

# **PSA Delivery Agreement 24:**

Deliver a more effective, transparent  
and responsive Criminal Justice  
System for victims and the public

---

Revised October 2009



# Contents

---

		Page
Chapter 1	Vision	3
Chapter 2	Measurement	5
Chapter 3	Delivery strategy	7
Annex A	Measurement annex	17



# 1

## Vision

---

1.1 The Government's vision is for a Criminal Justice System (CJS) that puts victims at its heart and in which the public are confident and engaged. It will be effective in bringing offences to justice through simple and efficient processes.

1.2 In 2007-08, 1.45 million offences were brought to justice – an increase of 44 per cent since 2001/02. Nearly 60 per cent of victims and witnesses are satisfied with the criminal justice system and longer-term trends in public confidence are upwards, with just over 42 per cent of the public confident that the system is effective in bringing offenders to justice. Perceptions of fair treatment among black and minority ethnic communities have improved but the Government still needs to improve understanding of, and address, race disproportionality in the CJS.

1.3 There is still more to be done. We need to ensure that the CJS builds upon these successes in support of the Government's Crime Strategy, by improving the efficiency and effectiveness with which serious crime, particularly serious sexual offences, is investigated and prosecuted.

1.4 Successful delivery of the Government's vision cannot be achieved simply through top-down performance management. Our strategy is therefore to develop a criminal justice operating framework that:

- provides local services with greater flexibility to determine how this vision is delivered efficiently and effectively;
- engages individuals and communities in shaping services;
- supports frontline delivery by building the capability and capacity of its workforce; and
- works effectively with the private and voluntary sector to increase efficiency and quality of service and foster innovation.

1.5 The Criminal Justice System has a key role to play supporting the Crime Strategy. Catching and convicting criminals helps to deter crime and re-offending, and reduces the overall incidence of crime, making communities safer places in which to live and work. This PSA represents the high level measures of success for the CJS strategy, and sits alongside the commitments set out in PSA 23 to *Make Communities Safer*, as well as PSA 14 to *Increase the Number of Children and Young People on the Path to Success*.

1.6 PSA 23 has been designed to build on the recent successes in reducing crime, but has a specific focus on protecting the public from the most serious crime. It also includes an ambition to reduce re-offending. By delivering justice efficiently and effectively, meeting the commitments in this PSA will contribute to deterring re-offending and reducing the overall levels of crime.

1.7 PSA 14 includes a commitment to reduce the number of first time entrants to the Youth Justice System. This PSA will support this aim by promoting a proportionate response to less serious offences and increased flexibility for partners to focus on delivering an effective criminal justice response to local priorities.

1.8 The effective delivery of these strategies will continue to require close working, particularly locally between Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) and Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs)<sup>1</sup> to ensure that local delivery plans are co-ordinated.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Wales: Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).

# 2

## Measurement

---

2.1 The indicators set out below represent the key measures of success in delivering the vision for this PSA. In delivering the core business of the CJS efficiently and effectively, these indicators recognise that we also need to:

- ensure that the public recognise, understand and support our services so that they have confidence in them;
- meet the reasonable expectations of people using criminal justice services; and
- treat minority groups fairly and equitably.

### Indicator 1: Effectiveness and efficiency of the CJS in bringing offences to justice

- The Criminal Justice System has delivered major improvements in building a more joined-up service, bringing more offences to justice, supporting victims and witnesses better, and improving the efficiency of key processes. But there is more to do to make sure that the system responds to the needs of all communities and all individuals; improves the way in which the most serious offences, including serious sexual offences, are investigated and prosecuted; drives up efficiency and effectiveness across the whole system; and focuses on outcomes which reduce the harm caused by crime and re-offending. This indicator seeks improved performance in bringing serious violent, sexual and acquisitive offences to justice, while reducing the budgeted CJS spend in bringing offences to justice. In particular we will focus on improving performance in dealing with those serious offences where the number of convictions is very low in comparison to the number of recorded crimes, for example rape.

### Indicator 2: Public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the CJS

- Public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of criminal justice is essential. Low public satisfaction and confidence lead to unnecessary fear of crime and insecurity, and mean that the public is less likely to report crime or act as witnesses. This indicator and indicator 4 below complement the Government's primary objective to improve criminal justice system performance.

### Indicator 3: Experience of the CJS for victims and witnesses

- This indicator reflects the Government's ambition to deliver a better standard of customer service that meets the needs of victims and witnesses and delivers improvements in both victim satisfaction with the police and victim & witness satisfaction with the CJS.

### Indicator 4: Understanding and addressing race disproportionality at key stages in the CJS

- The CJS is working to develop a better understanding of the scale and causes of under-and over-representation of people from ethnic minorities in the CJS.

## Indicator 5: Recovery of criminal assets

- This indicator measures our success in depriving criminals of the proceeds of their crimes, and it has a national target attached. Asset recovery work can play a major role in reducing the harm that crime causes to the community. It can ratchet up the pressure on criminals, at the criminal's own expense. It can begin to damage the incentives to crime, and undermine negative role models.

2.2 Alongside these indicators the Government will develop a robust measure of compliance and enforcement before the end of the CSR period. Prior to this, key areas of enforcement activity will be measured through a basket of measures to monitor delivery at operational level.

2.3 All indicators, with the exception of asset recovery, relate to performance in England and Wales. Asset recovery performance also covers activity in Northern Ireland, as well as co-operation with international partners.

# 3

## Delivery strategy

---

### Accountability and governance

#### Ministerial accountability

3.1 The lead minister for this PSA is the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice. But successful delivery of this PSA will require shared ownership and effective joint working between all CJS departments and agencies. The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice, the Home Secretary and the Attorney General therefore all share responsibility to deliver this PSA. However, the Home Secretary is solely responsible for improving victim satisfaction with the Police; and CJS ministers share responsibility for the improvements in the asset recovery indicator with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland.

3.2 The Senior Responsible Officer for this PSA is the Chief Executive of the Office for Criminal Justice Reform. The relevant Cabinet Committee/s will drive performance by regularly monitoring progress, holding departments and programmes to account and resolving inter-departmental disputes where they arise.

3.3 Beyond this, the National Criminal Justice Board (NCJB) brings together CJS ministers, senior representatives of the three government departments, the key criminal justice agencies and representatives of the judiciary and the voluntary sector, to oversee aspects of criminal justice strategy and performance, including delivery of this PSA. The NCJB sets the strategic direction and agrees targets for Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs).

3.4 The NCJB will work with the National Crime Reduction Board (NCRB) to oversee effective co-ordination in the delivery of the crime and criminal justice strategies and PSAs – there will be a close relationship between the two boards (including some overlap in membership) but distinct terms of reference.

#### PSA delivery board

3.5 The CJS Operational Board is the official-level PSA delivery board, chaired by the Senior Responsible Officer. It supports the NCJB in its role and has delegated day-to-day responsibility to a number of Delivery Boards including:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness Delivery Board;
- Confidence and Customers Delivery Board;
- Victim and Witness Delivery Board;
- Asset Recovery Board; and
- Enforcement Delivery Board.

## The Office for Criminal Justice Reform

3.6 The Office for Criminal Justice Reform supports CJS ministers, the NCJB (and the wider CJS governance structures) and LCJBs in fulfilling their roles. Specifically, OCJR is responsible for CJS strategic planning, portfolio management of the CJS reform programme and managing the relationship with LCJBs.

## Local Criminal Justice Boards

3.7 Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) have the central role in driving improvements in the CJS, and are therefore the principal vehicles for the delivery of this PSA. Led by the National Criminal Justice Board, LCJBs are charged with the responsibility for delivering a more effective, transparent and responsive criminal justice system for victims and the public. LCJBs bring together the local chief officers of the Police, Crown Prosecution Service, Her Majesty's Courts Service, the Prison and Probation Services and the youth offending teams in each of the 42 criminal justice areas in England and Wales. They will set and own local targets that will contribute to the delivery at the national level of the PSA. LCJBs will set these targets as part of their business planning cycle. Delivery of these targets will be underpinned by strategies and plans produced by each LCJB identifying their local priorities and the actions to be taken to improve performance.

3.8 The Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) provides the key link between central Government and LCJBs. The OCJR supports LCJBs and has a remit to oversee and drive delivery. The OCJR is working with LCJBs to improve the CJS through a programme of reform to support local improvement in the CJS by helping to realise the potential of LCJBs to innovate and manage local priorities for change.

## Delivery

3.9 Four key principles will guide the delivery of the reform of CJS services to meet these commitments:

- **'effective in bringing offences to justice'** – a system that is effective in bringing crime, and in particular the most serious offences, to justice so that it plays its part in reducing crime and re-offending;
- **'the public confident and engaged'** – people in local communities informed about the performance of the system, consulted and engaged about their priorities so they can be confident that it is fair, effective and meets local needs;
- **'the needs of victims at its heart'** – high standards of service for victims and witnesses with the needs of victims at its heart; and
- **'simple, efficient processes'** – speedy, streamlined and efficient processes supported by modern technology that enable the police to focus their time on tackling crime.

3.10 The key strategies to reform the CJS, which support the efficient and effective delivery of justice, are set out in the Criminal Justice System Strategic Plan 2008-11, which was published in November 2007. This builds on, and supports the delivery of, the Government's Crime Strategy<sup>1</sup>, which was published in July 2007.

3.11 At a national level, the five strands of this PSA are closely linked. Improvements in the way that the CJS deals with crime through more efficient and effective services, improved services to victims and witnesses and to Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, and taking more of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cutting crime – a new partnership 2008-11*, Home Office, July 2007.

profit out of crime, alongside the opportunities for the public to engage with and shape these services, should help to drive up overall public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the CJS. Providing a better, faster service which supports victims and witnesses should encourage them to pursue cases through to trial, and improve public perceptions about how the CJS puts victims and the public at its heart.

### **Priority action 1: increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system in bringing offences to justice**

3.12 Priority action 1 and the associated indicator seeks to improve the performance of the CJS in bringing to justice serious violent, sexual and acquisitive offences by the end of 2010/11, while reducing the budgeted CJS spend in bringing offences to justice over the same period by increasing efficiency.

3.13 Performance in bringing offences to justice will be measured by comparing the relative percentage changes in the number of recorded crimes and offences brought to justice in the previous 12 months. Any percentage change in the number of offences brought to justice for each of these categories of crime must be greater than the percentage change in the same category of recorded crime over the same period if the CJS is to show improvements in bringing offences to justice.

3.14 Budgeted spend is based on estimates provided by the criminal justice agencies, adjusted using HM Treasury's Gross Domestic Product deflators, to show the change in their value in real terms over the PSA period. These estimates are reviewed annually.

3.15 This indicator complements the focus of PSA 23 by seeking improvements in the performance of the CJS in bringing to justice those crimes that cause the greatest harm to individuals, communities and society as a whole. OCJR, working with criminal justice agency leads, will contribute to the achievement of this indicator through the work of the cross-CJS Efficiency and Effectiveness Delivery Board by:

- Improving the investigation and prosecution of serious violent, sexual and acquisitive offences, including by identifying and spreading good practice and providing support to poorly performing LCJBs.
- Providing effective support to LCJBs in developing local delivery strategies setting out how they plan to support the delivery of this indicator and the Government's broader crime strategy. LCJBs will be asked to determine their own priorities for delivery and performance improvement, and will set their own success criteria and develop delivery plans to achieve these.
- LCJBs will manage their own performance against the delivery of their local strategies, and OCJR will support them in doing this by providing advice, support and challenge to help drive better performance across the CJS. LCJB performance will be monitored against the delivery of the local priorities identified in their plans.

3.16 Although not measured by the PSA, this indicator also seeks to promote an effective and proportionate criminal justice response to local crime. We are therefore aiming to broadly maintain national performance on bringing all other recorded crime to justice, but with flexibility for LCJB performance to adjust to the particular circumstances of their crime profile and local priorities.

3.17 Government departments and criminal justice agencies will contribute to the delivery of a more efficient and effective criminal justice system by driving improvements across a range of criminal justice processes:

- A Rape Performance Group will be led by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to monitor police and CPS performance on investigating and prosecuting offences of rape. This will be supplemented by a programme of work to provide enhanced support for victims of serious sexual offences through the provision in each area of sexual assault referral centres and independent sexual violence advisers.
- The CPS and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) will work together to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of police investigations, the charging process and prosecution of defendants at court in order to improve performance in bringing serious violent, sexual and acquisitive offences to justice.
- Increased efficiency in the courts through the delivery of the Criminal Justice: Simple, Speedy, Summary (CJSSS) strategy led by the Ministry of Justice, will improve the processes and procedures by which cases are managed through the system, eliminating unnecessary court hearings and reducing the time taken to conclude cases in the magistrates, youth and Crown courts.
- Reducing the burden of bureaucracy by eliminating unnecessary work on, and time dedicated to, case file preparation through closer working between the police and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). This process aims to get the charge right first time, ensure cases are prepared thoroughly and proportionately, and to reduce attrition throughout the criminal justice process.
- Facilitating current cross-CJS investment in electronic preparation and presentation of evidence to maximise its potential for delivering more effective cases and efficiency savings will also improve efficiency.
- Making better use of technology to share case management information and developing the ability to conduct first hearings by video links between courts and police stations. This aims to make better use of resources while delivering effective outcomes more quickly.
- Better end-to-end management of CJS resources, both nationally and locally, is being developed through two tools, the New Justice Framework and a cross-CJS process map, known as the CJS Waterfall, which incorporates the costs of CJS processes. These tools help LCJBs and Government departments to highlight areas of waste, identify opportunities for changes in business processes and to realise the benefits they deliver.
- We will enhance the criminal justice agencies' management of prolific and other priority offenders by increased and more effective joint working between local criminal justice agencies such as the police, probation, prosecutors and courts, as well as other local agencies, to ensure criminals are brought to justice for the full extent of their offending and given the support they need to stop them re-offending.

## **Priority action 2: to increase the levels of public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the cjs**

3.18 Priority action 2 and the associated indicator, seeks to improve public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of end-to-end criminal justice services at the national level. At the local level it seeks to improve confidence in the local delivery of criminal justice services, with a particular focus on strengthening community engagement with the CJS and improving staff engagement and confidence in the services they provide.

3.19 This complements the indicator in PSA 23 which focuses on perceptions of local agencies involved in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB). Together, these indicators seek to ensure that the public has a role in shaping local services; that they recognise, understand and support the efforts to tackle crime; and that they have confidence that the CJS as a whole deals fairly and effectively with crime.

3.20 Successful delivery will rely on a combination of the delivery of the national crime and justice strategies, supported by local delivery of services by CJS departments and agencies. Meeting these commitments will therefore require co-operation and effective partnership working both nationally, and locally through partnerships between LCJBs and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs)/CSPs.

3.21 The day-to-day management of this indicator is the responsibility of **the cross-CJS Confidence Delivery Board**, which is also responsible for victim and witness satisfaction and race disproportionality.

### **Role of LCJBs**

3.22 Perceptions of fairness and effectiveness will be measured at a national level by questions in the British Crime Survey. It is not intended to devolve the headline indicator to LCJBs. However, in addition to the delivery strategies outlined elsewhere in the delivery agreement, LCJBs will be expected to produce and deliver clear plans for improvements in:

- **community engagement** – to drive up the responsiveness and transparency of local CJS services. OCJR will work with CJS officials, LCJBs and CDRPs to identify and share suitable techniques to improve and co-ordinate local activity to involve and consult individuals and communities on priorities in delivery of local CJS services. It will encourage LCJBs and CDRPs to use this to inform an agreed assessment of local crime trends; to develop and agree local delivery plans to address local concerns; and the allocation of resources to deliver them; and
- **staff engagement** – to improve the quality and quantity of information provided by CJS staff and volunteers to the public, through an increased understanding of the roles of the end-to-end system, better joined-up working and increased staff confidence. CJS staff are potential advocates for the system, and have the potential to significantly drive up public confidence in fairness and effectiveness.

3.23 LCJBs will be given local flexibility to determine their own priorities for delivery, to set their own success criteria and to develop action plans, using local data. Action plans will be assessed and progress against an agreed set of indicators will be monitored through the established OCJR performance management framework.

3.24 OCJR will continue to work with colleagues to provide central support to LCJBs and CDRPs through monitoring and dissemination of good practice; a continuing programme of research and data analysis to develop further our understanding of the drivers of confidence and what works to address them; and through national and local communications strategies to promote public knowledge and understanding of the cjs and shared successes.

### **Priority action 3: to increase the proportion of victims and witnesses that are satisfied with the way they are treated by the cjs**

#### **Role of LCJBs and CJS agencies**

3.25 LCJBs and the CJS agencies they comprise will also be the principal actors to deliver improvements in the victim and witness satisfaction indicator, monitoring local performance through agreed performance measures. Key actions will include:

- all victims and witnesses receiving a high quality of service from CJS staff. CJS agencies will ensure they will comply with the standards contained in the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime and the Witness Charter, and other individual agency service standards;
- the quality of the service provided by the police is vital, not just in its own right, but to ensure the willingness of victims and witnesses to engage with other services as well as influencing their level of satisfaction provided with the wider CJS. Indeed many victims' cases will not reach the stage of a trial. For these reasons "victim satisfaction with the police" will form one part of the composite indicator. This will reflect that the experience for many victims will only be with the police and allow better capture of peoples' experience;
- all police forces are required meet service standards set out in the *Quality of Service Commitment* (QoS<sup>2</sup>). This includes improving ease of contact with the police, keeping victims informed of progress and engaging with communities to give them a voice regarding services and service delivery. It aims to ensure that everyone who comes into contact with the police receives a high level of service and provides a framework for measurement. Progress against this indicator will be tracked through the Police Performance Steering Group using the Assessments of Policing and Community Safety;
- improving the ease with which CJS services can be contacted and accessed. CJS agencies will ensure that calls are handled in accordance with agreed standards, and that services provide a coordinated response to victim and witness needs rather than operating in individual silos;
- victims and witnesses receiving information about the CJS and about the progress of their case on a regular basis. Victims and witnesses tell us that not receiving timely information about how the CJS works, or about key events in their case, is one of the key issues about which they are dissatisfied. Victim care agencies will provide timely updates about developments in the case, from reporting of a crime through to sentence and beyond. They will also provide information about the CJS through leaflets, websites, DVDs and other appropriate formats;
- vulnerable and intimidated victims and witnesses will be identified and given appropriate support. Evidence suggests that CJS agencies under-identify the extent of vulnerability and intimidation. They will improve the effectiveness of identification processes through needs assessments at key stages in the criminal justice process to ensure that vulnerable or intimidated victims and witnesses are given the right support, and that special measures in court can be applied to assist them in giving their best evidence;
- ensuring victims and witnesses are offered practical and emotional support. CJS agencies will ensure timely referral of victims and witnesses to appropriate organisations where necessary, and help voluntary and community sector organisations to deliver tailored support;
- improving the experience of going to court. CJS agencies will fully inform witnesses about the court experience, making witnesses feel that their time at court has been well spent and that their contribution to the case has been important;

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/police-reform/reform-programme/citizen-focus/customer-service-standards>.

- undertaking a study on the feasibility of measuring the satisfaction of victims of serious sexual offences with the criminal justice process. Victims of these crimes are currently excluded from our measure of victim satisfaction for a number of ethical, methodological, and practical reasons. We want to establish whether it is possible to address these issues so that we can actively monitor the experience of some of the most vulnerable victims in the criminal justice system;
- OCJR will also ensure victims and witnesses are given the chance to have their voice heard in the system. Needs assessments at key stages will allow CJS staff to identify victims' and witnesses' individual needs, and to provide appropriately tailored support. The Victim Personal Statement scheme will allow victims of crime to tell CJS agencies and any other person or organisation involved in the case how the crime has affected them. OCJR will also set out clear standards of service that victims and witnesses can expect to receive, together with a clear means of resolution if those standards are not met. At national level, it will continue to support our Victims' Advisory Panel, so that there is a voice for victims at the heart of Government, and it will work with LCJBs to explore how to best achieve the same result at local level; and
- Local Authorities and voluntary sector organisations will also play an important role. It will be important for LCJBs to develop appropriate links with CRDPs, so as to ensure that strategies are joined-up in relation to prevention and support. But LCJBs should also work effectively with other organisations, for example, Police Authorities have a key role to play in terms of engaging with the community, establishing expectations and monitoring and reporting on performance.

#### **Key priority action 4: better identify and explain race disproportionality at key points within the cjs and have strategies in place to address racial disparities which cannot be explained or objectively justified**

3.26 The day-to-day management of the race indicator is the responsibility of the cross-CJS Confidence and Customers Delivery Board. Front line delivery is managed and owned by the LCJBs.

3.27 This PSA aims to establish a simpler, clearer and committed approach to improving BME people's experience of, satisfaction with, and confidence in the CJS, underpinned by existing cross-government strategy on race in the CJS and the associated work programme. This includes identifying wider socio-economic factors beyond the control of the CJS, which may be driving racial disparities, and working across government and with partners at national and local levels to deliver improved outcomes.

#### **Role of LCJBs**

3.28 LCJBs will:

- **Data Collection:** collect consistent ethnicity data according to the Minimum Data Set and Basket of CJS Indicators; adopt the 16+1 standard for recording of ethnicity data across CJS agencies.
- **Evidence and analysis:** use local ethnicity data and information to identify areas of disproportionality at key stages within the criminal justice process; and use that evidence and diagnostic tools provided by OCJR to analyse and understand the reasons for any identified race disproportionality.

- **Determining priorities and actions:** identify and define clearly local priorities for action to explain or reduce race disproportionalities; develop and implement robust and measurable strategies to address local priorities/problems, with periodic reviews and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating impact; and publish local action plans.

3.29 The key stages of the criminal justice process on which this measure will focus include collecting ethnicity data and monitoring outcomes in areas such as: use of Stop and Search powers; charging decisions; prosecution of race hate crime; bail; breaches of community orders; sentencing; quality of life in prisons; victim/witness satisfaction; and employment, retention and progression rates for CJS staff.

### Role of OCJR

3.30 To support delivery of the national PSA and to enable meaningful use of ethnicity data at local levels to identify and address unjustified disproportionality, the Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) is developing:

- a **Minimum Data Set** – setting out for the first time the minimum standards and areas for collection of ethnicity data within the CJS with accompanying guidance on data collection, use and analysis;
- a **Diagnostic Tool**<sup>3</sup> to enable criminal justice agencies and local criminal justice boards (LCJBs) to: look at ethnicity data for each key stage of the CJS; identify where there appears to be disproportionality; look at their policies, processes and operational practice to explore why the disproportionality is occurring and whether it is unjustified; and identify, implement and monitor the effect of actions to address the unjustified disproportionality.
- a **Core Framework/Action Plan** for use by agencies and LCJBs in addressing the issues identified locally.

### Priority action 5: reduce the harm caused by crime by increasing the quantity of criminal assets recovered

3.31 Delivering the strategy and associated indicator is the responsibility of the Asset Recovery Board.

3.32 The aim will principally be delivered by agreeing challenging but achievable annual recovery targets and delivery plans within key agencies, including the police, Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, the Serious Organised Crime Agency (including the Assets Recovery Agency), Crown Prosecution Service, Revenue and Customs Prosecutions Office, the Serious Fraud Office, HM Courts Service and Local Criminal Justice Boards.

3.33 In Northern Ireland, there are delivery partners within the Police Service Northern Ireland, the Public Prosecutions Service and the Northern Ireland Court Service.

### Role of asset recovery agencies

3.34 The focus of the strategy, led by the Home Office, is to drive up and maximise the use of powers available under the existing Proceeds of Crime legislation. The key actions for asset recovery agencies are:

---

<sup>3</sup> Similar to the successful Practice Oriented Package developed for police services to examine their use of stop and search powers.

- encouraging agencies to invest in capacity through enhancements to the asset recovery incentivisation scheme. Under the scheme agencies are entitled to share half of the recovered proceeds;
- making better use of financial intelligence, particularly through the use of Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs);
- the use of guidance and training in financial investigation produced by ACPO and the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), an example of this being the best practice material currently being piloted in eight Basic Command Units;
- improving confiscation order enforcement performance through Her Majesty's Court Service's Regional Centres of Excellence, Local Criminal Justice Boards, cross-agency support as well as using tougher powers and simpler processes provided in the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA);
- mainstreaming the use of POCA powers in police criminal enquiries, especially the use of restraint orders and money laundering prosecutions;
- strengthening and broadening the use of the civil recovery powers, including: (a) the merger of the Assets Recovery Agency with the Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), which will be more efficient, and deliver synergies in expert skills and experience; and (b) providing for various prosecutors to use those powers;
- making greater use of the powers of taxation to disrupt serious crime;
- increasing international co-operation with overseas partners in tackling crime. Formal agreements exist with partners in the USA, Canada and Jamaica and we are looking to make greater use of these with other countries; and
- gaining a greater understanding of the "asset recovery pipeline" by researching and modelling existing casework together with extrapolated projections based on improved performance.

## Local delivery

3.35 Criminal justice services are not generally delivered directly by, or in partnership with, Local Government organisations or their local delivery partners. Nevertheless, there are key links between the delivery of this PSA, mainly through LCJBs, and the crime indicators in PSA 23 *Make communities safer*, which are delivered principally through Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (or Community Safety Partnerships in Wales). The effective delivery of criminal justice services, including the delivery of these PSA commitments, therefore requires a co-ordinated approach both nationally and locally.

3.36 The development of PSA 23 and 24 has resulted in a set of indicators that are better aligned, removing some of the tensions that drove local agencies in different directions in the past. They now provide local agencies with much greater freedom to determine local priorities, and to develop strategies to tackle those problems of concern to local communities. This approach will be reflected during the business planning process to ensure that agreed local targets reflect local priorities.

3.37 Government will continue to encourage LCJBs to establish and maintain close links with the CDRPs and other local delivery partners in their areas. Government Offices have a key role to play in facilitating better co-ordinated local planning and delivery. Delivery strategies to tackle crime, anti-social behaviour, and re-offending should be based on a common assessment of local crime problems, and an agreed common understanding of local concerns.

## Consultation

3.38 The content of this PSA has been subject to extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. The process was initiated in May 2006 with the publication of a consultation paper, supported by a stakeholder event on 22 June 2006 which included representatives of the judiciary, magistracy and the voluntary sector. This was co-ordinated with the Home Office to ensure alignment with the development of PSA 23 *Making communities safer*.

3.39 Regional events with the chairs of LCJBs and other local representatives were held in October 2006. In February 2007, a joint consultation paper was then issued inviting views on, among a number of PSAs, proposals for tackling serious crime, its alignment with the delivery of justice, and reducing re-offending. Further consultation was undertaken in late 2007 and early 2008 to develop the commitments on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the CJS in bringing offences to justice which now form Priority Action 1.

3.40 Throughout the process of consultation and development of proposals, there have been regular informal discussions between CJS partners, and those involved in the development of wider governmental PSA objectives, to co-ordinate their development and ensure that high level objectives are aligned.

3.41 The feedback from these exercises and subsequent internal analysis has been used to develop proposals for this PSA, which we presented to LCJBs in March 2007.

## Results of consultation

3.42 The main change made as a result of the consultation is reflected in a much better alignment with PSA 23, with a focus on tackling serious crime.

3.43 The other significant change that resulted from the consultation is a change in the delivery strategy for confidence. LCJBs supported the move to a measure of the fairness of the CJS, as well as its effectiveness. But they expressed strong concern that local services did not have sufficient influence over local performance. They also felt that the British Crime Survey (BCS) is not sufficiently robust at a local level to measure improvements in local performance. The public confidence indicator is therefore a national indicator only, supported by a suite of indicators at local level based upon evidence of key drivers of public confidence and activities which contribute to confidence.

3.44 The race indicator has also moved away from a measure of perceptions of fair treatment amongst BME communities to a more tangible measure of the extent of racial disparities within the CJS. Supporting activities require LCJBs to collect and use improved and more comprehensive ethnicity data, plus other diagnostic tools, to identify, understand and address race disproportionality at key points within the system.

# A

## Measurement annex

### Priority action 1: Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System in bringing offences to justice

Indicator 1	The efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system in bringing offences to justice
Data provider	OCJR, Home Office.
Data set used	HMCS and Police data on convictions, cautions, offences taken into consideration, penalty notices for disorder (PNDs), cannabis warnings and recorded crimes. CJS agencies' estimated spend on bringing offences to justice
Baseline	2007/08 for serious sexual offences, serious acquisitive offences and the budgeted CJS spend in bringing offences to justice. 2008/09 for serious violent offences.
Frequency of reporting	OCJR receives data monthly. Provisional performance data will be published quarterly two quarters in arrears showing the 12-month rolling totals of recorded crime and offences brought to justice. We plan to publish data for the calendar year as a National Statistic in the following November.
95 per cent confidence interval	Not applicable as the data are not drawn from a sample.
Data Quality officer	Ministry of Justice Chief Statistician, Home Office Chief Statistician.
Minimum movement required for performance assessment	Performance will be assessed by comparing the percentage change in the number of offences brought to justice with the percentage change in the number of recorded crimes over the same period. Both percentages will be measured to 0.1 per cent.

### Definition of key terms

- *An offence is brought to justice*

When an offender receives a conviction, caution (includes conditional cautions, and reprimands and final warnings for youths), penalty notice for disorder or cannabis warning for a notifiable offence, or has a notifiable offence taken into consideration.

### Bringing Offences to Justice

**A.1** Success against this indicator will require the CJS to demonstrate improvement in bringing serious violent, sexual and acquisitive offences to justice by the end of 2010/11, while also reducing the budgeted CJS spend in bringing offences to justice over the same period.

**A.2** Success in bringing each of these categories of offences to justice will require that any percentage change in the number of offences brought to justice (OBTJs) from the baseline year is greater than the percentage change in the number of recorded crimes over the same period. For example, if recorded crime rises by 2%, the number of OBTJs must increase by more than 2%, while a 3% fall in recorded crime (a change of -3%) would require a smaller drop in the number of OBTJs (a change of a value greater than -3%, ie -2%, -1%, 0% or a positive value).

**A.3** For serious sexual and acquisitive offences, performance will be measured against the baseline period 2007/08. Performance in bringing serious violent offences to justice will be measured against the baseline period 2008/09 due to the number of recorded serious violent crimes before and after April 2008 not being directly comparable. This is the result of the separate collection of recorded crime data on offences of grievous bodily harm (GBH) without intent from April 2008, and a clarification to the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime governing the recording of GBH with intent in April 2008.

**A.4** It is accepted that crimes and offences brought to justice are not measured in exactly the same way. The Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime provide a framework for the consistent recording of crimes by police forces based on reports from victims and witnesses, whereas offences brought to justice are a count of the convictions, cautions, penalty notices for disorder and cannabis warnings given to individuals for separate offences, or the number of separate offences taken into consideration. This means that one crime could result in more than one offence being brought to justice. Additionally, a crime reported to and recorded by the police as GBH may, once all the circumstances of the case have been considered (including the evidential standard required to secure conviction and the public interest in prosecuting), result in a charge and be brought to justice as a less serious violent crime, such as ABH. In addition, there is an inevitable time lag between a crime being committed and the offence being brought to justice at court, so the level of recorded crime in a particular period is not directly comparable to the number of OBTJs in the same period. To attempt to mitigate for this, numbers of OBTJs and recorded crime will be measured on a rolling 12-month basis.

**A.5** Due to these differences between recorded crime and OBTJs, comparing the number of each as a ratio does not give a true measure of the proportion of crime which is brought to justice. It is for this reason that indicator 1 is assessed in terms of relative changes in the numbers of OBTJs and recorded crime. However, an OBTJ-to-crime ratio<sup>1</sup> will be used locally to help assess and manage LCJB performance. We recognise that this variation between national and local measurement of performance against this indicator is not ideal, and we are undertaking work to develop a more robust measure of the efficiency and effectiveness of the CJS in bringing offences to justice for the next spending review period. In the interim, we will be exploring with LCJBs whether it would be feasible to move to more consistent national and local monitoring arrangements during this CSR period.

**A.6** The budgeted spend of the CJS in bringing offences to justice is forecast to fall by 3.2% in real terms between the baseline year 2007/08 and 2010/11. The information on agency budgets for the spending review period is provided by the agencies themselves, and will be reviewed annually to ensure that changes in spending plans are reflected in the PSA measure. Where an agency is involved in providing more than one service, their budgets are adjusted using an agreed formula. Cash spend will be adjusted over time using HM Treasury's Gross Domestic Product Deflators to reflect the change in resources over time in real terms.

---

<sup>1</sup> The OBTJ to crime ratio is calculated by dividing the volume of OBTJs in the previous 12 months by the number of crimes recorded by the police during the same period, expressed as a percentage.

### OBJT crime categories: serious violent offences

Crime code	Offence
1, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3	Homicide and Child Destruction.
2	Attempted Murder.
5, 8F, 8H	Wounding or other act endangering life, and Grievous Bodily Harm without intent (including racially and religiously aggravated offences).
4/4, 4/6, 4/8	Causing Death by Dangerous Driving, Causing death by Careless Driving when under the influence of drink or drugs, and Causing Death by Careless and Inconsiderate Driving.
37/1	Causing Death by Aggravated Vehicle Taking.
1, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3	Homicide and Child Destruction.
2	Attempted Murder.
5, 8F, 8H	Wounding or other act endangering life, and Grievous Bodily Harm without intent (including racially and religiously aggravated offences).

### OBJT crime categories: serious sexual offences

Crime code	Offence
19A-H	Rape.
21	Sexual Activity involving a Child under 13.
17A, 17B (&17)	Sexual Assault on a Male.
20A, 20B (&20)	Sexual Assault on a Female.
22A	Causing sexual activity without consent.
70	Sexual activity etc. with a person with a mental disorder.
71	Abuse of children through prostitution and pornography.
72	Trafficking for sexual exploitation.

### OBJT crime categories: serious acquisitive crime

Crime code	Offence
28	Burglary in a dwelling
29	Aggravated burglary in a dwelling
34A	Robbery of Business Property
34B	Robbery of Personal Property
48	Theft or Unauthorised Taking of a Motor Vehicle
37/2	Aggravated Vehicle Taking
45	Theft from a Vehicle
28	Burglary in a dwelling

**OBTJ crime categories: other crime**

A.7 All other notifiable offences comprise this category.

**Priority action 2: to increase the levels of public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the CJS**

Indicator 2	Public confidence in fairness and effectiveness of the CJS
Data provider	Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate (British Crime Survey team).
Data set used	The British Crime Survey.
Baseline	Baseline data will be available in July 2008.
Frequency of reporting	Annual statistical publication, with published quarterly data releases of provisional rolling annual data two quarters in arrears, which will enable in-year monitoring and performance assessment.
95 per cent confidence interval	+/- 1.1% <sup>2</sup>
Data Quality officer	Chief Scientific Officer for the Home Office.
Minimum movement required for performance assessment	Measure will require a statistically significant increase in public confidence against the base line period (Six months: Oct 2007-March 2008). This will be established once BCS questions supporting this indicator have completed testing and are inserted into the BCS (Expected October 2007).

**Measurement: national**

A.8 The indicator is measured through a series of questions in the British Crime Survey (BCS). The BCS reports quarterly.

A.9 The CSR07 indicator broadens the SR04 indicator (effectiveness in bringing offenders to justice) to measure public perceptions of both ‘fairness’ and ‘effectiveness’ of the CJS.

A.10 The BCS will include a suite of questions designed to measure perceptions of different functions of the end-to-end CJS, culminating in measures:

- how confident are you that the CJS is fair?
- how confident are you that the CJS is effective?

**Measurement: local**

A.11 It is not possible to disaggregate BCS data at local level, so LCJBs will be required to demonstrate improvement against a set of indicators in relation to community engagement and staff engagement. Research evidence suggests that, alongside the service improvements outlined elsewhere in the PSA, these are key drivers of public confidence. However, we recognise that, in common with other perceptions measures, it is not easy to draw clear links between cause and effect.

---

<sup>2</sup> As the current confidence questions have not been used in the BCS yet this figure has been estimated based on an estimate of the likely sample size for this question (12,000 respondents). Public confidence is a key measure of how successful the CJS strategy is in delivering criminal justice services that the public expects. It is a proxy for the willingness of the public to engage with the CJS, on whom the CJS depends to deliver its outcomes.

**A.12** Consultation is ongoing, and indicators will be agreed with LCJBs as part of the annual business planning round. These are likely to combine output measures (e.g. number of community events held) with perception measures (e.g. % of staff who understand the roles of different CJS agencies).

**A.13** In line with the move to greater local flexibility, it will be for LCJBs to carry out a self-assessment and provide and analyse local evidence to produce clear action plans to deliver improvements during the target period. The OCJR performance management framework will include assessment of the quality and level of ambition of the action plans, and monitoring of progress against planned outcomes.

**Priority action 3: to increase the proportion of victims and witnesses that are satisfied with the way they are treated by the CJS**

Indicator 1	Experience of the CJS for victims and witnesses
Data provider	This indicator will be achieved if two criteria are met: victim satisfaction with the police; and victim & witness satisfaction with the CJS.
Data set used	Police forces. Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR).
Baseline	Police user satisfaction surveys. Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES).
Frequency of reporting	User satisfaction surveys: baseline data will be available in June 2008. WAVES: baseline data will be available in October 2008.
95 per cent confidence interval	Quarterly publication of provisional data for both components. Victim satisfaction with the police: rolling annual data will be published two quarters in arrears. WAVES: financial year-to-date data will be published three quarters in arrears.
Data Quality officer	User satisfaction surveys: +/- 0.19%. <sup>3</sup> WAVES: not yet available – a figure will be available once baseline period has finished – October 2008.
Minimum movement required for performance assessment	User satisfaction surveys: Head of Performance Framework & Assessment Unit, Home Office (under review). WAVES: Head of OCJR Research, Development and Statistics.

**Definition of key terms**

- “Victim” refers to a victim of crime to which the National Crime Recording Standard applies.
- “Witness” refers to a witness of a crime to which the National Crime Recording Standard applies.

**A.14** Overall, the measure will be met if both ambitions set out below are achieved.

<sup>3</sup> This figure is based upon the latest complete outturn (2006/07) with a sample size of 158,346. This includes the following user groups: domestic burglary, violent crime, vehicle crime and road traffic collisions.

## Victim satisfaction with the police

**A.15** Performance will be measured based on the answers given to a question in police force user satisfaction surveys. The surveys are carried out by telephone with a random sample of victims who report a crime to the police, within certain user groups. The measure will be based on the percentage of victims who answer that they are satisfied to the following question: *Taking the whole experience into account, are you satisfied, dissatisfied or neither with the service provided by the police in this case?*

**A.16** The baseline will be the aggregated national percentage of victims reporting themselves 'satisfied' for the 2007/8 year.

**A.17** The ambition will be met if, based on the results from the 2010/11 survey year:

- the percentage of victims reporting themselves 'satisfied' has increased by a statistically significant amount when compared to the baseline year; and
- the percentage of victims reporting themselves 'very satisfied' has not deteriorated by a statistically significant amount when compared to the baseline year.

**A.18** Police force user satisfaction surveys interview victims who have reported a crime to the police. The surveys cover victims of:

- domestic burglary;
- violent crime;
- vehicle crime;
- [racist incidences];
- [anti-social behaviour];
- [road traffic collisions]<sup>4</sup>

**A.19** The survey measures satisfaction on a seven-point scale:

- completely satisfied;
- very satisfied;
- fairly satisfied;
- fairly dissatisfied;
- very dissatisfied;
- completely dissatisfied; and
- neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**A.20** "Satisfied" is defined as all victims surveyed who are completely, very or fairly satisfied. 'Very satisfied' is defined as all victims surveyed who are completely or very satisfied.

---

<sup>4</sup> Groups in brackets to be confirmed through the APACS process.

## Victim and witness satisfaction with the CJS

**A.21** Performance will be measured based on the answers given to a question in the Witness and Victim Experience Survey (WAVES). WAVES is a telephone survey carried out with a random sample of victims and witnesses across England and Wales whose cases reach the point of an offender being charged or beyond. The measure will be based on the percentage of victims and witnesses who answer that they are satisfied to question 190 of the WAVES survey: "overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the contact you've had with the CJS?"

**A.22** The baseline will be the percentage of victims and witnesses satisfied during the six months to March 2008. Due to the need to make further developments to the WAVES survey for use as an indicator in this PSA, it is not possible to use an earlier baseline. As a result, the baseline will be confirmed once the survey data for the six months to March 2008 are available in October 2008.

**A.23** The aim will be met if, based on the results from the 2010/11 survey year, the percentage of victims reporting themselves "satisfied" has increased by a statistically significant amount when compared to the baseline year.

**A.24** WAVES surveys victims and witnesses in cases which an offender was charged, including:

- dropped/written off cases;
- guilty pleas; and
- contested trials (both Magistrates and Crown Courts, those who do and do not give evidence).

**A.25** WAVES surveys victims and witnesses of the following crimes:

- violence against the person;
- robbery;
- burglary;
- theft and handling stolen goods; and
- criminal damage.

**A.26** The survey measures satisfaction on a seven-point scale:

- completely satisfied;
- very satisfied;
- fairly satisfied;
- neither satisfied nor dissatisfied;
- fairly dissatisfied;
- very dissatisfied; and
- completely dissatisfied.

**A.27** "Satisfied" is defined as all victims and witnesses surveyed who are very, completely or fairly satisfied with the service they received.

**Priority action 4: better identify and explain race disproportionality at key points within the CJS and to have strategies in place to address racial disparities which cannot be explained or objectively justified**

<b>Indicator 4</b>	<b>Understanding and addressing race disproportionality at key stages in the Criminal Justice System (CJS)</b>
Data provider	Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs), comprising: Police Forces; the Crown Prosecution Service; Her Majesty’s Courts Service; the Prison Service; the National Probation Service; and Youth Offending Teams.
Data set used	Returns from LCJBs (and constituent agencies) on performance against core elements and the basket of indicators (at Annex A).
Baseline	Data will be available in October 2007.
Frequency of reporting	Quarterly and/or annual (depending on target element). Quarterly publication of provisional data will show end of period snapshot two quarters in arrears.
95 per cent confidence interval	N/A – data set is not a sample.
Data Quality officer	Head of OCJR CJ Evidence and Analysis Unit.
Minimum movement required for performance assessment	N/A – Assessment of LCJB progress will be made on the core elements (see below).

**Definition of key terms**

- *Race disproportionality*  
Particular minority groups may be more or less likely to be the subject of an action by a Criminal Justice Agency, and sometimes this involvement is disproportionate to their representation of that minority group in the resident population as a whole. We use the term ‘disproportionality’ to refer to this situation.
- *16+1 Standard:*  
The 16+1 standard classification of ethnicity was adopted following the Census 2001. It uses 16 self-classification codes under five main ethnic groups (White; Mixed; Black/Black British; Asian/Asian British; Chinese) and a “not stated” category. 16+1 refers to the sixteen ethnic categories plus the “not stated” category.
- *Equality Impact Assessment:*  
The process through which public bodies can examine policies, practices and services to ensure there is no potential for discrimination against a particular equality target group (the six equalities strands are race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief). It is a forward-looking process which enables public bodies to predict possible barriers faced by equality target groups. A judgement of adverse impact is made if the impact of a policy, practice or service disadvantages one or more equality target groups.

**A.28** There are three core elements to this indicator:

- 1 improving the collection by CJS agencies and the quality of ethnicity data at key stages within the criminal justice process, with all CJS agencies adopting the 16+1 standard for collection of ethnicity data (established by the 2001 Census);
- 2 improving CJS agencies’ use of ethnicity data and other diagnostic tools provided by OCJR to identify, examine and understand disproportionate over- or under-representation within the CJS of people from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities; and

- 3 ensuring that every criminal justice area has in place a robust and measurable strategy to address any identified race disproportionality which cannot be explained or objectively justified; jointly owned, implemented, monitored and reviewed by all CJS agencies.

**A.29** By 2011 all member agencies of Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) will need to demonstrate they have taken positive steps towards identifying, understanding and addressing race disproportionality in each of the broad areas of:

- victim and witness experience/satisfaction;
- suspect, defendant, offender experience;
- recruitment, retention and progression; and
- following negotiations with Local Criminal Justice Boards, it will be possible to agree more specific national milestones and benchmarks.

**A.30** Performance against the three core elements of this indicator will be monitored by the Office for Criminal Justice Reform and measured directly by reference to the achievement of the key steps and actions set out above.

**A.31** Due to different ethnic make-up of resident populations, it will not be possible to make direct area-to-area comparisons. LCJB activities and performance will therefore be benchmarked against central standards which will provide a broad framework within which LCJBs will be expected to operate but which will allow local flexibility to accommodate local issues and priorities. Central standards (to be developed by OCJR and agreed with LCJBs) will cover: (i) data collection under the Minimum Data Set specification and guidance, plus adoption of the 16+1 standard; (ii) use and analysis of local data in accordance with central guidance and advice; and (iii) core components for strategies and action plans. As a minimum, local strategies/action plan must include the following components:

- a clear statement of aims and levels of ambition;
- analysis of the local evidence (data and other evidence);
- outcome of self-assessment using the Diagnostic Tool;
- outcome of third sector/community consultation/engagement activities;
- proposed actions (SMART), with owners, time scales for delivery and clearly articulated levels of ambition;
- monitoring mechanism/evaluation of impact, including local community input; and
- periodic reviews/health-checks to ensure the actions are being implemented and to ensure the plan remains up-to-date and effective and responds to changes in local circumstances and priorities (E.g.: changes legislation; changes in resident population; specific local issues).

**A.32** The key stages of the criminal justice process on which performance will focus are:

(i) Stop and Search:

- disproportionality between BME and White communities in the use of Stop and Search measured by the resident population; and
- frequency of arrest arising from Stop and Search for each ethnic group.

ii) Charging Decisions:

- percentage and number of charging decisions for each offence type measured by ethnicity.

(iii) Prosecution of Race Hate Crime:

- percentage and number of unsuccessful outcomes in race hate crime cases due to victim and witness issues; and
- percentage and number of unsuccessful outcomes in race hate crime cases.

(iv) Bail

- the percentage of BME defendants proceeded against for a specific offence remanded in custody compared to the percentage of White defendants similarly remanded in custody

(v) Breaches of Order

- of the total community orders made, the percentage of White and BME offenders returned to court as a result of a breach of a community order

(vi) Sentencing

- the percentage of White and BME individuals with no previous convictions given a custodial sentence for specific offences

(viii) Quality of life in Prisons

The "quality of life" for BME and White individuals in prison in key areas such as:

- access to regime facilities; and
- personal safety.

(ix) Victim/witness satisfaction

- level of victim satisfaction of police action between White and BME communities

(x) Employment, Retention & Progression

- percentage of BME staff in senior positions in each CJS agency;
- percentage of BME staff employed in other grades in each CJS agency;
- percentage of judiciary and magistrates from BME communities; and
- wastage rates for police officers with 6 months to 2 years service broken down by ethnicity.

**Priority action 5: reduce the harm caused by crime by increasing the quantity of criminal assets recovered**

<b>Indicator 5</b>	<b>Recovery of criminal assets</b>
Data provider	2009/10- £250m.
Data set used	Asset Recovery Board.
Baseline	The aggregate annual asset recovery receipts in pounds sterling. Data to be provided from the Joint Asset Recovery Database (JARDB).
Frequency of reporting	Data received monthly. Quarterly publication of provisional financial year-to-date data two quarters in arrears.
95 per cent confidence interval	£125m recovered in 2006/07.
Data Quality officer	N/A – not based on a sample.
Minimum movement required for performance assessment	Organised and financial crime unit, Home Office.

**Definition of key terms**

- *Assets Recovery:*  
The recovery of criminal assets through both the criminal and civil courts as well as through international recovery activity and co-operation.
- *Asset Recovery Board:*  
Asset Recovery Board is a multi-agency body which has a steering remit over the business of recovery of criminal assets.
- *Cash Forfeiture:*  
Forfeiture of cash under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.
- *Confiscation:*  
Confiscation under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and earlier legislation.
- *Civil Assets Recovery:*  
Recovery of criminal assets under a civil action under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.
- *International Asset Recovery:*  
Recovery of assets following international assets recovery activity

**A.33** The measurement is the aggregate annual asset recovery receipts in Pounds Sterling confirmed by the Asset Recovery Board (ARB) as retrieved from the Joint Asset Recovery Database (JARDB).

**A.34** The aggregate annual asset recovery receipts in pounds sterling generated from receipts across four areas:

- cash forfeiture;
- confiscation;
- civil asset recovery; and
- international asset recovery.

**A.35** The target will have been met if, by 2009/10, the value of such assets before expenses is or exceeds £250 million. (excludes Scotland).

**A.36** Departments and agencies have delivery plans setting out the contribution they will be making. Examples are the confiscation orders and enforcement targets for 2007-08, targets for Police and Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) on cash forfeiture orders, and civil recovery targets for the Assets Recovery Agency (ARA) for 2007-08.

**A.37** The forfeiture of cash and civil asset recovery are administered under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. Confiscation is administered under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and earlier legislation.