am reliably informed is due to the fact that appropriate planning infringements are not being investigated and prosecuted as there are only two planning enforcement officer posts in place. Therefore, should the proposal to reduce the Trading Standards budget by £140K take place, then abovementioned income forecast will simply not be achievable and, as such, the proposed savings for future years will not be achievable.

7.0 Agreement for Future Funding

- 7.1 Meetings have been held with the respective Brent and Harrow Commissioning officers and senior Trading Standards managers with a view to finding a viable solution. As a result of these discussions it has been agreed between the two Councils that the LB of Harrow will continue to provide the existing level of funding for 2013-14 and the further saving of £140K will be met from POCA income from cases that have already been concluded, but where the incentivisation monies are yet to be received.
- 7.2 During these discussions, it was apparent that the vast majority of the POCA cases have resulted from Trading Standards investigations and from those referred by Brent Planning Service. Therefore, it has been further agreed that to meet the increased demands for savings, the LB of Harrow would actively encourage its planning department to institute proceedings for breaches of building regulations and refer these cases to the Trading Standards Service for financial investigation. In addition to this, the legal department for Harrow, which has taken over the provision of legal services for LB of Barnet, would refer appropriate planning and benefit fraud cases to our Accredited Financial Investigators with a view to increasing the incentivisation income.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 As a result of the above measures, members are advised that the above mentioned savings will be achieved through the course of 2013-14 but that the matter will be kept under review and reported to the respective Commissioning Officers on a quarterly basis. Furthermore, any further reductions will undoubtedly impact on the Trading Standards Service's ability to investigate and prosecute the cases that lead to financial investigation under POCA.

9.0 Background Information

- 9.1 2013/2014 Budget File.

Any person wishing to inspect the above should contact N Bilon, Third Floor, 349-357 High, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, telephone 020 8937 5500.

NAGENDAR BILON
HEAD OF TRADING STANDARDS

Advisory Board – 25th March 2013

Report Number 02/12 from the Head of Trading Standards

For information

Title of Report: **Trading Standards Work Plan for 2013/2014**

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report provides Members with information concerning the Trading Standards Work Plan for 2013/2014.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members consider the Work Plan and comment where appropriate.

3.0 Financial Considerations

- 3.1 There are no financial considerations arising from this report, and the Work Plan reflects the amount of work that can be achieved with the budget provided for the Service for 2013/2014.

4.0 Staffing Implications

- 4.1 There are no staffing implications arising from this report.

5.0 Detail

- 5.1 Each year, the Service produces a Work Plan, which details the work the Service is due to undertake for the financial year ahead. The plan is closely linked to the budget and reflects the outputs achievable with the budget provided.
- 5.2 A copy of the plan for the year 2013/2014 is attached as an Appendix to this report.

6.0 Background information

- 6.1 The Service Plan file.
Any person wishing to inspect the above should contact: N Bilon, 3rd Floor, Brent House, 349 – 357 High Road, Wembley, HA9 6BZ. Tel: 020 8937 5500.

Nagendar Bilon
Head of Trading Standards

This page is intentionally left blank



TRADING STANDARDS

2013 – 2014

Work Plan

Key Targets

The annual work programme is part of an ongoing review that has led to a change in policy with greater balance placed on a number of competing priorities as detailed below, including a much smaller programme of risk based inspections of businesses during 2013/2014. The work programme also takes account of the corporate strategies of both Councils and addresses the national agenda as well as the concerns of local consumers and businesses.

The general enforcement priorities are listed at the end of the Work Plan, however, the main priorities of the Consortium will be:

- ❖ Underage sales
 - Conducting underage test purchase exercises
 - Responsible Trader Scheme
 - Prioritising test purchasing exercises on alcohol, tobacco and knives
- ❖ Doorstep Crime
 - Proactive partnership working
 - Rapid responses to consumer requests for assistance
- ❖ Large scale cases involving consumer fraud
 - Counterfeiting
 - Car clocking
 - Importing/wholesaling of unsafe goods
- ❖ Proceeds of Crime
 - Confiscation of assets from defendants convicted of committing serious criminal offences
 - Cash seizures from businesses suspected of committing criminal offences
 - Undertaking Proceeds of Crime investigations on behalf of other Council Services
- ❖ Primary Authority
 - Provision of legal advice and assistance to businesses on a cost recovery basis
 - Promote compliance amongst local businesses through increased membership of the Primary Authority scheme

Partnerships

We will continue to work in partnership with colleagues within both Councils and from other enforcement agencies wherever the opportunity arises. This will include the Metropolitan Police, HMRC and UKBA as well as liaising and working in partnership with the regional Trading Standards groups to which we belong.

Primary Authority

One important area of work for the Service will be operating the Primary Authority scheme with local and national businesses. The Better Regulation Delivery Office (BRDO) oversees the arrangement which puts the Primary Authority scheme onto a statutory footing.

Its main aim is to provide one point of contact within one Local Authority for all the regulators to refer issues to, which are then discussed with the company concerned. Solutions are then found through negotiation between the company and the designated Primary Authority.

There are significant benefits to the company that forms such a partnership with a Local Authority and these include:-

- Access to robust and reliable advice
- Drafting inspection plans
- Consistency of advice
- Avoidance of repetition through agreed action plans and a Single Point of Contact
- Dispute resolution
- A recognition by all regulators of the partnership
- Statutory assurance mechanism

Service Outputs

For 2013/2014, the Service will produce 9,800 units of output work for Harrow and 9,800 units for Brent: - a total of 19,600 units. Both borough totals reflect a full establishment based on a complement of 19.5 FTE staff members.

The main activities of the Service are based on units of work set out in the table on the following page. Each unit equates to 1 hour's work and each day equates to 7 units. Based on 260 working days that are available during the year –

- Less - 9 days bank holidays
- Less - 30 days annual leave
- Less - 6 days briefing sessions
- Less - 4 days training
- Less - 12 days meetings

Units of Work

A total of 200 days @ 7 hrs per day = 1400 hrs for enforcement work is available per officer per year. Each Enforcement Officer is therefore expected to produce a minimum of 1400 units of work per annum. Each Assistant Enforcement Officer (AEO) will be expected to contribute 350 units to their respective team's target. Their role now consists far more in supporting Enforcement Officers now

that there is one AEO per Borough rather than two. The contribution from each Service Manager has also been reduced to 350 units each which reflect the additional time that they spend on management functions due to the increase in their number of direct reports following the restructuring of the Service in 2011.

Inspections

Inspections of trade premises are carried out in line with the 'Hampton Principles', namely, "*No inspection should take place without a reason*". This purpose behind this principle is to reduce burden on businesses by conducting inspections based on risk and, whenever possible, by making joint visits with other regulators. A Statutory Code of Practice for Regulators was published in 2007 by the Department for Business Enterprise & Regulatory Reform and every local authority is expected to abide by this code. Based on the above, our aim is to inspect high risk premises, visits to medium and low risk premises will not be made unless they are the subject of a complaint. However, the work that we now do is, in the main, demand led and requests for service from members of the public remain at a high level. Nevertheless, consumer complaints and requests for service will continue to take priority over other work, but it is likely that a system of grading will be introduced so that only those that are considered as serious will be investigated whilst the less serious matters will be used to gather further information for future intelligence based investigations and projects.

At 1st March 2013, there were 10,234 businesses in the consortium area liable for inspection; of these, 1.6% are considered as high-risk premises.

2013 Figures Below

	Total number of premises	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk
Brent	6141 (60%)	98 (1.6%)	2,871 (47%)	3,172 (51%)
Harrow	4093 (40%)	65 (1.6%)	2,042 (50%)	1,986 (48%)
Consortium	10,234	163 (1.6%)	4,913 (48%)	5,158 (50%)

New Business Risk Rating Scheme 2013-14

A task group led by the OFT has carried out a review of the 2004 LACORS Guidance on Risk Assessment of businesses for trading standards enforcement activity on behalf of the previous LG Regulation Trading Standards Policy Forum. The review was undertaken to address the inflexibility of the 2004 Scheme particularly with regard to the inability of that scheme to translate the significant reduction in risk which occurs in well managed businesses into reduction in the Risk Rating indicated by the Scheme.

The basis of the scheme is that each business within a local authority's area receives a score to direct enforcement activity to deal with the risk posed by the business, as opposed to a scheme which is based purely on *inspection* as a means of determining the risks. This means that businesses previously not

risk rated (e.g. builders working from home) because they were not “inspectable” will now be risk rated as they can pose a Trading Standards risk which can be dealt with via other mechanisms (e.g. surveys, test purchases or internet examinations etc).

The scheme comprises a hazard element that is scored on the basis of business category and a ‘Likelihood of Compliance’ element that is particular to the individual business and determined by local authorities. It should be emphasised that the new scheme relates to businesses as opposed to premises.

It is anticipated that this new scheme will be implemented during 2013 once the final calculations have been made using the business premises database operated by the Service.

Allocation of units for different activities

Activity	Number of units
Requests for action (criminal) completed	3.5
Requests for action (non criminal) completed	1
Trader Enquiries (including HA work)	5.25
Enterprise Act Complaints completed	14
Announced Primary High Risk Inspections	3
Announced Primary Medium Risk Inspections	2
Announced Primary Low Risk Inspections	0.5
Announced Secondary High Risk Inspections	1.5
Announced Secondary Medium Risk Inspections	1
Underage Test Purchase Visits	3
Alternative Enforcement Action	0.25
Home Authority Referrals	1.75
Home/Primary Authority Referrals	3.5
Average Quantity Visits	5.25
Criminal reports of Infringement	> 7 (depending on complexity)
Financial Investigations under Proceeds of Crime	> 40 (depending on complexity)
Enterprise Act investigations	> 40 (depending on complexity)
Prosecutions completed (Magistrates Court)	35
Prosecutions completed (Crown Court)	70
Simple Cautions	7
Letters of Warning	2
Approved Trader Scheme audits	3.5
Consumer Credit Checks	14
Verification Visits	3.5
Doorstep Crime Multi-agency Operations	21
Doorstep Crime Rapid response actions	14
Local Partnership Working	10
Mileage checks (each car)	2
Web sites (per check)	2
Press Releases issued	2

Harrow Enforcement Team 2013/14

The following members of staff contribute directly to Harrow's work:-

- Service Manager (0.25)
- 6 x Enforcement Officers (1.0)
- 1 x Assistant Enforcement officer (0.25)
- Financial Investigator (0.5)

	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Units</u>
Requests for action (criminal)	850	2975
Trader Enquiries (including HA work)	30	157
Enterprise Act Complaints completed	1	14
Announced Primary High Risk Insp.	70	210
Announced Primary Medium Risk Insp	25	50
Announced Primary Low Risk Insp	24	12
Announced Secondary High Risk Inspections	10	15
Announced Secondary Medium Risk Inspections	40	40
Test Purchase Visits	150	450
Home/Primary Authority Referrals	145	508
Average Quantity Visits	8	42
Criminal Reports of Infringement	50	3000
Financial Investigations under Proceeds of Crime	6	420
Enterprise Act Reports	1	60
Prosecutions completed	25	1125
Simple Cautions	12	84
Letters of Warning	20	40
Approved Trader Scheme audits	30	105
Consumer Credit Checks	4	56
Verification Visits	4	14
Doorstep Crime Multi-Agency Operations	6	126
Doorstep Crime Rapid response actions	6	84
Local Partnership Working	2	20
Mileage checks (each car)	40	80
Web sites (per check)	45	90
Press Releases issued	12	24
	Total	9,800

Brent Enforcement Team 2013/14

The following members of staff contribute directly to Brent's work:-

- Service Manager (0.25)
- 6 x Enforcement Officers (1.0)
- 1 x Assistant Enforcement officer (0.25)
- Financial Investigator (0.5)

	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Units</u>
Requests for action (criminal)	850	2975
Trader Enquiries (including HA work)	30	157
Enterprise Act Complaints completed	1	14
Announced Primary High Risk Insp.	70	210
Announced Primary Medium Risk Insp	25	50
Announced Primary Low Risk Insp	24	12
Announced Secondary High Risk Inspections	10	15
Announced Secondary Medium Risk Inspections	40	40
Test Purchase Visits	150	450
Home/Primary Authority Referrals	145	508
Average Quantity Visits	8	42
Criminal Reports of Infringement	50	3000
Financial Investigations under Proceeds of Crime	6	420
Enterprise Act Reports	1	60
Prosecutions completed	25	1125
Simple Cautions	12	84
Letters of Warning	20	40
Approved Trader Scheme audits	30	105
Consumer Credit Checks	4	56
Verification Visits	4	14
Doorstep Crime Multi-Agency Operations	6	126
Doorstep Crime Rapid response actions	6	84
Local Partnership Working	2	20
Mileage checks (each car)	40	80
Web sites (per check)	45	90
Press Releases issued	12	24
	Total	9,800

Infringement Reports

The units allocated for infringement reports are based on the complexity of the investigation, both in terms of legislation being enforced and length of time taken to fully investigate/report each individual case (as shown below).

<u>Category</u>	<u>Time taken for investigation (in days)</u>	<u>Minimum number of units</u>
0	1	7
1	2.5	17.5
2	5	35
3	7.5	52.5
4	10	70
5	15	105
6	> 16	@ 7 units per day

The criteria for assessing each category is detailed below:-

Category 0

Very brief report, unlikely to involve an interview. No other witnesses and resulting in no further action or a letter of warning.

Category 1

Very few background enquiries required small amounts of correspondence (largely standard letters), few difficulties encountered, straight-forward and routine, investigation usually completed the same day. Investigation does not normally involve outside witnesses. Straight-forward interview.

Category 2

Usually one or two non-Trading Standards witnesses. Some research and correspondence may be required. May involve seized or purchased evidence. Evidence straightforward to catalogue and analyse. Minor difficulties may be encountered during investigation. A simple supply chain may be documented and records usually one step back from the retailer. Usually one taped interview. Does not require substantial resources of officer time.

Category 3

Will contain the elements of a category 2 report plus one element from the criteria listed under category 4.

Category 4

- a) This level of investigation will contain the elements of a category 2 report plus at least two of the following elements:-
- b) large teams of officers necessary over a shorter time scale or smaller teams of officers spending significant amounts of time on background enquiries or observations.
- c) Interviews - multiple interviews requiring preparation or single interview of an extremely complex and demanding nature.
- d) Statements - several witness statements from non Trading Standards Officers required.
- e) Evidence - large quantities of evidence involved or smaller quantities of evidence of a diverse nature requiring considerable analysis.
- f) Report - large and complicated report required to fully explain the investigation and the nature of the offences.
- g) Other enquiries - significant problems encountered during investigation, large amount of non standard correspondence required (for example solicitor's letters). High profile investigation attracting media attention during the investigative process. Major financial impact (e.g. goods seized of high value, suspension notice especially of high value items).

Category 5

This level of investigation will contain the elements of a category 2 report plus at least three elements from the list under category 4.

Category 6

Will contain the elements of a category 2 report plus at least four elements from the list under category 4 including criterion (a).

Notes for Guidance

- 1 All work must be meaningful and necessary.
- 2 Officers should make it clear in their reports what work they have carried out.
- 3 Recognition will be deducted for work which is not completed to a satisfactory standard or that which is put in late (without good reason), so as to leave the Department open to criticism for "abuse of process".
- 4 Recognition will not be awarded in lieu of work which has not yet been completed

*Each Average Quantity visit to an importer/packer will be on the basis that the following is carried out:-

- a) The metrology control system is inspected, and
- b) Records and documents are checked, and
- c) Reference tests are carried out on a random sampling basis in accordance with the Packaged Goods Regulations, and
- d) "Code of Practice Guidance" advice is give

Enforcement Priorities

The priorities below are based on the hazard that a particular type of trading activity poses to the local community, the impact that the activity will have on local consumers and the likelihood of the activity occurring. The greater the hazard, impact and likelihood of an activity, the more resource this Service will put into combating this type of crime. Lower priority is given to those activities that are less likely to occur and have little hazard or impact. However, all complaints concerning breaches of the law are investigated and vulnerable customers are treated as a higher priority.

High Priority

Underage Sales – knives	Underage Sales – alcohol & tobacco
Doorstep Crime	E-crime
Unsafe Goods	Clocked Cars
Most Complained About Traders	Counterfeit Goods
Underage Sales – fireworks	Proceeds of Crime
Car Clamping	Misleading Claims
Distance Selling	Primary Authority

Medium Priority

Storage of Fireworks	Copyright
Misleading Prices	Weights and Measures
Underage Sales – butane	Price Marking
Furniture and Furnishings	Un-roadworthy Cars
Underage Sales – spray paints	Video Recordings – Unclassified DVDs
Package Travel	Underage Sales – DVDs / games
Harassment of Debtors	Business Names
Consumer Credit	Bogus Colleges
Essential Packaging	Hallmarking
Energy Performance Certificates	Incorrectly Labelled Goods (safety)

Low Priority

Energy Labelling of Goods	Restrictive Notices
Misleading Descriptions (low value goods)	Underage Sales – lottery
Property Misdemeanors	Estate Agents
Mock Auctions	Timeshares
Road Traffic – Overloaded Vehicles	Underage Sales – crossbows
Metriation	Motorcycle Exhaust Silencers

This page is intentionally left blank