



Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall

Police and Crime Commissioner: Tony Hogg
Chief Executive: Sue Howl

Reply to: Endeavour House
Pynes Hill
Exeter
EX2 5WH

Cllr T Evans
Plymouth City Council
by email: tudor.evans@plymouth.gov.uk

Our ref: CMS_COR_Commissioning-letter-to-partners-2014-15_130730

2 August 2013

Dear Tudor,

Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) – Commissioning Approach to 2014/15

In February 2013, I wrote to Chairs of Community Safety Partnerships, Youth Offending Service managers and the Chief Constable to outline my approach to funding in 2013/14. This outlined that there have been significant changes in the commissioning and funding landscape during 2012/13, notably:

- The creation of 43 Police and Crime Commissioners in England and Wales
- The government's austerity programme
- The announcement of the end of many government funding programmes and the creation of the single Community Safety Fund allocated through Police and Crime Commissioners.

The approach to 'commissioning' of services in 2013/14 was based upon ensuring that all previously funded partners were identified, ensuring that the reductions in funding were equitably passed on and that a period of minimum disruption throughout 2013/14 was maintained in order to minimise risk and ensure that time was available for a fuller analysis of options for distributing resources.

It was considered important to give local partnerships sufficient time to plan for any more substantial change in arrangements and a February 2013 announcement for April implementation of any different process was considered to carry too great a range of risks, both operational and reputational and in terms of maintaining and building relationships with local partners.

Endeavour House Woodwater Park Pynes Hill Exeter EX2 5WH
e-mail opcc@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk Website www.devonandcornwall-pcc.gov.uk

Tel (01392) 225555
Fax (01392) 225567

Member of



Having decided that funding decisions and allocations would follow a historical pattern in 2013/14, it was also considered important to improve the level of accountabilities of partners to the funding body (The PCC) and significantly improve the level of understanding in the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) around partnerships, patterns of spend, the rigour of their commissioning processes and the degree to which their spending patterns were supporting the aims of the PCC's Police and Crime Plan.

As a result, a framework of reporting was developed and issued in March 2013 alongside allocation letters to the wide variety of partnership bodies that were to be in receipt of PCC funding. These provided:

- Detailed spending intentions
- Provider performance reporting arrangements and
- Analysis of match with the Police and Crime Plan

Planning the PCC approach for 2014/15

Following submission of spending plans from partnerships a range of detailed analysis has been undertaken which includes:

- A percentage analysis of allocations
- A percentage comparison of allocations against percentage of Populations
- A percentage comparison of allocations against percentage of Total Recorded Crime
- A percentage analysis of the different amounts of spend across themes by local area
- A percentage breakdown of PCC funding across partnerships (peninsula wide) e.g. what percentage of PCC funding is spent on all YOTs
- The percentage of PCC funding as a proportion of each type of partnership total budget

Since allocation of funds, OPCC shall have begun attending partnerships in receipt of funding, namely YOTs, CSPs, DAATs, DV forums as new members of these partnerships. This has been with the purpose of:

- Contributing to the agenda
- Influencing debate and direction towards Police and Crime Plan aims and PCC priorities
- Influencing service specification where tendering is taking place
- Gathering intelligence on the effectiveness of the partnership meetings and
- Ensuring common issues around police performance are taken to the PCC Performance and Accountability Board

Partnership differences

It is important to consider the different nature of the various partnerships concerned within this process. Their scope, their statutory basis (if any), their purpose including any recognised commissioning mandate, their significance in relation to setting strategic priorities and their alignment to the PCC agenda. This will influence the PCC decisions on investment. For example, the YOT partnerships are statutory (1998 Crime and Disorder Act) and the Act places specific duties on the Police elected Body which may prescribe that the PCC has less discretion on whether or not to provide funding. A full analysis will be undertaken.

Police and Crime Plan Development

Since its launch, further work also continues on the Police and Crime Plan to identify and refine its outcomes, the ways in which these outcomes can/should be measured and what will be the PCC priorities for 2014/15.

Work to ensure the matching of the Police Delivery Plan to the PCC Delivery Plan is also underway. The Peninsula Strategic Assessment (PSA) will inform the Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA) around outcomes that will be commissioned and funded. An internal workshop in August 2013 is planned to take this forward.

Funding landscape 2014/15

The funding landscape and envelope for 2014/15 will only become clear in November when government grant figures are released.

Final funding figures will not be available until later in the year, however, using figures for central grant funding and OPCC funding of £2.9m already included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy, plus an estimate of £0.5m for victim support funding, gives an estimated spending envelope of £3.4m in 2014/15.

In 2013/14 the Community Safety Fund will lose its ring fence and will be incorporated into the total and un-ring fenced Main Grant to PCCs.

The external main police grant funding is likely to reduce by around 3% in 2014/15.

A new ring fenced Victim support fund will come to PCCs in order to enable them to undertake their new role as commissioners of services to support victims. The figure of £0.5m represents a half years funding as this duty applies from October 2014. The amount stated above is an estimate based on very general assumptions around usual percentage figures of national budgets. The individual PC allocations will not be announced until November 2013.

Developing the PCC Commissioning Intentions

A full day's workshop was held by the PCC in July 2103 at which all the above information and analysis was examined with the following initial conclusions:

Partnerships

It was concluded that two of the partnerships that the PCC currently funded had compelling evidence for continued direct PCC funding:

- Youth Offending Partnerships were on the whole partnerships that provide governance and accountability to the Youth Offending Services in each local Authority. They are not primarily commissioning bodies and the duties of the Crime and Disorder Act which establishes them and their purpose supposes a direct overseeing role for all partners.
- Local Children's safeguarding Boards (LCSBs) were established under the Children Act 2004. LCSBs are the key system in every locality of the country for organisations to come together to agree how they will co operate with one another to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The purpose is to hold each other to account. It would be impossible to see the PCC excluding themselves from these partnerships. An identical argument is made for Adult Safeguarding Boards.

The remaining significant partnerships, namely Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), Drug and Alcohol action Teams (DAATs) and Domestic Violence forums remain partnerships that the PCC has a full range of options available to explore.

It is a feature of the funding and spending patterns for 2013/14 that, following the PCC adoption of least disruption, the following consequences have emerged:

- The partnerships funded have been relieved and grateful that the least disruption approach has worked and continuity of work they commission has been high. This has given time for a positive relationship to develop between OPCC and these partnerships.
- PCC funding allocation proportions do not particularly reflect Police and Crime Plan priorities or population and crime.
- PCC funding to partnerships is a mix of direct funding and indirect funding via Community Safety Partnerships. This mix is very varied and inconsistent across Localities e.g. Devon CSP channels less than 10% of its PCC funding to the Devon DV partnership whereas Cornwall CSP channels over 60% of its PCC funding to the Cornwall DV partnership.
- The degree to which the PCC chooses to "route" funding through Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) is a key part of the decision making process for the commissioning strategy. Overall discussions at this point are leaning towards a greater use of the CSPs (subject to tests and judgements of their efficacy and competence) as a means of ensuring that funding at the local level is conducted through a virtual prism of community safety and crime reduction. CSP local plans are predicated on Strategic Needs Assessments which in turn are used at the peninsula level to create the Peninsula Strategic Assessment which predicates the Police and Crime Plan. A shared source of planning and priority setting is therefore held between PCC and CSPs.
- If the PCC opts to undertake a substantial role in holding local providers and commissioners to account through detailed and complex performance

management arrangements, this will incur substantial cost. This was endorsed by the view of the ex-MOPAC (Mayor's Office of Police and Crime) officer at the workshop who observed this had been the case in London in the first years of MOPAC where that burden had been considerable.

- If PCC funding is channelled through partnerships, a recognised benefit would be the majority of that performance monitoring would fall to those bodies which have both the local knowledge and existing and competent support to deliver that with the PCC maintaining an oversight ensuring best value as part of his public accountability. In this way both the PCC and the partnerships can ensure that their reciprocal statutory responsibilities to take account of each other's priorities is maintained. A key challenge will be to describe the relative allocations between existing and new fundees.
- For 2014/15, there was sufficient time to develop a process whereby CSPs could be asked to make recommendations to the OPCC about funded activity against more clearly established PCC outcomes and priorities than was the case for 2013/14, effectively developing a funding and activity programme more related to PCC Plan and priorities.

From this a draft commissioning plan and commissioning intentions can be drawn up.

I would be grateful if you could consider your responses to these initial conclusions and submit them under the following headings.

1. General observations
2. How do these thoughts fit with your commissioning intentions at the local level?
3. How do you all your local partnership work is coordinated?
4. How may our journey to a commissioning plan be improved?
5. How might we cooperate at a peninsula level?

I would be grateful if you could submit your comments by 24th August 2013

Yours sincerely



Tony Hogg
Police and Crime Commissioner for Devon and Cornwall

cc CSP Chairs/managers
Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Boards
DAAT Chairs/managers
YOT managers
DV forum Chairs/officers
Chief Constable
LCJB members