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Introduction
This document is designed to assist in the briefing of members on the options designed following an independent assessment of Community Safety structures across South Wales by Chief Superintendent Dave Hayler. To assist in the briefing process also attached are a number of Appendices; the background and context to this work is outlined at Appendix ‘A’; while the Executive Summary is provided at Appendix ‘B’, and the six recommendations derived from the review are attached as Appendix ‘C’.

Recommendations and Options
As a result of the meeting and written feedback from both Jon House and Keith Griffiths, six options are outlined below. Two relate to CSP structures only, (Option 1A & 1B), two relate to LSB structures (Options 2A & 2B), and two options based on the regional footprint for CSPs and LSBs (Option 3A & 3B). A glossary is also provided at Appendix ‘D’, which provides an explanation on the terminology used throughout the presentation of the options and associated diagrams (Appendix E – J).

In all six options the assumption made is that the Safer South Wales (SSW) group and the Safer South Wales Action Group (SSWAG) are disbanded, and replaced by the South Wales Strategic Partnership Board (SWSPB) for Chief Executives, the Chief Constable, Health, 3rd Sector and appropriate representation as required from, for example, Fire, Probation, Courts, WG, CPS, Prison Service.

1. Community Safety Partnership reform
The following two options were proposed following the meeting:

Option 1(A) - CSP arrangements based on three Local Partnership Teams for South Wales (Appendix ‘E’).
- The existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form three new Local Partnership Teams (LPTs) aligned to Health Board footprints, combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery. The LPTs hold the LNMA to account for delivery of outcomes.
- Each Local Authority’s ‘Local Service Board’ (LSB) or Integrated Partnership Board (IPB) holds their respective LPT to account for delivering the agreed ‘desired outcomes’ on their area.

Option 1(B) - Combining Existing Community Safety Partnership Arrangements to create one South Wales Partnership Team (Appendix ‘F’).
- The existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form a single South Wales Partnership Team (SWPT), combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery.
- Each Local Authority’s ‘Local Service Board’ (LSB) or Integrated Partnership Board (IPB) holds the South Wales Partnership Team to account for delivering the agreed ‘desired outcomes’ on their area.
• LSBs/IPBs retain responsibility for the Single Integrated Plan (SIP) and commissioning of services, and hold the Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements to account for delivery of outcomes via the SWPT.

It should be noted that in both options 1(A) and 1(B) above, the following apply:

• The SWSPB is responsible for oversight/coordination of South Wales' partnership delivery, delivery of agreed strategy and identifying 'desired outcomes'.
• Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements (LNMA) are determined by each Authority in conjunction with partners.
• LSBs/IPBs retain responsibility for the Single Integrated Plan (SIP) and commissioning of services, and hold the Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements to account for delivery of outcomes via the LPT.
• A three-BCU model for the police is adopted aligned to Health Board footprints.
• Generic risk assessments across all key partner agencies are conducted identifying a Specific Needs Assessment for individual clients, with LNMA responsible for managing their neighbourhoods and delivering 'desired outcomes', reducing the number of separate professional contacts required per client.

2. Consideration of LSB structures.
The following two options were proposed following the meeting:

Option 2(A) – Combining LSBs and an Integrated Partnership Board to create a single South Wales Delivery Group (Appendix ‘G’).

• The six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board are combined to create a single South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG), which implements a pan-South Wales Single Integrated Plan.
• The existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form three new Local Partnership Teams (LPTs) aligned to Health Board footprints, combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery. The LPTs hold the LNMA to account for delivery of outcomes.

Option 2(B) – Creating single-body partnership structures for South Wales (Appendix ‘H’).

• The six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board are combined to create a single South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG), which implements a pan-South Wales Single Integrated Plan.
• The existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form a single South Wales Partnership Team (SWPT), combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery.

It should be noted that in both options 2(A) and 2(B) above, the following apply:

• The SWSPB is responsible for the governance of South Wales’ partnership delivery, and is ultimately responsible for delivery of the agreed strategy and agreed 'desired outcomes'. The SWSPB holds the South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG) to account for delivery of outcomes.
• Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements (LNMA) are determined by each Authority in conjunction with partners.
• A three-BCU model for the police is adopted aligned to Health Board footprints.
• Generic risk assessments across all key partner agencies are conducted within the relevant strategic CSP body (LPT’s or SWPT) to identify a Specific Needs Assessment for individual clients, with LNMA responsible for managing their neighbourhoods and delivering ‘desired outcomes’, reducing the number of separate professional contacts required per client.
• The six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board are combined to create a single South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG), which implements a pan-South Wales Single Integrated Plan. The SWDG turns SWSPB’s strategy and ‘desired outcomes’ into deliverable business, develops and commissions ‘menu-services’ pan-South Wales, and holds the relevant Strategic CSP body (LPT’s or SWPT) to account for delivery of outcomes.

3. Consideration of ‘Footprint’ Options at CSP and LSB levels.
The following two options are proposed for consideration:

Options 3(A) – CSP and LSB arrangements based on ‘footprint’ creating three Local Partnership Teams and three combined LSBs (Appendix ‘I’).
• The existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form three new Local Partnership Teams (LPTs) aligned to Health Board footprints, combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery. The LPTs hold the LNMA to account for delivery of outcomes.
• The six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board are combined to create three Combined Service Boards aligned to Health board footprints.

Option 3(B) – CSP and LSB arrangements based on ‘footprint’ creating one South Wales Partnership Team and three Combined LSBs (Appendix ‘J’).
• In Option 3(B) the existing Community Safety Partnership arrangements are combined to form a single South Wales Partnership Team (SWPT), combining and enhancing existing CSP business delivery.
• The six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board are combined to create three Combined Service Boards aligned to Health board footprints.

It should be noted that in both options 3(A) and 3(B) above, the following apply:

• The SWSPB is responsible for oversight/coordination of South Wales' partnership delivery, delivery of agreed strategy and identifying ‘desired outcomes’.
• Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements (LNMA) are determined by each Authority in conjunction with partners.
• LSBs/IPBs retain responsibility for the Single Integrated Plan (SIP) and commissioning of services across the ‘footprint’ area, and hold the Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements to account for delivery of outcomes via the LPT/SWPT.
• A three-BCU model for the police is adopted aligned to Health Board footprints.
• Generic risk assessments across all key partner agencies are conducted identify a Specific Needs Assessment for individual clients, with LNMA responsible for managing their neighbourhoods and delivering ‘desired outcomes’, reducing the number of separate professional contacts required per client.
Next Steps

- **Discussion with political leaders in the Local Authority context** – given the impending election of the Police and Crime Commissioner on the 15th November it would be useful to be in position to describe where the Group collectively see the Community Safety Partnerships travelling over the forthcoming months. Therefore, Chief Executives are requested, if possible, to provide feedback on their preferred way forwards following consultation by 1st December 2012.

- **The future of Safer South Wales (SSW) and Safer South Wales Action Group (SSWAG)** – the review of the SSW and SSWAG recognised that these were not performing as intended. Arrangements need to be put in place to transfer the existing arrangements to any new governance structure for strategic delivery of community safety across South Wales.

- **Decision in principle, through to delivery** – Since ‘do nothing’ is not an option, which was universally agreed by attendees on the 8th October, any proposal for change will necessarily involve change management. What plans/processes can be put in place to manage the change process?
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Background and Context

**November 2011**
Professor Martin Innes (University Police Sciences Institute) was commissioned to work with Superintendent Jon Edwards to draft a Terms of Reference and a plan to review the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) operating across South Wales.

**30th January 2012**
The plan was introduced to the Chief Executives/Chief Constable Group and it was agreed that a four phase model for the review would be implemented. The strategic drivers for the review were identified as:
- The CSR settlement and the resulting fiscal tightening experienced across the public services.
- The Introduction of the Police and Crime Commissioner to the Community Safety landscape.
- The growing political drive from the Welsh Government for greater collaboration (introduction of the Public Service leadership Group).
- Health engagement and the growing pressure to consider the health footprints as part of the partnership environment.

**21st May 2012**
Professor Innes delivered a presentation to the Group derived from his findings. These were:
- **Impact of Austerity** – in the tightening fiscal climate CSPs are already struggling to sustain the services provided due to shrinking resource levels available to carry out the work. This has resulted in ‘meeting overload’ for those remaining.
- **Variability** – evidence that there were wide variations in working processes and practices across the individual CSPs.
- **Inward focused** – evidence that in the main CSPs were not really public facing and insufficient regard was being paid to publicly defined priorities.
- **Evidence-based approach** – it was difficult to discern how evidence and data were informing decision-making, even in such austere times.
- **Reactive rather than proactive** – the more proactive CSPs were seizing the opportunity to prevent issues from occurring, in contrast other were more reactive in nature, coupled with the fact that in many cases there was a significant lapse of time between an issue being identified and any action commencing.

Chief Superintendent Dave Hayler (Avon and Somerset Police) was commissioned to review the partnership landscape and to consider alternative models for delivering ‘Community Safety’ activity across South Wales.

**8th October 2012**
Chief Superintendent Hayler presented the findings of his review to the Group, which stimulated significant discussion. No decision was taken during the meeting to move to any particular model. The Executive Summary from Chief Superintendent Hayler’s report identified seven key themes and is provided at Appendix ‘A’; the six recommendations made in the report are at Appendix B.

Two things were agreed at the meeting. Firstly, that ‘Do nothing’ is unsustainable; and, secondly, that the existing Safer South Wales and Safer South Wales Action Groups are not fit for purpose. The discussions held considered the merits of various options and broadly covered two areas. The first concerned the structure of Community Safety Partnerships and...
the delivery of safety to communities; the second, the structure and arrangements for Local Service Boards (LSB).

In essence:

- There was considerable support for combining the business of Community Safety Partnerships to deliver ‘safety to communities’ and the extent of possible change was debated;
- There was support from a number of quarters for a move to combine LSB delivery into a pan-South Wales model, and the extent of possible change was debated;
- Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements (LNMA) were seen as key to local service delivery. It was agreed the shape of LNMA was a matter for local agreement.

**16th October 2012.**

On 16th October 2012, the Welsh Government (WG) sent two letters that inform the debate. WG wrote firstly to Local Authorities in relation to their Provisional Local Government Settlement and indicated intent to create a £10m fund for regional collaboration; and secondly, to Community Safety Partnerships in relation to the Safer Communities Fund (SCF) and its move to a regional footprint basis in April 2013. The letter identifies that if further aggregation up to a pan South Wales area was deemed a suitable option, then this would be acceptable. In summary, it is clear that the work that the Group have commissioned in relation to CSPs recognises WG’s strategic drivers.
Delivery of Community Safety in the South Wales Police Area -
Executive Summary

Introduction and Context
The author was tasked with reviewing Community Safety (CS) delivery in South Wales, and asked to generate options which better suited the current and emerging environment. Starting with a blank sheet, consideration was to be given to who should be involved, achieving line of sight governance and assessing whether a vision for Safer South Wales was shared by Chief Executives.

The existing context includes Welsh Government’s (WG) desire to see key service delivery aligned to the geographic footprint of Health Board areas, with the Public Service Leadership Group similarly aligning its ‘Leaders of Collaboration’. Certain services are devolved to WG, with others either not devolved, or not devolved but with an All-Wales footprint. Budget reductions for CS delivery have already led to staff reductions, and while there is uncertainty regarding the next CSR, it seems certain that reductions in budgets will occur. The forthcoming election of a PCC adds a further dimension, with them expected to have a very keen interest in CS structures and the effectiveness of commissioned services. The impact of Health Service provision on CS issues is increasing, with direct links to Domestic Violence, other violence, Public Protection, Mental Health, SARC etc.

Key Themes
Consultation with senior police leaders and Local Authority partners across South Wales raised issues which were grouped into 7 key themes, namely:

1. **Threat, Risk and Harm** – It was recognised that a pan-South Wales needs-assessment would identify similar issues across many of the areas. Such an assessment would inevitably see areas such as Community Safety, Public Protection and Health converging and overlapping. Jointly conducted generic risk assessments across business functions focused on an individual’s specific needs, present a route through service delivery which places the client ahead of their geographical location.

2. **Health: Impact and Involvement** – Strategically linking Health to service delivery pan-South Wales is a critical success factor. Mental Health (MH) and ‘care in the community’ issues are increasingly drawing on resources across partners adding to the CS agenda and creating challenges to safety in the community. Understanding Health’s role and ensuring their effective involvement is vital if threat, risk and harm existing in CS business areas are to be understood effectively.

3. **Geography** – There is a strong ‘sense of place’ within South Wales, supported by WG and LA structures with considerable focus on representation of its citizens. It is a fact that the number of community and county councillors covering once BCU footprint is greater than the number of police officers working there (665 versus 578). ‘Sense of place’ is important and the link to the ‘local’ should be maintained and valued. However, it can also restrict opportunities to achieve desired outcomes by limiting delivery through geographic isolation.
4. **Strategy and Structure** – There is a need to achieve strategic clarity and separation within the South Wales partnership landscape. Critical to success is that all relevant strategic leads meet, agree the strategy, commit their organisations to it, and appropriately connect with their organisations to ensure its delivery; some existing structures are not seen as fit for purpose. A sense emerges that CSP’s were “of their time” and a belief some are now “separate and ineffective”, with the “real business” being done through other groups with access to more resources. A vision for South Wales’ partnership landscape agreed by strategic leads, would provide a solid foundation for developing structures and strategy. Any structure and strategy should give proper consideration to the appointment of the PCC in November 2012.

5. **Performance, Accountability and Governance** – Lack of accountability and governance was a concern across many areas, as was an inability to effectively hold partners to account. There is a clear understanding that accountability and governance are crucial and must be transparent and effective. Concern was expressed about a lack of real evaluation of approaches and services, and how to ensure revised services and structures deliver better outcomes for the public.

6. **BCU Alignment** – The majority of police and partners would adopt three BCUs aligned with Health Boards. Perceived benefits were providing the best opportunity to address the crimes and issues faced; SWP’s vision, “To be the best at understanding and responding to our communities’ needs” could be best achieved by working with partners in alignment; and, that funding often follows structures so alignment “made sense”. Some partners preferred 3 BCUs as it would assist in managing Members’ expectations and encouraging broader partnership working.

7. **Operations and Delivery: Working partnerships** – The strength of a multi-agency ‘hub’ approach to triaging needs and generating service delivery was understood and generally accepted. Good use was made in some areas of joint analysis and this could be spread more widely, with a strong example of good practice evident in ‘Genome-mapping’ ensuring effective needs assessments are made.

**Recommendations and Options**

A crucial element for each and every ‘Step’ proposed is the concept of Local Neighbourhood Management Teams. These are already in-being in some areas and there is potential to maximise their use further, making them the local lenses through which services are focused. Seven recommendations are detailed in the report and four ‘Steps’ are proposed to improve outcomes, governance and to de-clutter the partnership landscape; each could be adopted in isolation but are intended to be linked together.

The seven recommendations made relate to agreeing strategic priorities; agreeing functions and services; adopting a partnership vision; the approach to any design of services and structures; and, consideration of the PCC.

The four steps proposed to restructure Community Safety Delivery are:

Step 1 – A pan-South Wales Strategic Partnership Board, three BCU model and Local Partnership Teams (LPTs) aligned to Health Board footprint, with Local Neighbourhood Management Teams (Appendix ‘F’)

Step 2 – As Step 1 ‘plus’ LSBs Merge into Collaborative Integrated Partnership Boards (CIPBs) (Appendix ‘G’)
Step 3 – As Step 2 ‘plus’ Pan-South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG), Single Integrated Plan and Commissioned Services (Appendix ‘H’)

Step 4 – As Step 3 ‘plus’ single pan-South Wales Local Partnership Team (Appendix ‘I’)

Conclusion

The Steps proposed have been developed giving consideration to the current position taking account of existing research. Opportunities exist to improve the existing governance structures, de-clutter the partnership landscape, improve the performance framework and clearly focus on the public to provide effective, cost-efficient, locally delivered services.

The recommendations and options will not be universally popular and will bring challenges linked to both ‘sense of place’ and operating within a Political landscape. However, there is agreement that now is a good time to consider the options, with broad acceptance that changes seem inevitable, especially with the advent of the PCC.

These challenges should not be underestimated, but there are reasons to be optimistic that the ‘Steps’ proposed will improve services and more effectively deliver outcomes, using the Local Neighbourhood Management Teams as the lenses through which local services are focused and to retain a ‘sense of place’.

Recognition amongst partners of the need for change is clear, as is the potential for change to be dictated to partners by Welsh Government at some point in the future; however, it has to be recognised that the appetite for change among partners at this time is less certain.

Dave Hayler
Chief Superintendent
09.08.12
SIX RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE REPORT

Recommendation 1 – Agreed Priorities
In developing the existing community safety partnership landscape across South Wales it is recommended partners adopt the WG’s priorities set out in the Programme for Government as the foundation for the desired strategic outcomes of any structural design.

Recommendation 2 – Agreed Functions and Services
In developing and designing suitable structures to provide the services needed, it is recommended partners fully consider the functions that require undertaking to achieve the WG’s priorities and develop a ‘Menu Services’ approach.

Recommendation 3 – Single Partnership Vision
In developing the partnership design, it is recommended that a single partnership vision is agreed which anchors governance and accountability to ‘agreed outcomes’ linked to WG’s priorities.

Recommendation 4 – Approach
In developing the partnership design it is recommended that ‘safety of communities’ receives priority over the more limited definition of ‘Community Safety’ set out in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

Recommendation 5 – Approach
In developing the partnership design it is recommended that there is clearly identified separation between strategic, tactical and operational levels, with clearly defined governance and accountability structures and processes identified and agreed for each level.

Recommendation 6 – Consideration of the PCC
Many of the elements considered in this report have clear links to the role of the PCC. In relation to where the approach outlined fits into the timeline for the introduction of PCCs, it is recommended that consideration is given to including any agreed approach within the Police and Crime Plan.
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Desired outcomes'</td>
<td>Agreed by the South Wales Strategic Partnership Board to clearly identify the <em>Desired Outcomes for South Wales</em> partnership work, taking account of WG's priorities. ‘Outcomes’ are specifically referenced to ensure performance frameworks and accountability are appropriately structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic risk assessments</td>
<td>Risk assessments for clients based on shared information across all partnership business areas. Ensures that all aspects of threat, risk and harm within the broader partnership arena are considered and addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements (LNMA)</td>
<td>• These are determined by each Local Authority area in conjunction with partners, and are the arrangements by which partners actually get the necessary services delivered to clients. They are specifically local to ensure ‘sense of place’ is retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LNMA become the local lenses through which services are focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deliver prioritised and risk-assessed services according to Specific Needs Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share information in order to ensure effective service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operate cross-organisation in order to effectively deliver the ‘Desired Outcomes’ and reduce the numbers of separate professionals contacting a client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership Teams (LPTs)</td>
<td>Created by combining existing CSP arrangements into 3 Team aligned to Health Boards footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share information in order to conduct generic risk assessments across all business areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produce Specific Needs Assessments for individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and arrange the necessary services to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have responsibility for informing, directing and coordinating Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales Delivery Group (SWDG)</td>
<td>Created by combining the six existing Local Service Boards and the Integrated Partnership Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produces a Single Integrated Plan for South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales Partnership Team (SWPT)</td>
<td>Created by combining existing CSP arrangements into a single South Wales Partnership Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share information in order to conduct generic risk assessments across all business areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produce Specific Needs Assessments for individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and arrange the necessary services to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are accountable to and governed by the South Wales Delivery Group and have responsibility to deliver 'Desired Outcomes'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have responsibility for informing, directing and coordinating Local Neighbourhood Management Arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Wales Strategic Partnership Board (SWSPB)</th>
<th>The single over-arching strategic partnership group for South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attended by: Chief Executives, Chief Constable, Health and 3rd Sector, with appropriate representation from Fire, All Wales Health, Probation, Courts, WG, CPS, Prison, and Home Office Crime Team Wales (if/when reintroduced).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree the partnership vision for South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider the overarching information and intelligence to identify threat, risk and harm in order to generate a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pan-South Wales Strategic-Needs Assessment.

- Set direction, strategy and specific Desired Outcomes for South Wales’ partnership work, taking account of WG’s priorities.

| **Specific Needs Assessment** | Created by conducting a Generic Risk Assessment. Documents the specific needs of a client ensuring all necessary services and actions are identified; moves away from delivery of generic suite of services to focus on what is specifically required. |
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