



THE REPORT

Item

By: Stuart Beaumont – Head of Service, Emergency Planning & Community Safety

To: Kent Community Safety Partnership July 3rd 2012

Subject: Joint Commissioning Framework

Classification: Unrestricted

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To provide Kent Community Safety Partnership (KCSP) options for discussion and consideration regarding establishing a joint commissioning framework for community safety across Kent.

2. Background

- 2.1 In response to the regulations within the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Kent Community Safety Partnership was established in 2007 with the overarching purpose:-
- (i) To agree and performance manage a three year community safety agreement on behalf of the Responsible Authorities for Kent, refreshing it annually.
 - (ii) Through the collective focus of the Responsible Authorities and other partners to deliver Safer & Stronger Communities that will contribute to the three countywide ambitions set out in the vision for Kent, they being:-
 - To help the economy grow
 - To tackle disadvantage
 - To put the citizen in control
- 2.2 KCSP strategic responsibilities lie mainly in establishing joint systems so as to produce a county wide strategic assessment, to monitor performance and activity against the Kent Community Safety Agreement and to attract resources from appropriate funding streams.

- 2.3 Unlike other comparable upper tier CSPs across the south region, KCSP did not adopt a centralised, commissioning model in order to allocate the Home Office Community Safety Fund and any other available resources.
- 2.4 KCSP oversaw the proportionally allocated Community Safety Fund (using a Home Office formula – number of crimes per 1000 popn) to each of the District Authorities engaged with Community safety partnerships across Kent.
- 2.5 This current financial year the amount, including the DIP element, totalled £630,569 of which, £506,882 has been allocated to the CSPs.
- 2.6 Each district has received on average £38,198.
- 2.7 As of April 2013 this fund is transferred to the Police and Crime Commissioner, along with Youth Crime and Drugs Intervention grant.
- 2.8 Other small funding pots currently managed by some Responsible Authorities, such as the Victim Services Fund, the Drug Intervention main grant and Positive Futures grant, may also be transferred to the PCC at a future date.
- 2.9 As well as the above monies the Police and Crime Commissioner will have control of the police budget from when they take office in November 2012.
- 2.10 These differing funding streams will be collated into one PCC pot in 2014.

3. Police and Crime Commissioner – Police & Crime Plans

- 3.1 The Commissioner is required to issue a Police and Crime Plan as soon as practicable after taking office and in doing so, should prepare a draft in consultation with the Chief Constable. The draft plan should then be sent to the Police and Crime Panel, allowing a reasonable amount of time for it to be considered. The Commissioner must have regard and provide a response to any report or recommendations made by the panel.
- 3.2 The Police and Crime Plan should determine, direct and communicate the Commissioner's priorities during their period in office and set out for the period of issue:-
 - the Commissioner's police and crime objectives for the area;
 - the policing of the police area which the chief officer of police is to provide;
 - the financial and other resources which the Commissioner is to provide to the chief officer of police;
 - the means by which the chief officer of police will report to the Commissioner on the chief officer's provision of policing;
 - the means by which the chief officer of police's performance in providing policing will be measured; and
 - the crime and disorder reduction grants which the Commissioner is to make, and the conditions (if any) of those grants

- 3.3 Chief Officers of local, unitary, county and district authorities have a duty to co-operate with the PCC for the purpose of formulating Police and Crime Plans.
- 3.4 In turn, the Commissioner has a number of additional statutory responsibilities that they must consider when formulating the Police and Crime Plan.

These include a duty to:-

- Co-operate with Responsible Authorities in formulating and implementing local crime and disorder strategies and have regard to the relevant priorities of each Responsible Authority;
 - Make arrangements for engaging with local people;
 - Achieve value for money;
 - Co-operate with local criminal justice bodies to provide an efficient and effective criminal justice system for the police area;
 - Have regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children;
- 3.5 Partner agencies, particularly criminal justice, local authority and wider community safety partners, will also require a clear understanding of the Commissioner's objectives, details of any crime and disorder grants allocated and the conditions, if any, of such grants.
- 3.6 If the plan is developed with input from partners and underpinned by a joint understanding of need, it can be key planning document for all Responsible Authorities and the criminal justice system. Such an approach could also demonstrate how the priorities of other agencies have been taken into account in the production of the plan.

4.0 Commissioning

- 4.1 The Police and Crime Plan will be a key strategic commissioning vehicle for Police and Crime Commissioners and should include any crime and disorder reduction grants which the Commissioner is to make, including any conditions of such grants.
- 4.2 There are many mechanisms by which the Commissioner may be able to secure services or contribute to securing delivery against the police and crime objectives for the policing area. These might include for example, agreeing section 23 collaborations, entering into contracts, providing grants, aligning budgets with partners, pooling budgets and developing community budgets. The Commissioner should be aware of any existing good practice with regard to joint commissioning.
- 4.3 Importantly, it would seem sensible that Responsible Authorities should ensure that the cooperation and trust that has been built up over time between them can be maintained and developed.

Robust governance arrangements need to be in place to ensure that any commissioning activity:-

- Supports the effective delivery of the Police and Crime Objectives;
 - Responds to local need and is informed by local assessments of risk and threat;
 - Takes account of the views of the public and service users;
 - Is achievable and realistic within the resources available;
 - Has clear and transparent accountability arrangements;
 - Provides sufficient value for money; and achieving economies of scale through co and joint commissioning to meet shared partner priorities;
 - Is appropriately monitored and performance managed.
- 4.4 The PCC may wish to explore how existing joint commissioning initiatives, such as Drugs Intervention Programmes, Youth Offending Services, Integrated Offender management schemes can be further developed, and consider services that could be delivered by single providers across CSP areas.
- 4.5 The Commissioner may also wish to consider the skills and expertise required to fulfil this function and whether capability will be:-
- Developed 'in-house', via the Commissioner's Office or externally; or
 - Be supported by existing skills and expertise within the Constabulary, Community Safety Partnerships and other partners, including Probation, KFRS and Health.

5. Possible Community Safety Commissioning Models

- 5.1 Members of KCSP are more than familiar with the various types of commissioning frameworks and the process of specifying, securing and monitoring services to meet individuals' needs at a strategic level.
- 5.2 It's suggested there are at least 3 possible commissioning models that could be applied to a large and complex crime and community safety landscape such as Kent & Medway or, indeed, a combination of these approaches.
- 5.3 **Strategic commissioning approach** as the basis of negotiating Service Level Agreements and specific contract schedules with 'prime' providers. This would take time to build and may duplicate services that are already in place within other agencies, such as health and probation. (see appendix 1).
- 5.4 **Service level commissioning model** to secure new or revised services (often, though not exclusively, through competition). This may not make full advantage of the potentials for pooling funding – e.g. there are separate pots of funding for victims work held by probation, police etc. (See appendix 2).
- 5.5 **Co-commissioning or Joint Commissioning** model (see appendix 3) which is a process of aligning strategies for using resources with one or more external commissioning bodies. Each may retain their separate funding or create a formal pooled budget.

- 5.6 The Co-commissioning or Joint Commissioning model is favoured by several of the Responsible Authorities in Kent as it brings together the expertise of a wide range of commissioners and is more likely to achieve the value for money and economies of scale previously referred to. Using a mix of commissioning bodies would allow agencies to be brought together according to the nature of what is being commissioned. Different organisations could lead on each commissioning process.

6. Considerations

- 6.1 The PCC may wish to take a different approach in year one than they do in subsequent years of office. A PCC may initially be preoccupied with getting to grips with policing in the first instance, and then turn to the topic of commissioning at a later stage. This will, however, be dependent upon their knowledge and understanding of the policing and community safety issues.
- 6.2 The commissioning models above assume the Force is not a service provider - on one school of thought, when the community safety fund and main police grant are combined, the PCC can commission community safety and policing services from wherever they see fit. This makes the police force one of the many potential providers.
- 6.3 It is worthwhile considering that there might be a difference between grant giving and commissioning for the PCC. The PCC may wish to issue grants to certain organisations using one model, and undertake a full commissioning approach on another.
- 6.4 It is also worth noting that a PCC might not wish to come to a joint commissioning table if other agencies are not prepared to commit funds as well. Why should others assist the PCC in spending his/her money if they can't help you spend yours!
- 6.5 A PCC is unlikely to want a 'bitty' approach to commissioning – its probable that they'll want a one size fits all model that is easy to engage with.
- 6.6 Therefore careful consideration should be given to KCSPs relationship with the Kent Criminal Justice Board given that the PCC has a wider role around criminal justice and any commissioning model may not be sustainable without their inclusion.
- 6.7 The same point applies to the inclusion of Medway CSP.

7. Options for Consideration

- 7.1 KCSP members are asked to consider whether the KCSP should position itself as a commissioning body or a provider of services.
- 7.2 If KCSP decides to adopt a commissioning role, should there be discussions with Medway Authority and the KCJB to consider establishing a joint Kent & Medway approach?

Stuart Beaumont

Head of Service, Emergency Planning and Community Safety, KCC

July 2012