



Police and Crime Commissioner for Dyfed-Powys

OPCC Complaint Reviews Reporting period Update Report April-December 2024 Quarter 3

Number of reviews received

	Complaint cases finalised under Schedule 3	Reviews Received	Reviews received as proportion of complaint cases	No OPCC reviews investigated	No OPCC reviews not investigated	Number IOPC reviews received - investigated	Number IOPC reviews not investigated
DPP	277	58		0	47	4	7
SPLY	348	48		0	38	3	7
MSF	370	59		0	47	5	8

Timeliness

Timeliness is calculated upon receipt of a request for a review. The OPCC Caseworker will check the validity of the review before requesting the case file from PSD. PSD will have 5 working days to provide the OPCC with the case files which are then checked and sent to the Independent reviewer.

Once the independent reviewer return the review, the OPCC Caseworker will consider the findings to reach their determination. Reviews are Quality Assured before being sent to the complainant

The average number of days to complete a review is less than the same period last year.

	Force	SPLY	MSF Avera
OPCC Average working days to complete review	17	21	19
Sancus average working days to complete review	8	/	/
IOPC Average working days to complete review	127	146	159

From the time the OPCC submits a review to Sancus, the average time for the review to be returned is 8 working days.

Reviews found not reasonable and propotionate

During this period the OPCC have upheld 9 reviews which is significantly more than the previous year but just under the MSF average.

	Investigated			Non - investigation		
	Valid completed reviews	Upheld	Upheld %	Valid completed reviews	Upheld	Upheld %
DPP	0	-	N/A	49	9	18.4%
SPLY	0	-	N/A	38	3	8%
MSF	0	-	N/A	52	10	19.2%

Reason for upheld reviews

1. Complaint ref: PCC-23052024-5 - CO/00054/24

- Complainant was not provided with sufficient information to understand the rationale of an outcome.
- Consideration is required to determine, whether a new or additional allegation should be recorded.

PSD response

- Accepted the recommendations and further contacted the complainant to determine whether there was an additional or new complaint.

2. Complaint ref: PCC-09052024-5 - CO/433/23

- To consider whether there are processes in place to ensure that there is appropriate handover of investigations/cases for when officers retire or leave the organisation.
- The outcome of the complaint/review to be shared with relevant officers/supervisor of this case for an opportunity to reflect on importance of providing updates to victims/members of public.
- To consider the allegation of the drain damage and if it should be recorded as a new complaint.

PSD response

- PSD did not accept the recommendations made but provided a detailed rationale as to why.
- Force systems of an investigation (e.g. Niche occurrence) then this will naturally be picked up when an officer retires.
- In this instance the matter subject to the complaint allegation occurred between 2020 and 2021 and so a considerable period has passed since. Any learning arising from this is unlikely to still be relevant or applicable and there is nothing to suggest that this is more than a one-off failing. Furthermore, some of the officers involved are no longer in service. Therefore, in line with IOPC guidance I do not consider such learning to be reasonable or proportionate in the circumstances.
- Additional matter complained about occurred after the recording of this complaint case, therefore recommended the complaint to submit a new complaint.

3. Complaint ref: PCC-12072024-3 - CO/00902/23

- The findings for allegation 2 should be re-considered.
- Learning from this case should be shared to ensure that all officers are supported by receiving Trauma Informed training.

PSD Response

- PSD partially accepted the recommendations made. They agreed that the outcome for allegation 2 should have been unable to determine if acceptable or not.
- In respect to the recommendation to share learning, PSD disagreed that there was any learning for this case as it was determined that the officer subject to the complaint had done no wrongdoing.

4. Complaint ref: PCC-18072024-1 - CO/178/27

- Consider providing an apology for incorrect advice provided to the complainant.
- To provide feedback to the officer who provided the incorrect information.

PSD Response

- PSD accepted the recommendations set and agreed to write to the complainant directly.

5. Complaint ref: PCC-16082024-1 - CO/00215/24

- Dyfed Powys Police need to review the period of retention in respect of Clare's Law disclosure applications and decision responses.

PSD Response

- Did not accept the recommendation but provided reassurance that the implementation of NICHE has resolved the concerns. Additionally, NICHE will be subject to retention / deletion in line with the Management of Police Information Guidance. Under such guidance, reports of domestic abuse would be retained for a minimum 10-year clear period.

6. Complaint ref: PCC-19092024-1 - CO/280/24

- The case to be referred to the Economic Crime Team within Dyfed Powys Police for them to review the case from a fraud perspective and the decision to be provided to the complainant.

PSD Response

- PSD accepted the recommendation set.

7. Complaint ref: PCC-23092024-3 - CO/362/24

- To formally record an additional allegation which will provide an opportunity for a further review once the complaint has concluded.

PSD Response

- PSD provided an explanation to the allegation within the recommendation's outcome letter

8. Complaint ref: PCC-11112024-2 - CO/00385/24

- For the Appropriate Authority to establish what advice has been given to the complainant
- To determine whether the information provided was in a clear manner for the complainant to understand why there are no criminal offences

PSD response

- Accepted the recommendation and allocated a PSD investigator to seek assistance from a Roads Policing Officer and a member of the Rural Crime team to establish whether there are

any offences. The findings will be provided to the complainant at the conclusion of a new complaint.

9. Complaint ref: PCC-02122024-1 - CO/00068/24

- Determination of allegation 1 should have been that the service was not acceptable.
- Outcome letter was not clear for the complainant to understand the outcome reached for each allegation made.

PSD response

- Accepted the recommendation that allegation 1 should have been that the service was not acceptable.
- Apology issued to the complainant.

Oversight

The local policing bodies will, during the course of the review process, spot anomalies that do not change the outcome being reasonable and proportionate, but where the service in handling the complaint can be improved. The review process provides local policing bodies with the opportunity to address those anomalies, in individual cases, with the appropriate authorities [IOPC-Focus-19-Reviews \(18\).pdf](#)

There were 20 reviews during this period where it was considered the service in handling the complaint could have been improved.

Themes identified as oversight:

- Timeliness of the handling of the complaint: Outcome of the investigation taking longer to conclude, with one lasting 4 months and others lasting over 6 months.
- Lack of regular updates: No regular updates sent to complainant within a 28 day interval.
- Delay in acknowledging complaints: With one lasting 56 days and another lasting 77 Days before they were acknowledged.
- PSD professionalism: There is mention in one complaint that care could had been given to the language used within one email from PSD to a complainant.
- Delay in postal mail identified: Postal mail only leaves Dafen custody once a week (Wed).

The OPCC also make a record of any best practice identified from conducting a review.

Positive

- Terms of reference (ToR) clearly set out by the complaint handler.
- Meeting held in person with complainant.

General comments