This note reviews the results of a survey conducted by the Consultative Panel on Parliamentary Security (the Panel) in March 2017, regarding Members’ security away from the Parliamentary Estate.

1. Introduction

The Consultative Panel on Parliamentary Security, chaired by the Chairman of Ways and Means, issued a survey to all Members in early March 2017 to assess the quality of service provided by local police forces with respect to the physical security of MPs and their staff outside the Estate. 97 survey responses were received: 45 in electronic format and 52 paper based. The Panel intends to discuss the findings and consider whether actions can be taken forward to address identified concerns. The Chair will meet separately with individual Members to discuss their feedback in more detail.

2. Security concerns reported to local police forces and/or the Parliamentary Liaison and Investigations Team (PLAIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No response given</th>
<th>Local police force only</th>
<th>PLAIT only</th>
<th>PLAIT and local police force</th>
<th>Not reported any incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 81 Members (84% of respondents) had reported security concerns or incidents to their local police force and/or PLAIT.
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3. Visits undertaken by local police forces to assess the security of Members’ properties, constituency homes, London homes or constituency offices, after Members reported an increased risk

Table 2: responses to the question “Has your local police force visited you, after you have reported an increased risk, to carry out an assessment of the security of any of your properties, constituency home, London home or constituency office?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No response given</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78 Members reported that local police had visited them to carry out a security assessment at one or more of the following locations: constituency home, London home, surgery and constituency office. As some Members had been visited on multiple occasions, 126 visits were reported in total.

Of the 18 Members who reported that they had not been visited by local police to carry out a security assessment, 4 gave a satisfaction score of 5 or less.

4. Members’ satisfaction with the way that police managed concerns/issues

Table 3: responses to the question “Which property did they visit?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No response given</th>
<th>Constituency home</th>
<th>London home</th>
<th>Surgery</th>
<th>Constituency office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 97 responses received, 79 Members (81%) rated their satisfaction on this criteria 6 or more out of 10, where 1 indicated ‘least satisfied’ and 10 ‘extremely satisfied’. 13 respondents rated their satisfaction 5 or less, which the Panel has taken to indicate a low level of satisfaction. 5 Members did not provide a response to this question.

The 13 Members who reported a low level of satisfaction gave a variety of explanations for their responses, along the following themes:

- Lack of/limited action taken by local police in response to specific incident(s)
• Lack of/limited action taken by local police in response to general security concerns being raised
• Lack of clarity about who was responsible for undertaking security assessments
• Failure of local police to follow-up after an incident had occurred
• Slow response to reports of specific incident(s)
• Police intervention in response to specific incident(s) was ineffective

5. Local police forces highlighted as part of this survey

On the whole the picture is a positive one. Of the local forces that were mentioned by two or more respondents:
• Three had an average score of 6 or below (1 being least satisfied and 10 being most satisfied)
• Twelve had an average score or either 8 or 9
• Three had an average score of 10
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