

NORTHERN IRELAND POLICING BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE HELD

11th June 2026 at 9:30am

PRESENT:

Mr Gerry Kelly, Chair
Mr Les Allamby, Vice Chair
Mr Trevor Clarke
(4) Ms Cheryl Brownlee
(3) Ms Nuala McAllister
Ms Deirdre Hargey
Mr Thomas O'Reilly
(3) Mr Colin McGrath

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mr Brendan Mullan

POLICE SERVICE OF NORTHERN IRELAND IN ATTENDANCE

(1) Chief Superintendent Gary McDonald
(1) Superintendent Kerry Brennan
(1) Chief Inspector Louise Cummings

CJINI IN ATTENDANCE

(2) CJINI Inspector Rachel Lindsay
(2) CJINI Inspector Joanna Milliken

OFFICIALS IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr Adrian McNamee, Director of Performance
Mr Aonghus Kelly, Human Rights Advisor,
7 Officials

*Attended via video conferencing

(1) Attended for Item 6.1

(3) Attended up to Item 6.1

(2) Attended for Item 6.2

(4) Attended up to Item 6.3

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Patrick Nelson, Frank McManus and Peter Osborne.

The Committee agreed the agenda for the meeting.

The Chair asked Members to advise of any items they wished to raise at Item 9 under “Any Other Business”. None were advised.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interests were declared.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee considered the draft minutes of the Performance Committee meeting held on 14th May 2026. A Member suggested several minor amendments which were agreed by the Committee.

It was **NOTED**

That Minutes of the Performance Committee meeting on the 14th May 2026 were agreed.

4. UPDATE ON ACTION LOG

The Director of Performance provided an update on the open actions listed on the Action Log.

The Director provided an update on AP1 from the meeting held on 12 February 2026 – Officials to write to the PSNI to request a copy of their

internal guidelines in respect of use of Covert Human Intelligence Sources (CHIS). A response from ACC Beck was provided at the Committee meeting in May. The Human Rights Advisor provided an update following his meeting with PSNI to view the draft guidelines and dip sample cases. The Human Rights Advisor confirmed that he was able to examine a case and the guidelines were being followed. Members expressed concerns with the guidelines being followed by PSNI and still wish to see these. They also emphasised the importance of the Human Rights Advisor continuing to dip sample cases.

The Director provided an update on AP2 from the meeting held on 16 April 2026 – Officials to provide Members with the updated Spit and Bit Guard and Strip Search 2025/26 figures when they become available. The Official Statistics were provided to Members. Members raised a number of queries on the reports provided.

It was: -

AGREED

In relation to the Official Statistics on Use of Force that Officials would ask PSNI to outline any steps taken by officers prior to the application of a Spit and Bite Guard where mental health is a factor? **(AP1)**

In relation to the Official Statistics on the Use of Stop and Search Powers that Officials would request that PSNI provide an explanation of why the stop and search figure for Irish Travellers is so high. **(AP2)**

The Director provided an update on AP6 from the meeting held on 16 April 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to provide an initial impression on oversight

and accountability gaps for Members. The Human Rights Advisor is continuing to work on this report and will bring it to a future Committee meeting.

The Director provided an update on AP1 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to clarify with ACC McNally how automation software is used by the PSNI. The Human Rights Advisor is awaiting clarification from PSNI.

The Director provided an update on AP2 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Officials to clarify with ACC Beck the prioritisation Matrix (eCop) weighting statistical information. Officials wrote to PSNI on 15 May 2026 and are awaiting reply.

The Director provided an update on AP3 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Human Rights Advisor to clarify with PSNI if a specific custody suite is used for those children detained. The Director informed Members that PSNI have responded to confirm that at present they do not have any suites or cells designed specifically for children. However, they have long-term plans for an improved custody suite which would include facilities for women and children. This action is now closed.

The Director provided an update on AP4 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Officials to ask PSNI for figures on the number of drug related deaths per year. The NISRA statistics published in May 2026 were received from PSNI along with a press release. These were included at Item 4.1. Members were content with this response and this action is now closed.

The Director provided an update on AP5 from the meeting held on 14 May 2026 – Officials to distribute the Imperial College London Wastewater Analysis Research conducted on behalf of NI Water. Officials distributed the

wastewater analysis review by email on 15 May 2026. This item is now closed.

It was: -

NOTED

Members were content with the responses received.

5.0 CHAIRPERSON'S BUSINESS

The Chair confirmed that there were no other items of business.

6. ITEMS FOR COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1 Policing Plan Indicator 1.6 – Crime Outcomes

Board Officials presented a paper providing Members with an analysis of PSNI's Performance to date in relation to Indicator 1.6 – Delivery for Effective Outcomes for Recorded Crimes with progress measured through the impacts identified within the Policing Plan 2025 to 2030.

The Chairperson welcomed the PSNI to the meeting. He invited them to brief Members on the work relating to Policing Plan Indicator 1.6.

The PSNI presented information through an OBA Report Card and provided a statistical commentary of their performance against Indicator 1.6 and discussed with Members the work carried out in key areas including:

- Baselines and qualitative data;
- Challenges to investigation timeliness;
- Improvements to reduce investigation time; and

- New initiatives to improve attrition rates.

The PSNI provided the following information: -

- The PSNI advised Members of their self-assessment score of “adequate progress” stating that they continue to deliver effective outcomes for recorded crimes and that PSNI performance compares favourably to forces in England and Wales;
- The PSNI informed Members that in the year to 5th May 2026 there has been 89,870 outcomes. This is a slight reduction in outcomes of 1.8% from the same period in the previous year. They attributed this to investigations taking longer to complete;
- The PSNI informed Members there has been 16,382 offences assigned a charge or summons outcome giving a rate of 17.9%;
- The PSNI reported their median investigative timeframe has increased to 23 days, an increase of 8 days;
- The PSNI identified lack of resources and a large quantity of cyber-related material as two main factors for more lengthy investigations;
- PSNI highlighted that overall file timeliness has shown continued improvement at 82.5% an increase of 2.1%;
- In relation to delays caused by cyber issues, the PSNI informed Members of their ongoing plans for Cyber transformation. These include allocation of new resources, the continued prioritisation of serious cases and those involving children and the trial of “kiosks” to allow officers to triage cyber materials quicker and reduce “bottlenecks” in the Cyber department;
- The PSNI informed Members that crimes where the victim does not support the Police pursuing a criminal justice outcome has slightly risen by 0.3%;
- The PSNI informed Members action is underway to improve victim experience including training with Women’s Aid;
- The PSNI informed Members of meetings with Judge Keown who wants to set up a new Domestic Violence Contest Court in Laganside Courts with

the aim of speeding up prosecutions and reducing witness attrition in domestic violence cases;

- The PSNI reported improvement in relation to Stalking Protection Orders, with 491 charges so far;
- In relation to sexual offences, the PSNI informed Members of a joint strategy between the Public Prosecution Service and PSNI which was launched on 1 April 2026. The stated goals of the strategy are that no victim will withdraw their support for their case as a result of their experience with the criminal justice system and to reduce time taken to progress cases through investigation and prosecution by a third; and
- The PSNI reported that the Hate Crime Advocacy Service have recorded an increase in referrals relating to hate crime from 252 to 389.

Members engaged in discussion with PSNI and sought clarity on a number of issues including: -

- A Member asked for further information on what is being launched in September in Laganside;
- A Member noted the issues raised around investigative delays and queried what the impacts on victim engagement were and if there were other areas of focus to improve confidence;
- A Member noted that 22.5% of sexual offences cases fail to proceed and queried if this highlighted issues in victim support measures;
- A Member referred to a recent visit to Police Protection Branch (PPB) and had been informed that 80% of cases were being triaged out to local teams. They noted this was causing delays in processing cases while they waited for local teams (i.e. Cyber) to triage their cases. The Member asked if it was possible for some Cyber work to be done internally within PPB to reduce delays in processing cases;
- A Member noted the median investigation times including sexual offences and referenced the joint strategy between PPS and PSNI. They asked for

clarification on how improvement will be measured in practice and how long until the outcome of the strategy will become clear;

- A Member asked for clarification on when they will get sight of the updated Race and Hate Crime Guidance; and
- A Member asked for clarification on how many victims left the criminal justice process due to delays and the reasons for these delays. They asked if the delays had impacted on success of prosecutions. The Member also asked if PSNI had access to data on the stage at which each victim left the process and why.

The PSNI provided the following responses:

- A new Domestic Abuse Fast Track Pilot Court is being launched with Judge Keown at Laganside Courts. The aim is to make a huge difference to speeding up prosecutions and tackling witness attrition in order to combat violence against women and girls;
- In relation to victim engagement PSNI admitted there is lots of work to be done and they were taking a two-prong approach to making improvements by reducing delays and supporting the victim's journey. PSNI stated they wanted to establish a better end-to-end process including changing the stage at which a Victim Needs Assessment (VNA) is carried out as the standard practice of carrying this out at the earliest opportunity may be counterproductive and looking at alternative ways of delivering support, such as engaging with victim at home. PSNI also highlighted a victim's portal being piloted, which would allow victims to receive updates on their case. However, PSNI stated they were seeing low uptake levels at the moment, but they saw room for growth;
- In relation to sexual offences cases failing to proceed, PSNI stated that this was partly due to several factors. They noted that much of the evidential material comes from third party sources including injury and emergency department reports. PSNI also explained that the vulnerability of the victims could also present delays, for example in arranging

interviews, which can affect the ability of PSNI to quickly progress these cases;

- In relation to allocating a designated Cyber resource within PPB, the PSNI recognised that Cyber materials are a growing area of business. They stated they had no plans at the present time to redistribute Cyber resource to within PPB although PPB was working with Cyber internally on the issue. PSNI highlighted the proposed kiosk system as a measure to shift demand away from the central Cyber team and increase efficiency. They acknowledged that there were still issues with the project and would need “assurance of standard of the kiosks”. PSNI also said they were awaiting funding and were unsure of the timeline for this, they suggested one to two years;
- In relation to medium times and measuring progress of the joint strategy between PPS and PSNI, the PSNI informed Members the strategy was ambitious and had two main goals:
 - To ensure no victim will withdraw their support for their case because of their experience with the criminal justice system; and
 - Reduce time taken to progress cases through investigation and prosecution by a third to 149 days.

PSNI also informed Members that there was a robust governance strategy in place with four pillars of outcomes/measures embedded alongside the DoJ Victims Charter supporting a trauma informed approach;

- In relation to the updated Race and Hate Crime guidance, PSNI said they would provide Members a copy when available;
- In relation to data on the stage at which victims withdraw, the PSNI informed Members that they don’t routinely gather data on this specifically however, the Department of Justice (DoJ) does collect data on timeliness through the five criminal justice stages; and
- In relation to the reasons for delays, the PSNI stated that often it is due to the victim not engaging, particularly at the beginning of the process. The

PSNI informed Members that a large number of reports are from a third party and/or outside the forensic window which can make evidence gathering more challenging and therefore impact on success of prosecution. The PSNI added in cases where the victim doesn't wish to proceed with the process, often the reason is fear of perpetrator and/or familial pressure to withdraw.

The Chairperson thanked the PSNI for their attendance and briefing and they left the meeting.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials to request further detail on whether cyber work could be done internally within PPB with extra training to reduce the backlog to the cyber centre **(AP3)**

Officials to request Updated race/Hate crime guidance **(AP4)**

Officials to request further detail on governance processes and how success will be measured under the joint strategy between PPS and PSNI. **(AP5)**

6.2 Item 6.2 CJINI Inspection Contact Handling and Management

The Director of Performance presented a paper to Members to update them on the agreed Terms of Reference in relation to the forthcoming CJINI inspection into PSNI Contact Handling and Management.

The Chairperson welcomed CJINI to the meeting. He invited them to brief Members on their Inspection of PSNI's Contact Handling and Management.

CJINI provided the following information: -

- CJINI advised Members they wished to consult with them on several questions as part of their inspection;
- CJINI informed Members that they will be looking at when public and other partner agencies respond and the way officers are being dispatched including urgency, scheduled and immediate need;
- CJINI advised that they will be listening to incoming 999 and 101 calls;
- CJINI informed Members that they will be meeting with other blue light services and PCSPs; and
- They advised that fieldwork within PSNI will be undertaken in the autumn with a report to follow and publication likely to be in spring 2027.

The inspectors identified a series of questions and invited members to share their views. The questions that they have identified are:

How well does the PSNI meet the needs of the public who make contact using a range of communication methods?

How well does the PSNI understand risk and vulnerability at the first point of contact and makes sure it gives appropriate advice and guidance to the public?

Does the PSNI provide an appropriate response to calls for service and manage and prioritise ongoing risk to keep the public safe?

Members engaged in a discussion regarding the questions identified by CJINI inspectors -

On the question of how well PSNI answer calls to 999 and 101:

- A Member stated that public perception is that 101 does not seem to work. They said despite messaging to encourage calls to 101, calls are not answered in time and Members of the public will resort to calling 999 instead or not ring the police at all;
- In relation to the Virtual Officer service, a Member asked for clarification on how PSNI measure who is using the service and how well it works;
- A Member expressed concern that people who cannot use the Virtual Officer service are catered for;
- A Member stated that to their knowledge, the Virtual Officer service required high levels of supervision, needing quality assurance checks on all queries. They questioned if this was the best use of resources;
- A Member sought clarification on where the PSNI performance ranks against other police forces;
- A Member asked for clarification on where the PSNI are drawing support for technological developments from and sought assurance that they had the ability to move at pace with changing technological landscape;
- In relation to online reporting, a Member stated that this system could be difficult for older people, disabled or those of minority ethnic background to use; and
- A Member queried whether there was an ability to cater for those with language barriers.

On the question of how well the PSNI understands the vulnerabilities and risks when responding to victims of crime and other issues:

- A Member stated that at present the PSNI were often being called out to scenarios where public health was more appropriate which was absorbing police resource and preventing attendance where they are needed. They suggested the Right Care Right Person strategy is not working as intended;

- A Member cited lack of availability of public health workers such as social workers, resulting in police being used for issues outside of their scope and training;
- A Member stated that as the first point of contact, training for the police was essential. However, they queried what training would be most appropriate and how this could best be utilised;
- A Member drew a distinction between neighbourhood policing teams and response teams. They queried whether certain calls going straight to neighbourhood teams would be more appropriate due to familiarity with area and people.

On whether 999 calls were being responded to quickly enough:

- A Member stated that some data suggests 999 aren't being responded to quickly enough. They highlighted that the PSNI is behind some other parts of the UK in terms of 999 response times;
- A Member suggested that several different IT systems being used for different information was preventing up-to-date information reaching officers quickly enough;
- A Member highlighted the need for consistency across policing districts;
- A Member highlighted an issue with some ongoing issues and individuals taking up large amounts of response resource. They queried if a process can be put in place to move ongoing issues away from response officers and into other channels of support;
- A Member raised the issue of information on drug dealing activity not being acted on. The Member queried whether the system was too siloed and information was being lost/deprioritised. The Member also stated that the public were not being informed on when action was taken against drug dealing information received;
- The Human Right Advisor highlighted that a large proportion of 999 calls that police attend will involve mental health issues, drugs or a combination of both. They queried whether officers attending these incidents were

receiving enough information to prepare adequately and provide the best service. They sought clarification if there are plans to roll this information out further;

- A Member queried whether the hardware officers are supplied with is fit for purpose. They stated that the devices currently in use were too small to quickly access detailed information and that although some officers have been provided with laptops, these were not being used due to being inefficient. The Member suggested a large-fixed screen in vehicles would be more effective in allowing officers access to the information they need; and
- A Member queried whether data patterns from previous 999 calls was being used to support “predictive policing”. They suggested the PSNI could be using the information gathered on likely patterns of activity more effectively to allocate resources to hotspots and reduce response times.

On the question of how PSNI schedule response to non-urgent calls and how much use PSNI are making of opportunity to schedule

- A Member suggested the issue hadn't been explored enough yet to comment on.

CJINI provided the following responses: -

- In relation to police attending calls appropriate to them, CJINI confirmed they will examine this in their upcoming field work;
- In relation to Right Care Right Person initiative, CJINI confirmed they were being supported by HMICFRS and they would assist in assessing PSNI performance against forces in England and Wales;
- In relation to information on action against drug-related crimes, CJINI stated they would examine whether the public were being kept updated on action take in this area;
- In relation to officers being provided with accurate and in-depth information about the calls they are attending, CJINI informed Members that they

- would be examining how effectively the information gathered by call handlers was passed on to response officers. They also stated they would ask local officers for their input when conducting field work; and
- In relation to technology available to officers in the field, CJINI reported that PSNI have been looking into providing response officers with laptops.

The Chairperson thanked CJINI for their attendance and briefing and they left the meeting.

6.3 Human Rights Advisor Update

The Human Rights Advisor (HRA) provided Members with an overview of areas within his current work programme during the period May/June 2026 including; McCullough Review, Research and consideration of oversight and accountability gaps and how the Board can obtain assurance on PSNI's use of Covert Human Intelligence Sources and Preparatory work on the Human Rights Annual Report 2025/26. The HRA informed Members of meetings held with various stakeholders.

The Human Rights Advisor also outlined his work plan for June-August 2026 including attending the Board and Performance Committee meetings and arranging to meet with various PSNI officers and stakeholders. The HRA provided an update on his visit to London in May to meet with Angus McCullough KC, John Wadham, the National Crime Agency, attend at the IPT, view utilisation of LFR technology by the Met Police Force and to meet with academics working on AI and LFR matters.

The HRA highlighted to Members that considering recent anti-immigration protests and resultant criminal damage, he would like to see statistics on criminal damage to property related to race/hate crime.

Members engaged in brief discussion:

- A Member sought further information on property damage motivated by race/hate crime.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

HRA to investigate statistics on destruction of property due to sectarian/hate crime data. **(AP6)**

6.4 PSNI Overdue Priority 1 Recommendations Report

The Director of Performance presented a paper to Members to update them on the outstanding Priority 1 Recommendations relating to PSNI. PSNI provided Members with an update report that sets out the classification of recommendations and provides an update on progress to overdue Priority 1 Recommendations.

Members engaged in brief discussion:

- A Member asked for clarification on Child Internet Protection Teams and PSNI equipment (PPWs).

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

In relation to the PSNI's Report on Overdue Priority 1 Recommendations Appendix A – Members requested clarity from PSNI on two points:

- Recommendation 1 – Child Internet Protection Team – Members noted the update provided and request further

information on what is happening in this area post 30 June 2026 and what are PSNI's future plans for improvements in this area?

- Recommendation 3 – PSNI Equipment (PPWs) – Members request the number of officers and civilian staff that are currently with no appointed line manager? **(AP7)**

6.5 Community Background Monitoring Research – Update

The Director of Performance provided Members with an update on the progress of the Community Background Monitoring Research being conducted by Ulster University. Members were informed that a draft report will be prepared and presented at the Performance Committee meeting in September.

6.6 DoJ Consultations on The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2026

The Director of Performance provided members with a paper regarding the DoJ Misconduct Regulation Amendments along with a draft copy of the Amendments. Members were reminded that Performance Committee Members took part in the DOJ consultation into Police Misconduct in 2024/25. Members were advised that a letter was received from DOJ on 2 June 2026 to consult on the amendments made. Thirteen of the sixteen proposals are to be progressed through amendment to the Police (Conduct) Regulations (NI) 2016 and the revised Code of Ethics have also been added in line with statutory requirements. These revised Codes will replace the Schedule to Regulations 2016.

Members were advised that DOJ has requested a response to this consultation by Friday 4 September 2026. Members are asked to provide any comments by close of business on Friday 31 July to allow sufficient time for all

comments to be considered and approved by the Board at its meeting on Thursday 3 September, enabling a response to be submitted by the Department's deadline.

Members engaged in brief discussion:

- A Member referred to Section 28A, Paragraph 13 of the regulations and asked for clarification on the role of the Ombudsman as an observer in cases involving senior officers.
- A Member referred to Section 28A, Paragraph 13 of the regulations and asked for clarification on the process when the Board and the Ombudsman cannot come to an agreement on cases involving a senior officer.

Following discussion Members: -

AGREED

Officials would compile a draft response to include Members feedback to be considered and approved by the Board at its meeting on Thursday 3rd September to submit a final response due on the 4th September 2026.

7. QUESTIONS FOR THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

7.1 Members wished to ask the following questions to the Chief Constable;

Question 1 - Stop and Searches under TACT

In light of the recent NISRA figures showing an almost four-fold increase in stop and search under TACT Sections 43 and 43A from 2024/25 to 2025/26 and that of 1,580 stops and searches there were only three arrests

(a) could the CC set out the reasons for this increase?

In addition, given that TACT stops and searches are based on having a reasonable suspicion of there being terrorism related activity

(b) why have these searches led to so few outcomes?

Question 2 - Stops generally

The Committee noted that while the number of stops per 1,000 population is close to the average for England and Wales, PSNI has the second worst outcome in terms of stops resulting in arrests across the 44 police forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Is there any reason for such a poor outcome and what can be done to improve the situation?

7.2 RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

Members noted the Chief Constable's responses to the questions enclosed at 7.2. In relation to Stalking Protection Orders response, a Member expressed disappointment at the timeliness of the Chief Constables response.

8. COMMUNICATION ISSUES

There were no communication issues arising from the meeting.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No Items of any other business were raised.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next Performance Committee meeting would take place on the **Thursday 10th September 2026** at **9:30am**.

Meeting closed at 13:10pm.

PERFORMANCE DIRECTORATE

11 June 2026

Chairperson