

## Appendix B

Question	Answers from stakeholders	OPCC response
<p><b>Q1a. Do you support only awarding 6 months of PLF for April to September 2016 against Sir Clive's Police and Crime Plan with the expectation that the incoming PCC may award a further 6 months funding against their priorities?</b></p>	<p>No = 9 Yes = 2 Blank = 4</p>	<p>It is clear from the responses that providing only 6 months PLF funding carries some significant risks in terms of delivery of positive outcomes with the majority asking that a full years PLF funding be given. In response to this we can confirm that we will be awarding a full years funding for 16/17.</p>
<p><b>Q1b. If we were to provide the full years PLF funding how could we ensure that the priorities of the new PCC are reflected in PLF provision?</b></p>	<p>Personally, the PLF supports core functions and activities within the local CSP, which is best placed to respond to the area's needs and community desires, while linking into the local area assessments and the police crime plan. I really don't think that the incoming PCC will radically change the CSP's workings or the core area of police business tackling core crime, violence related incidents, CSE or Cyber Crime, if they do, then CSP and partners will have to adjust their local plans in accordance with the new PCC's outcome desires.</p> <p>I cannot imagine that priorities would change that greatly as the plan is relevant and up to date – it will be very distracting and will create instability and uncertainty for those that rely on the 12 month funding to deliver their programmes of work. This reminds me of the issues we had at the beginning of the PCC's term in office where 6 months was all that was given until the plan had been agreed. I understand the sentiment but think that sensible commissioning of major priorities would also be acceptable to any incumbent PCC who would also need time to reflect on their new plan and priorities which wouldn't happen immediately anyway.</p> <p>I feel unable to comment on this as we are unsighted on the new PCC's priorities</p>	<p>As the new PCC's strategic priorities become clear we will work with CSPs to help align any of their uncommitted spend (such as contingency monies) with the new priorities.</p>

The PCC's Crime Plan is clear in its objective, fit for purpose and we are working in partnership to achieve our agreed goals. It is our view that these priorities are unlikely to change dramatically in the short term, as evidenced by the fact the plan addresses the needs of those within our District. There is a threat if we were to receive 6 months funding as the District's performance could be adversely effected by short term planning of initiatives and contracts. Changing the way CSP's are funded could affect service delivery, potentially leading to changes to service providers.

By receiving only 6 months funding will prove difficult in terms of budgeting as evidenced previously when only 6 months funding was secured from LCC. In addition, some initiatives scheduled to take place in the latter half of the financial year are likely to suffer as funding will not be guaranteed so any advance planning compromised.

Locally we have adapted to the change from funding services to commissioning against outcomes. This has been a great success for the performance of both the District and OPCC. Changing the way funding is allocated may lead to less successful outcomes due to the shorter length of the contracts on offer and a potential higher cost of delivering shorter contracts. There is however an opportunity that organisations who may not normally have the capacity to tender for longer, higher value contracts, being able to adapt to do so.

As we have been doing this year, we will continue to submit our plans to the OPCC to ensure that priorities of both the current and future PCC are reflected.

- We would identify/ target areas of work which meet the aims/ objectives of more than one partner agency.
- We would endeavour to deliver projects which are reflective of partnership priorities which have been identified clearly through local need.
- Previous strategic assessments and commissioning statements (pre and post PCC) have all taken into account issues experienced within localities; with that in mind there is an expectation that the in-coming PCC would take a similar approach.

Strategic priorities are so broad they are likely to incorporate any 'specific' priority from the new PCC

The current themes and strategic priorities, namely: Reducing Offending, Supporting Victims / Witnesses, Making Communities & Neighbourhoods Safer and Protecting the Vulnerable are believed to be both valid and an integral part of building a safer and stronger community. With this in mind, it is difficult to foresee an incoming PCC making drastic changes to the strategic priorities.

If one accepts this point of view, Charnwood's Strategic Assessment, has and will continue to support the delivery of outcomes required to deliver on these key priorities. As we are currently in the planning stages of our Strategic Assessment 2016/17, we would not be supportive of receiving 6 months PLF. We believe such an approach to be restrictive to both our strategic and fiscal planning for 2016/17. More importantly it would impact upon our ability to commission services in support of our priorities. We note that it is not proposed to inhibit other organisations, in so far as they appear to be in receipt of their total funding allocation for the forthcoming twelve months. Hence in summary we would ask that Charnwood is equally afforded the opportunity of maximum funding in order that we may make necessary provision for our strategic assessment.

If we are allocated a full years funding we are confident that our partnerships priority of crime prevention initiatives in rural areas is key to the reduction of crime in our rural communities. Our four year plan for our partnership is based on robust evidence, comprehensive consultation and a clear plan that it will take a sustained focus and period of time to ensure crime is reduced in our Borough.

It is unlikely that the priorities will change whoever is in post, so it is essential that the money is given for twelve months to enable whatever initiatives are in place to be implemented effectively. Moreover, it will take the new OPCC that long to get to grips with their role.

CSP plans will be developed incorporating community views. Suggest a review meeting with CSPs when new PCC when in place to negotiate any changes in light of new PCCs priorities.

It would be difficult for CSPs to change priorities half way through a year, our priorities are set through looking at Strategic Assessments and community consultations and our action plan is put in place. We have aligned these priorities to OPCC priorities and funding we feel an incoming PCC will need time to assess what is required for the following year. It would not be practical to run projects for only 6 months (some need up front funding), and likewise there would not be enough time in the funding year to develop new projects and re-assign funding for the last 6 months. There may be an argument for assigning a small amount of funding for immersing issues and for close consultation between the new PCC and CSPs to allow for any shift in priorities.

	<p>All feedback from Hinckley and Blaby CSP members is clearly and strongly against only awarding 6 months of PLF funding. The CSP feel this change would negatively affect service, resources, outcomes for service users and negatively impact on our delivery of local initiatives that contribute to the PCC Plan. The CSP feel that it is crucial that funding is allocated for the full 12 months. Gradual change in relation to the new PCC's priorities can then be introduced prior to the 2017-2018 planning year where the new priorities can be fully embedded in to the provision.</p> <p>We are opposed to the 6 month funding proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is extremely difficult to manage short term funding and change priorities mid-stream</li> <li>• It makes it very difficult for partnerships to plan and secure resources for such a short period particularly where funding may be for officer roles e.g. children's worker etc.</li> <li>• The current PCC priorities went out to consultation and are supported by partners/stakeholders so these should not dramatically change regardless of a change in personnel.</li> <li>• It is unlikely that our local priorities will change significantly part way through the year to warrant this and only 6 months' funding is too short to achieve significant outcomes. Local priorities are set annually to fit in with the current annual PLF commissioning framework.</li> <li>• In terms of the new PCC's priorities – the PLF is about meeting local needs/gaps which we will have identified locally</li> <li>• increased time and associated costs with extra consultation, project planning, bidding etc</li> <li>• other areas of PCC funding will be in place for the full year regardless of personnel change</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Q2. How do you feel the OPCC can best provide VCS infrastructure support?</b></p>	<p>From looking at the plan the VCS appears to only related to Leicester City for a value of £5'000, I am confident in the belief that OPCC staff plus local CSP staff can support the process through BIK support.</p> <p>I would encourage more collaboration across the VCS to maximise resources, e.g. back office functions and that this could be an element of a funding requirement that shows they are doing all they can to minimise such costs to ensure maximum front line delivery. Too often the VCS organisations are competing for funding now and this isn't necessarily the most effective way to run in the future.</p> <p>Instead of annual funding a commissioning programme with the VCS as and when required would be beneficial</p> <p>A first step would be to engage with the VCS to establish what support would best suit their strategic priorities and needs.</p>	<p>The OPCC has historically funded a total of £20,000pa of VCS infrastructure support across LLR. The table in Appendix B of the Commissioning Framework for consultation only shows £5,000 spent via Leicester City Council in 16/17. This is because the existing contract for the city ends on the 30th September 2016 whilst the County and Rutland contracts end on the 31st March 2016.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OPCC needs to clarify the role of VAL and identify gaps in provision with the aim of meeting these where relevant.</li> <li>• The OPCC needs to provide agenda (community safety) specific support to the VCS, e.g. information on good practice projects, helping with the formation of collaborative/ partnership arrangements and bids.</li> <li>• Improved process/ communication on the needs of the OPCC and examples of how the VCS can meet these.</li> </ul>	<p>Responses received are largely supportive of VCS support being spent in a more targeted manner rather than through generic VCS infrastructure support contracts. We will engage with VCS agencies and their representative umbrella bodies in identifying the best way forward (starting from the responses already received as part of this consultation). We expect that our eventual plans will be shaped and signed off by the new PCC.</p>
<p>Open days Not sure if this means support to VCS or VCS support to individuals in appropriate circumstances.</p>	<p>In relation to some of the more sepcific feedback given on this matter:</p>
<p>Charnwood have established effective relations with a number of user groups from within the Voluntary and Community Sector. Critical to this work is the need to establish sustainable long term outcomes. We would encourage the OPCC to reaffirm a commitment to active citizenship and prioritise funding streams to those priority neighbourhoods or areas of business centred on reducing threat, risk &amp; harm. The critical concern is that of sustainability and hence we would advocate for funding to support the infrastructure beneath such voluntary support groups to professionalise their business discipline, in order to capture enhanced outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a commissioner of numerous services from the VCS, the OPCC considers that it has an inherant responsibility to fund VCS infrastructure support.</li> <li>• We will consider with the VCS the possibility of funding some specific work seeking to create efficiencies in back office functions between locally based VCS agencies.</li> </ul>
<p>The OPCC could best provide support by ensuring that the VCS is clear as to the priorities of the OPCC is and work with them to structure their services were appropriate to be in a position to contribute towards the reduction of crime and positive interventions, rehabilitation and support for victims. This approach should ensure that the VCS is more informed and were their aims and objectives fit with that of the OPCC more robust initiatives and conversations take place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We fully expect some of our VCS infrastructure funding to directly contribute to support for VCS agencies in responding to some of our larger commissions.</li> </ul>
<p>By funding VCS organisations who provide work in the criminal justice system with proper funding for their work. It is not the role of the OPCC to fund infrastructure support; that is for others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OPCC is indeed committed to active citizenship and already directly supports this through a number of other initiatives such as the Youth Commission and volunteer Independent Custody Visitors</li> </ul>
<p>No view on this.</p>	
<p>The County Council also commission VCS Infrastructure support and districts fund local VCS 'hubs'. The best way the PCC could support the VCS would be to have a comprehensive volunteering offer. There are police volunteers but a bigger more visible programme would increase volunteering numbers, ensure volunteers learn new skills and have a tangible impact on community safety e.g. campaigns.</p>	

	<p>We have received the following comments from members of the CSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talk directly with key providers from the VCS. An umbrella organisation can lead the development of provision across a number of VCS groups with the clear expectation that infrastructure costs are minimised. Some organisations may well have covered their infrastructure costs through other grants/allocations and its vital that the OPCC funding is not being used to 'double fund' these costs.</li> <li>• It's difficult to comment without knowing what the PCC have funded previously</li> <li>• It would be useful to know more about why the anticipated change for the county. Is this the same for the city?</li> <li>• If what has happened previously is a VCS event to raise the profile of the PCC Grant and support with applications, this is something our local VCS Forum could do in the future with perhaps a visit from someone from the OPCC to support the process</li> </ul>	<p>(more information is available on our website - <a href="http://www.leics.pcc.police.uk">www.leics.pcc.police.uk</a>). Targeting of funding not already committed in contracts for 16/17 (such as potential PPC grants) will now fall to the new PCC to direct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OPCC are keen to fully fund projects/initiatives. Whilst it may be the case that some organisations have covered some of their "infrastructure" costs through other grants/allocations, we would not wish to rely on this as we believe that fully funding each individual project/initiative (ie. each project having reasonable overhead provision) is the only fair and right way of ensuring the sustainability of VCS organisations. Not doing so runs the risk of encouraging a "race to the bottom" rather than encouraging quality and sustainable service provision within the VCS. In addition, grants to solely cover VCS organisation's basic costs/overheads are becoming increasingly rare as commissioners shift to outcomes based commissioning which we are fully supportive of.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q3a(i) Do you support the proposed additional allocation for Project 360?</b></p>	<p>No = 0 Yes = 12 Blank = 3</p>	<p>All respondents were in support of continued funding of Project 360 (which under the new contract will be called "Domestic Violence 360 Support") or did not answer this question so we will be pushing ahead with re-commissioning this service.</p>
<p><b>Q3b(i) How do you feel the additional allocation for Project 360 can best maximise positive</b></p>	<p>I really do believe that project 360 has delivered some cracking work, although cases within Rutland that have received input would be a very small sample, I would wish to think that the lessons learnt and knowledge gained during this project could be implemented for all clients experiencing repeat domestic incidents. Funding should remain until full integration has been completed.</p>	

<p><b>outcomes?</b></p>	<p>Reduce repeat victims is crucial given the statistics that state that a victim of DV will not report until around 30 incidents have taken place. It would be good to try and work to reduce this so that reporting happens much earlier and when the earlier intervention could benefit all involved (e.g. especially children in the household who witness the abuse). The earlier the intervention the better to break the cycle and to enable victims and their families to live free from fear and abuse.</p>	<p>The new service (expected to be in place by the 1st April 2016) will cover all cases where there have been more than 3 repeat incidences of DV reported to the Police within a rolling year. We know that there are likely to have been many more incidences that are not reported to the police prior to first report (which may be from a concerned 3rd party) which is why we are currently investing £50k during the remainder of 15/16 to raise awareness and promote the new LLR wide SV/DV service which has ben jointly commissioned with the City, County and Rutland County councils.</p> <p>Because of the academic rigour of the initial pilot project, this service can be considered as "evidenced based practice" in development. As such, we are prioritising maintaining the fidelity of the service. This means that significant changes (including moving to payments by results or to completely different measurements of success) will not be considered at this stage. Once a fuller longitudinal study is completed by the university we will then be in a position to consider what changes may or may not be appropriate in terms of ensuring an efficient and effective service. The new contract will be awarded as a 1 year + 1 year contract (where we have the option after 1 years provision as to whether or not we extend the contract for a further year). This will ensure that we are able to respond to the more in-depth academic</p>
	<p>Evidenced base policing research focussed on outcomes with such a significant investment- I understand that DMU academics are supportive of the programme but a careful grip will need to be maintained- is there an opportunity for staged payments based upon outcomes?</p>	
	<p>Project 360 has had great early success so would support it's continuation in its current format. This project supports our work with domestic abuse victims which as a District with high rates of domestic abuse we wholeheartedly support.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project 360 needs to work closely with the newly commissioned domestic and sexual violence services (this relationship is already being considered and strengthened through the Joint Commissioning &amp; Assurance Group set up by the commissioners of the 4 agencies; Leicester City Council, Rutland &amp; Leicestershire County Council and the OPCC).</li> <li>• There is a need to ensure that duplication between Project 360 and other domestic violence services (and conversely gaps) are identified and tackled.</li> <li>• Need to ensure that the work of the project is properly communicated to all potential referrers (particularly, neighbourhood Police officers).</li> <li>• It would be useful to have a breakdown of the number of City victims supported against the total number of victims supported by the project.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership approach to target vulnerable / identified persons</li> <li>• Support for prosecution / mediation</li> <li>• Education – victim / offender</li> <li>• Education to support reporting – Community / GP / Police etc</li> </ul>	
	<p>Charnwood is supportive of Project 360 as it is victim focused and centred upon ensuring there are supportive interventions within the initial and critical 24 hours following a domestic incident.</p> <p>Our CSP Plan (2014/17) currently has a priority aimed at providing services &amp; support to Domestic Abuse victims &amp; their families. We would respectfully suggest that the outcomes we are measuring: 75% of all clients that have received outreach support should be happy with that service and 75% of clients that have received 'Sanctuary' support should be happy with that service and feel safer in their homes, are conducive to measuring the outputs of Project 360.</p>	

	<p>This investment is key so as that victims are supported in order to reduce the risk of repeat offences. Research shows that repeat victims of medium and low DV shows if violence continues and they are experiencing such issues this will have much wider impacts and demands on all public services. It is key also key that this project links in with services within children's services, adult social care, sure start and Me &amp; My Learning in Melton. The Safer Melton Partnership fully supports this approach.</p>	<p>findings as they become available.</p> <p>The service will not be "taking referrals" but will rather be responding to all cases, as identified from the Police's database, that meet their criteria. The new specification has been developed in consultation with all members of the Joint Commissioning and Assurance Board (sometimes referred to as the Joint Commissioning and Assurance Group) and will continue to be considered there from a strategic development perspective. This will ensure against any duplication with other SV/DV specific services and ensure that relevant referral pathways are utilised.</p> <p>Funding for the UAVA service has been agreed previously between co-commissioners and so it would be inappropriate for the PCC to be adding additional funding at this stage to this service.</p> <p>The academic assessment of project 360 (interim report) is available from the PCC's office on request.</p>
	<p>I think that it is important that Project 360 takes a holistic approach to the individuals, both the victims and the perpetrators and that effective work is undertaken with all involved including the children involved. Good partnership working across agencies needs to ensure that people are not having to tell their story over and over and that people are referred to organisations who can genuinely help. It will be important from a funding point of view to ensure that there is no duplication with SARC.</p>	
	<p>Outcomes for this will be maximised through integration with existing DA support services to support the shortest and route and seamless service through to support, and therefore greater engagement.</p>	
	<p>There needs to be a clear link with the Countywide UAVA project, and with the new target hardening project – of which we still have no details. Districts are also being asked to consider top up of 8-10k to plug expected deficit for the UAVA service, could some funding be allocated to this project so it is fully funded. It would also be good to see some analysis from 360 on numbers and outcomes from the existing project.</p>	
	<p>The CSP feel that the information given is very brief and so difficult to comment on. In general there is support for Project 360 but it would be good to see evidence of outcomes for this project as it is a large amount of funding and also some reassurance that the project fits with the county wide plans for commissioned domestic abuse services.. The CSP feel that investment in the preventative end of the work is important when it comes to maximising outcomes. Partnership work is already proving effective locally with joint work between borough and county services – in particularly having a dedicated Children's domestic abuse worker to work directly with young people who are witnesses, victims or perpetrators of domestic abuse. Positive outcomes can be maximised by making sure that partnership links in localities are built upon.</p>	
<p><b>Q3a(ii) Do you support the proposed additional allocation for Tags for the IOM cohort?</b></p>	<p>No = 3 Yes = 10 Blank = 2</p>	<p>Whilst some responants were not supportive of this option the majority were and on this basis (and having taken account of the various comments) we will be</p>



<p><b>Q3b(ii) How do you feel the additional allocation for Tags for the IOM cohort can best maximise positive outcomes?</b></p>	<p>Fully supportive, would welcome TAGS being upgraded to GPS enabled units of all offenders in time, but mindful of rights etc.</p>	<p>pressing ahead with this initiative.</p>
	<p>I have said no as I know very little about what this will entail. Tagging is one thing, but what is driving them to offend and reoffend? Will this make them more socially isolated which impacts on their mental health etc. I believe that getting to the root cause of their behaviour is the best way to reduce reoffending as they will find a way to avoid detection of breaking the 'tag' as has happened already elsewhere. Does tagging really work – where is the evidence?</p>	<p>Those that were not in support were largely concerned that tagging does not address the root causes of offending behaviour or build positive behaviours/ attitudes. However, we consider voluntary tagging to be working with those for whom tagging allows them to maintain a period of non-offending within which wider work can be undertaken in relation to changing their underlying behaviours and attitudes. Indeed, this could be through accessing some of our other funded initiatives such as mentoring.</p>
	<p>Really supportive of this through the IOM programme- evidence base exists following trials and the aim of reducing reoffending I'm sure will be monitored through the outcomes.</p>	
	<p>By definition, the TAGS are already being utilised on persons of most concern, who may commit more crime than others so the benefit of wearing the tag is already provided by the fact the offender is an IOM case. Specific attention will be given to persons who feature in other priority areas, such as the 16-24 age range. Tagging is a valuable tactic in helping people desist from crime and in reducing demand for those whose role involves managing the individual. It has been demonstrated within performance statistics and is a recognised tactic nationally.</p>	
	<p>From information we have had sight of, this appears to be a valuable project and we would support continuation.</p>	<p>The voluntary nature of the tagging means that they are unlikely to seek to break the tag off. There are no conditions attached to the tags in terms of where they can go. It is rather considered a deterrent to committing crimes as we'd know they were present at the scene of the crime if they did.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The profile of this work needs to be raised in order to ensure that key relationships are built between this project and other relevant projects e.g. domestic violence, as all IOM nominals can be considered within the voluntary project.</li> <li>• Whilst we understand that this initiative is currently being used in a number of cities; it would be useful to get an objective evaluation of the project at its various stages in order to ensure that partners are able to play a full part in maximising the outcomes.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to some of the more sepcific feedback given on this matter:</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of offenders to support prosecution / prevent offending</li> <li>• Use of IOM as 'peer' support to offenders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary tagging is relatively new so the evidence base is still growing. We will work with the force to consider whether academic evaluation of our provision is feasible</li> <li>• We will work with the force to consider how intelligence from the tags can be used</li> </ul>
	<p>Charnwood has always been a key partner of IOM and officers previously sat on the Strategic Project Board. To this end we are supportive of voluntary tagging as a control measure in the thematic of 'Reducing Offending'. However, we would seek to emphasise the importance of the relevant intelligence/data ie who is tagged and any subsequent breaching behaviour is captured at a Joint Action Group (Crime). If this data was not forthcoming then we believe it would be a missed opportunity in delivering our community safety strategy.</p>	

	<p>This is an initiative that the Safer Melton Partnership supports and links in to our priority of reducing re-offending and supporting those being released from custody to take a pathway into independent living and moving towards employment and making a positive contribution to society.</p> <p>The £40,000 would be a lot better spent giving this money to Leicestershire Cares to support offenders into employment, training or education. For the same price as a few tags that do nothing to change attitudes towards offending, or enhance a sense of self-worth (so vital an element in desistance) we would work with @ 50 people. The referrals would be specific to the Police (we already work with the Police in all its guises: MAPPA, MAPPOM, PIOM, IOM, Engage etc) and this would be a way of ensuring that we can continue to take referrals from you as we are having to move to a new funding model of charging referral agencies. As 67% of the clients we work with go into employment, training and education, the outcomes would be that the majority of those same offenders would no longer be offending, but instead, contributing positively to their local community and the economy, a far more cost effective, value for money, option!</p> <p>Clear evaluation of impact.</p> <p>Out CSP felt we did not have enough information to comment on this project.</p> <p>Again there was very little information given in order for us to comment. In general the CSP cannot support this based on the evidence given. The following comments received evidence the lack of positive support for this project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm not convinced the voluntary nature of the tagging will be taken up by many so consequently may not be cost effective.</li> <li>• Is there evidence of voluntary tagging for IOMs working in other places?</li> <li>• What are the consequences of breaching?</li> </ul>	<p>in support of Joint Action Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The funding requirement is a result of demand outstripping current supply. They are proving to be popular with those offenders who wish to resist peer pressure to commit crimes</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q4. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make in relation to the refresh of the Commissioning Framework 15-17?</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity of feedback whilst we know we've had budget cuts to lots of local services as a parish and borough councillors in our home we attend many local meetings, we both are very frustrated that local crimes don't appear to be followed up! the police person makes excuses that they tried to follow up the crime, this is just not good enough!</p> <p>In my opinion there is a complete lack of passion and enthusiasm for local beat management, my husband is a retired DC and at one point as a local beat officer, all his residents knew him this we believe has gone!</p> <p>He loved his job and followed the local crimes through.</p>	<p>This has response has been fed through to Inspector Tracey Willetts from the Charnwood Neighbourhood Policing Area.</p>

<p>I have scanned through the proposals for the dispersion of funds and see nothing alarming. However a much deeper knowledge of policing and crime is needed for knowledgeable responses, and I certainly do not have this.</p> <p>My response here is to applaud you for consulting. However meaningful responses can only come by being familiar with the pros and cons of the tabled proposals. Have you considered making a YouTube presentation or the like of these pros and cons so responses from the public could be more meaningful?</p>	<p>We will consider such an approach for future consultations</p>
<p>With regards to young people I think that there needs to be further links into schools that require them to fully accept that they can't single handily undertake or deliver the early interventions that some young people need, certainly when it comes to YOS involvement.</p> <p>I would question the substance misuse service and how it actively promotes itself to engage with partners and communities, I think this could be greatly improved, aware that current provisions contract</p>	<p>We are starting to work with the Better Care Together partnership group which will be seeking to link in with schools from an early intervention perspective.</p> <p>The substance misuse services that we fund are currently in the process of being re-commissioned which should resolve any such issues.</p>
<p>The SLP/ Leicester City Council welcomes the ongoing support to agendas such as children &amp; young people, mental health and safeguarding (children's and adults); that said there is real concern with the intention to allocate funding for 6 months only,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects will not be able to make a meaningful difference within this time period,</li> <li>• It will be difficult to engage, where applicable, new staff for a period of 6 months only; there will be issues related to staff retention, losing expertise etc</li> <li>• The in-coming PCC will take time to bed down his/ her commissioning priorities and this will reflect on timescales for allocating monies to various initiatives – this will further delay programmes which will adversely affect crime and ASB.</li> <li>• IF the in-coming PCC's commissioning views differ significantly from those that partners are currently working to, there will be a disconnect between the 2 halves of 2016-17.</li> <li>• There is precedence for continuing funding over the 12 month period, as there were "transitional" arrangements in place between the Police Authority going out and the PCC infrastructure coming in.</li> <li>• Finally, it would be useful (for planning purposes) to get an indication as to when the OPCC will be announcing their intention as to whether funding will be allocated over a 6 month or a 12 month period.</li> </ul>	<p>See answer to Q1</p>

<p>SARC already included – could extend to include CHISVA</p>	<p>We are currently considering how we can fill the gap in relation to provision of Child ISVAs. It had originally been intended that this, alongside wider therapeutic support for children, would be provided via a Strategic Partnership Development Fund (SPDF). However, it has now been decided that this is not appropriate as spend within the required time period is not likely to exceed £100,000 (a requirement for the SPDF).</p>
<p>As stated previously, we believe that the four current strategic priorities as set out in the Commissioning Framework are valid and continue to be fit for purpose. Moving forward we would ask for a review of the localism agenda in respect of IOM as it is felt that there are currently blockages in the sharing of data in respect of local offenders committing crime within the Borough of Charnwood. Finally, whilst we are supportive of the strides taken in respect of the establishment of Victim First, we have continuing reservations about the lack of support for victims of ASB. Other than victims deemed to be high risk, there is no real provision for support. We believe this is a continuing threat.</p>	<p>We will raise the matter of data sharing with the force for their consideration.</p> <p>We will continue to work with CSPs/VF in relation to ASB and understanding demand/needs requirements.</p>
<p>The Safer Melton Partnership would like to see the issue of cyber-crime and digital safety included into the priorities of the OPCC priorities. This area of concern is affecting more people in our community and we feel this is an area that as a County we need to be proactively focusing on to reduce the risk of people becoming victims of cyber-crime.</p>	<p>Whilst cyber crime and digital safety are not "strategic priorities" of the Police and Crime Plan, the OPCC recognise the growing importance of these issues and it is for this reason that they have been prioritised within the Strategic Partnership Development Fund (SPDF). Further details of successful SPDF bids will be shared in due course.</p>

	<p>Preventing violent extremism is a notable gap in the plan and commissioning framework.</p> <p>We would request that the co-commissioning arrangements for the Youth prevention and diversion-County (– Targeted diversionary youth activities working with either young offenders or those likely to offend) is changed to direct commissioning to district councils or the County Council. It currently funds a number of really key youth crime diversion schemes but it is not of benefit to go via the County Council to continue this commissioning. We would welcome a conversation to change this.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate at this point in the political cycle for a refresh of the Police and Crime Plan. The inclusion or otherwise of preventing violent extremism will be a decision for the incoming PCC when they write their new plan. The Commissioning Framework must commit spend against priorities from the existing plan.</p> <p>We will work with the County Council to come to a reasonable solution in relation to the Youth Prevention and Diversion contract.</p>
	<p>The CSP strongly believe that moving to a short term funding cycle of 6 months would be detrimental to the work and outcomes for our communities. There is limited time to progress the work and meet the needs of vulnerable people and deliver projects with positive outcomes.</p>	<p>See answer to Q1</p>

The comments are not about the refresh but about the framework currently:  
Of the £1.95m for Re-offending, only £148k is issued to the voluntary sector and that is for only one organisation. Is the VCS not considered an essential and capable sector to deliver on the prevention of re-offending? Why are the grants only for small scale work in local neighbourhoods? Having said that, I would be interested to know what 20 20 spends so much money on. Do you have a breakdown?  
By contrast, over half the budget for supporting victims and witnesses has gone to creating an in-house OPCC VCS team of vast proportions, spending £750,000. What exactly is each of this small new army doing, why was Catch 22 chosen over Victim Support and how does any of this fit with value for money or outcomes based commissioning?  
Lastly, much is made of outcomes commissioning, which is as it should be, but where can we find the outcomes for this £4m budget?

The OPCC greatly values the VCS and the contribution it makes towards all elements of the Police and Crime Plan. Our commissioning arrangements with partner commissioning organisations (i.e. the councils in the region) mean that much of our funding that is indeed spent with the VCS is referenced as going to one of the councils. This is both because we recognise the local expertise and knowledge that councils have and because it maximises the commissioning /procurement resource across the partnership in relation to the spend of our money against the outcomes we have specified in our contracts with the relevant council.

The OPCC seeks to strike a balance between funding large scale services which are able to meet the needs of all eligible people across LLR and funding smaller initiatives that only meet the needs of those in specific neighbourhoods. This allows us to ensure certain levels of fair provision across LLR whilst also allowing us to fund smaller, perhaps "grass roots", organisations who are best placed to engage with the relevant people within their locality (taking account of the particular peculiarities of their neighbourhood).

Catch 22 were selected as the provider of Victim First (VF) through a full and fair procurement process which ensured value for money, balancing the achievement of positive outcomes for victims of crime

against the cost of such provision. We are confident that the VF service will provide a high quality and cost effective service to victims and witnesses across LLR. We will of course be contract managing this service in an appropriate manner to ensure that this is the case. In addition to the VF launch day event, VF will be continuing to raise awareness of the service across partner agencies/LLR residents.

The PCC's annual report sets out achievements against the outcomes sought in the Police and Crime Plan. In addition to this, the OPCC has recently produced an Outcomes Framework for our providers which will better enable us to report on outcomes achieved through commissioned services.