

**Review of Business Crime  
Initiatives in Derbyshire**  
**Derby & Derbyshire  
Economic Partnership**  
**Final Report**  
**January 2009**



**CARLISLE**

4 Finch Close  
Carlisle  
Cumbria  
CA1 2WB  
01228 545722  
07501 725 114

[stephen@dcresearch.co.uk](mailto:stephen@dcresearch.co.uk)

**LEICESTER**

46 Pipistrelle Way  
Oadby  
Leicester  
LE2 4QA  
0116 271 8911  
07501 725 115

[jon@dcresearch.co.uk](mailto:jon@dcresearch.co.uk)

## Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION IN DERBYSHIRE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
The Projects .....	6
Business Crime Evidence Base .....	8
Police Business Crime Data .....	9
<b>3 BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT ...</b>	<b>12</b>
Stakeholder Perspectives .....	12
Business Impacts of Crime .....	14
Approaches used to date.....	15
Business Perspectives.....	17
Financial and Monitoring Performance.....	22
<b>4 FUTURE BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION OPTIONS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
Future Approaches: The issues .....	24
Future Approaches: The options.....	25
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Recommendations.....	32
<b>ANNEX 1: CONSULTEES.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: INDICATIVE RURAL CRIME DATA .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: DEFINITION OF CUSTOM OFFENCE GROUPS .....</b>	<b>36</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DC Research was commissioned by Derby & Derbyshire Economic Partnership (DDEP) in October 2008 to review business crime reduction investments made by DDEP and to provide evidence to support options for future business crime reduction investments.

Crime affects business in a number of ways. Crime and the cost of dealing with incidents is very much a barrier to business growth and prevent businesses from fulfilling their role in stimulating economic regeneration.

Whilst raising awareness and supporting businesses to combat business crime is important, businesses also need to be encouraged to take responsibility and manage business crime risk. Part of this involves being prepared to report business crime – if suspicions around underreporting are true and were better quantified, it would help to raise the profile of business crime as an issue.

Derby and Derbyshire is well regarded in terms of its approach to reducing business crime, and whilst difficult decisions may need to be made in terms of the targeting of future business crime prevention investment, the sub region is able to make these decisions from a strong position in terms of past performance, expertise and track record.

Partners are now at the point where decisions about future focus need to be made. This report sets out some options and recommendations that are based on the analysis of evidence and perspectives gathered as part of this study.

### Options

There are three future options set out in the report:

- **Option 1:** Roll out of additional grant funding to cover all of Derby & Derbyshire
- **Option 2:** Focus additional resources on tackling acquisitive rural business crime
- **Option 3:** Focus on maximising number of businesses engaged in networked schemes

### Recommendations

The recommendations below are intended to further enhance and support the existing business crime reduction activities established as a result of DDEP's investments. Nevertheless they are contingent, in part, on which option, if any, is pursued.

- The business crime reduction referrals approach **needs to be better promoted by both the public and private sector organisations that engage with business, and especially small businesses.** In particular there would be benefit in communicating directly with East Midlands Business (EMB)/ Business Link to reaffirm the expertise that they can refer to in the sub region.

- It is essential that **police officers engaging with businesses in communities in Derby and Derbyshire are fully aware** as to both business crime issues and the support and advice that are available through Business Crime Prevention Advisors.
- Business Crime Prevention Advisors need to **increase both support and coverage for rural businesses**, and Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce needs to look at **improved geographic penetration across the sub region**, building on its coverage in North East Derbyshire.
- Derbyshire Constabulary should consider whether there is any **divisional flexibility in the geographical remit** of Business Crime Prevention Advisors. Enhanced flexibility would better enable targeting of specific vulnerable groups (such as remote rural businesses).
- Provider delivery of any trial approach to rural business crime networking should, if pragmatically possible, be **commissioned through a competitive process**. This will open up the potential for more experimental approaches to be considered, as well as involving organisations who have been closely involved with delivery to date.

## 1 INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH

1.1 DC Research was commissioned by Derby & Derbyshire Economic Partnership (DDEP) in October 2008 to review business crime reduction investments made by DDEP and to provide evidence to support options for future business crime reduction investments. This encompassed:

- A review of DDEP's investment to date, confirming the number of businesses supported, and – through consultation with the Police, representatives of business and businesses directly – an assessment of the impact of that investment
- A review of other crime prevention / reduction projects within the sub region and neighbouring authorities and assessing if those initiatives have had a greater or lesser impact than those supported by DDEP
- Development of justifiable recommendations for future levels and areas of investment.

1.2 The report starts by setting out the business crime reduction investments made by DDEP followed by:

- Summary of the business crime policy and evidence base
- Review of the performance of the specific projects supported by DDEP to date
- Stakeholder and business perspectives on current initiatives and future opportunities and threats to provision
- Conclusions, recommendations and future investment options.

1.3 The findings in this report have been informed by the following sources of evidence:

- Desk based analysis of project documentation and data
- Analysis of business crime data for Derbyshire. Business crime data from the Police has been specifically generated for this study, and has supplemented evidence provided by stakeholders and businesses
- Stakeholder consultations and focus group meetings. Stakeholders have been consulted both on a one-to-one face to face basis, and by focus groups organised on a divisional basis by the Business Crime Prevention Advisors (BCPA's)
- An online survey of businesses for their views on business crime in the sub region, and perceptions as to the effectiveness of business crime reduction approaches. Rather than contact businesses directly DC Research engaged with partners who made their business networks aware of the survey through various communications, and this was supplemented by a press release coordinated by DDEP.

1.4 Carrying out this evaluation has required significant contributions of time, information and insight from a number of people and organisations. Their assistance is greatly valued and appreciated.

---

## 2 BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION IN DERBYSHIRE

- 2.1 This section sets out the business crime context in Derby and Derbyshire. In terms of policy and strategy, it is immediately clear that whilst most partner organisations accept that business crime is an important issue, it does not feature as a priority in terms of many plans and strategies. In part this is a national issue, as the new national indicator set<sup>1</sup>, which contains the 198 indicators from which partners choose 35 for their Local Area Agreement targets, does not include an indicator that allows partners to choose to focus on business crime.
- 2.2 This is due, in no small part, to the inability of the Home Office to introduce a crime classification for a business as a victim in the recording and collation of crime data. Whilst it is not true to say that crime against business is not recognised as a crime, there is no mechanism for separating crime committed against businesses from that committed against any other organisations type (say a Government department, religious building, charity or even a Scout hall). As such, business crime lacks the bespoke data to allow it to be regarded as strategically significant.
- 2.3 Despite this, working in partnership with Derbyshire Constabulary and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce (DNCC), DDEP has invested over £1million in the last four years with the aim of making Derbyshire the '**Safest place to do Business**'. The Derbyshire Business Against Crime Programme began in 2003 by providing comprehensive, free of charge advice and information about how to combat business crime. It aims to reduce business crime and the fear of crime.
- 2.4 The Derbyshire Business Against Crime Programme comprised a website [www.saferderbyshire.gov.uk](http://www.saferderbyshire.gov.uk), an e-mail alert system servicing over 2,000 local businesses, seminars, and the establishment of the Business Crime Forum, comprising of local business leaders which steers the project. The first round of grants administered by the team benefited over 100 businesses and totalled £150,000. This in turn attracted match funding from the businesses themselves totalling £250,000. The second round of grants totalling £200,000 is forecast to lever in £800,000 from the businesses.
- 2.5 The Programme was evaluated in 2004 by Focus Consultants, who found:
- Only 1 in 5 businesses are currently part of a crime prevention scheme
  - Less than 1 in 3 businesses have received any formal crime prevention advice
  - 7 out of 10 businesses would be prepared to invest in crime prevention if financial assistance was made available.
- 2.6 More recently, Johnson Tidsall Chartered Accountants, commissioned by Derbyshire Constabulary Business Crime Unit, estimated that for the period April 2004 to March 2006 the cost to business of crime had fallen from around £90m per annum to £76m.

---

<sup>1</sup> "The New Performance Framework for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships: Single Set of National Indicators"

- 2.7 To date, DDEP's investment has provided assistance to over 3,400 businesses. The Johnson Tidsall analysis alone showed that for an initial investment of £324,000, the saving to local companies was £4.8m in reduced crime (6200 less crimes). Taken together, this evidence suggests that this **investment has made a significant contribution to reducing business crime within the sub-region.**
- 2.8 Unusually for business crime reduction programmes, the sub region enjoys strategic links between the Police and the Regional Development Agency, with projects being funded by DDEP (via *emda* single pot funding) and administered by Derbyshire Constabulary. Whilst this is unusual there are clear links to priorities in the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), with recognition of the importance of reducing business crime being part of its 'Achieving Equality' theme, based on an understanding that it is a key reason for companies deciding not to invest in deprived areas. There is a specific priority action (9B) being contained in the RES for business crime:
- ADDRESSING CRIME:** Reduce the impacts of crime on communities and businesses through neighbourhood and business crime.
- 2.9 Despite the strategic hook of RES inclusion, regional approaches to business crime have been mixed, mainly due to approaches being contingent on the willingness of each constabulary to engage and commit resources. However, in addition to Derby and Derbyshire, approaches in the Welland Sub Regional Strategic Partnership (with a rural focus) and Nottinghamshire have also progressed.
- 2.10 The best strategic fit and linkages for business crime reduction would be at the LAA level, cutting across both the 'Safer & Stronger Communities' and 'Economy & Environment' themes. However business crime reduction does not tend to feature prominently enough as a measurable priority to enable its inclusion.
- 2.11 At the national level, the emphasis towards enterprise and small business growth under the government's mandate of making the UK, the best place in the world to start and grow a business<sup>2</sup> coincides with a focus on simplifying the small business support provision where the Chancellor has challenged the public sector with reducing the 3000 existing business support schemes to less than 100 (an initiative entitled the 'Business Support Simplification Programme' – BSSP).
- 2.12 Driving the government's BSSP is the aim of establishing a business support service which is accessible, financially efficient and delivering measurable impacts. This is to be achieved by integrating business and skills brokerage services under the Business Link Information, Diagnostic and Brokerage (IDB) model. Fundamental to this is the establishment of a portfolio of business support products that are currently in development.
- 2.13 The business crime reduction support offered to date by DDEP clearly underpins several of the BSSP product areas.

---

<sup>2</sup> Enterprise: Unlocking the UK's Talent, BERR (March 2008)

## The Projects

2.14 DDEP's business crime investments for the purposes of this review comprise of the following projects:

- Business Against Crime & Business Against Crime Extension
- Business Crime Toolkit
- Business Crime Targeted Action.

2.15 In addition to the four projects, DDEP also supported Derbyshire Safeguard, which along with the four projects is described below.

### *Business Against Crime and Business Against Crime Extension*

2.16 Business Against Crime is a partnership project that aims to reduce business crime and the fear of crime. It provides comprehensive crime prevention advice and information, free of charge, to businesses in Derbyshire. Key features of the project include:

- An e-mail alert system servicing 2,000 local businesses
- A compendium of business crime prevention advice included within [www.saferderbyshire.gov.uk](http://www.saferderbyshire.gov.uk)
- The delivery of 4 business crime reduction seminars across the county
- The creation of a Business Crime Forum, comprising local business leaders and police representatives
- Crime prevention surveys tailored around individual business needs
- Grant support to assist with implementing recommendations.

2.17 Whilst the project is open to all business sectors, the project seeks to actively assist small businesses and, in particular, micro businesses to reduce their risk of crime.

2.18 The project, which is managed by Derbyshire Constabulary, incorporates four Business Crime Prevention Advisors (Business Crime Prevention Advisors). The Business Crime Prevention Advisors are dedicated entirely to tackling business crime in the county, and latterly the project linked directly to the Business Crime Targeted Action project.

2.19 Business Against Crime Extension allowed the project to be sustained up to March 2008, and has since been sustained further by Derbyshire Constabulary Authority.

### *Business Crime Toolkits*

2.20 The overall objective of this project is to provide a range of crime prevention measures, at an affordable cost to businesses, in order to tackle six key crimes identified in the Focus (2004) report into crimes against businesses in Derby and Derbyshire:

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| ▪ Theft from shop           | ▪ Making off without payment            |
| ▪ Burglary – (not dwelling) | ▪ Obtaining property by fraud / forgery |

- Damage – (not dwelling)
- Obtaining property by deception

2.21 Business Crime Toolkits was designed to complement and enhance the activities of the Derbyshire Constabulary Business Crime Advisors to provide a cost effective way for businesses to address these key crimes and implement measures to both prevent and deter further criminal activity. This includes:

- Target hardening
- Reducing the pay-off (de-valuing the property)
- Access control
- Increasing the chances of being caught
- Surveillance – formal and informal.

2.22 The aim was to provide businesses with a tailor-made package, or 'Tool Box', which is equipped with a number of measures to address the potential for crime in each environment. These various measures and sub-projects included the following:

- Smart Water
- Auto Dial alarms
- Securi-Disc vehicle security – tamper-proof tax disc holders
- Fraud / Forgery detection equipment
- IT Asset labels and UV pens
- Memo-Cams – a self contained digital CCTV system offering high resolution video and still image capture
- Access Control Signage
- Surveillance Mirrors
- Crime Prevention packs – information packs offering advice to businesses.

*Business Crime Targeted Action*

2.23 The Targeted Action project sought to supplement the Business Against Crime project by actively assisting small businesses (less than 50 employees) and particularly micro businesses (less than 10 employees) to reduce their risk of being a victim of crime. This includes, following Business Crime Prevention Advisor recommendation, the provision of:

- Smart Water kits to 1,200 businesses at 24 sites across the DDEP area. The sites to be targeted by a process including crime pattern analysis, business surveying and local intelligence. It was proposed that every business within these sites would be offered SmartWater for a small contribution of 25% of the costs
- Ringmaster (alerting businesses to intelligence broadcasts by telephone or fax) for firms who cannot access the email alerts system supported by Business Against Crime
- Databases, sending Home Office literature in hard copy format to businesses (10,000 packs).

- 2.24 In addition to the four business crime specific projects, **Derbyshire Safeguard** was also funded by DDEP. The project was designed to improve the quality of neighbourhoods and communities by focussing specifically on areas where people trade, carry out business, visit for recreation and gateways for travel across Derbyshire, to make the sub region a more attractive place to invest and visit.
- 2.25 DDEP investment into Derbyshire Safeguard was sought for improvements to infrastructure, to include street lighting, street furniture provision, barriers to reduce fly tipping (at known locations) and gateway improvements. Specifically, intended outcomes arising from DDEP funding are focussed on raising Local Environmental Quality (LEQ) in the sub region's commercial areas, concentrating on industrial areas but also linking to Market Town support in the County.

### Business Crime Evidence Base

- 2.26 The **British Chamber of Commerce (BCC) Crime Survey** (April 2008) reported that business crime is rising significantly. Since 2004 the total cost of crime against business has, according to the survey, risen nearly 20% from £10.5 billion to £12.6 billion, and BCC argue that given that the Home Office has previously estimated the total cost of crime in Britain each year is £59.9 billion<sup>3</sup>, this would suggest that business crime accounts for a substantial share of the total cost of crime.
- 2.27 Businesses who responded to this survey indicated that crime has a negative impact on business location decisions (73%), inward investment (62%), expansion decisions (57%), and recruitment (49%). As a result over 80% of businesses believe that crime against business is a problem in their local area.
- 2.28 The most recent Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) survey of its membership, published in November 2008, suggested that SMEs lose an average of £13,500 each year to crime. Entitled **Putting the economy back on track: Crimes against business**<sup>4</sup>, the report found crimes against businesses make up 20 per cent of all recorded crime in the UK – also referred to as the 'forgotten fifth.'
- 2.29 Results from the FSB survey of 8,700 of its members revealed that two-thirds of businesses were victims of crime over the past year – a figure that has risen by seven per cent over the past two years. The most frequent crime experienced was vandalism, followed by vehicle damage, threatening behaviour, graffiti, shoplifting and burglary.
- 2.30 The FSB survey also found that in comparing the incidence of crime in urban and rural businesses, there was a higher level of 'some experience of crime' for urban businesses (65%) than for rural businesses (59%). There was also, however, a greater difference in the incidence of certain crimes. The most significant difference was in regard to vandalism, which was experienced by 42.8% of urban businesses, but only 36.7% of rural businesses. A considerable variation also occurred with graffiti, vehicle damage and threatening behaviour, with differences of more than 3%. The

<sup>3</sup> Home Office, The Economic and Social Costs of Crime, 2000

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.fsb.org.uk/policy/assets/crimes%20against%20business.pdf>; accessed 03/12/2008

results indicate that all other crimes showed a smaller variation between urban and rural businesses.

- 2.31 For comparison, the BCC survey suggests that more businesses located in urban areas have experienced crime in the last 12 months compared to those in rural areas (61% vs. 50%, respectively).

### Police Business Crime Data

- 2.32 Derbyshire Constabulary kindly supplied data on organisational crime for the years 2006/7 and 2007/8. This allows analysis of recent trends (notably in the years following the Focus (2004) and the Johnson Tidsall (2006) studies) and comparison and analysis of crime data by location, crime type and broad organisation type.

- 2.33 As mentioned earlier, it is important to note that official crime data is not structured to distinguish a business from other organisational types. Whilst all efforts have been made to ensure that the following tables relate to business crime, it should be noted that neither Derbyshire Constabulary nor DC Research can guarantee that non business organisational types are not excluded from the data as presented.

- 2.34 Organisations that were included were broken down into the following categories:

- **Manufacturing:** Garages, construction, transport, manufacturing, pharmaceutical
- **Services:** Service industry, leisure, financial, entertainment, security, insurance, media, storage
- **Retail:** Wholesalers, retail
- **Utilities:** Utilities
- **Non Business:** Local Authority, Education, Religious, Health, Charitable, Community, Emergency Services, Armed Forces, Prison, Criminal Justice, Government, Criminal/ Prohibited
- **Type not Recorded**

- 2.35 This approach allows analysis to both segment, but include, those organisations captured by crime data that are not businesses. Annex 2 sets out indicative data on rural crime provided by the Police and cited by a number of stakeholders. Detailed crime definitions are set out in Annex 3 of this report.

- 2.36 Table 2.1 shows organisational crime by Police division from October 2006 to September 2008 (the most recent available data in quarterly form). This suggests a fairly stable level of crime, with some quarterly fluctuations, with the broad maintenance of the 2004 to 2006 reductions noted in the Johnson Tidsall (2006) report.

- 2.37 Derby and South Derbyshire shows the highest levels of recorded crime against organisations, with High Peak and Derbyshire Dales the lowest.

<b>Table 2.1: Number of Organisations victim to a Crime in the period by Division</b>					
<b>Division</b>	<b>Oct 06 to Mar 07</b>	<b>Apr 07 to Sept 07</b>	<b>Oct 07 to Mar 08</b>	<b>Apr 08 to Sept 08</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amber Valley & Erewash (A)	2212	2132	2077	2265	<b>8686</b>
High Peak & Derbyshire Dales (B)	1097	1024	1002	1083	<b>4206</b>
Chesterfield & North East Derbyshire (C)	2372	2132	2099	2278	<b>8881</b>
Derby & South Derbyshire (D)	3601	3342	3373	3530	<b>13846</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>9282</b>	<b>8630</b>	<b>8551</b>	<b>9156</b>	<b>35619</b>

Source: Derbyshire Constabulary, 18<sup>th</sup> November 2008

2.38 Table 2.1 shows that in the final six months to September 2008, business crime has increased, and is approaching the levels recorded in the six months to March 2007. Most of this increase is recorded by Divisions A and C, and may be related, at least in part, to the recent economic downturn.

2.39 Table 2.2 sets out organisational crime by type. Retail and manufacturing crime is notably significant, with rises for both types in the six months to September 2008 (especially retail).

<b>Table 2.2: Number of Organisations victim to a Crime in the period by type of Organisation</b>					
<b>Type</b>	<b>Oct 06 to Mar 07</b>	<b>Apr 07 to Sept 07</b>	<b>Oct 07 to Mar 08</b>	<b>Apr 08 to Sept 08</b>	<b>Total</b>
Manufacturing	2294	2129	2052	2329	<b>8804</b>
Non-Business	2097	2112	1967	1935	<b>8111</b>
Not Recorded	441	468	278	159	<b>1346</b>
Retail	2702	2486	2793	3227	<b>11208</b>
Services	1466	1213	1272	1328	<b>5279</b>
Utilities	282	222	189	178	<b>871</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>9282</b>	<b>8630</b>	<b>8551</b>	<b>9156</b>	<b>35619</b>

Source: Derbyshire Constabulary, 18<sup>th</sup> November 2008

2.40 Looking at the organisational data by offence type, arson, non dwelling burglary and shoplifting have all increased in the six months to the end of September 2008.

<b>Table 2.3: Number of Organisations victim to a Crime in the period by offence type</b>					
<b>Type</b>	<b>Oct 06 to Mar 07</b>	<b>Apr 07 to Sept 07</b>	<b>Oct 07 to Mar 08</b>	<b>Apr 08 to Sept 08</b>	<b>Total</b>
Arson	135	132	130	156	<b>553</b>
Damage (exc. arson)	2628	2255	2208	1952	<b>9043</b>
Non-Dwelling Burglary (inc attempts)	1482	1379	1366	1506	<b>5733</b>
Other	2655	2576	2299	2590	<b>10120</b>
Robbery – business	30	23	37	17	<b>107</b>
Shoplifting	1623	1623	1833	2244	<b>7323</b>
Theft by Employee	90	97	106	99	<b>392</b>
Theft of and from Vehicle (inc interference)	632	538	566	584	<b>2320</b>
Violence against the Person	7	7	6	8	<b>28</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>9282</b>	<b>8630</b>	<b>8551</b>	<b>9156</b>	<b>35619</b>
Source: Derbyshire Constabulary, 18 <sup>th</sup> November 2008					

### 3 BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

- 3.1 This section sets out perspectives from both stakeholders engaged in business crime reduction, and also from businesses themselves.
- 3.2 There is a clear consensus running through this study that the major barrier facing the recognition of business crime reduction as a priority is the **absence of clear differentiation of business as a victim of crime**, and thus as a result the lack of a clear indicator. Put simply, business crime is **not adequately recorded by the Home Office**, and as a result it is very difficult for local partners to make a case for its inclusion in action plans in general and Local Area Agreements (LAAs) in particular.
- 3.3 Business crime therefore suffers from not being a top priority for a range of interested and relevant organisations (including LAAs and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership priorities and plans). In part this is due to Government targets, and in parts it is due to a perception that business crime is 'victimless'. The latter issue, which can include some organisational perceptions, were a particular cause of concern amongst many stakeholders, as often the **victims of business crime can be entrepreneurs who lose their business, employees who lose their jobs, and often communities that lose their amenities**.
- 3.4 As an illustration, one often cited example is retail crime, with anti social behaviour often having massive knock-on business impacts. Figures from the opening of Derby Westfield shopping centre suggest that around £640m of disposable income is now spent in the city centre per annum. If the British Retail Consortium estimates that around 1.75% of retail turnover 'disappears', with around half of this disappearance accounted for through crime, then in Derby City Centre alone circa £3m is being lost to businesses as a direct result of crime.

#### Stakeholder Perspectives

- 3.5 Stakeholders were asked to provide their **definition of a business crime**. Responses ranged from "*any crime against business*", "*crime that impacts on business*", to more specific definitions such as "*where the victim or consequence effects a business and its viability*", or where there is "*an identifiable risk against businesses*".
- 3.6 There was variance in relation to issues of assault and violence against staff, and some stakeholders felt that 'outside the premises issues' should be excluded in terms of definition.

On balance business crime was defined by stakeholders as crime that represented a direct attack on the business itself, or that has negative business impacts.

- 3.7 Whilst official definitions (or lack thereof) in terms of statistical definition and recording is a recurring theme throughout this report, it is important to note that this, along with the significant underreporting by businesses themselves that has been noted by many stakeholders, limits the extent

to which more expansive definitions that include viability can be supported by available evidence.

*Business Crime: How important is it as a priority for Derby and Derbyshire?*

- 3.8 The whole agenda was, until recently, neglected in comparison to total crime. Whilst actual estimates vary, most consultees felt that a high proportion of business crime is not reported, especially retail crime and crimes of nuisance. Such underreporting is felt to be higher in urban areas as opposed to rural, but the impacts exist in all areas.
- 3.9 For businesses with narrow margins, business crime can lead to affected firms quickly going under. There was a clear consensus that a significant proportion of business crime goes unreported partly because businesses, for various reasons (such as customer confidence, public relations, insurance etc) are reluctant to admit to being victims of crime. In particular many stakeholders suspected that levels of reporting (and engagement with business crime activity) amongst the self employed was very low. Many practitioners noted that the self employed were particularly vulnerable to the business impacts of computer and data loss – particularly where business critical data was not recoverable.
- 3.10 Significant developments (such as The Markham Vale development near J29A of the M1, and the Westfield Shopping Centre in Derby) tend to take a more strategic approach to managing out crime where possible. Business Crime Prevention Advisors often provide expert advice in these cases.
- 3.11 **Repeat victimisation was a concern across the board**, with many businesses replacing stolen items only to be hit again. Both Business Crime Prevention Advisors and watch schemes tend to better engage firms keen to avoid being repeat victims.
- 3.12 A number of stakeholders argued that the recent economic downturn would lead to increases in business crime, notably acquisitive crime (such as metal, plant, fuel theft) and threats of violence. Indeed some reported anecdotal examples of increases over the last six months (which is supported by data for the six months to September 2008 as reported in section 2).

*Sub Regional Leadership*

- 3.13 Consultees are clear that **the Police are the lead organisation in terms of business crime reduction in the sub region**, and it is also clear that business crime represents a significant demand on mainstream Police resources. Police leadership and the Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach is well respected in the sub region and beyond.
- 3.14 The Police need to continually **balance awareness and fear of crime** – it is important that businesses minimise the impact and risk of crime, but Police have to ensure that awareness raising does not tip into levels of ‘fear of crime’ that do not compare to actual levels. This supports an approach that lends more towards supporting business crime victims to limit their risk of suffering repeat crime.

- 3.15 The Police have considerable support from a range of partners, with DDEP showing clear leadership in terms of the strategic economic development rationale for reducing business crime (mirrored by the Alliance SSP in Chesterfield, Bolsover and North East Derbyshire), DNCC providing expertise and experience in delivering a range of watch schemes, Local Authorities supporting a range of locality based initiatives and engagement opportunities, and specialist support from organisations such as the Federation of Small Businesses and the National Farmers Union also making significant contributions.
- 3.16 There is a particularly good track record of joint working and complementarity between Business Crime Prevention Advisors and DNCC, including referrals, data sharing and coordinated approaches where appropriate.
- 3.17 Another active partner in some parts of the sub region is Groundwork Derby & Derbyshire, who have worked with the Business Crime Prevention Advisor for Derby and South Derbyshire supporting aesthetic solutions (such as defensive planting, fencing, and making businesses look aesthetically 'cared for') and sustainable security improvements, as well as operating a grant scheme (Landscape Navigator). This work has also been funded by DDEP.

On balance Business Crime Prevention Advisor approaches work best with individual businesses, and the DNCC BusinessWatch approach where there is critical mass and the potential for cooperation. Watch schemes are contingent upon a critical mass of firms to be successful and sustainable, which is why to date they have been less successful in market towns and more rural areas.

Moving forwards, it is clear that DNCC is particularly skilled at dealing with issues on run down industrial estates, and Business Crime Prevention Advisors are better suited to making progress on the rural business crime agenda.

### **Business Impacts of Crime**

- 3.18 In the main, business crime priorities as highlighted by consultees were consistent, with industrial estates and retail being urban/semi urban priorities, town centre management and rurally isolated business crime being priorities in semi rural and rural areas. Bolsover was highlighted as an area of particular concern in relation to HGV / Logistics crime around Tibshelf services, and moving forwards there may be the need for targeted work both around Tibshelf and the Markham Vale development at J26A.
- 3.19 Other geographic areas of particular concern included Long Eaton and Ilkeston (both having specific town centre retail issues) and retail related issues in Derby City. More generally there is an increasing concern about the vulnerability of rural businesses to increases in acquisitive crime.
- 3.20 There were a range of views as to which specific crime caused maximum damage to businesses, with impacts relating often to the hassle, inconvenience and downtime that is involved resolving the issues the incident has left the business with. However in general terms crimes can

---

be usefully split into two categories: acquisitive crimes and nuisance crimes, and different approaches need to be used to tackle each type.

- 3.21 Burglary and break-ins in particular cause a disproportionate amount of damage to affected businesses. There is a direct opportunity cost in terms of inconvenience and downtime in replacing equipment, and the loss of computers (especially if not securely backed up) can be catastrophic to the business's viability. Allied to this is a recent trend of insurance firms either downgrading or not paying claims, which in turn can lead to some firms self insuring. This is an issue that contributes towards low reporting rates.

### **Approaches used to date**

- 3.22 The Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach is very well regarded, mainly because they are seen as going to, and working with, businesses directly. A key element in this success is the partnership approach that Business Crime Prevention Advisors have used in delivering support and advice to businesses.
- 3.23 Referrals are essential in ensuring this continues to work well – if the Police are the leaders in terms of business crime reduction, then other organisations need to ensure that they refer to Business Crime Prevention Advisors in the first instance<sup>5</sup>. From this referral, the Business Crime Prevention Advisor can provide advice to the best approach, and bring in delivery partners as appropriate. This referrals approach needs to be better promoted by both the public and private sector organisations that engage with business, and especially small businesses. In particular there would be benefit in communicating directly with EMB/Business Link to reaffirm the expertise that they can refer to in the sub region.
- 3.24 Referrals are also important from a Police perspective, with a number of consultees suggesting that there is scope for the profile of both business crime and the work of Business Crime Prevention Advisors to be raised internally in the force, especially in terms of frontline officers. It is essential that officers engaging with businesses in communities in Derby and Derbyshire are fully aware as to both business crime issues and the support and advice that is available through Business Crime Prevention Advisors.
- 3.25 The Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach does tend to be reactive to issues highlighted by businesses, especially when these businesses feel vulnerable or have been recent victims of crime. This is a pragmatic approach given that the alternative is likely to be significantly more costly (i.e. businesses that are yet to be victims and are not convinced that they are at risk). In contrast, 'watch' type schemes focus on managing collective and individual business risk in a more traditional business support environment, but takes a more preventative risk management approach.
- 3.26 What is clear is that these are complementary approaches as long as referral mechanisms and partnership working operates effectively, and there is evidence of good joint working relationships between Business

---

<sup>5</sup> There is anecdotal evidence that this is beginning to happen.

Crime Prevention Advisor's and DNCC (moving beyond co-location), with a good understanding of the type of support that is most appropriate on a case by case basis.

- 3.27 The **credibility that Business Crime Prevention Advisors have in being seen as representing the Police is very significant to businesses**. Of equal significance however is the independent brokerage role of Business Crime Prevention Advisors – the ability to tailor bespoke advice to businesses individual requirements.

*Delivering rural business crime reduction*

- 3.28 Increasingly Business Crime Prevention Advisors and the Police are being made aware of uplift in rural business crime, especially acquisitive crime related to equipment, plant and fuel. There is a developing view among consultees that business crime, especially the acquisitive crime, is being **'crowded out' of urban areas, and is increasing impacting on rural businesses** as they are in more isolated locations.
- 3.29 Business crime reduction activities in rural and semi rural locations are harder to deliver given the more dispersed nature of business location, and also heightened vulnerability that comes with more isolated business location. In the context of the business crime reduction suite of support that is the focus of this study, such businesses are harder to reach and engage with in comparison to those in urban areas and on industrial estates.

**Approaches taken elsewhere**

- 3.30 As mentioned above, **Derbyshire has been seen as the regional exemplar for business crime reduction approaches in the East Midlands**, with other sub regions varying in the extent to which business crime reduction is prioritised. Nottingham and Nottinghamshire is also proactive in its approach, and has adopted and adapted much of the Derbyshire approach (and its evidence base), but places a greater focus on cooperative approaches and toolkits. It is clear that the two forces have different approaches, but like Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire is serious about addressing the impacts of business crime.
- 3.31 The approach in the Alliance SSP area has a number of commonalities with the Derbyshire approach to date, and its rationale for intervention uses Derbyshire's approach and arguments to help make the case.
- 3.32 Over the past two years the North Nottinghamshire Anti Business Crime project has targeted SMEs offering crime prevention surveys and setting up combined approaches to improving security on industrial estates.
- 3.33 This initiative has been recognised by the Home Office who have provided funding of £162,000 to cover salary costs for the project team from April 2008 to March 2009. The project to date has concentrated on assisting with the set up and enhancement of combined security schemes and providing crime prevention surveys to businesses. Additionally, funding was provided to initiate the purchase of crime prevention interventions for businesses, such as Smartwater, CCTV etc. There is an element of sustainability here as companies purchase these items at a discounted

rate allowing the project to replenish stocks and thereby assist further companies.

- 3.34 Working on a similar basis to the Derbyshire Business Against Crime initiative, the scheme is administered on the basis of SMEs wanting to take up the opportunity of a crime prevention survey and those that wish to make the recommendations as per the written reports are offered up to 50% assistance (up to a maximum of £2,000 per organisation). The key elements of the North Nottinghamshire approach are:
- Grant Assistance for SMEs towards security improvements/target hardening
  - Tackling Rural Crime
  - Grant Assistance for Rural/Leisure SMEs towards security improvements/target hardening
  - Vehicle Crime in Rural/Business/Leisure areas
  - Keybase Keyholder & Messaging
  - Tackling Retail Crime
  - Forecourt Watch
  - Production of a joint range of marketing literature and promotional mailshots
  - Crime Prevention Design Advice – also to be promoted through Chamber & FSB.
- 3.35 In comparison to Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire lack the divisional presence and bespoke advice provided by Business Crime Prevention Advisors, and also senior leadership/championing in the Force.
- 3.36 In the Welland SSP area, rural crime has been at the forefront of a dual programme of cross border crime intelligence and rural crime reduction, through innovative partnership working between three police forces (Welland SSP area stretches across Lincolnshire, Rutland, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire).
- 3.37 In 2007 Welland SSP launched the Crime Cracker project in conjunction with Leicestershire Police in 2007. This included a new crime prevention CD and a new crime prevention device developed by one of the SSP's own business start-ups.

### **Business Perspectives**

- 3.38 As part of the review, a business survey was designed by DC Research and distributed by partners (including **DDEP, Derbyshire Constabulary, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce, the Federation of Small Businesses, the National Farmers Union and Local Authority partners**) to businesses across Derby and Derbyshire. In addition a press release was prepared by DDEP and circulated widely amongst sub regional media.
- 3.39 The survey was designed to capture business perspectives on current and future business crime issues, and also views on existing business crime reduction support and priorities for the future.

3.40 In total 109 replies were received by DC Research. The remainder of this sub section analyses the survey findings and presents the results as follows:

- Business information
- Experience of business crime
- Impacts and costs
- Crime reduction

*Business information*

3.41 Businesses were asked questions as to their location, number of employees and business type, and responses are set out in Tables 3.1 to 3.3.

3.42 Table 3.1 shows the location of respondent by Local Authority District. As would be expected, nearly a quarter of all respondents were from Derby City. It is interesting to note a high number of businesses responding from High Peak (in particular) and Derbyshire Dales, and a lower than anticipated number from Bolsover, Chesterfield, North East Derbyshire and South Derbyshire.

<b>Table 3.1: Business Location</b>	
Amber Valley	16.3%
Bolsover	1.9%
Chesterfield	6.7%
Derby City	24.0%
Derby Erewash	8.7%
Derbyshire Dales	15.4%
High Peak	21.2%
North East Derbyshire	3.8%
South Derbyshire	5.8%
Source: DCR Business Survey, n=104	

3.43 Table 3.2 highlights that the majority of respondents (82%) were businesses with less than 50 employees.

<b>Table 3.2: Business Employment</b>	
Less than 5	37.5%
Between 5 and 49	45.2%
Between 50 and 249	12.5%
More than 250	4.8%
Source: DCR Business Survey, n=104	

3.44 Table 3.3 shows the type of location / premises that responding businesses are operating from.

<b>Table 3.3: Business Location Types</b>	
Industrial Estate	29.2%
Business Park	7.5%
Retail Park	0.0%
Town Centre	20.8%
Office Block / Complex	0.9%
Home	10.4%
Residential Area	13.2%
Other (please specify)	17.9%
Source: DCR Business Survey, n=106	

- 3.45 Over a quarter were located at industrial estates, with over a fifth in town centre locations. However, of those respondents specifying other locations, all except three described their business as operating in a rural location.
- 3.46 Responding firms were asked to select a broad category that best described their business activities. The 106 that responded to the question are categorised as follows:
- Agricultural (3.8%)
  - Manufacturing (21.7%)
  - Services (31.1%)
  - Retail (20.8%)
  - Other (22.6%)
- 3.47 Those describing their activities under the 'other' category included a wide range of businesses.

*Business crime experience*

- 3.48 Businesses were asked which crimes (if any) they had experienced in the past 12 months, and also the number of incidences. In total, responding businesses had suffered 184 criminal incidents in the past 12 months. Table 3.4 sets out this information, highlighting the relative significance of burglary, vehicle theft / damage, anti social behaviour and vandalism.

<b>Table 3.4: Experience of incidents of crime during the past 12 months</b>						
Types of incident	Number of incidents					
	None	1 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15	16 to 20	Over 21
Burglary or attempted burglary	49	36	2	0	0	1
Robbery (involving force or threat of force)	64	9	0	0	0	1
Vehicle theft or damage to vehicles	53	25	2	0	0	0
Violence or personal injury	66	6	0	0	0	0
Theft by an employee	62	13	1	0	0	0
Arson	69	2	0	0	0	0
Anti-social behaviour / nuisance	50	22	4	0	0	4
Structural damage (including vandalism)	55	26	4	0	0	0
Graffiti	62	14	1	0	0	0
Other	48	10	0	0	0	0

Source: DCR Business Survey, n=102, multiple response

### *Impacts and costs*

3.49 Table 3.5 breaks down the impacts of these incidents in terms of total cost to the business. Total cost includes the value of damage done or property stolen, as well as the costs involved in returning the business to its full trading position.

<b>Table 3.5: Total business cost of crime in the past 12 months</b>						
Types of incident	Number of incidents					
	Under £5000	£5000 - £9999	£10000 - £14999	£15000 - £19999	£20000 - £24999	£25000 - £29999
Burglary or attempted burglary	42	7	1	1	2	1
Robbery (involving force or threat of force)	32	1	1	0	2	0
Vehicle theft or damage to vehicles	37	3	1	0	0	0
Violence or personal injury	29	0	0	0	0	0
Theft by an employee	33	0	0	0	0	0
Arson	27	0	0	0	0	0
Anti-social behaviour / nuisance	36	3	1	0	0	0
Structural damage (including vandalism)	45	2	1	0	0	0
Graffiti	31	0	0	0	0	0
Other	31	0	0	0	0	0

Source: DCR Business Survey, n=77 (a number of businesses were not prepared to answer), multiple response

3.50 In terms of additional impact (over and above cost), 89 firms reported the following:

- Disruption to trading (46.1%)
- Loss of business or customers (18.0%)
- Damage to company image (20.2%)

- Impact on staff morale (40.4%)
  - Increased insurance premiums or difficulty in obtaining insurance (22.5%)
  - Postponement of investment (7.9%)
  - Has had no impact (30.3%)
  - Other, which entailed responses similar to those set out above, (11.2%)
- 3.51 The impact of crime in terms of damage to trading circumstances is particularly notable, as are impacts to staff morale. This is underlined by **14 of the responding businesses stating that they have considered relocation** as a direct result of the effects of crime.

*Business crime reduction*

- 3.52 To test both awareness and take up of business crime reduction support, businesses were asked which organisations they were (a) aware of, and (b) had received support from.

<b>Table 3.6: Awareness and take up of business crime reduction</b>		
	Aware of	Received support from
The Police / Business Crime Prevention Advisors	48	40
Chamber of Commerce	52	5
Business Support Advisors / Accountants	22	2
BusinessWatch / ShopWatch etc	28	6
Bank / Insurance Company	30	8
Security Company	31	16
Other local companies	15	4
None	3	2
Source: DCR Business Survey, n=81, multiple response		

- 3.53 Table 3.6 suggests that most businesses have had support either from, or brokered by the Business Crime Prevention Advisors in the sub region, and brokered support may well have been provided by other organisations. The table does however highlight the prominence, of the Business Crime Prevention Advisor support from a business perspective.
- 3.54 In addition, the survey highlighted that **just under a quarter of responding businesses were members of an existing business crime reduction scheme**. Whilst this is heartening, it also indicates that there is much more scope remaining for take up of support.
- 3.55 Finally, Table 3.7 sets out business views on the effectiveness of the crime reduction support received.

<b>Table 3.7: Experience of incidents of crime during the past 12 months</b>					
Types of support	Effectiveness				
	Very effective	Effective	Not very effective	Not at all effective	Don't know
Grant assistance for security measures	12	4	2	0	10
Business Crime Prevention Advisors	15	18	2	1	9
Business Watch / ShopWatch schemes	4	7	2	2	11
Video surveillance	8	11	3	2	9
Private security patrols	6	7	2	2	11
Crime reduction training	3	2	1	1	12

Source: DCR Business Survey, n=55, multiple response

3.56 The main business crime reduction support delivered by DDEP partners in Derby and Derbyshire is, on balance, well regarded by responding businesses.

### Financial and Monitoring Performance

3.57 The tables below set out the financial and performance data of the five projects considered as part of this study.

3.58 Table 3.8 shows actual spend for each of the DDEP supported business crime projects, and Table 3.9 presents an aggregate position.

<b>Table 3.8: Actual spend on DDEP supported business crime projects</b>					
	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	Totals
<b>Business Against Crime</b>					
Capital	£107,500	£0	£0	£0	£107,500
Revenue	£45,000	£91,074	£0	£0	£136,074
<b>Business Against Crime Total</b>	<b>£152,500</b>	<b>£91,074</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£243,574</b>
<b>Business Crime Toolkits Total</b>					
Capital	£184,000	£0	£0	£0	£184,000
Revenue	£0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Business Crime Toolkits Total</b>	<b>£184,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£184,000</b>
<b>Business Crime Targeted Action</b>					
Capital	£0	£218,000	£0	£0	£218,000
Revenue	£0	£10,000	£0	£0	£10,000
<b>Business Crime Targeted Action Total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£228,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£228,000</b>
<b>Business Against Crime Extension 06/08</b>					
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Revenue	£0	£0	£98,550	£0	£98,550
<b>Business Against Crime Extension 06/08 Total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£98,550</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£98,550</b>
<b>Derbyshire Safer Neighbourhoods</b>					
Capital	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Revenue	£0	£0	£300,000	£0	£300,000
<b>Derbyshire Safer Neighbourhoods Total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£300,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£300,000</b>

Source: DDEP Project Data November 2008

<b>Table 3.9: Total actual spend on DDEP supported business crime projects</b>					
	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Capital	£291,500	£218,000	£0	£0	<b>£509,500</b>
Revenue	£45,000	£101,074	£398,550	£0	<b>£544,624</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£336,500</b>	<b>£319,074</b>	<b>£398,550</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1,054,124</b>
Source: DDEP Project Data November 2008					

3.59 In terms of output performance, out of the five, only Business Against Crime Extension 06/08 formally recorded outputs. These are set out in Table 3.10 below.

<b>Table 3.10: Total actual outputs from DDEP supported business crime projects</b>					
	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>Totals</b>
T4: Businesses Assisted to improve their performance	0	0	672	2,738	3,410
KPI 20: Business Support (Financial)	0	0	1	0	1
Source: DDEP Project Data November 2008					

---

## 4 FUTURE BUSINESS CRIME REDUCTION OPTIONS

### Future Approaches: The issues

- 4.1 As a consequence of SSP overlap in Derbyshire, the Business Crime Prevention Advisor for Chesterfield, Bolsover and North East Derby will be able to offer grant based support to businesses wanting to part fund business crime reduction investments through funding secured from the Alliance SSP. Evidence set out above suggests that adding grant funding to the menu of available options available to Business Crime Prevention Advisors is a key factor in engaging the harder to reach (and harder to help) businesses who are vulnerable to business crime. It is a matter for DDEP to decide, following this report, how business crime reduction is funded in the remainder of Derbyshire.
- 4.2 There is strong evidence that the Business Crime Prevention Advisor's role has wider benefits than advice to businesses alone. They are well networked with local CDRP's, and often provide advice to Local Authorities on specific town centre and business park schemes, and often engage in Council led approaches to planning out, and designing/developing out business crime, providing expert and trusted advice.

The key question for DDEP and partners in the context of support for business crime reduction activities in the rest of the sub region is the level of additional support (if any) that could be made available, and how it is best deployed.

- 4.3 From consultations, there is a consensus that the core element of support has got to be sustainable. Put simply, there is a need to secure the existing resource and expertise (as far as possible) that resides with the Business Crime Prevention Advisor team. **The team is a very productive mix of skills and backgrounds** (50:50 former Police Officers and those with a business background) and there is evidence of good joint working and sharing of expertise in the team. This represents a very good platform in terms of expertise and credibility.
- 4.4 There was also a degree of consensus amongst consultees that the focus needed to continue to be on SME and micro businesses, enabling a focus on firms less likely to be able to ring fence resources for security. In terms of focus (beyond firm size) there was a clear recognition that different approaches were needed for different places and business types, so **flexibility is an essential component of future provision**.
- 4.5 With regard to rural business crime, there is emerging evidence that rural business crime is of increasing concern, and key rural stakeholders have recently been advocating the need to specifically tackle rural based crime.
- 4.6 There is also an acceptance that policing resources are thinly spread in rural areas, and with specific reference to Business Crime Prevention Advisors, much more time can be spent travelling in areas such as Derbyshire Dales and High Peak. However, data (where it exists) will always record higher levels of crime in more densely populated areas, although recent Police data dealing with crime in rural areas has highlighted increasing incidences of acquisitive crime, specifically regarding vehicle and plant theft, fuel theft and livestock involving land

based businesses, as well as burglary incidences in more rurally isolated parts of the sub region.

- 4.7 Nevertheless, business crime was not highlighted as a key priority in the recently launched DDEP Sub Regional Rural Action Plan 2008 – 2011 for Derbyshire (an issue which is consistent with the generic low priority of business crime in CDRP, LAA and other action plans and strategies as highlighted earlier). The Rural Action Plan defines rural as settlements with a population of less than 10,000.

### Future Approaches: The options

- 4.8 Partners have already made significant progress in sustaining the business crime reduction expertise that has been established since the 2004 Focus report. Specifically DDEP have supported the Business Crime (Premium Service) project<sup>6</sup> which seeks to purchase the necessary hardware, software and other assets, to allow the Derbyshire Business Against Crime Team (the Business Crime Prevention Advisors) to become self sustaining by April 2009. This will be achieved with the implementation of an income generation project.
- 4.9 The Derbyshire Business Against Crime programme is beginning to move towards a self sustaining position due to business crime continuing to exist outside of national priorities from a Government perspective. As such, it does not form part of Derbyshire Constabulary's core policing responsibilities, and on-going mainstream investment in this area is likely to prove increasingly difficult. As such it is necessary to look at self sustaining options for Business Crime Prevention Advisors moving forwards.
- 4.10 To this end the project entails Business Crime Prevention Advisors offering services to small-to-medium businesses (SMEs) for a modest annual subscription fee. These include the registration of key holder and premises details with the police, through to a series of tailored services and products delivered on a one-to-one basis by the Business Crime Advisors.
- 4.11 The services are split into bronze and silver categories, offered to businesses for an annual subscription fee:
- The **bronze service**, charged at £35.00 per annum inclusive of VAT, will allow businesses to register information about keyholders on their premises - via a new and more efficient keyholder database with a web front-end. Derbyshire Constabulary would procure and implement the technology for this system from a third party and use lessons learned from the implementation of keyholder technology by Kent and Northamptonshire Police to ensure that the service is delivered efficiently and effectively.
  - The **silver service**, charged at £85.00 per annum inclusive of VAT, will include all the bronze services listed above. Beyond this, Business Crime Prevention Advisors will continue to provide Business Crime Toolkits to businesses following an assessment to determine the most

---

<sup>6</sup> Branded as part of Derby Safeguard

beneficial element in each case, with businesses being expected to make a financial contribution.

- 4.12 Derbyshire Constabulary and DNCC have discussed options to jointly develop a gold service. .
- 4.13 The key development in regard to the Premium Service project is the membership subscription element, which does introduce a cost element alongside the established Business Crime Prevention Advisor support approach. A key benefit of this approach to date has been the menu of options that Business Crime Prevention Advisors have been able to deploy on a case by case basis to the businesses it has advised.

Whilst it is recognised that there is no pragmatic mainstream alternative to sustaining the Business Crime Prevention Advisor legacy, the Police, DDEP and partners should be mindful of the need to preserve the 'honest broker' role of the Business Crime Prevention Advisors to date, and corresponding referral mechanisms. Put simply, Business Crime Prevention Advisors must continue to be able to provide bespoke advice and solutions to businesses.

- 4.14 In addition to supporting and creating the condition where the Business Crime (Premium Service) can thrive and move towards a more sustainable position, there are a number of options available to DDEP and partners should there be both the will, and the available resources, to further support business crime reduction in Derby and Derbyshire. These options are:

- Roll out of additional grant funding to cover all/part of remainder of the sub region in addition to provision in Alliance SSP Area<sup>7</sup>
- Focus additional resources on tackling acquisitive rural business crime
- Focus additional resources on maximising the number of businesses supported through networked schemes (such as BusinessWatch, ShopWatch etc).

- 4.15 Ahead of considering the potential options, it is important to set out some guiding principles under which these options can be considered.
- Any further support must be additional to that already provided – DDEP should not be investing in continuation funding of existing (or historic) approaches
  - There is clear scope to better market and raise awareness of business crime reduction opportunities (both with businesses and within stakeholder organisations)
  - Monitoring approaches have got to be directly related to the support provided
  - Any further support must be compliant in terms of the Business Support Simplification agenda.

---

<sup>7</sup> Following the publication of guidance in support of the national Business Support Simplification Programme (BSSP) and its portfolio of business support products, it will be important to ensure that the economic case is made to emda in terms of market failure if grants directly to businesses are to be supported

---

**Option 1:** *Roll out of additional grant funding to cover all of Derby & Derbyshire.*

- 4.16 As mentioned earlier, the Business Crime Prevention Advisor in Chesterfield, Bolsover and North East Derbyshire is currently able to draw on grant funded solutions, where necessary and appropriate, to support advice and recommendations made to businesses that are engaged. Whilst this is positive, there is a clear disparity at the sub regional level, with businesses in the other Divisions not being able to access the same level of support.
- 4.17 The Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach has flourished by being able to adopt the role of 'honest broker' and recommend specific options based on business need. It is beneficial to have the *option* of grant support if this is necessary to support a business who would otherwise not be able (or willing) to take up such recommendations. Put simply, the availability of a mix of full cost, part grant supported and free elements on a menu of solutions that can be recommended to advised firms on a case by case basis is ideal in terms of getting the best value from the Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach, especially as the advisors are able to deliver much more when there is an option of linking advice to grant funding.

**Option 2:** *Focus additional resources on tackling acquisitive rural business crime*

- 4.18 The increase in acquisitive crime against rurally based businesses is of considerable concern to the Police and a number of partners who have engaged with this study, with the potential for this trend to be linked to successful target hardening in more densely populated areas, and also recessionary impacts. The underlying fear is that an upwards trend in acquisitive crime will lead to the impact on rural businesses being exponentially greater than that felt in urban areas.
- 4.19 Option 2 could entail a package of measures designed to enhance the rural business crime reduction offer in Derby and Derbyshire. In part this is dependent on the willingness of the Police to relax the current divisional territories of the four Business Crime Prevention Advisors, so that they are deployed cross-divisionally (in part) to enhance their rural offer.
- 4.20 This approach would quickly need to be self sustaining (following the Premium model set out above), allowing additional funding to target specific problems and trial new approaches. This could include a series of rural specific options (including where appropriate a grant element) for Business Crime Prevention Advisors to choose from in terms of their overall menu of options to recommend to businesses:
- Trialling new approaches and technologies in rural areas, and achieving business engagement as a result
  - Pump-priming specific schemes in market towns (working with retail groups and DNCC)
  - A mobile "Farm Watch" unit (like a speed watch unit) providing visible and mobile police presence and advice.
- 4.21 Business Crime Prevention Advisor can offer 'BusinessWatch' in partnership with specialist providers (such as DNCC) under this approach, referring to local intelligence as to potential demand and feasibility on a

case by case basis. As part of this option, DDEP should consider the potential to look at trialling one rural cooperative watch on an experimental basis in the short term, with the Business Crime Prevention Advisor team and specialist providers working with the Rural Action Zone team to discuss demand and identify a potential shortlist of candidate areas.

Provider delivery of any trial approach should, if pragmatically possible, be commissioned through a competitive process. This will open up the potential for more experimental approaches to be considered, as well as involving organisations who have been closely involved with delivery to date.

**Option 3:** *Focus on maximising number of businesses engaged in networked schemes*

- 4.22 The benefits of integrated security schemes (such as BusinessWatch on industrial estates, as well as ShopWatch, PubWatch and LocalWatch in urban and market town locations) are well understood in both crime and economic development terms. If engagement is at a sustainable level (and there was a consensus from consultees that this equates to 75% of firms to be engaged in any scheme, although there is a recognition that both 50% is more realistic, and also that 100% is unrealistic), then such approaches are able to cover a significant number of firms.
- 4.23 The arguments supporting this approach are partially based on the economic rationale of business crime being a locational factor, and actions can also include tidying up industrial estates and raising LEQ on the basis of enhancing investor perceptions.
- 4.24 Whilst DNCC, who have a sub regional track record in delivering such approaches (particularly BusinessWatch in North East Derbyshire and Bolsover), need to increase their penetration across the whole of the county, it assumed that in areas where there is a critical mass of businesses that these schemes can be brought forward through business activism and sign up (i.e. demand), or that the case for intervention can be made on an economic basis (i.e. tidying up industrial estates and raising LEQ on the basis of enhancing investor perceptions as well as target hardening in business crime reduction terms).
- 4.25 Assuming that this approach is sustainable in economic terms in urban areas and industrial estates where critical mass exists, the viability of a networked scheme in less densely populated areas could be supported by an argument of market failure (i.e. businesses themselves are not able to network together and develop a viable scheme).

To summarise, **DDEP and partners need to balance circumstances where businesses can be brought together, leaving bespoke support to focus where it is really necessary.** There is perhaps an early opportunity to trial a rural form of BusinessWatch in a rural or semi rural location with the Police and DNCC working together in partnership. This trialled approach should be actioned in the short term, ideally within the next 18 months.

- 4.26 As part of the consultation process, stakeholders were invited to participate on a short **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats** (SWOT) exercise in relation to business crime prevention in Derby and Derbyshire. The table overleaf sets out the key findings from this exercise. It is helpful to look at the Strengths and Weaknesses in the context of approaches taken to date, and Opportunities and Threats in the context of future options and approaches.
- 4.27 The SWOT analysis reaffirms that the business crime interventions taken to date are valued and well regarded. It also highlights frustrations around business crime definition, and concerns about the implications of future funding changes (and changes in sub regional arrangements).
- 4.28 In terms of opportunities, the SWOT highlights the need to build on the expertise that is a legacy of DDEP investment, the knowledge of DNCC in delivering XWatch schemes, and the engagement and focus of Derbyshire Constabulary.

<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tailored BCA approach stands out nationally</li> <li>▪ Good dedicated team, easily accessible</li> <li>▪ Grant funding and advice from professionals</li> <li>▪ Awareness in forums / business networking</li> <li>▪ Lots of good work and engagement taking place</li> <li>▪ New approach to self funding</li> <li>▪ Joint working and flexibility, and good partnership links</li> <li>▪ The Police brand</li> <li>▪ Face to face contact, and, buy in from businesses that are seen</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Finance and funding, with need for pump priming</li> <li>▪ Time intensive approach, with large rural area especially difficult to cover</li> <li>▪ Business crime not in strategic planning documents</li> <li>▪ Profile of business crime in NI / target terms for the CDRP and LAA</li> <li>▪ Businesses often hard to reach and hard to engage (business apathy)</li> <li>▪ Needs to satisfy different needs in different areas</li> <li>▪ Business Crime not treated seriously by Home Office</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainable Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach: good base on which to build</li> <li>▪ Trialling of new product / techniques / technology</li> <li>▪ Sub regional structures changing</li> <li>▪ Develop / form a business crime group</li> <li>▪ All parties to meet and share information - regularly</li> <li>▪ Awareness raising with businesses and partners</li> <li>▪ Lobbying for business crime NI</li> <li>▪ offer matched funding for security upgrades</li> <li>▪ Business Crime Prevention Advisor good at engaging a hard to reach group</li> <li>▪ Cross border info sharing / alerts</li> <li>▪ Potential income stream</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provision not available (funding runs out)</li> <li>▪ Fear of losing Business Crime Prevention Advisor's</li> <li>▪ Current economic climate</li> <li>▪ Competing priorities</li> <li>▪ Lack of awareness in businesses and partners</li> <li>▪ Businesses folding or leaving the area due to crime</li> <li>▪ Current economic climate and unemployment</li> <li>▪ Sub regional structures changing</li> <li>▪ Organised crime increasing</li> <li>▪ CDRP not classing business under community</li> </ul>

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 It is clear from the evidence presented in this report that crime affects business in a number of ways. Not only is there the expense of having to replace stock or assets that have been stolen or damaged, there are the consequential costs of the incident as well as the disruption to trading. Crime also increases company insurance premiums, and often has a negative effect on company image as well as lowering staff morale and possibly putting customers off.
- 5.2 In addition there are often detrimental secondary effects including firms being unable to make further investments due to resources being diverted to cover the costs of crime. On this basis alone there is a clear economic rationale for further targeted support for business crime reduction.
- 5.3 Tackling business crime should be better recognised in economic development strategies. Crime and the cost of dealing with incidents is very much a barrier to business growth and prevent businesses from fulfilling their role in stimulating economic regeneration.
- 5.4 It should be noted that business crime in areas of particular deprivation requires more specific and detailed consideration than has been possible in the context of this study. In addition to the simple priority of business growth and survival, such areas can often face ongoing community facility provision issues when businesses struggle to trade as a consequence of crime.

There are many single person low growth businesses in such areas with a range of **challenges that are better supported with holistic and geographically targeted schemes** similar to Local Enterprise Growth Initiatives through LAA priorities under the Economic Development & Environment theme.

### *Approaches to business crime reduction in Derby & Derbyshire*

- 5.5 It is clear that Derby and Derbyshire is well regarded in terms of its approach to reducing business crime, and whilst difficult decisions may need to be made in terms of the targeting of future business crime prevention investment, the sub region is able to make these decisions from a very strong position in terms of past performance, expertise and track record.
- 5.6 There has been close ongoing cooperation between DDEP, the Police, Local Authorities, DNCC and other partners, and this has led to significant performance effects (business crime dropped from 2004 to 2006, with more recent data suggesting this drop has been sustained).

**DDEP and Derbyshire Constabulary have been especially proactive in business crime reduction**, with the former investing significant resources in an area where many partners, whilst supportive, struggle to support in resource terms due to other (better evidenced) priorities. Leadership from the Police has been at a senior level (Chief Inspector), and **significant innovation in terms of the Business Crime Prevention Advisor approach has developed from this partnership approach.**

- 5.7 Partners are now at the point where decisions about future focus need to be made, and there are a range of views and perspectives. Some stakeholders argue that **focus needs to continue to be towards where the greatest impact can be made**, which usually entails working in areas where there is a significant concentration of businesses (industrial estates and retail areas). Others advocate the need to **focus on the challenges of addressing crime in rural areas**, with a rationale that acquisitive crime is increasing in such areas, being crowded out of urban areas, and that business crime reduction initiatives need to respond to this challenge rather than continue to develop approaches that are bespoke to urban and market town environments.
- 5.8 Whilst raising awareness and supporting businesses to combat business crime is important, businesses also need to be encouraged to take responsibility and manage business crime risk. Part of this involves being prepared to report business crime – if suspicions around underreporting are true and were better quantified, it would help to raise the profile of business crime as a priority issue.

### Recommendations

- 5.9 The recommendations below are intended to further enhance and support the existing business crime reduction activities established as a result of DDEP's investments. Nevertheless they are contingent, in part, on which option is pursued as a result of this report.
- 5.10 Whilst it is recognised that there is no pragmatic mainstream alternative to sustaining the Business Crime Prevention Advisor legacy, the **Police, DDEP and partners should be mindful of the need to preserve the 'honest broker' role of the Business Crime Prevention Advisors to date, and corresponding referral mechanisms**. Put simply, Business Crime Prevention Advisors must continue to be able to provide bespoke advice and solutions to businesses.
- 5.11 **Partner referrals** are essential in ensuring this continues to work well – if the Police are the leaders in terms of business crime reduction, then other organisations need to ensure that they refer to Business Crime Prevention Advisors in the first instance. From this referral, the Business Crime Prevention Advisor can provide advice to the best approach, and play in delivery partners as appropriate.

The business crime reduction referrals approach needs to be **better promoted by both the public and private sector organisations that engage with business, and especially small businesses**. In particular there would be benefit in communicating directly with East Midlands Business/Business Link to reaffirm the expertise that they can refer to in the sub region.

- 5.12 Referrals are also important from a Police perspective, with a number of consultees suggesting that there is scope for the profile of both business crime and the work of Business Crime Prevention Advisors to be raised internally in the force, especially in terms of frontline officers.

It is essential that **officers engaging with businesses in communities in Derby and Derbyshire are fully aware** as to both business crime

issues and the support and advice that are available through Business Crime Prevention Advisors.

- 5.13 Both Business Crime Prevention Advisor and DNCC need to consider increased penetration levels, but there is increasing segmentation in terms of location and business type.

Business Crime Prevention Advisor's need to increase both **support and coverage for rural businesses**, and DNCC needs to look at **improved geographic penetration** across the sub region, building on its coverage in North East Derbyshire.

- 5.14 **With specific reference to Option 3**, DDEP could consider the potential to look at trialling one rural cooperative watch on an experimental basis in the short term, with the Business Crime Prevention Advisor team and specialist providers working with the Rural Action Zone team to discuss demand and identify a potential shortlist of candidate areas.

Provider delivery of any trial approach should, if pragmatically possible, be **commissioned through a competitive process**. This will open up the potential for more experimental approaches to be considered, as well as involving organisations who have been closely involved with delivery to date.

In taking forward this option (or indeed others), it is important for partners to **demonstrate additionality** that will be derived from further DDEP investment into business crime reduction .

- 5.15 Given the upcoming changes in sub regional partnership funding arrangements from 1<sup>st</sup> April onwards, it will be important for partners to investigate funding options in the short to medium term. In addition to sub regional funding, options for further investigation could include the Home Office, new LEADER programme and ERDF Objective 2 Competiveness Programme (PA1 and PA2).

## ANNEX 1: CONSULTEES

Name	Organisation
John Cunningham	Alliance SSP
Craig Edson	Alliance SSP
Allison Rose	Amber Valley DC
Ian Brailsford	Business Crime Prevention Advisor Derbyshire Constabulary
Richard Burgess	Business Crime Prevention Advisor Derbyshire Constabulary
John Davenport	Business Crime Prevention Advisor Derbyshire Constabulary
Ian Hinds	Business Crime Prevention Advisor Derbyshire Constabulary
Brian Murray-Carr	Bolsover DC
Giles Dann	DDEP
Sonja Smith	DDEP
Suman Gupta	Derby City Council
Ian Ferguson	Derby Chamber of Trade
Howard Frost	Derby Community Safety Partnership
Mike Brittain	Derbyshire County Council
Malcolm Mayfield	Derbyshire Dales DC
Tim Frohwein	Derbyshire Constabulary
Jenny Hyams	Derbyshire Constabulary
Sgt Garry Staples	Derbyshire Constabulary
Scott Knowles	DNCC
Gordon Booth	DNCC
David Parkin	East Midlands Business
Philip Poulter	Erewash Partnership
Jan Stanley	Federation of Small Businesses
Tina Boddington	Groundwork Derby & Derbyshire
Phil Clark	Lincolnshire Police (formerly seconded to emda)
David Boddy	National Farmers Union
Andy Wright	Safer South Derbyshire
Chris Smith	South Derbyshire DC

## ANNEX 2: INDICATIVE RURAL CRIME DATA

Table A2.1: "Rural" Crimes by Location												
Area	Farm Equipment (incl.Tractors)		Plant Theft		Land Rover Theft		Fuel Theft		Metal Theft		Livestock Crime	
	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008
Chesterfield & North East Derbyshire	16	32	200	170	9	27	273	274	467	831	53	66
High Peak & Derbyshire Dales	22	32	90	99	19	37	83	112	117	220	34	34
Amber Valley & Erewash	15	18	179	181	1	13	255	258	445	710	52	61
Derby & South Derbyshire	18	20	188	237	13	7	465	677	681	841	52	44
Totals	71	102	657	687	42	84	1076	1321	1710	2602	191	205
Source: Derbyshire Constabulary												
Notes:												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data for each year period runs September to August (Sept 06-Aug 07 and Sept 07 - Aug 08)</li> </ul>												

### ANNEX 3: DEFINITION OF CUSTOM OFFENCE GROUPS

Note: crimes were grouped into specific categories to match the crime groups being used in the survey by DC Research, all other crimes were grouped into the 'other' category

Custom Offence Groups	Offence
Arson	ARSON (ENDANGERING LIFE) (ARSON)
	ARSON NOT ENDANGERING LIFE (ARSON)
Damage (exc. arson)	ENDANGERING LIFE DAMAGE TO DWELLING (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A DWELLING)
	ENDANGERING LIFE DAMAGE NOT DWELL (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	ENDANGERING LIFE DAMAGE TO VEHICLE (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A VEHICLE)
	ENDANGERING LIFE DAMAGE OTHER (OTHER CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	DAMAGE DWELLING (NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS) (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE NOT DWELL (not rac/rel) (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE TO VEHICLE(NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS) (CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A VEHICLE)
	DAMAGE OTHER (NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS) (OTHER CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	DAMAGE DWELLING - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE NOT DWELL - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE NOT DWELL - RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE NOT DWELL - RACIALLY/RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED OR N/K WHICH (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	DAMAGE VEHICLE - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A VEHICLE)
	DAMAGE OTHER - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED OTHER CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	DAMAGE OTHER - RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED OTHER CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	DAMAGE OTHER - RACIALLY/RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED OR N/K WHICH (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED OTHER CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	THREAT TO COMMIT DAMAGE (THREAT OR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL DAMAGE)
	CRIMINAL DAMAGE OVER £20 (PRE010498)
Non-Dwelling Burglary (inc attempts)	ATTEMPTED BURGLARY NON DWELLING (BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
	BURGLARY NON DWELLING (BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN

Custom Offence Groups	Offence
	A DWELLING)
	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY - NON DWELLING (AGGRAVATED BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING)
Other	ATTEMPTED BURGLARY DWELLING (BURGLARY IN A DWELLING)
	DISTRACTION BURGLARY DWELLING (BURGLARY IN A DWELLING)
	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING
	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY IN A DWELLING
	GOING EQUIPPED TO STEAL ETC
	ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY (ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY)
	BLACKMAIL
	CONCEALING CRIMINAL PROPERTY S327 (PROCEEDS OF CRIME)
	CONTROL/USE/ACQUISITION CRIMINAL PROPERTY FOR OTH S328 (PROCEEDS OF CRIME)
	ACQUISITION/USE & POSSESSION CRIMINAL PROPERTY S329 (PROCEEDS OF CRIME)
	NOMINATED OFFICER CONSENT TO PROHIBITED ACT S336 (PROCEEDS OF CRIME)
	THEFT FROM PERSON (THEFT FROM THE PERSON)
	THEFT IN A DWELLING (THEFT IN A DWELLING OTHER THAN FROM AN AUTOMATIC MACHINE OR METER)
	THEFT OF MAIL (THEFT OR UNLAWFUL TAKING OF MAIL)
	ABSTRACTING ELECTRICITY
	THEFT OF PEDAL CYCLE (THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF A PEDAL CYCLE)
	THEFT FROM AUTOMATIC MACHINE OR METER
	OTHER THEFTS
	THEFT OF OTHER CONVEYANCE (OTHER THEFT)
	FRAUDULENT TRADING/COMPANY DIRECTOR (FRAUDS BY COMPANY DIRECTORS ETC)
	FALSE ACCOUNTING
	FAIL TO KEEP PROPER ACCOUNTING RECORDS (FALSE ACCOUNTING)
	MONEY ORDER FRAUD - P.O.SERVANT (OTHER FRAUDS)
	RAILWAY FRAUDS (OTHER FRAUDS)
	EVASION OF LIABILITY BY DECEPTION (PRE 150107) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	MAKING OFF WITHOUT PAYMENT (OTHER FRAUDS)
	DISHONESTLY RETAIN WRONGFUL CREDIT (OTHER FRAUDS)
	UNAUTHORISED ACCESS TO COMPUTER MATERIAL (OTHER FRAUDS)
	UNAUTHORISED MODIFICATION OF COMPUTER MATERIAL (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OTHER FRAUDS
	OBTAIN PROPERTY BY CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD(PRE 150107) (CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)
	OBTAIN PECUNIARY ADVANTAGE BY CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD (PRE150107) (CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)
	CONSPIRE COMMIT CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD (CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)
	OBTAIN SERVICES BY CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD (PRE150107) (CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)

Custom Offence Groups	Offence
	MONEY TRANSFER BY CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD (PRE150107) (CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)
	OBTAIN PROPERTY BY DECEPTION NOT CHEQUE/CREDIT CARD (PRE 150107) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	PECUNIARY ADVANTAGE BY DECEPTION NOT CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD (PRE 150107) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OBTAIN SERVICES BY DECEPTION (NOT RAIL CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD) (PRE 150107) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OBTAIN MONEY TRANSFER BY DECEPTION((NOT CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD) (PRE 150107) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD - COMMON LAW
	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION CHEQUE, PLASTIC CARD & ONLINE BANK ACCOUNTS (NOT EBAY OR PAYPAL)
	CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD APART FROM CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD - COMMON LAW
	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION OTHER FRAUD (NOT CHEQUE PLASTIC CARD)
	FRAUD BY FAILING TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION
	FRAUD BY ABUSE OF POSITION
	OBTAINING SERVICES DISHONESTLY
	MAKING OR SUPPLYING ARTICLES FOR USE IN FRAUDS
	POSSESSION/CONTROL ARTICLES FOR USE IN FRAUDS
	HANDLING STOLEN GOODS
	FORGE FALSE INST.-PRESCRIPTION (FORGERY ETC OF DRUG PRESCRIPTION)
	USE FALSE INST. - PRESCRIPTION (FORGERY ETC OF DRUG PRESCRIPTION)
	FORGE/COPY FALSE INSTRUMENT (OTHER FORGERY)
	USE FALSE INSTRUMENT (OTHER FORGERY)
	PASS COUNTERFEIT COIN/NOTE (OTHER FORGERY)
	WITH INTENT MAKE/POSSESS/HAVE UNDER YOUR CONTROL APPARATUS/ARTICLE/MATERIAL DESIGNED/ADAPTED FOR MAKING FALSE ID CARDS. IDENTITY CARDS ACT 2006 S.25(3),(4),(6) (OTHER FORGERY)
	AFFRAY (OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE & PUBLIC ORDER)
	BOMB HOAX-PLACE/DESPATCH ARTICLES (OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE & PUBLIC ORDER)
	BOMB HOAX-COMMUNICATE INFORMATION (OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE & PUBLIC ORDER)
	PUBLIC ORDER SEC 4 - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT)
	PUBLIC NUISANCE (OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE & PUBLIC ORDER)
	TRESPASS WITH FIREARM GRP II (OTHER FIREARMS OFFENCES)
	POSSESSION OF CLASS C - CANNABIS (POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (CANNABIS))
	DISHONESTLY OBTAIN ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICES (OTHER INDICTABLE OR TRIABLE EITHER WAY (TEW) OFFENCES)
	OTHER OFFENCES (OTHER INDICTABLE OR TRIABLE EITHER WAY (TEW) OFFENCES)

Custom Offence Groups	Offence
	UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF CONVEYANCE NOT MOTOR VEHICLE OR PEDAL CYCLE (OTHER THEFT)
	UNAUTHORISED ACCESS TO COMPUTER MATERIAL
	FALSE STATEMENT OBTAIN/PRODUCE REVOKED LICENCE (DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS ETC)
	ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1988 S.174(5) (DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS ETC)
	FRAUD/FORGE REGISTRATION/LICENCE DOCS (FRAUD, FORGERY ETC ASSOCIATED WITH VEHICLE OR DRIVER RECORDS)
	ROBBERY (PRE010498) (ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY)
	OBTAIN PROPERTY BY DECEPTION(PRE010498) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OBTAIN PEC.ADV.BY DECEPTION(PRE010498) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OBTAIN SERVICES BY DECEPTION (PRE010498) (OTHER FRAUDS)
	OBTAIN MON.TRAN BY DECEPTION (PRE010498) (OTHER FRAUDS)
Robbery - business	ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY (ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY)
	ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO ROB BUSINESS PROPERTY (ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY)
Shoplifting	THEFT FROM SHOP (SHOPLIFTING) (THEFT FROM A SHOP)
Theft by Employee	THEFT BY EMPLOYEE (THEFT BY AN EMPLOYEE)
Theft of and from Vehicle (inc interference)	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING/INJURY/DAMAGE (AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING)
	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE (THEFT FROM A VEHICLE)
	THEFT FROM OTHER VEHICLE (THEFT FROM A VEHICLE)
	THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE (THEFT OF A MOTOR VEHICLE)
	VEHICLE INTERFERENCE (VEHICLE INTERFERENCE & TAMPERING)
	TAKING WITHOUT OWNERS CONSENT (UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF A MOTOR VEHICLE)
	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING CRIM.DAM. £5000 OR UNDER (AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING)
	TAMPERING WITH MOTOR VEHICLE (VEHICLE INTERFERENCE & TAMPERING)
Violence against the Person	MAKING THREATS TO KILL (THREAT OR CONSPIRACY TO MURDER)
	ABH S47 MINOR INJURY (NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS) (OTHER WOUNDING)
	POSSESS OFFENSIVE WEAPON S2(1) (POSSESSION OF WEAPONS)
	HARASSMENT 1997 S4 -NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS (HARASSMENT)
	BREACH OF RESTRAINING ORDER (HARASSMENT)
	BREACH OF ANTI - SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER (OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST THE STATE & PUBLIC ORDER)
	PUBLIC ORDER S4A - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT)
	COMMON ASSAULT NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS (COMMON ASSAULT)
	PUBLIC ORDER S4A - NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS (HARASSMENT)
	PUBLIC ORDER S4 - NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS (HARASSMENT)
	PUBLIC ORDER S5 - NOT RACIAL RELIGIOUS (HARASSMENT)
	PUBLIC ORDER S5 - RACIALLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT)

---

<b>Custom Offence Groups</b>	<b>Offence</b>
	PUBLIC ORDER S5 - RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT)
	PUBLIC ORDER S5 - RACIAL & RELIGIOUS OR N/K WHICH (RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT)
	HARASSMENT 1997 S2 NOT RACIAL/RELIGIOUS (HARASSMENT)