

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETING - 11 OCTOBER 2013

- Key points summarised from local authorities and CSP's peninsular wide in response to the PCC's letter of 2 August 2013 outlining his commissioning intentions.

I. General Observations

I.1	Most respondents welcomed the PCC's approach and the proposal for greater use of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and that they play a major role in overseeing future funding, addressing key issues, learn from best practice and recognise any risks concerning the impact of changes.
I.2	CPS's take on many forms and their capacity to deliver formal commissioning varies, based on their status as unitary or district partnerships. -However, there is concern that the document suggests that CSPs, although a significant partner, are not bodies with whom you feel there is compelling evidence for continued funding.
I.3	More detail was required on - the PCC's priorities to ensure responses can be more targeted to reflect prevention and early intervention. - clarity around performance monitoring expectations - Urge any commissioning approach to encompass a number of financial years so that there is clarity and stability
I.4	- Identification in demographic profiles, urban verses rural / seasonal adjustments to population size in 'tourist hot-spots' and crime per head was welcomed. - expectation of the population and visitors are higher and the impact of low crime is more starkly felt
I.5	Greater direct funding to district CSPs would enhance local accountability and local decision making
I.6	Essential to gain common understanding as to what constitutes 'good commissioning' and 'good performance management'.
I.7	Local authorities would still incur costs if holding local providers and commissioners to account, this should be reflected in final proposals
I.8	There was concern and surprise by some respondents around the statement that CSP's need to be 'subject to tests and judgements of their efficacy and competence'

2. How do these thoughts fit in with your commissioning intentions at a local level?

2.1	The letter is not clear how funding would be channelled and time is running out if CSP's are going to have to make decisions concerning commissioning and employment to take effect from 2013/14. The PCC is urged to take these constraints into account to prevent disruption to front line services.
2.2	Agreement that re-evaluation of allocations is needed following historically based proportions. However:- -Rural areas have their own challenges in relation to crime and across large

	<p>geographic areas.</p> <p>-The 'fear of crime' is greater in rural areas and especially significant when combined with rural isolation.</p> <p>-Rural areas are reliant on small amounts of funding to maintain and support local rural issues.</p> <p>- when geographically remote, funding commissioned services incurs extra costs which has to be built in, but could be prohibitively high per head of population.</p>
2.3	It would be beneficial to have an amount that could be allocated more flexibly/used for emerging priorities for local commissioning work at District CSP level.
2.4	The PCC's representative attends Joint Commissioning Partnerships / CSP Chairs meetings, so the PCC and OPCC will be aware of the wider commissioning landscape which adds benefit.
2.5	Welcome PCC/OPCC support in strengthening working relationships between key partnerships such as Health and Wellbeing Board.
2.6.	Joint commissioning for key services across the peninsula has been considered, but difficult to implement as existing contracts do not align.

3. How do you ensure all your local partnership work is coordinated?

3.1	<p>Respondents reported that Co-ordinated working is undertaken via –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSP Managers and Chairs aligned with Peninsula Strategic Assessment and Police and Crime Plan • Crime and Disorder scrutiny and joint scrutiny between councils • Local health partnerships and working with leads from Clinical Commissioning & Devon Public health to co-ordinate commissioning. • Robust governance and performance management partnership arrangements • Working with the private sector and generating income to make projects sustainable and share good practice. • The CSP and YOT Management Board work closely together • The majority of local delivery is coordinated via Safer Communities partnership team – both have performance monitoring responsibilities. • LAG's (Local Action Groups) work extremely well as part of CSP's • Each of the LAG's and Thematic Groups have action plans which are monitored for effectiveness internally and also via CSP Steering Group.
3.2	Attendance at CSP Chairs groups is valued but incurs travel and accommodation costs therefore attendance is kept to a minimum, however this could lead to isolation.
3.3	CSP's and local authorities are going through changes in ways of working – if commissioning is going to be via CSP's then there is a need to ensure links between CSP's and Joint Commissioning Partnerships are defined.
3.4	Health and Well Being Boards are in their infancy- could PCC influence working arrangements?
3.5	Timing is crucial as each CSP has different arrangements for decision making. More emphasis should be given to 'joint work planning' to drive commissioning decisions

4. How may our journey to a commissioning plan be improved?

4.1	Traditionally Community Safety Services suffer from short term commissioning, causing issues with continuity of service and service users. It is often the case that voluntary and community sector partners put staff 'on notice' – only to have to recruit when funding is approved. It is essential for providers to plan for any meaningful medium term commissioning arrangements.
4.2	-It is not clear from the letter what you intend to commission, why and for how long. -Local partners need to be clear about what the PCC's commissioning reach is, so that local circumstances do not overlap at peninsula level.
4.3	It is suggested, that population and crime levels become 'formal criteria' for allocation, ensuring allocation against need.
4.4	Some CSP's welcome the PCC's commitment to a joining of forces to achieve a clear commissioning strategy and to have the opportunity to learn from lessons of the past "promulgated" across the Peninsula.
4.5	It is welcomed that the PCC's expectations for smaller grants under £25,000 may be proportionately reduced to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy.
4.6	Once the process for 2014/15 has been completed it is suggested that an evaluation is undertaken, with timely steps for recommendations / improvement for the following year.

5. How might we co-operate at a peninsula level?

5.1	Formation of the CSP Chairs group has been a positive step and led to shared priorities and a forum for discussion on wider commissioning opportunities with the Peninsular Strategic Assessment at its heart. There are real benefits of co-operating at a peninsula level for addressing population wide issues and such work should continue.
5.2	Consistencies across the force area where relevant, but recognise there will be on-going local differences to how services are commissioned.
5.3	Continue to assess to meet local need which should not be lost in a general aspiration for shared working and delivery.
5.4	You have indicated that CSP's have a strong role in moving forward and we would support this and our expectation would be that commissioning would be through these partnerships in each locality.
5.5	There is an opportunity locally with the development of a LIST (Local Integrated Services Trust) to formalise partnership working and joint commissioning.