

Classification **PUBLIC**

Meeting: **November 10, 2014**

Agenda Item: **Monitoring Report:
Asset Protection**



Recommended Motion:

THAT the Board finds that all provisions of the *Asset Protection Executive Limitations* policy has been complied with.

ASSET PROTECTION

I hereby submit my monitoring report on your Executive Limitations Policy, “Asset Protection” according to the schedule set out. I certify that the information contained in this report is true.

Signed: _____
Chief of Police

Date: _____

BROADEST POLICY PROVISION:

The Chief of Police will not cause or allow Durham Regional Police Service assets to be unprotected, inadequately maintained or unnecessarily risked.

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation that the Board has comprehensively interpreted this policy in its subsequent policy provisions. My interpretations will be attached to those provisions below.

Further, without limiting the scope of the foregoing by the enumeration, the Chief of Police will not:

Policy Provision #1

1. “Unnecessarily expose the organization, its members, the Board or the Regional Municipality of Durham to claims of liability.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

Policing involves activity by our members in which they place themselves in danger as well as our tangible and intangible assets at risk of loss or damage.

I will take all reasonable steps to ensure that the Service is managed and controlled with an attitude, systems and procedures which avoid these outcomes. The Risk Management Committee takes a proactive approach to monitoring and reporting on major risks.

Claims of liability means lawsuits launched by parties who allege that they have been damaged by the actions of our members in the course of their duties.

I interpret unnecessary exposure to such claims to occur when our members knowingly take actions or allow conditions to occur which will likely result in a claim.

Further, in view of the fact that some claims will succeed even if all actions are proper, I will ensure that the insurance arrangements put in place by the Region of Durham provide an adequate level of protection against claims which are made.

Data in Support:

Risk Management Committee

1) Mandate and Definition

“To develop a systematic approach to identifying, monitoring and reducing risks affecting human life and health, reputation and property.”

Our definition of risk management is “the process of looking into the future for things which may go wrong and doing something now to prevent them going wrong or lessen the damage of those things going wrong.”

Our focus is activities which can be examined and improved to lessen unnecessary risks.

2) Committee Membership

The Committee is chaired by the Director of Business Services and is composed of the Unit Leaders or LG representatives from our Quality Assurance Unit (policies and procedures, risk based audits), Strategic Planning Unit, Professional Standards Unit (police discipline and Special Investigations Unit liaison), Legal Services Unit (civil claims), Police Education and Innovation Centre (training), Superintendent Community Policing and Duty Inspectors’ Office (front-line operations and Collision/Suspect Apprehension Pursuit Review Committee).

3) Standing Reports

Currently consist of

- a) Monthly (YTD) Vehicle Collision Report produced by Fleet Management and posted on MediaOne.
- b) Collision/Suspect Apprehension Pursuit Review Committee update produced by the Duty Inspector/Quality Assurance.
- c) Public and Internal Complaints Report produced by Professional Standards.
- d) Special Investigations Unit Incident Report produced by Professional Standards.
- e) Lawsuit Update produced by Legal.
- f) Use of Force Report produced by the Police Education and Innovation Centre.

Suspect Apprehension Pursuits

We have placed a focus on Suspect Apprehension Pursuits (SAP). It represents a relatively risky activity which is nonetheless necessary to maintain community safety in certain circumstances. The DRPS, in comparison to other police services in Ontario, has the most stringent pursuit guidelines and is considered by the Ministry to be a leader in this field. The service has and continues to provide additional training and guidance as well as management oversight of these activities with the following results:

Suspect Apprehension Pursuits	2012	2013	2013	2014
	Year	Year	Sep YTD	Sep YTD
Number of Pursuits	32	39	29	24
Compliant	27(84%)	30(75%)	21(72%)	19(79%)
Non-Compliant	5(16%)	9(25%)	8(28%)	5(21%)

We have been capturing the data on the number of pursuits since 1996. We have seen the trend on the number of pursuits range from a high of 73 (year-1996) to a low of 32 pursuits (year 2012). To analyze the reasons behind the frequency of pursuits occurring would be nearly impossible as there are many factors that play into when a pursuit occurs.

We can however look retrospectively at our policy non-compliance and begin to target how we can improve on compliance.

In 2013 there were 39 pursuits and 30 of those (75%) were fully operationally compliant. The 9 pursuits that were non-compliant were carefully analyzed for the reasons of non-compliance.

All non-compliant issues are addressed by the debriefing Duty Inspectors and Acting Duty Inspectors to make compliance and non-compliance determinations. Most important is an emphasis on immediate notification of the Communications Unit and ultimately the Duty Inspector and Patrol Sergeant of any strategic following/pursuit by a patrol officer. This priority is being echoed at all SAP debriefs. Communications Unit supervisors are very aware of this priority. Furthermore, Communications Unit dispatchers are cognizant of the need to direct officers to turn on emergency lighting and siren equipment if they don't hear it when an officer reports a SAP over the radio.

In 2013 officers who engaged in pursuits suffered no personal injuries, and only one DRPS vehicle was temporarily taken out of service due to damage (approx. \$5,719.88). In addition to this, there was one report of property damage (cost to owner unknown), as a direct result of a suspect apprehension pursuit.

The top three risks identified after reviewing 2013 non-compliant SAP were: failing to notify Communications Unit forthwith of becoming engaged in a SAP, failing to update Communications Unit about changing information or conditions, and the lack of/or continual use of emergency lights and siren equipment.

Throughout 2014 the Suspect Apprehension Pursuit / Collision Review Board Committee has been redefining the program to improve our overall compliance to 79% with an enhanced focus on accountability through our Duty Inspector Office and a focus on training and education in collaboration with the Police Education and Innovation Centre.

Vehicle Collisions

Driving vehicles is the single most risky activity in which police officers engage based on both its' frequency and the negative consequences of collisions.

Consequently, since 2004 the Risk Management Committee has helped the service focus on reducing our vehicle collisions and the attendant injuries with significant success as outlined in the following table:

Departmental Collisions Injuries and Expenses	2012	2013	2013	2014	
	Year	Year	Sep YTD	Sep YTD	
Member Injuries	34	10	6	5	
Time Lost in Hours	263	65	0	60	
Wages Lost(Straight Time)	\$10,694	\$2,732	0	\$2,578	
WSIB Non-Wage Expenses	\$2,697	\$2,172	\$1,007	\$1,279	
# of Collisions	189	156	115	132	
# Write-Offs	7	6	4	6	
Average Repair Cost	\$2,621	\$2,523	\$2,423	\$2,624	
DRPS Collision \$ Value	\$495,282	\$393,612	\$278,606	\$346,384	

Special Investigations Unit

In 2012, seven (7) incidents involving our members were reported to the Special Investigations Unit with the following results:

- The SIU invoked their mandate on five (5) occasions;
- In all five (5) cases the subject officers were cleared of criminal responsibility by the SIU;
- In all five (5) cases the subject officers were also found not to have committed any offence under the code of conduct of the Police Services Act by the Professional Standards Unit.

In 2013, two (2) incidents involving our members were reported to the Special Investigations Unit with the following results:

- The SIU invoked their mandate on two (2) occasions;
- In both cases the subject officers were clear of criminal responsibility by the SIU;
- The subject officer was also found not to have committed any offence under the code of conduct of the Police Services Act by the Professional Standards Unit.

From January 1st 2013 up to and including September 30, 2013, there was one (1) incident involving our members and reported to the Special Investigations Unit with the following results:

- The SIU invoked their mandate;
- The subject officer was cleared of criminal responsibility by the SIU;
- The subject officer was also found not to have committed any offence under the code of conduct of the Police Services Act by the Professional Standards Unit.

From January 1st 2014 up to and including September 30, 2014, six (6) incidents involving our members were reported to the Special Investigations Unit with the following results:

- The SIU invoked their mandate on three (3) occasions;
- In all three (3) cases the subject officers were clear of criminal responsibility by the SIU;
- The subject officer was also found not to have committed any offence under the code of conduct of the Police Services Act by the Professional Standards Unit.

Statement of Compliance/Non-Compliance:

I report compliance with this provision

Civil Liability Claims

The following chart provides a breakdown of civil liability claims, by category, for the past three years:

Year	Assault/Excessive Use of Force	Departmental MVC	False Arrest	Improper Search and Arrest	Negligence	Sexual Assault	Erroneous Press Release	Total
2011	3	3		1	4			11
2012	3	3			1	1	1	9
2013	2	2	2	1	7			14

In comparing civil liability claims received from January 1st to September 30th in 2013 and 2014, the results are as follows:

Year	Assault/Excessive Use of Force	Departmental MVC	False Arrest	Improper Search and Arrest	Negligence	Sexual Assault	Erroneous Press Release	Total
2013	2	1	1	1	3	0	0	8
2014	3	3	0	1	8	0	0	15

In October 2014, Ms. Sonia Coward, Manager, Risk and Insurance for the Region provided a confidential overview of Risk Management and claims experiences as it relates to the Service during the Board’s In Camera session. Confidential information was discussed to confirm that the organization, its members, the Board and the Region are not unnecessarily exposed to claims of liability.

Further, Ms. Coward’s report confirmed that the current focus of our risk management efforts are being placed in the areas where they are needed, based on the frequency and the severity of claims.

Insurance Coverage

The Regional Finance Department's Insurance and Risk Management Division manages the insurance program which provides protection for individuals and assets along with protection against liability. Further protection is provided for claims made against the organization, its members, the Board and the Region. This program includes comprehensive policy wordings with high limits of liability. The Region has assured us that they have developed comprehensive custom solutions that will meet DRPS needs. Relevant information including annual statistics, types of claims and trending was also provided during the in camera session of October’s Board meeting.

Statement of Compliance/Non-Compliance:

I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision #2

- 2. “Fail to protect intellectual property, information and files from loss, damage or compromise.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation of the provision that I am to ensure there are effective systems and controls to protect intellectual property and information, and that patents and licensing provisions of electronic information and systems remain secure from breaches, misuse or misappropriation. Furthermore, I have a duty to ensure that the intellectual property licensed by the Service and developed for the Service is protected.

Data in Support:

Human Resources Policies on Intellectual Property Protection

In relation to protecting the development of intellectual property while in the employ of, or on behalf of the Service, Human Resources ensures that all offers of employment clearly identify the proprietary rights of the Service for the intellectual property and products developed on behalf of the Service, during the individual's term of employment (contract or otherwise). There are also directives in place to deal with installation of hardware and software as well as monitoring tools to determine if there is inappropriate software installed on our network.

The Human Resources unit has confirmed that new employees of the Service are required to sign an employment offer letter agreeing to abide by the Service's Intellectual Property policy which reads as follows:

Intellectual Property

All work products including documentation, reports, and intellectual property created or developed by the member for the DRPS during the course of their employment shall belong to and remain with the DRPS.

In relation to protecting the development of intellectual property while in the employ of, or on behalf of the Service, Human Resources ensures that all offers of employment clearly identify the proprietary rights of the Service for the intellectual property and products developed on behalf of the Service, during the individual's term of employment (contract or otherwise). There are also directives in place to deal with installation of hardware and software as well as monitoring tools to determine if there is inappropriate software installed on our network.

Information Technology Policies on Database Security

Directives include:

AO-08-005 "Computer Data Recovery and Data Storage management"

AO-08-001 "Internet Use by Police Service Members"

AO-08-003 "Electronic Messaging (e-mail and VMDT transmissions)"

AO-08-002 "Computer Software and Hardware"

AO-08-006 "Automatic Vehicle Locator"

Computerized data is backed up daily to disk and then onto offsite magnetic storage media.

The IT department regularly checks service computers to ensure that only properly licensed software are being used by our Security IT unit.

The external security infrastructure audit involves the following:

External Penetration Testing is the process of assessing our DRPS network for external vulnerabilities and if any penetration is found, subsequently performing a controlled attack to verify the results.

The Infrastructure security audit looks at our documentation and the records on our configured devices such as firewalls, routers, switches, etc. Thoroughness and organization of the network documentation is reviewed during the assessment. The greater security concern associated with sensitive documentation is the proper encryption of the data while at rest (storage) and while in transit (over the network). The assessment reviews the following:

- Thoroughness of network documentation including network diagrams
- Storage location of documentation
- Encryption of documentation at the disk and network levels

The best strategy to protect our systems and users against social engineering (defined as the act of manipulating people into performing actions or divulging confidential information, rather than by breaking in or using technical hacking techniques) is awareness of the risk.

End user education focuses on how to identify and protect corporate confidential information. We did this through numerous What's New Messages, Insider Reports and All messages in 2013 and in 2014. Our users are much more aware of security vulnerabilities as they have in the past and with added security software such as anti-virus software these vulnerabilities are not always getting through our network.

There have been no instances that I am aware of where intellectual property, information or files have been lost, damaged or compromised. However, we do conduct reviews on member's emails, MDT's, CCTV private files and GPS records when required by the Professional Standards Unit or senior command relating to a particular incident or case. Unit leaders are requested to fill out the following e-Forms for any non-compliance of our directives that take place.

- CCTV Hide e-Form – DRP 112
- Internet, Email, Secure Folder Audit DRP 209H
- GPS Audit – DRP209F
- Private/Invisible RMS – DRP140

Number of audits conducted in 2013/2014:

- 1) Internet/email -32 audits were conducted
- 2) GPS Audit- 35 GPS/AVL audits were conducted
- 3) Private/Invisible Requests-38 Private/Invisible Requests
- 4) CCTV hidden requests-15 requests

There are also strict provisions that limit the utilization of licensed products (e.g. computer software), which are strictly monitored and managed by our Information Technology Department, including the administrative controls over adding computer programs and the downloading of programs.

As part of the CPIC Reference manual developed by the Canadian Police Information Centre all agencies need to be in compliance with IT security and conduct both an external and internal security audit every 3 years. The next external audit will take place in 2015 to be complete by Dec 2015. There will be an external and internal security audit each year as part of the budget process for added security.

Based on the Professional Standards Disciplinary chart there was 1 report of an officer conducting unauthorized CPIC checks in Jan 2014.

Statement of Compliance/Non-Compliance:

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision # 3

3. “Receive, process or disburse funds and found or seized property under controls that are inconsistent with sections 132, 133 and 134 of the Police Services Act, or insufficient to meet the standards of the auditor appointed by the Regional Municipality of Durham.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation of this provision that I am to ensure that appropriate directives and procedures are in place to meet the above standards and that they are being complied with. The directive covering these procedures is in place and is called AO-04-001 Seized and Found Property.

Data in Support:

The Quality Assurance Unit completed an Audit of the Property Unit on July 24, 2014 which found it was in compliance with policy. The audit takes place annually and traces the handling of property to ensure that current DRPS procedures meet adequacy standards. The 2014 Audit of the Property Unit focused on the handling and storage of drugs under our control. The Audit found the Property Unit to have a 99% accuracy rate and compliant with the AO-04-001 Seized and Found Property directive. The Audit also made several recommendations that will be covered in the next Audit Function Monitoring Report.

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision # 4

4. “Fail to ensure that all monies that accrue from the local sale of unclaimed goods are promptly transferred to the Board’s control.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation that I shall ensure that all revenue accrued from the sale of unclaimed goods is accounted for, and that all monies from the sale are properly and promptly transferred to the Board.

Data in Support:

The Property unit arranges public auction sales with an independent auctioneer. Both the Unit and the auctioneer maintain separate records of the sales and funds received.

For the purpose of Records Management Systems (Versadex) and auction follow up, the DRPS is given a computer printout that indicates each item sold, the amount of the bid and it identifies the bidder. The reconciliation of the auction list, property files in Versadex, and the remitted funds sent to the Board occurs after every auction. The property staff conducts the reconciliation.

There was (1) property auction in 2013 and there has not been an auction to date in 2014. I am not aware of any identified discrepancies between the sales lists/totals and the total amount remitted to the Police Services Board.

The auctioneer provides the Durham Regional Police Services Board with a cheque for the proceeds minus their commission. The Service has no role in remitting funds other than to act as courier of the cheque to the Board.

The Auctioneer's computer printouts are kept at the Property Unit. Auction records are on file in accordance with retention by-laws.

The Region of Durham's external auditor (Deloitte and Touche) carries out an audit on this account activity and forwards it directly to the Board. They audited the 2013 Durham Regional Police Services Board Unclaimed Property Fund as at December 31, 2013. The audited statements were presented and approved by the Board in March 25, 2014.

Statement of Compliance/Non-Compliance:

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision # 5

5. "Compromise the independence of the Board's audit or other external monitoring or advice. Engaging parties already chosen by the Board as consultants or advisers is unacceptable."

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation of this provision that I will not engage parties who are under contract to the Board where a conflict of interest may exist or where it may compromise the independence of the Board's audit or other external monitoring.

Data in Support:

I have been provided a list of these parties by the Executive Director of the Board. I confirm that the Service has not taken any actions with these parties which would compromise the independence of these parties as it relates to providing advice or monitoring to the Board.

The list of parties is as follows:

In 2013: Hicks Morley; Ellis, Locke and Associates; Deloitte and Touche; The Employers Choice; Perley-Robertson, Hill and MacDougall; Mungall Consulting Group.

In the first half of 2014: Perley-Robertson, Hill and MacDougall; Deloitte and Touche.

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision # 6**DIRECTOR SELBY**

6. “Endanger the organization’s public image, credibility or its ability to accomplish Ends.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation of this provision that the Service will not perform any action that impacts negatively on the public image or credibility of the Police Service. The Service will not perform any function that is contrary to the achievement of the Board’s Ends.

Data in Support:

The organization's image and credibility remains high, with the vast majority of media coverage being balanced or positive. The Corporate Communications Unit is very active throughout the year sharing positive news stories on a daily basis with the public and the media. In 2013, the Unit issued 838 formal public statements, the highest ever recorded for the organization (813 were issued in 2012). Corporate Communications also measures initial media coverage every year, as it has a major influence on shaping public perception of the police service. Of the 2,781 original newspaper articles/editorials clipped in 2013 (2,591 were clipped in 2012), a total of 2,381 (2,380 in 2012) were considered balanced (fair), 135 (116) were clearly positive in tone about the police service and 236 (94) were negative in tone. This means that 8.5 percent of all monitored media coverage was negative, a small percentage of the overall number, but a significant increase from the previous year. Overall, the public perception of the police is largely balanced or positive (91.5 per cent). One issue dominated the negative coverage in 2013 – the inappropriate use of Twitter by a DRP Officer. The other negative media coverage centered on a few incidents in which police officers were charged or accused of wrongdoing.

Of the media stories clipped last year, 1,914 (1,735) were about crime, 324 (465) were about trials, 183 (123) involved crime prevention and 358 (266) were corporate in nature (e.g. notices of public meetings, budget stories, new assignments, new buildings, etc.)

The DRPS also began sharing information on its official Facebook page and through a Twitter account in 2012. Last year at this time we had 2,845 followers on Twitter and that has since increased to 7,587. Last year at this time we had 1,542 followers on Facebook and now we have 4,634 followers.

In 2014, we have measured 1,771 media clippings in the first seven months of the year. A total of 1,335 involved stories about crime; 82 were about crime prevention, 136 involved trials and 222 were corporate in nature. So far in 2014, 1,440 of the clippings are balanced (fair), while 119 were positive and 209 were considered negative. The negative stories so far in 2014 have involved a police shooting in North Ajax, a YouTube video produced by employees, and several cases in which an officer was charged or involved in a court case regarding alleged wrongdoing.

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Policy Provision # 7

7. “Change the organization’s name or substantially alter its identity in the community.”

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation of this provision that there will be no change in the name of the Service or in the role that the Service plays within the community.

Data in Support:

I have neither directed nor allowed any changes in the organization’s name or identity.

Statement of Compliance/Non-Compliance:

Therefore, I report compliance with this provision.

Based on the above proof provided, I report overall compliance with the policy.