

Working Together for Safer Communities Review – A Framework for Change

EVIDENCE-BASED PROBLEM-SOLVING

1. Establish/maximise and sustain intelligence-led business processes that identify the root causes of community safety issues in order to prevent them from occurring?

IDENTIFIED ISSUE	BARRIERS	ENABLERS	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE	PROPOSALS
Statutory and strategic assessment 'fatigue'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained disinvestment in analytical resources (data rich but analysis poor) • Too many 'statutory assessments' create duplication/overlap • Too much guidance and prescription from government, not joined up, pulling delivery partners in opposing directions • Inconsistent data sets used in different ways by different areas/partnerships • Double-keying and labour intensive data cleansing required, lack of URNs before overlaying and analysis • Not enough analysis, more collations and presentations of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on common minimum 'data sets' e.g. Section 17A • More joined up but less prescriptive government guidance reflecting overlaps and interdependency • More analysts, co-located or co-producing • Strategic managers who are 'analysis aware' to improve commissioning of analytical products • Agreement on common data sets and formats (e.g. Gwent Police issue) • Ease of access to aggregated or anonymised personal data (e.g. portals) • Data processing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamlining and mainstreaming statutory 'assessment' requirements – routine activity rather than stop-start • Improvements to current data gathering and sharing arrangements • Renewed investment in analytical capacity and resources (invest to save rationale) • Intelligence-led business models become 'core business' • Greater role for social scientists and research (what works, what doesn't) • Back to basics – SARA, PAT, RAT, NIM, etc., • Better 'tasking' of analysts through commissioning of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a more holistic model of undertaking strategic population assessments at national, regional and local levels, supported by appropriate cross-governmental guidance on intelligence-led business approaches and strong encouragement to 'pool' appropriate resources • Develop a common 'minimum' data sets for use in strategic population assessments • Stimulate greater investment in multi-agency resources (e.g. analysts, systems, training, research,

	<p>sets – not enough ‘why?’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency of data gathering and recording standards – police have consistent standards for incident recording but others don’t • Inability to access personal data, even aggregated • Lack of coterminous ‘regional footprints’ • Lack of understanding around differences between management performance and intelligence data and respective analysis • Timeliness (or time-lag) of data availability • ‘make-do’ attitude promotes use of inappropriate data (e.g. not right info collected or not right geography/frequency) • What is measurable is made important • Data (particularly consultation) kept in silos and duplication is inevitable • Partnership analytical burden tends to fall to police, then LAs but health analysts too 	<p>agreements covering analysis of personal data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data ‘hub’ or observatory collaborative models with portals • Strategic managers who understand performance management and difference between outputs and outcomes • Common regional footprint across themes (e.g. health, police, fire, social care, education etc.) • Investment in appropriate software & systems • Live time automated or semi-automated data sharing processes/portals • Multi-agency agreements around data standards • Multi agency agreements on data development with government buy-in • Make what’s important measurable • Streamlining data gathering by halting collection of meaningless data 	<p>analytical products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More effective data needs ‘development’ • Greater value placed on data and analysis and role in driving business (e.g. Tesco) • Greater investment in intelligence-led business awareness-raising and training – not just for analysts either 	<p>data development) to support ‘intelligence-led’ business approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a national multi-agency network of analysts & social science researchers to support and promote information sharing, research, data development, effective practice and mainstreaming of intelligence-led business process across organisations and partnerships • Establish national regional and local multi-agency data hubs, portals or observatories for use by analysts & researchers • Work more closely with the private sector in establishing the cost benefits of mainstreaming intelligence-led business methodologies and to explore optimising of intelligence-led business hardware & software for more effective use in the
--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competing demands for analysts – organisational comes first and partnership second 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyst and researcher networks (e.g. GAIN, IRAP) to share both data and practice Strategic leads from partnership organisations agree common priorities for tasking analysts 		Welsh public service sector
Reluctance to share data, particularly personal but also non-personal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of Section 115 ‘gateway’ understanding Over cautious data ‘protection’ managers Risk of cyber threats and hacking WASPI not fully understood or adopted Legal challenges over the ‘purpose’ for which data was originally collected Don’t know what you don’t know – organisations may be sitting on valuable data Organisations ‘lose’ personal data through inept data management but remain paranoid about sharing, despite safeguards being more stringent around shared info Unknown impact and uncertainty of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data processing agreements covering analysis Section 115, other ‘gateway’ & WASPI training Toolkit of 115 & WASPI protocol templates Practitioner ‘toolkit’ of relevant ‘gateways’ (e.g. Cwm Taf MASH) Appropriate protective measures and systems (e.g. encryption) Use of non-human analytical software (data-mining and bridging) Co-location or at least face-to-face MARAC style meetings (also helps overcome jigsaw puzzle effect) Building relationships = trust Concept of ‘WASPI approved analysts’ recognised by all partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to data sharing protocols and data sharing/management training and systems Shift in cultures toward ‘Dare to Share’ and understanding the risks (to individuals, communities and organisational reputations) in failing to share Senior management empowerment of front line operators to share appropriately More focus on data management and transfer systems with built-in protection Repository of data sources so all partners can see what potential data may be available under sharing or processing agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilise the recommended national network (see section above) to review the effectiveness of current WASPI arrangements and to build on effective practice (e.g. GAIN) Develop appropriate cross-governmental guidance for Wales clarifying legal ‘gateways’ and mechanisms for personal information sharing (based on the recommended review) Establish the concept of ‘WASPI approved’ or ‘WASPI compliant’ individuals/groups to undertake analysis of personal data under data processing agreements

	<p>General Data Protection Regulation 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jigsaw puzzle effect with incomplete picture due to missing data 			
Inability to effectively benchmark or assess progress toward improving outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer a 'common CS data set' (e.g. Section 17A) • Inconsistent or incomplete guidance from government (e.g. PSB well-being assessments) • Too much focus on symptoms (e.g. crime) and not enough on causal factors (e.g. ACEs) • Inconsistent data sets used in different ways by different areas/partnerships • Inconsistency of data gathering and recording standards – police have consistent standards for incident recording but others don't • Lack of coterminous 'regional footprints' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on common minimum 'data sets' (e.g. Section 17A) • More joined up government guidance reflecting overlaps and data stream interdependencies • Multi-agency agreements around data standards • Multi agency agreements on data development with government buy-in • Greater application of 'social science' to understand causal factors and 'what works' • Common regional footprint across themes (e.g. health, police, fire, social care, education etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewed focus on outcomes-based thinking within business planning, service commissioning & performance management • Greater investment in data development (make what's important measurable) and common recording standards • Establishment of clearer, more coterminous regional footprints • Establishment of a minimum common data set for strategic assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a common 'minimum' data sets for use in strategic population assessments • Develop appropriate cross-governmental guidance on intelligence-led business approaches including the need for appropriate outcomes-based thinking and need for data development • Establish a national multi-agency network of analysts & social science researchers to support and promote information sharing, research, data development, effective practice and mainstreaming of intelligence-led business process across organisations and partnerships
Service or solution commissioning often	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioning cross-cutting services and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership-based collaborative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment in training and skills required for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop appropriate cross-governmental

<p>based on incomplete needs/gaps data and 'what works' analysis</p>	<p>interventions (e.g. VAWDASV, SM, housing, perpetrator) in thematic silos with incomplete picture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much focus on symptoms data (e.g. crime) when designing the most effective solutions relies on understanding personal journeys and how people got there (e.g. crime) • So-called 'commissioning' isn't true commissioning (e.g. parochial democracy rather than evidence-led co-production) • Lack of true collaborative commissioning expertise within partners and partnerships • Lack of 'citizen voice' in service commissioning, limited service user involvement until too late • Even more robust commissioning often excludes evaluation (too expensive) • Commissioning often 	<p>commissioning to co-produce services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen-focus at the centre of the service – follow the citizen's journey (Kafka model) rather than what suits agencies • Hub-and-spoke models of service, one-stop-shops etc. • Data development built around specific outcomes • More sustainable understanding of 'value for money' (i.e., cheaper = false economy) • Investment and involvement in research and evaluation • Building in evaluation from the outset as an ongoing process of contract monitoring • Collaborative and co-production approaches to service design and delivery built on consortia or co-operatives of specialists rather than single contracts with generalists • Greater flexibility with contracts and SLAs to 	<p>true partnership commissioning (SM model)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater recognition of the role and added value of service user/expert by experience involvement in service planning and commissioning • Greater recognition of the role and added value of the third sector in service planning and commissioning • Greater recognition of the role and added value of social science in service planning and commissioning • Remove the 'sting' of competitiveness created by third sector marketization • Return to NIM/SARA principles in community safety business planning and management • Shift in service planning, commissioning and investment from crisis point provision to more sustainable predictive, preventative and early intervention approach • Scrap 'fear of crime' 	<p>guidance on intelligence and evidence-led multi-agency (collaborative) citizen-centred service planning & commissioning that complements & builds on existing statutory guidance (e.g. SM, VAWDASV)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish appropriate partnership commissioning training programme (as part of broader 'Appropriate Skills & Knowledge' response) • Stimulate greater investment in prevention and early intervention services that address and manage future demand • Develop a more sophisticated and scientifically sound approach to perception and public confidence monitoring to replace 'fear of crime' and traditional crime survey measurement in Wales • Develop and promote more effective public
--	---	---	---	---

	<p>seen as a stop-start process rather than ongoing evolving re-commissioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketization of third sector (particularly social care providers) fuels intense competition and unwillingness to share intelligence as commercially sensitive • Problem Profiles (e.g. S&OCPs, CTLPs) based on incomplete or partial understanding but still used to commission solutions • NIM worked! But it's been lost or eroded over time • Health and social care commissioning is driven by organisations designed to respond/react to crisis rather than predict and prevent • Academic research and evaluation is cyclical and repeated, duplicated time and again • Perception vs Reality Gap (e.g. fear of crime worse in low crime areas) yet prioritisation and solution planning 	<p>enable responsive adaptation of service based on intelligence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyst and researcher networks (e.g. GAIN, IRAP) to share both data and practice • NIM compliance at the heart of business planning and management • PHW is organisationally focused on longer term and more sustainable service planning in health & social care – more of a commissioning role? • 'Do it once and make widely available' approach to academic research and evaluation • More sophisticated and scientifically-based approaches to perception measuring and monitoring (e.g. KINs) • Greater effort to engage and involve so-called 'hard-to-reach' sectors and less attention given to usual suspects and those who shout loudest • Emerging practice 	<p>survey concept in favour of more sophisticated and scientifically sound methodologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift in statutory cultures toward true 'citizen focus' in prioritising, shaping and delivering services 	<p>sector procurement approaches that minimise the impact of 'marketization' on third sector providers</p>
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>or activity is often based on perceived problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jigsaw puzzle effect: individual agencies only have part of the jigsaw and when MARAC/MASH style approach is adopted (e.g. YOS visual 'timeline') causal factors and missed opportunities for intervention become clear 	<p>around 'citizen stories' based practice (e.g. SenseMaker)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substance Misuse commissioning programme built on a common understanding of model(s) and rolled out with significant training programme (IPC) MARAC/MASH style approaches can mitigate jigsaw puzzle effect and sometimes evidence a 'threshold' for intervention has been met 		
--	---	--	--	--

RESOURCES & STRUCTURES

2. Establish and sustain effective and responsive delivery structures that work collaboratively to find long-term solutions to community safety issues?

IDENTIFIED ISSUE	BARRIERS	ENABLERS	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE	PROPOSALS
<p>Austerity impacts: frontline services at breaking point, unable to meet demand, partnership 'jam' spread too thin, shrink into silos</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vicious circle of too many competing immediate 'priorities' (crisis demand management) and no space or resource to consider shift toward prevention (future demand management) Too many meetings spread among too few 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to give greater focus to longer term 'outcomes' rather than immediately pressing priorities Clear evidence of cost savings achieved through partnership and preventative initiatives Total Place/Budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Service Boards need to adopt more Total Place/Total Budget type approaches and true collaboration & integration of mainstream services Welsh and UK Governments need greater focus on outcomes and cultural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide stronger leadership and impetus around more sustainable 'place-based' service planning and budgeting by public sector bodies (PSBs or CSPs), particularly looking at flexibilities that shift the

	<p>staff – now have to prioritise which meetings to attend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Partnership’ still not seen as organisational ‘core business’ but ‘nice to’ if you can • Lack of clarity over cost effectiveness of multi-agency interventions (used to have the HO cost of crime audit) • Inability to invest in upstream prevention without disinvesting in crisis management • Thresholds for key service involvement (e.g. SS, CAMHS) set too high for prevention and early intervention • Too many competing regional ‘footprints’ • Vast and complex partnership structures with poor or no governance created by ‘priorities’ or WG/HO/Moj (e.g. LCJBs, CONTEST, S&OC) • Annual government grants don’t work – timescales too short, no stability of service or time to take effect • Inflexibility of 	<p>approaches give real meaning to PSBs and joint working for more sustainable services and improved well-being outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-location of multi-disciplinary teams reduces meetings and increases capacity, capability and info sharing – whole greater than sum of parts • Joint service centres bringing together 999 and local authority services • Emerging practice of multi-agency, multi disciplinary ‘flying squad’ approach to react/respond to emerging issues in different neighbourhoods • Intelligence-led business processes to improve targeting and problem-solving • Review and refresh of partnership structures to streamline in line with identified priorities rather than historic arrangements • Greater use of technology to enable 	<p>change rather than structures, processes, inputs and outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Government Reorganisation model that complements regional working across co-terminous footprints • Streamlining and simplification of partnership structures across national, regional and local levels to eliminate duplication and talking shops • Stop killing trees and burning fossil fuel, greater use of technology and virtual approaches to facilitate multi-agency networking, replacing the need for physical meetings • Make meetings matter – those meetings that have to happen should affect change • Greater emphasis and drive around prevention and early intervention in service planning & commissioning • Review of ‘thresholds’ for service requirements to allow for more sustainable resourcing 	<p>proportion of investment from ‘crisis’ & immediate demand management to prevention, early intervention and future demand management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationalise regional ‘footprints’ and nationally-led requirements for partnership structures (e.g. CONTEST, VAWDASV etc.) to ensure minimum duplication and effective governance and oversight that drives local delivery • Strengthen the impetus for compliance with S17 ‘mainstreaming’ requirements via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Provide longer term and more flexible ‘outcomes focused’ funding to support more holistic, collaborative partnership service planning & commissioning arrangements • Review the Third
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>government funding regimes – too many strings, too much effort to win and then monitor for so little reward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austerity works against co-location as people’s job titles grow – who best to co-locate with? • Austerity impacts on third sector with cuts to grants and contracted out arrangements eroding the market • Section 17 ‘mainstreaming’ requirement has no obvious ‘sanction’ for non compliance, despite being statutory • Election horizons – short term policy initiatives designed to meet vote-winning political objectives rather than sustainability 	<p>‘virtual’ partnership discussion rather than physical meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer term funding regimes with greater flexibility, more focus on outcomes and less concern with ‘bean counting’ – greater trust in delivery partners from Govt. • Third sector partners bring added value to the table – unrestricted or additional charity funds and community links and strengths, better engagement • Community or neighbourhood ‘hub’ approaches bringing range of public services closer to citizens • Section 17 ‘mainstreaming’ requirement has statutory basis but currently ‘untested’ by case law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer term and more flexible funding regimes rather than short-term knee-jerk investments • Change in organisational culture toward ‘partnership’ and ‘sustainable working’ as mainstream rather than ‘nice to’ • Greater recognition and parity for the third sector/community sector 	<p>Sector Scheme and other relevant accords/compacts to strengthen the role and parity of third sector organisations in partnership working</p>
Regional footprints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of coterminous ‘regional footprints’ creates competing agendas/priorities – particularly for regional bodies that have to work across 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coterminous boundaries allow for greater/simpler regional working (e.g. North Wales footprints) • Clear governance and accountability between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional footprints and partnership arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete a fundamental cross-departmental review of all regional footprints utilised in partnership working (e.g. CSP, PSB, RCC

	<p>several LA areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG drive toward greater regionalisation is creating additional partnership 'layers' with feed up/down issues (e.g. CONTEST, Cohesion) • Community safety, by nature is community (local) focused so tensions around regional working to support local delivery (e.g. 5 LAs of Gwent and how to balance 'priority' in Mon. vs Pill) • Significant role of small specialist third sector services (SM, VAWDASV, community justice) makes regional approaches and economies of scale difficult to achieve • Regions usually historic, political or organisationally convenient and often not based on geo-demographic considerations 	<p>regional and local partnership working, with effective cascade up/down communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of representation from partner organisations at both regional/local forums • Effective links and channels of communication between national strategy and regional or local delivery (e.g. CONTEST, S&OC) • Clear rationale for what works best at a regional and/or local level rather than duplicating or shoe horning inappropriate arrangements to a one-size-fits-all • Careful management of local democratic issues, recognising that politicians are ultimately answerable to their respective constituents, not regional partnerships • Greater consideration of geo-demographic needs (e.g. city region or Powys/Shropshire) 		<p>etc.) to establish greater co-terminosity, clearer governance & accountability and removal of conflicts, unnecessary overlaps and duplications. Regions should be defined on a clear evidence-based rationale for what works best at a regional and/or local level and with the citizen at the centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move toward organisational reconfiguration to achieve greater co-terminosity
Erosion of appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of common 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tried & tested model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish a

<p>skills & knowledge within CSPs</p>	<p>‘framework’ and language for CS partnership working – previously HO invested significantly in partnership-oriented training (e.g., problem-solving training, crime prevention & reduction techniques, project & performance management, joint commissioning, communication & engagement etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wealth of resources – training packages, toolkits, guidance, research & evaluation, cost of crime audits, CSP assessments, peer networks (e.g. NCSN) no longer available from HO website or CS division • WACSO and NCSN no longer providing an effective level of CSO support or lobbying on CS policy development • Significant churn since 2010-11 within the small pool of CSOs/CSMs with loss of ‘corporate memory’ and key skills • Post-austerity dilution of role to ‘community 	<p>of partnership learning & development still available (although requiring updating) and fundamental principles (e.g. SARA) have not changed, just need refreshing (e.g. ACEs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although scattered, most of the ‘what works’ research & evaluation and toolkits – much of which is still relevant – is still available and could be collated into an online CS library, enhanced by more recent work and toolkits • WACSO still surviving although in need of refresh and revival • Scottish Government has recognised the important role played by SCSN and is investing in it as a resource for CS working • Complementary natures of CS partnership preventative problem-solving and WBoFGA and sustainable development principle • Both versions of the 	<p>refreshing of the ‘appropriate skills & knowledge’ base within CS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced opportunities for networking, sharing effective practice and policy/practice development • Closer links between CS practitioners and emerging ACEs and other trauma-informed practitioners • Recognition of the CSO/CSM ‘professionalism’ – built around appropriate skills & knowledge and ‘chief whip’ concept rather than traditional CS service manager (though not exclusive of) 	<p>community safety ‘partnership’ policy & practice team within Welsh Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish an online library and resources database for Wales of community safety guidance, toolkits, online learning, effective practice, case studies, research & evaluation • Re-establish a specific Welsh programme of community safety learning & development incorporating the various themes identified throughout this document (partnership problem-solving, intelligence-led business process, analysis, project management & evaluation, commissioning, community engagement, etc.) • Revitalise WACSO as a more inclusive expert national network of community safety lead practitioners covering every unitary authority area (from LAs, Police,
---	---	--	---	---

	<p>safety &...' or '...& community safety'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local divergences between a more strategic policy focused role and a more operational service manager role (with shrinking resource) Partnerships are forever 'forming & storming' but rarely reach 'norming & performing' due to constant personnel changes (e.g. police promotion, elections) 	<p>CSO/CSM role (strategic policy vs. operational service manager) play crucial part in driving CS agendas in complex partnership environments (if appropriately skilled & knowledgeable)</p>		<p>OPCCs, Probation, Fire, Health, Third Sector etc.), researchers, policy makers – based on the Scottish SCSN model – this could incorporate the second and third recommendations above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilise the proposed guidance for community safety in Wales to ensure every LA has a recognised community safety 'chief whip' professional (in addition to an elected portfolio holder) responsible for driving the CS agenda within a partnership context
Devolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-devolved CS agencies operating in devolved context have to please two masters with contrasting or conflicting priorities London-based civil servants still struggle with 'Wales is different' concept and make no concessions to fundamental differences in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaders of non-devolved CS agencies are largely flexible, adaptable and creative and have grown expert in operating 'in the margins' between UK and Welsh Govt. policy Ambition to see policing & justice devolved has prompted a much more engaged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stronger and more visible leadership from WG around CS partnership working (e.g. clear messaging for devolved partners such as LAs about the priority afforded to CS and expectations around joint working with non devolved partners such as PCCs) Strengthening the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress the devolution of policing and justice to Welsh Government Establish a dialogue with the Home Office to consider the appropriateness of refreshing the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 in a way that better reflects Welsh devolution.

	<p>operational delivery landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is accountable to who? Non devolved inspection & audit regimes rarely jointly work with devolved counterparts • Advent of PCCs resulted in HO dismantling CS division and support with expectation PCCs would drive CS agenda – might work in England but devolved partners not as accountable to PCCs in Wales • PCCs play a key role in setting local and regional policing and justice policy within a UK policy framework and while the current PCCs are in tune with devolved policy direction, elections mean this can't be taken for granted • Historic (if slowly changing) perception that criminal justice aspects of CS are 'nothing to do with us' (e.g. ASB, youth offending and SM often given more 	<p>approach from WG on CS issues traditionally seen as 'non devolved'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appetite for more effective and supportive 'joint' approach to audit and inspection being driven by greater levels of partnership working – no longer appropriate to 'inspect/audit' in silos • Willingness of non devolved agencies to 'Welshify' delivery, policies and processes (e.g. ACEs focus) • Potential opportunities presented by future tax raising powers and possibility of 'administrative devolution' of policing & justice (e.g. Manchester model) • Opportunity to utilise Local Government Reform Bill to strengthen CS 'mainstreaming' requirement – could be followed through with LHBs, fire etc., at some future point 	<p>impetus or motivation for all 'responsible authorities' to comply with S17 of the C&DA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater parity for Wales around non devolved CS funding streams (e.g. Transformation Fund) • A shift in focus from both UK and Welsh Governments towards intelligence-led commissioning utilising longer term, less prescriptive and more flexible funding streams rather than 'bidding' rounds for short term, highly prescriptive funding streams • Development of more holistic (i.e. joint inter-agency, inter-governmental) inspection & audit regimes and scrutiny approaches that support and enhance sustainable partnership working to achieve better community safety outcomes (e.g. reducing reoffending) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the impetus for compliance with S17 'mainstreaming' requirements via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Establish closer and more routine working arrangements between the Community Safety Division, Home Office & Ministry of Justice – including consideration of co-location and enhancement of cross-departmental forums • Pilot joint thematic inspection and audit arrangements for CSPs around 'reducing reoffending' with relevant devolved and non devolved audit and inspection regimes
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>priority in Welsh CSP than reducing reoffending)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Consequential’ funding previously provided to Welsh CSPs then PCCs is being lost to Wales as a result of ‘bidding’ mechanisms (Transformation Fund) with % of Welsh bids unsuccessful • Weakness of C&DA Section 17 ‘mainstreaming’ requirement (lamb in wolf’s clothing) difficult to address in Wales as UK Govt. legislation 			
Third Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austerity impacting on statutory services but why don’t they work more closely with third sector services and harness their contributions to bring volunteering and also non-statutory funding to the table? • Statutory agencies pay lip service to ‘co-production’ but not fully committed to it (Community Asset Transfer examples) – needs clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • True collaboration and co-production plays to the strengths of both statutory and third sectors • Community-based groups are more effective at citizen engagement and involvement, something the statutory sector struggles with • Third sector can operate more quickly, flexibly, responsively and efficiently than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater recognition and parity for third sector partners and genuine commitment rather than lip service to the ‘Big Society’ concept • Collaborative and co-production models of CS service planning and commissioning across all relevant partnerships and their respective agencies • Investment in training and skills required for true partnership commissioning (SM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Third Sector Scheme and other relevant accords/compacts to strengthen the role and parity of third sector organisations in partnership working • Develop appropriate cross-governmental guidance on intelligence and evidence-led multi-agency (collaborative) citizen-centred service planning &

	<p>expectations from both sides;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAs not always fair, open or transparent with 3rd sector delivery partners vs. 3rd sector partners often struggle to provide the robust governance, financial management etc., required of them; • Growing 'marketization' of small, specialist third sector services through CCT and traditional procurement approaches; • Post-code lottery of CS services – examples, one LA funds VAWDASV services another doesn't, small specialist community-based services that grew up to meet local needs – how to 'spread the wealth' but retain the community-based specialist nature; • Statutory funders don't like paying for 'core costs', only direct service provision – impossible • Cheaper isn't cost 	<p>statutory sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More passion and commitment to 'make a difference' in third sector organisations than statutory organisations – you need to be passionate & committed to work for a charity • Third sector organisations can provide a community voice to balance parochial self interested politicians 	<p>model)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater flexibility within procurement mechanisms to minimise the negative impacts of marketization and competitive tendering 	<p>commissioning that complements & builds on existing statutory guidance (e.g. SM, VAWDASV)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish appropriate partnership commissioning training programme (as part of broader 'Appropriate Skills & Knowledge' response) • Provide longer term and more flexible 'outcomes focused' funding to support more holistic, collaborative partnership service planning & commissioning arrangements • Develop and promote more effective public sector procurement approaches that minimise the impact of 'marketization' on third sector providers • Revitalise WACSO as a more inclusive expert national network of community safety lead practitioners covering every unitary authority area (from LAs, Police, OPCCs, Probation, Fire, Health, Third
--	--	--	---	---

	<p>effective, more effective social intervention services are expensive but cheaper in the long run (revolving door syndrome) – yet cost is often given significant weighting in tender processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory partners like single contracts for ease of management – creates more generalists than specialists • Lack of nationally agreed service quality standards in many aspects of CS work means unequal market place 			<p>Sector etc.), researchers, policy makers – based on the Scottish SCSN model – this could incorporate the second and third recommendations above</p>
Where are health?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health services (together with schools) play a critical role in early identification of community safety issues (e.g. violence, SM, ACEs) & are vital to more ‘upstream’ prevention & early intervention • Around 70% of policing demand is related to mental health but CSPs struggle to effectively engage MH services • LHBS usually willing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing evidence of trauma informed practice (e.g. enhanced case management) reducing reoffending • PHW has a wealth of data, intelligence, research and analysis to help drive more holistic and sustainable approach • Some partnerships have recognised the complexity of ‘health’ (i.e., not a single entity) and work to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant investment in mental health services (particularly CAMHS) and closure of the 16-18 ‘gap’ • Training in trauma informed practice for ‘early intervention’ practitioners (e.g. EWOs, YOTs) • Local Government Reorganisation model that complements regional working across co-terminous footprints • Longer term and more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop appropriate cross-governmental guidance on intelligence and evidence-led multi-agency (collaborative) citizen-centred service planning & commissioning that complements & builds on existing statutory guidance (e.g. SM, VAWDASV) • Establish appropriate partnership commissioning

	<p>partners 'around the table' but reluctant to dip into pockets to core fund activity (whether PSB or CSP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too focused on 'treatment' and therefore crisis management and not enough on prevention & early intervention • Complex organisations with less than clear 'command & control' structures - who am I speaking to in health? • Commissioning seems to fall into 2 silos - core budget business (traditional treatment) and grant funded business (SM, VAWDASV etc.) seem unwilling to reshape core services to meet partnership priorities • Regional vs Local - LHB can't take different approaches in different localities and need to evidence equality of service • PHW very focused on longer term thinking, population needs and future demand management...but very limited resources 	<p>engage more appropriately</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LHBs can bring a wealth of resources and expertise (e.g. service commissioning) to the partnership table • GPs can play a vital role in reaching and working with local communities (e.g. Pill area focus) • Excellent (but patchwork of) effective practice examples - e.g., NTE triage and alcohol services, traffic light system, substance misuse interventions, sex work initiatives, SARC, rarely mainstream LHB service provision • LHBs (but not PHW etc.,) are subject to S17 'mainstreaming' requirement 	<p>flexible funding regimes for social care interventions rather than short-term knee-jerk investments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in organisational culture toward 'partnership' and 'sustainable working' as mainstream rather than 'nice to' • Greater emphasis and drive around prevention and early intervention in service planning & commissioning • Review of 'thresholds' for service requirements to allow for more sustainable resourcing • Streamlining and simplification of partnership structures across national, regional and local levels to eliminate duplication and talking shops • Stop killing trees and burning fossil fuel, greater use of technology and virtual approaches to facilitate multi-agency networking, replacing the need for physical meetings • Make meetings matter - 	<p>training programme (as part of broader 'Appropriate Skills & Knowledge' response)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a more holistic model of undertaking strategic population assessments at national, regional and local levels, supported by appropriate cross-governmental guidance on intelligence-led business approaches and strong encouragement to 'pool' appropriate resources • Develop common 'minimum' data sets for use in strategic population assessments • Develop appropriate cross-governmental guidance for Wales clarifying legal 'gateways' and mechanisms for personal information sharing (based on the recommended review) • Establish the concept of 'WASPI approved' or 'WASPI compliant' individuals/groups to
--	--	--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPs play key role but complex and patchy engagement • Partners not great at identifying the health benefits or cost savings to be achieved in partnership activity • WG Health Division not joined up with other WG divisions so mixed messaging coming out • Health information systems (multitude of) do not join up with each other, never mind partners • Section 17 'mainstreaming' requirement has no obvious 'sanction' for non compliance, despite being statutory 		<p>those meetings that have to happen</p>	<p>undertake analysis of personal data under data processing agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stimulate greater investment in prevention and early intervention services that address and manage future demand • Provide stronger leadership and impetus around more sustainable 'place-based' service planning and budgeting by public sector bodies (PSBs or CSPs), particularly looking at flexibilities that shift the proportion of investment from 'crisis' & immediate demand management to prevention, early intervention and future demand management • Rationalise regional 'footprints' and nationally-led requirements for partnership structures (e.g. CONTEST, VAWDASV etc.) to ensure minimum
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>duplication and effective governance and oversight that drives local delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot joint thematic inspection and audit arrangements for CSPs around 'reducing reoffending' with relevant devolved and non devolved audit and inspection regimes • Seek opportunities to strengthen the impetus for compliance with S17 'mainstreaming' requirements via future legislation and/or statutory guidance for health
--	--	--	--	--

GOVERNANCE & LEADERSHIP

3. Integrate community safety strategic assessments and plans into other statutory assessment and planning processes (e.g. Programme for Government, PSB single planning processes, Police & Crime Plans)?

IDENTIFIED ISSUE	BARRIERS	ENABLERS	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE	PROPOSALS
Too much 'delivery' guidance and prescription, often conflicting, coming from different (UK & Welsh) Government departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy divergences between UK and Welsh Governments • (UK & Welsh) government departmental silos not communicating with each other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater focus from government(s) on outcomes rather than structures, processes, inputs and outputs • Improved cross-government and cross-departmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolution of policing and justice (wholesale or administrative) • Appropriate 'policy testing' (e.g. ensuring no conflict, evidence base, practicalities around implementing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress the devolution of policing and justice to Welsh Government • Establish closer and more routine working arrangements between the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic policy-making not grounded in ‘real world’ practicalities or evidence of ‘what works’ • Lack of linkage and ‘line of sight’ between national policy or practice-making forums and front-line practitioners (how does a national directive get translated to street level?) • Prescribed regional structures (e.g. CONTEST, S&OC) that do not link with or duplicate local delivery • One size does not fit all (we don’t all fit under a regional blanket) • Sometimes lack of government trust in delivery partners, leading to over prescription which gets in the way of delivery • Perverse consequences of ‘indicators’ that then become ‘targets’ (e.g. former sanction detection & OBJs driving higher FTEs) • Lack of place-based 	<p>communication to join up interdependent policy areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practitioner & Academic involvement in evidence-led policy-making with policy makers (reality checks) • PSBs provide an opportunity for ‘place-based’ thinking and service planning and commissioning that cut across thematic silos to focus on prevention and early intervention, tackling root causes 	<p>before announcing</p>	<p>Community Safety Division, Home Office & Ministry of Justice – including consideration of co-location and enhancement of cross-departmental forums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot joint thematic inspection and audit arrangements for CSPs around ‘reducing reoffending’ with relevant devolved and non devolved audit and inspection regimes • Revitalise WACSO as a more inclusive expert national network of community safety lead practitioners covering every unitary authority area (from LAs, Police, OPCCs, Probation, Fire, Health, Third Sector etc.), researchers, policy makers – based on the Scottish SCSN model – this could incorporate the second and third recommendations above • Provide stronger leadership and
--	---	---	--------------------------	---

	thinking & budgeting that ignores organisational or thematic silos but focuses instead on prevention and early intervention, tackling root causes			impetus around more sustainable 'place-based' service planning and budgeting by public sector bodies (PSBs or CSPs), particularly looking at flexibilities that shift the proportion of investment from 'crisis' & immediate demand management to prevention, early intervention and future demand management
Confusing and complex multi-themed partnership 'landscape' (CSPs vs PSBs etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 legislative changes and CSP 'de-regulation' led to SIPs with safer boards (not everywhere) BUT SIPs replaced by PSBs with emphasis on handful of high priorities = confusion around CSP working and governance • Variable approach to strategic assessment of 'well-being' - CS issues and CJS data often overlooked or ignored • Where PSBs do recognise community safety themes, quite often don't get the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where there is a clear & shared sense of 'region' (e.g. Gwent) efforts are under way to resolve statutory footing & governance arrangements • Some PSBs have engaged very effectively with CS issues and priorities (e.g. Newport Pill Focus) and can make a real and lasting difference with significant resources at hand • Community safety officers/managers with dedicated focus on CS themes and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of dedicated CS partnership 'leads' within key partners • Partnership structural rationalisation and simplification • Strengthening S17 requirement • Focus on 'root cause' problem-solving common to most areas of partnership working (e.g. ACEs) • Our approach to regionalisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish a community safety 'partnership' policy & practice team within Welsh Government • Establish a dialogue with the Home Office to consider the appropriateness of refreshing the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 in a way that better reflects Welsh devolution. • Re-establish an online library and resources database for Wales of community safety guidance, toolkits, online learning, effective practice,

	<p>‘reducing re-offending’ aspect (too CJS-y) despite statutory requirement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional CSPs and VAWDASV boards struggling with ‘statutory footing’ and clear governance arrangements • Organisational and thematic leads wearing too many ‘hats’ • Lack of CS thematic ‘leader’ with appropriate skills and knowledge to drive partnership delivery • Plethora of sub groups and geographic layers, largely historical and added to rather than refreshing the partnership landscape based on priority and need • Lack of co-ordinated approach to regional ‘footprints’ • Strong CS links to regional safeguarding boards but issues around local-regional relationships and child/adult arrangements • Section 17 ‘mainstreaming’ 	<p>appropriate skills and knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 17 ‘mainstreaming’ requirement has statutory basis but currently ‘untested’ by case law • Simplified and clear partnership structures kept under constant review to remain ‘fit for purpose’ • Co-terminous operational boundaries (e.g. North Wales) • Neighbourhood or locality focused services or action plans cut across partnership (CSP/PSB) divides 		<p>case studies, research & evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish a specific Welsh programme of community safety learning & development incorporating the various themes identified throughout this document (partnership problem-solving, intelligence-led business process, analysis, project management & evaluation, commissioning, community engagement, etc.) • Revitalise WACSO as a more inclusive expert national network of community safety lead practitioners covering every unitary authority area (from LAs, Police, OPCCs, Probation, Fire, Health, Third Sector etc.), researchers, policy makers – based on the Scottish SCSN model – this could incorporate the second and third recommendations above
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>requirement has no obvious 'sanction' for non compliance, despite being statutory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much focus on 'structure and process' to tick boxes and not enough on cultural change – PSBs often going through the motions but no real drive to 'place-based budgeting' to solve priority issues and drive investment toward prevention and early intervention; • Dilemma of balancing strategic buy-in and commitment of resources & cultural change (PSB table) with local problem-solving and delivery – do CSPs sit somewhere in between? • PSBs have very limited third sector involvement – usually more tick-box or lip service, but is the third sector (bit like health, very broad and disparate) configured to provide meaningful engagement? Role for voluntary councils, particularly as charities 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilise the proposed guidance for community safety in Wales to ensure every LA has a recognised community safety 'chief whip' professional (in addition to an elected portfolio holder) responsible for driving the CS agenda within a partnership context • Strengthen the impetus for compliance with S17 'mainstreaming' requirements via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Fundamental cross-departmental review of all regional footprints utilised in partnership working (e.g. CSP, PSB, RCC etc.) to establish greater co-terminosity, clearer governance & accountability and removal of conflicts, unnecessary overlaps and duplications. Regions should be defined on a clear evidence-based
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>often struggle to attend lots of meetings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What front line operational differences do strategic partnerships make? Strategic well-meaning ‘make-it-so’ leaders talk a good talk (“motherhood and apple pie”) and decide on strategic directions, but nothing much changes at street level 			<p>rationale for what works best at a regional and/or local level and with the citizen at the centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of organisational reconfiguration to achieve greater co-terminosity
Devolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy divergences between UK and Welsh Governments subject to respective election results and constantly changing • Non-devolved CS agencies operating in devolved context have to please ‘two masters’ with contrasting or conflicting priorities • London-based civil servants still struggle with ‘Wales is different’ concept and make no concessions to fundamental differences in the operational delivery landscape • Non-devolved CS agencies have to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of non-devolved CS agencies are largely flexible, adaptable and creative and have grown expert in operating ‘in the margins’ between UK and Welsh Govt. policy • Mechanisms for cross-governmental dialogue and negotiation exist, if not fully utilised • Greater degree of pragmatism from WG Ministers in co-operating with non-devolved agencies to improve CS outcomes in Wales • Ambition to see policing & justice devolved has prompted a much 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater levels of cross-governmental dialogue and co-operation (both in terms of UK and Welsh Governments but also internal departments of both) leading to joint development of policing & criminal justice policy and practice specific to Wales • Eventual devolution of policing and criminal justice to Wales – either full (i.e. Scotland model) or administrative (i.e., Manchester model) • Stronger and more visible leadership from WG around CS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress the devolution of policing and justice to Welsh Government • Establish a dialogue with the Home Office to consider the appropriateness of refreshing the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 in a way that better reflects Welsh devolution. • Establish closer and more routine working arrangements between the Community Safety Division, Home Office & Ministry of Justice – including consideration of co-location and

	<p>operate 'in the margins' and sometimes face a policy/process 'vacuum'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political announcements from Westminster often catch civil servants on the hop and no time to have meaningful dialogue with WG over Welsh implications • Silos within silos are multiplied x2 (e.g. WG departments not aligned to UK departments) • Who is accountable to who? Non devolved inspection & audit regimes rarely jointly work with devolved counterparts • What gets measured gets done – audit, inspection and scrutiny regimes drive organisational prioritisation & behaviour (in different directions if not joined up, e.g. devolved vs non devolved) • Added complexity of Wales Office/Sec of State and Assembly scrutiny 	<p>more engaged approach from WG on CS issues traditionally seen as 'non devolved'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appetite for more effective and supportive 'joint' approach to audit and inspection being driven by greater levels of partnership working – no longer appropriate to 'inspect/audit' in silos • Growing maturity of WG and recognition of need for more sustainable working and focus on outcomes (rather than process) in leadership style • Willingness of non devolved agencies to 'Welshify' delivery, policies and processes (e.g. ACEs focus) • Potential opportunities presented by future tax raising powers and possibility of 'administrative devolution' of policing & justice (e.g. Manchester model) • Opportunity to utilise Local Government Reform Bill to 	<p>partnership working (e.g. clear messaging for devolved partners such as LAs about the priority afforded to CS and expectations around joint working with non devolved partners such as PCCs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening the impetus or motivation for all 'responsible authorities' to comply with S17 of the C&DA • Greater parity for Wales around non devolved CS funding streams (e.g. Transformation Fund) • Development of more holistic (i.e. joint inter-agency, inter-governmental) inspection & audit regimes and scrutiny approaches that support and enhance sustainable partnership working to achieve better community safety outcomes (e.g. reducing reoffending) • 	<p>enhancement of cross-departmental forums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot joint thematic inspection and audit arrangements for CSPs around 'reducing reoffending' with relevant devolved and non devolved audit and inspection regimes • Re-establish a community safety 'partnership' policy & practice team within Welsh Government • Strengthen the impetus for compliance with S17 'mainstreaming' requirements via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Consideration of organisational reconfiguration to achieve greater co-terminosity
--	--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added complexity of PCCs – devolved politicians within a non-devolved institution leading a non-devolved agency • Advent of PCCs resulted in HO dismantling CS division and support with expectation PCCs would drive CS agenda – might work in England but devolved partners not as accountable to PCCs in Wales • PCCs play a key role in setting local and regional policing and justice policy within a UK policy framework and while the current PCCs are in tune with devolved policy direction, elections mean this can't be taken for granted • Unlike Scotland, no single 'government' controls all of the key policy areas and drivers for community safety • Historic (if slowly changing) perception that criminal justice aspects of CS are 	<p>strengthen CS 'mainstreaming' requirement – could be followed through with LHBs, fire etc., at some future point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement of HO and MoJ in WG's Working Together for Safer Communities Review • Possible opportunity of Cardiff base for 'devolution' focused HO/Moj officials with opening of new HMRC HQ to build closer ties with WG 		
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>'nothing to do with us' (e.g. ASB, youth offending and SM often given more priority in Welsh CSP than reducing reoffending)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weakness of C&DA Section 17 'mainstreaming' requirement (lamb in wolf's clothing) difficult to address • Does WG do enough to influence UK Government when it comes to non devolved funding – particularly crime & justice monies that third sector can bid for (VAWDASV and victim/perpetrator services); 			
Personalities drive partnerships (as well as organisations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of organisational leader or partnership rep/chair can render an effective partnership ineffective • Partnerships are forever 'forming & storming' but rarely reach 'norming & performing' due to constant personnel changes (e.g. police promotion, elections) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ineffective partnership can be turned around by an effective leader • Partnerships that can retain 'corporate memory' and have effective knowledge management & retention are better placed to weather the storm • Process and systems are important to save reinventing the wheel and minimise 'forming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish clear expectations for organisational commitment to community safety partnership working 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilise the proposed guidance for community safety in Wales to ensure every LA has a recognised community safety 'chief whip' professional (in addition to an elected portfolio holder) responsible for driving the CS agenda within a partnership context • Strengthen the

		<p>& storming' BUT they need to remain flexible, adaptable and responsive to changes in need/priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit, inspection and scrutiny can play a role in keeping partnerships with changing personalities on course 		<p>impetus for compliance with S17 'mainstreaming' requirements via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot joint thematic inspection and audit arrangements for CSPs around 'reducing reoffending' with relevant devolved and non devolved audit and inspection regimes • Provide stronger leadership and impetus around more sustainable 'place-based' service planning and budgeting by public sector bodies (PSBs or CSPs), particularly looking at flexibilities that shift the proportion of investment from 'crisis' & immediate demand management to prevention, early intervention and future demand management
Regional footprints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of coterminous 'regional footprints' creates competing agendas/priorities - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coterminous boundaries allow for greater/simpler regional working (e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional footprints and partnership arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete a fundamental cross-departmental review of all regional

	<p>particularly for regional bodies that have to work across several LA areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG drive toward greater regionalisation is creating additional partnership 'layers' with feed up/down issues (e.g. CONTEST, Cohesion) • Community safety, by nature is community (local) focused so tensions around regional working to support local delivery (e.g. 5 LAs of Gwent and how to balance 'priority' in Mon. vs Pill) • Significant role of small specialist third sector services (SM, VAWDASV, community justice) makes regional approaches and economies of scale difficult to achieve • Parochialism of some elected members fixated on representing their own ward, never mind county, in a regional partnership arrangement • Regions usually 	<p>North Wales footprints)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear governance and accountability between regional and local partnership working, with effective cascade up/down communication • Consistency of representation from partner organisations at both regional/local forums • Effective links and channels of communication between national strategy and regional or local delivery (e.g. CONTEST, S&OC) • Clear rationale for what works best at a regional and/or local level rather than duplicating or shoe horning inappropriate arrangements to a one-size-fits-all • Careful management of local democratic issues, recognising that politicians are ultimately answerable to their respective constituents, not regional partnerships • Greater consideration of geo-demographic 		<p>footprints utilised in partnership working (e.g. CSP, PSB, RCC etc.) to establish greater co-terminosity, clearer governance & accountability and removal of conflicts, unnecessary overlaps and duplications. Regions should be defined on a clear evidence-based rationale for what works best at a regional and/or local level and with the citizen at the centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of organisational reconfiguration to achieve greater co-terminosity
--	--	---	--	---

	historic, political or organisationally convenient and often not based on geo-demographic considerations	needs (e.g. city region or Powys/Shropshire)		
CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT				
4. Provide visible and constructive accountability around community safety issues that engages and involves a diversity of the population in the decisions that affect them?				
IDENTIFIED ISSUE	BARRIERS	ENABLERS	WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE	PROPOSALS
Too much 'consultation' not enough participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overkill on 'consultation' but with minimal feedback (e.g., 'you said, we did..') and virtually no participation; • Limited resources for citizen consultation – small teams, small budgets and no money to invest in preparing the groundwork for meaningful engagement • Not enough 'service user' engagement prior to planning, designing and commissioning services so they are more effective, appropriate, relevant and ultimately more successful; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More effective models of citizen participation based around 'citizen stories' (e.g. SenseMaker, Kafka Model, Planning for Real) • More targeted engagement (e.g. service users) rather than generic scattergun approaches • Greater clarity around the purpose/scope of engagement • Multi-agency co-ordination of citizen consultation and sharing of findings and data (e.g. 'Ask Cardiff') • Community-based third sector groups are often better placed to facilitate meaningful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved access to citizen involvement expertise (e.g. toolkits, effective practice 'what works' case studies) • Greater investment in more innovative and inclusive approaches, linked to 'intelligence-led business' • Better co-ordination of citizen involvement activity and data sharing across partners • Greater recognition and parity for third sector partners and genuine commitment rather than lip service to the 'Big Society' concept • Collaborative and co-production models of citizen involvement across all relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a national multi agency network of citizen engagement, involvement and participation specialists to develop and promote more effective tools and practice for the public sector in Wales • Strengthen the impetus for more effective citizen engagement and involvement via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Re-establish a community safety 'partnership' policy & practice team within Welsh Government • Re-establish an online

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We organise and brigade our services and structures to suit us, not the citizen – example ‘warm hand-overs’ and ‘tell us once’ limited • Not sharing consultation data leads to duplication • How do we define ‘community’ – e.g. virtual communities, communities of interest rather than just geographic communities, many of which have no sense of ‘community’, commuter belt; • CSPs don’t communicate with citizens effectively, we don’t spell out ‘this is our strategy’ or provide communities with clarity around what we promise and what we deliver, equally, what we expect from communities to help; • Citizen ‘stories’ approaches (e.g. SenseMaker, Kafka model, Planning for Real) more informative than tick box 	<p>engagement but need to be involved earlier in co-production of engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory agencies more visible in their communities to foster better engagement and involvement, (e.g., ‘community hubs’) • PSBs have made more effort around ‘involve’ but still struggling – social media campaigns generate more and broader engagement but there are risks (e.g. fake news, unrepresentative but highly vocal ‘keyboard warriors’, number of ‘followers’ does not necessarily mean support for a viewpoint); • Participatory budgeting (if appropriately managed) has proved effective and is being adopted more widely (e.g. Edinburgh) • Wealth of experience and expertise around effective models of engagement, involvement and participation to draw 	<p>partnerships and their respective agencies</p>	<p>library and resources database for Wales of community safety guidance, toolkits, online learning, effective practice, case studies, research & evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish a specific Welsh programme of community safety learning & development incorporating the various themes identified throughout this document (partnership problem-solving, intelligence-led business process, analysis, project management & evaluation, commissioning, community engagement, etc.) • Revitalise WACSO as a more inclusive expert national network of community safety lead practitioners covering every unitary authority area (from LAs, Police, OPCCs, Probation, Fire, Health, Third Sector etc.), researchers, policy makers – based on
--	--	---	---	---

	<p>questionnaires, but require more effort and don't translate easily to quantitative data and graphs/charts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't ask what citizens want if you're not prepared to deliver it (e.g. if it requires change of practice, investment you can't afford) as this just creates dis-engagement; 	<p>from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing dialogue (e.g. Citizen Panels) is more effective than random, or stop-start mechanisms 		<p>the Scottish SCSN model – this could incorporate the second and third recommendations above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide stronger leadership and impetus around more sustainable 'place-based' service planning and budgeting by public sector bodies (PSBs or CSPs) • Review the Third Sector Scheme and other relevant accords/compacts to strengthen the role and parity of third sector organisations in partnership working • Develop a more sophisticated and scientifically sound approach to perception and public confidence monitoring to replace 'fear of crime' and traditional crime survey measurement in Wales
'Black Box' syndrome – are 'citizens' really interested in how services are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough 'service user' engagement prior to planning, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater role for 'community justice' (pre-2011 Home Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer understanding and definition of 'customer expectations' 	<p>AS ABOVE PLUS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop appropriate

<p>configured? Just that they are easily accessed when needed and they work to meet need.</p>	<p>designing and commissioning services so they are more effective, appropriate, relevant and ultimately more successful;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call centre models – they usually suit service providers but not citizens, who want single ‘front door’, ease of contact, outside of office hours, ‘tell-us-once’ approaches – not be passed around the houses repeating the issue until someone takes it on 	<p>& MoJ drive) with more focus on reparation, restorative sentencing, community identified priorities for courts processes, participatory budgeting, etc.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wealth of service user consultation data telling us the same things about what is important 	<p>from service provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better feedback to customer – i.e., if service can’t be delivered as they expect for good reason • Improved access to citizen involvement expertise (e.g. toolkits, effective practice ‘what works’ case studies) • Better co-ordination of citizen involvement activity and data sharing (particularly ‘service users’) across partners • More systematic ongoing dialogue with service users to refine service delivery 	<p>cross-governmental guidance on intelligence and evidence-led multi-agency (collaborative) citizen-centred service planning & commissioning that complements & builds on existing statutory guidance (e.g. SM, VAWDASV)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish appropriate partnership commissioning training programme (as part of broader ‘Appropriate Skills & Knowledge’ response)
<p>So-called ‘hard to reach’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex needs present barriers to more traditional forms of communication by statutory agencies – e.g., language, culture, chaotic lifestyles, distrust & disengagement, learning needs, mental & emotional health • Limited resources for citizen consultation – small teams, small budgets and no money to invest in preparing the groundwork for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based groups have untapped strengths in engaging marginalised (e.g. service users, outreach services) • Wealth of experience and expertise around effective models of engagement, involvement and participation to draw from • More effective models of citizen participation based around ‘citizen stories’ (e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring balance of engagement with diversity of population through development of KIN (key individual network) via community-based organisations and front-line practitioners • Greater investment in more innovative and inclusive approaches, linked to ‘intelligence-led business’ foundation • Greater focus on measuring ‘unidentified 	<p>AS ABOVE</p>

	<p>meaningful engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are 'hard to reach' for a reason – vicious cycle of being unable to respond to their complex needs, become further disengaged and even harder to reach with even more complex needs but don't vote or speak up so not prioritised 	<p>SenseMaker, Kafka Model, Planning for Real)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth of social media use even among 'hard to reach' groups 	<p>demand' – just because people aren't using the service doesn't mean it's not needed, could be just delivered inappropriately</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater recognition and parity for third sector partners and genuine commitment rather than lip service to the 'Big Society' concept • Collaborative and co-production models of citizen involvement across all relevant partnerships and their respective agencies 	
<p>Politics and democratic accountability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election horizons – short term policy initiatives designed to meet vote-winning political objectives; • Over-reliance on the 'usual suspects' – most vocal, most articulate, best connected & 'worried well' • Too focused on 'dissatisfied' – natural tendency for people to express extremes of dissatisfaction or delight but not satisfaction – do we clearly articulate the standards of service we expect to deliver?; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a more proactive role for local councillors? Rather than wait for ward councillors to bring the gripes from the usual suspects and worried well to the statutory partners, should we be taking the issues to them and asking them to help engage with their constituents – virtuous circle as constituents may flag issues that require political solutions at local, Wales or UK Government levels and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater effort and investment in proactively working with county and community councillors and other democratically elected representatives – informing them more thoroughly about the consultation, engagement, involvement and participation needs and better harnessing their status and networks within respective communities • Ensuring balance in establishing 'evidence' 	<p>AS ABOVE PLUS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the role of elected politicians (including Police & Crime Commissioners and local councillors) in scrutinising the activities and effectiveness of community safety partnerships via new guidance for CSPs/PSBs in Wales • Establish a dialogue with the Home Office to consider the appropriateness of refreshing the Crime & Disorder Act 1998

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginalised groups are ignored – the young person involved in ASB, the chaotic substance misuser, gypsies and travellers • Political structures are centuries old and not fit for purpose – councillors only engage citizens where they feel comfortable (example ASB kids, who is prepared to reach out to them when they are causing a nuisance, upsetting voters etc., because youth services and centres have been closed due to cuts?) 	<p>local politicians are best placed to lobby their Executive Members, AMs/MPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing number of younger councillors with more modern ideas and approaches, including activists from marginalised communities • Social science research into the perception vs. reality gap and so-called ‘fear of crime’ provides clearer understanding 	<p>of issues raised (i.e., ‘major problem’ not just based on one or two people telling councillor but backed up by calls for service, social media etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring balance of engagement with diversity of population through development of KIN (key individual network) via community-based organisations and front-line practitioners • Scrap ‘fear of crime’ survey concept in favour of more sophisticated and scientifically sound methodologies 	<p>in a way that better reflects Welsh devolution.</p>
--	---	--	---	--