

Archwilydd Cyffredinol Cymru
Auditor General for Wales

Community safety in Wales



WALES AUDIT OFFICE
SWYDDFA ARCHWILIO CYMRU



I have prepared and published this report in accordance with the Public Audit (Wales) Act 2004 and the Government of Wales Act 2006.

The Wales Audit Office study team Project Manager was Nick Selwyn and comprised Steve Frank, Gareth Jones, Andy Bruce, Martin Gibson and Duncan Mackenzie under the direction of Jane Holownia.

Huw Vaughan Thomas
Auditor General for Wales
Wales Audit Office
24 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
CF11 9LJ

The Auditor General is independent of the National Assembly and government. He examines and certifies the accounts of the Welsh Government and its sponsored and related public bodies, including NHS bodies. He also has the power to report to the National Assembly on the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which those organisations have used, and may improve the use of, their resources in discharging their functions.

The Auditor General, together with appointed auditors, also audits local government bodies in Wales, conducts local government value for money studies and inspects for compliance with the requirements of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009.

The Auditor General undertakes his work using staff and other resources provided by the Wales Audit Office, which is a statutory board established for that purpose and to monitor and advise the Auditor General.

For further information please write to the Auditor General at the address above, telephone 029 2032 0500, email: info@audit.wales, or see website www.audit.wales

© Auditor General for Wales 2016

You may re-use this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium. You must re-use it accurately and not in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Auditor General for Wales copyright and you must give the title of this publication. Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned before re-use.

If you require any of our publications in an alternative format and/or language please contact us using the following details: Telephone 029 2032 0500, or email info@audit.wales

Contents

	Summary report	6
	Background	6
	About this report	9
	Main conclusions and Recommendations	10
1	Public bodies have overlapping responsibilities for community safety, which creates barriers to effective delivery	13
	The complex accountabilities for community safety make it difficult for public bodies to provide clear and consistent leadership and direction	14
	The suspension of the all-Wales community safety advisory board is viewed by some public bodies as having inhibited cooperation and minimised opportunities to promote new ways of working	17
	Arrangements to deliver community safety are complex, have changed over time and are not always joined-up which has created difficulties for partnership working	19
	The developing approaches to regional working could address current weaknesses but progress has been slow and further work is needed to ensure accountability arrangements are fit for purpose	21
	Citizens who responded to our survey are not clear on who is responsible for community safety in Wales	26
2	National, regional and local priorities differ greatly and are not aligned, which risks confusion and unco-ordinated action. There is limited evidence of public engagement to inform the plans	28
	There is wide variation in the robustness of community-safety plans, and the lack of alignment between UK, Welsh, regional and citizens' priorities undermines partnership working and opportunities for improvement	29
	Police and Crime Commissioners generally draw on a wide range of evidence to determine their priorities for action but the approach taken varies and is not always robust	34
	Most local authorities have adopted priorities for community safety but these are not always clearly set out	35
	We found limited evidence of effective engagement with citizens and local communities to inform priorities	40

3	Whilst Welsh Government grants have increased significantly, the complex and short-term nature of funding and real-terms reductions in police and local authority community-safety management budgets impact upon partnership working and delivery of value for money	42
	The availability and use of grants to fund community-safety activity is intricate and changing but it is not always clear what benefits or positive impact grants are having	43
	Real-terms spending on policing has fallen and there has been a three per cent reduction in frontline police numbers	50
	Local-authority real-terms expenditure on management of community safety has fallen by 32.7 per cent in the last five years and the reduced capacity is inhibiting activity and improvement	51
4	Because of difficulties in defining community safety and weaknesses in data, scrutiny and evaluation, it is challenging for public bodies to demonstrate the impact of their activity	55
	Police records and survey findings suggest that crime in Wales has fallen significantly in recent years but recent reviews have raised issues of concern about the integrity of the data, which makes measurement of community safety difficult	56
	Citizens have mixed views on their quality of life and how safe they feel	60
	Judging performance and impact in delivering plans is difficult because of wide variations in the quality and range of measures, targets and actions that public bodies use	63
	Appendices	
	Appendix 1 – The statutory basis for management of community safety in England and Wales	70
	Appendix 2 – Responsibilities for community safety in Wales	71
	Appendix 3 – Study methodology	74
	Appendix 4 – Good-practice case studies	76

Summary report

Background

- 1 Community safety relates to people's sense of personal security and their feelings of safety in relation to where they live, work and spend their leisure time. Feeling safe influences how people value their community, and is important to people's quality of life often making the difference between people wanting to live and stay in their neighbourhood or not.
- 2 Because community safety covers so many different aspects of life, there is no agreed definition of what community safety is or the services and activities that contribute to delivering it. Commentators have offered a number of broad characterisations that suggest that it is concerned with those activities that prevent, eradicate, or at least contain not just crime, but the things that are disruptive to the quality of life and wellbeing of people. In its broadest sense, therefore, community safety can cover anything that adversely affects people's lives such as poorly lit streets, graffiti or the cleanliness of an area through to services focussed on crime, victims of crime or those living in fear of crime. Community safety can also be subjective with citizens' views on community safety often influenced by the personal circumstances. For example, the challenges of community safety can be very different in an urban or city environment with a concentrated population in comparison to rural communities where the population is dispersed.
- 3 The involvement of local government in addressing community safety was first actively promoted through a joint central government circular issued in 1984¹. Subsequently, the **1991 Morgan Report**², recommended that there should be a clear statutory responsibility on local government for the development and encouragement of community-safety activities. The Morgan Report was built upon by the **1998 Crime and Disorder Act** (the '1998 Act'), which created statutory local community-safety partnerships. The 1998 Act defined the core group of agencies – local authorities, the Police, Fire and Rescue authorities and health boards – involved in these partnerships as well as their functions and role at the local level. The provisions of the 1998 Act placed a duty on local agencies to work together to achieve their goals, and highlighted that local authorities, the police and health authorities together are responsible for achieving community safety. In 2007³ the UK Government introduced a Statutory Instrument that further strengthened arrangements and requires the prescribed authorities set out in the 1998 Act to work together to develop a strategic assessment. The assessment should underpin local strategies and activities and, if done well, will allow for partners to align their work to deliver the greatest impact.

1 Home Office, Department of Education and Science, Department of Environment, Department of Health and Social Security and Welsh Office, **Crime Prevention (Home Office Circular 8/1984)**, Home Office, 1984.

2 Home Office, **Safer Communities: The Local Delivery of Crime Prevention through the Partnership Approach**, Home Office, 1991 ('The Morgan report').


3 Home Office, **Statutory Instrument No. 1831: The Crime and Disorder (Prescribed Information) Regulations 2007**, Home Office, June 2007.

- 4 The most recent major legislative change to the community-safety landscape in England and Wales is the **Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011** (the '2011 Act'). The 2011 Act transferred the control of police forces from police authorities to elected Police and Crime Commissioners and the first police commissioner elections were held in November 2012 and the second elections in May 2016⁴. A key duty of Police and Crime Commissioners is the production of the Police and Crime Plan. Whilst Police and Crime Commissioners are not specifically members of community-safety partnerships they do have community-safety-related powers and duties – including a reciprocal duty to co-operate with community-safety partnerships – and also have powers to directly commission work on addressing community safety.
- 5 Responsibility for the development of policy that contributes to addressing community safety in Wales is split between many different agencies and is complex. The UK Government through the Home Office legislates and provides direction for Police and Crime Commissioners and sets policy in relation to the function of 'community safety' for local government in England and Wales. Responsibilities for community safety are also influenced by the Welsh Government which is accountable for setting the policy for key public agencies such as health boards, Fire and Rescue Authorities and for the major areas of operation of Welsh local authorities. In addition, whilst a wide range of agencies contribute to addressing community safety, the prime responsibilities for setting policy priorities that contribute to addressing community safety in Wales rest with the Welsh Government nationally; Police and Crime Commissioners at a regional level; and local authorities at a local level. **Appendices 1 and 2** set out in more detail the legislative basis and organisational arrangements for community safety in Wales.
- 6 **Figure 1** summarises the line of accountability for the major public bodies and shows that policy and funding decisions are split between the UK and Welsh Governments whilst delivery of the services that impact upon community safety at a regional and local level falls to Police Forces, Police and Crime Commissioners, health bodies and local authorities, amongst others. The approach of the Welsh and UK Governments to addressing community safety are markedly different. The two Governments have different priorities for action which influences how regional and local public bodies operate and work in respect of devolved and non-devolved matters. Arrangements are also subject to change which can offer opportunities to improve how partners work together to deliver services but can also create further complications. Going forward, the introduction of Public Service Boards⁵ is seen by the Welsh Government as playing the key role at local level in focussing public bodies on the agreed priorities of an area, including community safety.

⁴ Elections were held in 40 police-force areas in England and Wales on 5 May 2016 and three of the four Commissioners for Wales changed – Dyfed-Powys, Gwent and North Wales. Our fieldwork with Police Forces and Commissioners was undertaken in 2015-16 prior to the May 2016 elections.

⁵ The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 establishes statutory Public Service Boards in each local-authority area. The purpose of Public Services Boards is to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing in their area by strengthening joint working across all public services in Wales.

Figure 1 – The public bodies which contribute to addressing community safety in Wales



About this report

- 7 During 2015-16, staff of the Wales Audit Office, on behalf of the Auditor General, examined whether the Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities are working together effectively to tackle crime and other public-safety issues that have a negative effect on people's wellbeing. Our study methods are set out in [Appendix 3](#). These included an online survey for citizens to tell us about their views on community safety and how well organisations work to address their needs, and audit fieldwork at the four Police and Crime Commissioners and seven of the 22 local authorities in Wales. Our methodology also included an analysis of reported crime data, budgets and a review of key plans and strategies. Our report also includes examples of good practice in delivering community safety in Wales and we have also published specific reports summarising performance on community safety by each Police Force and Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 8 For the purposes of our review we have judged the effectiveness of delivering community safety against the following criteria – empowered and effective leadership; intelligence-led business processes; engaged communities; partnership working with effective and responsive delivery structures; visible and constructive accountability; and appropriate skills and knowledge. Using this criteria we judge an effective approach to community safety to be one where partners have agreed the actions that prevent and reduce crime, and where responsible public bodies work well together, and with citizens, to support wellbeing and safety in local communities. The approach to community safety should be underpinned by effective visible leadership with partners delivering agreed actions within clear, appropriate and aligned strategies that make the best use of resources and focus on the things that matter.

Main conclusions

- 9 Based on the findings of this audit, the Auditor General has concluded that **complex responsibilities make it difficult for public bodies to co-ordinate a strategic approach to community safety, which weakens collective leadership and accountability and undermines the potential to help people stay safe.**
- 10 Policy responsibilities across the range of community safety activities are split between the UK Government – which is accountable for policing matters, youth justice and counter extremism among other policy areas – and the Welsh Government which is answerable for the bulk of local authority services in Wales, as well as the Fire and Rescue authorities and Health Boards. As a result of devolution the Welsh and UK Government’s policy approach to the various elements of community safety are however developing in different ways and may therefore diverge in practice and approach.
- 11 Local policing in Wales is not devolved and is delivered via four police forces and four Police and Crime Commissioners. They take their lead from the Home Office. To be truly effective the Police need to work with local authorities because local government is responsible for managing the local community safety partnerships. However, community safety partnerships operate at a local authority, not police force, level. The guidance for partnerships is produced by the Home Office to whom they are accountable. However the bulk of public funding to local authorities comes from Welsh Government.
- 12 The complexities of the lines of accountability means that no single body either leads on or takes responsibility for all aspects of community safety within Wales. Some new regional partnership approaches are being established but these are in their early stages of development. The suspension of the all-Wales community-safety advisory board and the diminishing role of the Wales Association for Community Safety Officers (WACSO) are seen by some partners as having reduced opportunities for joint working on community safety. The complexities of delivery and accountability arrangements are reflected in the findings of our citizens’ survey where many respondents are not clear on who is responsible for community safety in Wales.
- 13 The Welsh Government has no single strategy for community safety and has focussed its activity on delivering the **Programme for Government**⁶. Whilst all local authorities and the four Police and Crime Commissioners have plans, these are not consistently aligned to ensure the best use of resources and maximise impact and there are no areas where national, regional and local bodies have the same priority. Disjointed planning and poor co-ordination can create a risk of organisations either duplicating activity or no one focussing on the most important issues.

⁶ The **Programme for Government** is the Welsh Government’s plan for action setting out the key priorities to be delivered during the National Assembly Term 2011-2016.

- 14 Some community-safety plans are not underpinned by good-quality information and have not been updated to reflect changing patterns and trends in community safety, whilst others remain too ambitious and undeliverable. Only 23 per cent of citizens who responded to our public survey stated that they know where to access plans for community safety in their area and only 18 per cent felt that the plans focussed on addressing the most important community-safety issues in their area.
- 15 Funding of community safety has changed significantly in the last six years. Authorities used to receive grants from the Home Office but these are now part of the Police Main Grant. Whilst funding for Police and Crime Commissioners and police forces in Wales has remained stable, in real terms their spending on policing and community safety has fallen. Decisions on where to fund community-safety-partnership activity have mostly followed historical patterns of investment and have not been consistently challenged to ensure grants are used to address the most important issues. The amount of grant monies provided by the Welsh Government to support public bodies in tackling community safety is growing. The complexities of the overall funding regime for community safety, and its short-term nature, are reducing opportunities to improve value for money. Spreading money widely reduces the benefits that can be realised from pooling and targeting funding.
- 16 Cuts to local-authority budgets have resulted in a real terms funding reduction of 32.7 per cent for the management and co-ordination of community safety. Community-safety partnerships recognise that they need to secure alternative sources of funding to sustain their existence but to date little work has been undertaken to access new finance streams. With resources continuing to fall, it is questionable if the current structures for community safety are sustainable or able to deliver what is needed.
- 17 Judging how organisations are improving community safety is difficult. There are no statutory indicators or measures for community safety and no single agency has overall responsibility. Performance is primarily based on Police records and survey findings. Whilst these suggest that crime is now starting to rise after a long period of reported crime falling, historically, crime data has not been reliable. Citizens who responded to our survey feel less safe in their area than they did last year and only 10 per cent are confident that those responsible for community safety are doing a good job.
- 18 Processes for overseeing and challenging performance are not aligned and wide variations in the quality and range of measures, targets and actions make it difficult to demonstrate impact. These conclusions on the effectiveness of performance management arrangements is consistent with the findings of our most recent reviews, and highlights the continuing difficulty public bodies face in collating and evaluating data. Improving data analytics needs addressing if public bodies are to make the right choices on where to invest scarce resources and focus their activity to make the biggest impact.

Recommendations

Recommendations		
R1	Improve strategic planning to better co-ordinate activity for community safety by replacing the existing planning framework with a national strategy supported by regional and local plans that are focused on delivering the agreed national community-safety priorities.	Welsh Government, Home Office Wales Team, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R2	Improve strategic partnership working by formally creating effective community-safety boards that replace existing community-safety structures that formalise and draw together the work of Welsh Government, police forces, local authorities, health boards, fire and rescue authorities, WACSO and other key stakeholders.	Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R3	Improve planning through the creation of comprehensive action plans that cover the work of all partners and clearly identify the regional and local contribution in meeting the national priorities for community safety.	Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R4	Review current grant-funding arrangements and move to pooled budgets with longer-term funding commitments to support delivery bodies to improve project and workforce planning that focusses on delivering the priorities of the national community-safety strategy.	Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R5	Ensure effective management of performance of community safety by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • setting appropriate measures at each level to enable members, officers and the public to judge progress in delivering actions for community-safety services; • ensuring performance information covers the work of all relevant agencies; and • establishing measures to judge inputs, outputs and impact to be able to understand the effect of investment decisions and support oversight and scrutiny. 	Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R6	Revise the systems for managing community-safety risks and introduce monitoring and review arrangements that focus on assuring the public that money spent on community safety is resulting in better outcomes for people in Wales.	Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities
R7	Improve engagement and communication with citizens through Public Service Boards in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developing plans and priorities for community safety; • agreeing priorities for action; and • reporting performance and evaluating impact. 	Public Service Board members

Part 1

Public bodies have overlapping responsibilities for community safety, which creates barriers to effective delivery



1.1 Fundamental to effective partnership working is having good and clear leadership. In this part of the report, we consider the different responsibilities and roles of partners and how effective the various bodies are at working together on community safety. We also examine leadership and accountabilities for delivery. Finally, we consider the findings of our survey of citizens to gauge their awareness and understanding of who is accountable for community safety in Wales and, from their perspective, how well these current arrangements work.

The complex accountabilities for community safety make it difficult for public bodies to provide clear and consistent leadership and direction

- 1.2 Legislation and guidance promote a partnership approach as the best way to address the problems of unsafe communities. The benefits of partnership working and effective leadership are numerous and partnerships are potentially powerful tools for tackling difficult policy and operational problems that local agencies face:
- partnerships are better than individual agencies at identifying and defining problems of the greatest community concern and can draw on wider information to prioritise the right things for action;
 - partnerships are better able to develop inventive and targeted actions by drawing together a diverse group of agencies with different responsibilities, skills and approaches;
 - effective partnership can provide clarity of leadership and purpose for co-ordinated action and delivery;
 - collective action is usually more effective than a single agency intervention and potentially will have a greater impact;
 - partnerships allow for resources to be brought together and aligned to focus more effectively on addressing common problems; and
 - multiple interventions are likely to maximise the impact on an issue.
- 1.3 Partnership working as a method of delivering community-safety outcomes is well established and has been promoted as far back as Home Office Circulars⁷ from the 1960s onwards. Since the 1990s, successive national-government policies have given a greater focus to the importance of agencies working together to address community safety including the most recent guidance on serious and organised crime published in October 2013⁸.

⁷ Home Office, **Report of the committee on the Prevention and Detection of crime (Cornish Committee)**, 1965.

⁸ Home Office, **Serious and Organised Crime Strategy**, October 2013.

- 1.4 Because responsibility for community safety is shared by a wide range of public bodies and framed by the priorities of the Welsh Government on devolved matters and the UK Government on non-devolved issues, leadership on community safety can be challenging. The style and approach of the two Governments can influence how regional and local organisations operate and work, in particular in respect of devolved and non-devolved activity, which can make some partnership working difficult for public bodies.
- 1.5 This is further complicated by the differing priorities of the Welsh Government and UK Government for addressing community safety. The Welsh Government is concentrating on agreed priorities within the **Programme for Government**, rather than on community safety as a standalone area of activity, which allows the Welsh Government and public bodies to focus on delivering these priorities. For example, the recent work undertaken by the Welsh Government on domestic abuse which has seen:
- new legislation introduced through the Violence against Women, Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (Wales) Act 2015 (the ‘2015 Act’)⁹;
 - a national advisor appointed to work with public bodies and victims to drive improvements in the way services are planned, commissioned and delivered;
 - the creation of a national training framework to support delivery of the 2015 Act¹⁰;
 - the creation of an Advisory Group drawing membership from a range of key partners and stakeholders to advise and guide the work of the Welsh Government in this area; and
 - funding set aside to support public bodies to implement the new legislation.
- 1.6 The change of emphasis does, however, mean that community safety as an area of activity is becoming less relevant, particularly at a local-authority level. And, because the Home Office is primarily focussing on strengthening the role of Police and Crime Commissioners, who are promoted as being responsible for co-ordinating and overseeing delivery of community safety at a police-force level, the local-authority co-ordination role via community-safety partnerships is diminishing.
- 1.7 Through our surveys, we found that only 59 per cent of community-safety partnership members that responded to our survey felt that the Welsh Government provides visible and effective leadership on community safety in Wales. The result is lower than the responses for their Police and Crime Commissioner, where 66 per cent felt there was effective leadership, and much lower than the 94 per cent who felt their local community-safety partnership was providing the most effective leadership. However, 27.5 per cent of survey respondents also recognised that their community-safety partnership did not have a high profile and needed to do more to promote its activity.

⁹ Welsh Government, [Violence against women and domestic abuse webpage](#)

¹⁰ Welsh Government, [The National Training Framework on violence against women, domestic abuse and sexual violence: Statutory guidance under section 15 of the Violence against Women, Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence \(Wales\) Act 2015 and section 60 of the Government of Wales Act 2006](#), January 2016.

- 1.8 One of the biggest barriers to delivering better community safety is the complex relationship between the various agencies, and the disjointed nature of responsibilities and leadership for community safety, as highlighted in responses to our survey. One commentator stated that 'The community safety agenda is set by the local authority, Welsh Government, Home Office and Police and Crime Commissioner. Governance.....it is complex and difficult to manage effectively.' Others noted that 'there will remain areas of duplication and potential confusion re primary accountability [there is a] risk of increased gap between ambition and ability to deliver'; and another that 'the leadership from each agency to get things done is good, but much of that is down to the individuals who have long standing working relationships. The community safety partnership does bring it together but I think much of it would happen anyway. There is tension between the community safety partnerships and the Police and Crime Commissioner's office and I cannot comment on its relationship with Welsh Government.'
- 1.9 The extent to which government, local authorities, the police and other partners work together to deliver community safety is fundamental to improvement and is not insurmountable where there is a shared vision and a clear willingness to change. At present, however, the complexities of responsibilities and accountabilities for community safety mean that agencies in Wales do not share 'ownership' of community safety and leadership can often be fragmented because it is difficult to align.
- 1.10 Building trust between partners is a key component of success whilst poor leadership can be a barrier to improvement. Because so many agencies can be engaged in activity, there is also a risk that responsibility for leading and prioritising action can become unclear. To create the right interventions and make the best use of their resources, organisations therefore need to sign up to work together and have clear and effective leadership to overcome any structural difficulties.
- 1.11 However, from our fieldwork we found that partnership arrangements between public bodies are not always working effectively. In addition, a number of community-safety partnership co-ordinators highlighted concerns on the changing relationship resulting from the recent creation of Police and Crime Commissioners and the impact these structural changes are having on community-safety partnerships. For example, the growing focus on regionalisation is reducing the focus on local issues, and in some cases opportunities for improved strategic working were being lost, which is ultimately reducing opportunities to improve services for the public.

The suspension of the all-Wales community-safety advisory board is viewed by some public bodies as having inhibited co-operation and minimised opportunities to promote new ways of working

- 1.12 To support delivery of its strategic aims, the Welsh Government established in October 2012 the All Wales Community Safety Advisory Board. The Board was seen as the single strategic all-Wales group and its purpose to work in partnership to support delivery of the **Programme for Government** commitments in respect of community safety.
- 1.13 The Board was established to replace the previous All-Wales Community Safety Forum. The Forum was seen by the Welsh Government as needing to be refocused on the priorities of the Welsh Government's Programme for Government. Chairmanship and secretariat support for the new Board moved to the Welsh Government and a draft terms of reference was produced. The Welsh Government in revising these arrangements saw the Board as having a more strategic role, with one of its key aims being the members' ability to unblock issues preventing or slowing down delivery, and was keen to focus activity on delivering the Programme for Government.
- 1.14 Specifically, the **Terms of Reference**¹¹ for the Board identified the following priorities:
- work together to support and enable effective delivery of the commitments outlined in the **Programme for Government**;
 - maintain a strategic oversight ensuring delivery is effectively joined up, with appropriate regional collaboration and, in doing so, the group will try to identify opportunities to maximise the outcomes of activity that is delivered;
 - play a key role in identifying and unblocking issues that are preventing or threatening to slow down delivery;
 - influence national, regional and local policy direction and implementation and raise issues of concern;
 - provide key policy updates/activities to other members of the group;
 - consider and discuss community-safety issues on a strategic and national basis;
 - aid collaboration in Wales; and
 - disseminate good practice.

¹¹ Welsh Government, **All Wales Community Safety Advisory Board, Draft Terms of Reference**

- 1.15 The Board met three times between October 2012 and June 2013 following its establishment. Members of the Board felt there was some duplication of the Board with other meetings, such as the Wales Youth Justice Advisory Panel and the All Wales Criminal Justice Board. Members were informed by letter in August 2013 that the group going forward would hold ad hoc meetings for specific issues should members request to do so, however, no requests were received¹². The Welsh Local Government Association, local authorities and Police and Crime Commissioners expressed concerns to us that the suspension of the Board has created a leadership vacuum on community safety in Wales and the absence of a national group representing all interested parties hinders opportunities for improvement.
- 1.16 Partners recognise that the Welsh Government has an important leadership and policy role in supporting community safety in Wales. Yet many do not consider that the Welsh Government is facilitating partnership working. For example, one survey respondent noted that the Welsh Government leads well on areas such as 'Substance Misuse, Community Cohesion, however other significant parts of the agenda are not so clear such as on Crime (accepting the devolved aspect), Anti-Social Behaviour and Preventing Extremism. The regionalisation and isolation of the component parts of the Community Safety Agenda (domestic abuse, substance misuse, slavery etc.) are leading to a clear dilution of leadership, governance and accountability.'
- 1.17 Partners did acknowledge that the Welsh Government provides clear leadership in some policy areas and has developed well-rounded and appropriate strategies, and resourced their implementation. This is recognition of the changing agenda for community safety taken by the Welsh Government which is focussing activity on core themes and priorities in the **Programme of Government** – for example, the new arrangements for safeguarding created under the Social Services and Well-being Act 2015¹³ – rather than focussing on community safety as a standalone and single concept. However, the suspension of the Advisory Board, and the lack of direction on activity outside of the **Programme of Government**, is seen by some of those we have spoken to as part of our review as a weakness, particularly because of the split in responsibilities between the Welsh and UK Governments for community safety.

¹² Welsh Government, **Minutes of All-Wales Community Safety Advisory Board meeting**, 30 October 2012.

¹³ Welsh Government, **Safeguarding webpage**

Arrangements to deliver community safety are complex, have changed over time and are not always joined up, which has created difficulties for partnership working

- 1.18 Our review has identified there are some important structural barriers to effective partnership working. We have already noted on [page 5, paragraph 5](#) above that the separation of responsibilities between the Welsh Government and the Home Office in terms of policy decisions and oversight of regional and local public bodies can cause some confusion. The separation of responsibilities is further compounded by the lack of alignment between public-sector service boundaries in Wales.
- 1.19 [Figure 2](#) below sets out the boundaries for the main public bodies responsible for contributing to addressing and improving community safety, and highlights that the boundaries between agencies significantly impacts on the relative ease or complexity of partnership working.
- 1.20 Because public bodies do not always share the same geographical boundaries, partnership arrangements can be complex with some organisations having to duplicate activity by servicing a variety of fora within different governance and decision-making arrangements. These geographical differences add to an already complicated picture and can put a strain on already stretched resources with staff having to attend multiple meetings and committees. For example, whilst 96 per cent of respondents to our survey of community-safety partnership members stated that their partnership worked well with their local fire and rescue authority, only 70.5 per cent felt their engagement with the Welsh Government was effective and 76.5 per cent with local health boards.
- 1.21 The different alignments for partnership working can hinder joint working. For instance, the partnership bodies for community safety for South Wales Police covers two fire and rescue authorities, four health boards and seven local authorities. Similarly, the Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue Service covers six community-safety partnerships, three health boards and two police forces. Conversely, in North Wales the footprint for public services operate on the same geographical boundary with police, fire-and-rescue, and health services having conterminous boundaries with the six local authorities that make up North Wales. Different geographical boundaries with a lack of co-terminosity hamper accountability, decision making and budgeting.

Figure 2 – Boundaries for key public services and community safety in Wales

Welsh Government			Home Office	Covered by both Welsh Government and Home Office
All Wales NHS bodies	Regional NHS bodies	Fire and rescue authorities	Police forces	Local authorities
Public Health Wales NHS Trust and Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust	Betsi Cadwaldr	North Wales Fire and Rescue	North Wales Police	Conwy Denbighshire Flintshire Gwynedd Isle of Anglesey Wrexham
	Aneurin Bevan	South Wales Fire and Rescue	Gwent Police	Blaenau Gwent Caerphilly Monmouthshire Newport Torfaen
	Cardiff and Vale University		South Wales Police	Cardiff Vale of Glamorgan
	Cwm Taf			Merthyr Tydfil Rhondda Cynon Taf
	Abertawe Bro Morgannwg	Bridgend Neath Port Talbot Swansea		
	Hywel Dda	Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue	Dyfed Powys	Carmarthenshire Ceredigion Pembrokeshire
	Powys Teaching			Powys

Source: Wales Audit Office

- 1.22 Some survey respondents also raised some specific concerns around continuity of attendance, which is resulting in some partnerships involving mainly the council and police at a strategic level. Partnerships operating with such a restricted focus run the risk of becoming too deeply fixated on narrow areas of activity and one interviewee stated that 'community safety partnerships have drifted away and no-one has really stopped this'. If insufficient partners are involved in local forums then partners could focus on the immediate service issues and will have a less rounded view on who uses services and the views of local communities. At the other end of the spectrum, some partnerships have many representatives from a broad range of organisations, although funding restrictions are beginning to reduce some partnerships' ability to maintain large infrastructures.

The developing approaches to regional working could address current weaknesses but progress has been slow and further work is needed to ensure accountability arrangements are fit for purpose

- 1.23 Where partnerships are focussed on addressing common problems and are effectively aligned, they can make a positive difference. For example, the Wrexham Harm Reduction Unit is a pilot initiative of the Community Safety Partnership. The Unit contains staff from North Wales Police and various services of the local authority working together under one roof to address issues within communities and neighbourhoods. A shared calendar of events helps co-ordinate the partners' activities, while sharing online ICT helps to store information so every partner can access and add information and decide on an appropriate course of action. The initiative has engendered more proactive ways of working instead of reacting to issues, which happened under previous arrangements. The real advantage is having a multi-disciplinary team working together and under one roof, which is saving time and facilitates quicker decision making.
- 1.24 Likewise, the Denbighshire Top 20 is an initiative which identifies the people for whom improved partnership working would help to maximise their independence and resilience and therefore reduce unplanned access to services. The initiative stemmed from Denbighshire County Council's **Well Being Plan**¹⁴ and is a problem-solving initiative where partners, such as the Police, local authority, fire and rescue, health and the ambulance service, meet to discuss and share information on a number of people who are persistent and heavy users of public services. These heavy service users may not have serious problems or issues of concern, but they regularly demand services or draw attention to themselves, whether it is crime related or on other matters. Having different partners present helps different ideas and solutions to be generated and the initiative has produced some positive outcomes with some individuals.

¹⁴ Conwy and Denbighshire Local Service Board, **Supporting Independence & Resilience: Denbighshire Wellbeing Plan 2014-2018**

- 1.25 We have highlighted the Swansea Help Point in [Figure 3](#) which is making a positive impact in the city centre and delivering value for money. Similar initiatives have also been provided in Cardiff with the Cardiff Alcohol Treatment Centre and in Wrexham, the Wrexham Alcohol Treatment and Welfare Centre. The detail of these good practice approaches is set out in [Appendix 4](#).

Figure 3 – Swansea Help Point

As a result of the effective multi-agency working at the city centre's Help Point, people in Swansea are safer. The Swansea Help Point is a specialist mobile first-aid centre established within the city centre to help alleviate pressure on Accident and Emergency Services at peak times. The Help Point is staffed by the St John Ambulance, South Wales Police, university student volunteers and the street pastors. It is also a refuge and information centre.

In 2014-15, the project helped to reduce the burden on busy services at peak times and treated 582 patients – classified as 55 assault victims, 238 injured persons and 287 vulnerable persons. Only 98 required further treatment at Accident and Emergency with 37 conveyed to hospital by St John Ambulance. The 2014 evaluation estimated that without the existence of the service, 80 per cent (465) of all admissions to the Help Point would have gone directly to Accident and Emergency.

Volunteers also give health advice and make sure that vulnerable people start to make their way home safely, an important issue because safety in city centres at night remains an issue nationally and is a key priority within Safer Swansea's plans that form part of Swansea's Single Delivery Plan. In addition, the Council is investing in regenerating the town centre. Making sure people are safe at night is attracting more businesses into the city centre.

- 1.26 Opportunities for collaboration on a larger scale and across Wales are also being explored. Collaboration is regularly discussed at the All Wales Policing Group and the four Welsh forces are considering areas where they might effectively collaborate. Some attempts have been made to overcome these obstacles by agencies working together at regional (as opposed to local) level. In particular, we found that Police and Crime Commissioners have a growing reputation for providing leadership on regionalising community safety, although their standing appears to be partly driven by their ability to influence the local agenda through their funding.

- 1.27 The North Wales Safer Communities Board is an enabling body which assists the work of the region's individual community-safety partnerships on a North Wales level. Established in 2012, its purpose is to develop a consistent approach to community safety throughout the region. The Board comprises the public organisations that are required by law to work together to tackle crime and disorder and includes all six local authorities, North Wales Police, the Police and Crime Commissioner, Health Board, North Wales Fire and Rescue Service, the Probation Service, Voluntary Sector, Wales Community Rehabilitation Company and the Welsh Government. The aim of the North Wales Safer Communities Board is to provide strategic direction for the exercise of the Community Safety and Youth Justice functions across the region. The North Wales Safer Communities Board has consequently reduced duplication between regional and local arrangements on key priority areas.
- 1.28 Likewise, in early 2015 the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent established the Safer Gwent Group. The main purpose of the Safer Gwent Group is to regionally co-ordinate work with key community-safety partners to provide strategic direction and a structured approach across the five local authority areas of Gwent. Membership includes the five local authorities, the local health board, registered social landlords, voluntary sector, youth offending services and the probation and rehabilitation services. The group meets quarterly and enables information sharing to:
- facilitate better partnership working;
 - influence existing funding opportunities to support the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan priorities;
 - map existing community-safety services to identify duplication and gaps in service provision; and
 - provide information to support commissioning of community-safety services.
- 1.29 One of the main benefits of partners working regionally can be a better alignment of organisations which can be more responsive to citizens' needs than their constituent partners are. However, in legal, political and financial terms, regional entities, if not created and managed effectively, can lead to further challenges as well:
- Whilst regional bodies can draw membership from the local-authority community-safety partnerships, they cannot replace the statutory role of partnerships, including their accountability and reporting, which is vested within the established local-authority governance framework. The role could be replicated by the aims and objectives of any regional group, but needs to be managed carefully to avoid duplicating activity.

- The requirements to maintain statutory local partnerships and also service larger regional entities can spread already stretched resources further and it is questionable if such an approach is sustainable.
- Regionalising arrangements raises other potential concerns such as public meetings and public reporting. Regional bodies may not be as transparent as the established local authority executive and scrutiny frameworks and are often less clearly accountable than their individual members, which raises important questions about the governance and accountability of these partnerships.
- On a practical level, Police and Crime Commissioners are relatively new roles. They need to embed and ensure their governance arrangements are working effectively and their accountabilities are clearly understood. It may be too much to therefore expect Commissioners to both create their own governance infrastructure and commit time and resources to develop alternative regional models as well.
- Continual shifting of arrangements can disrupt relationships especially where there is a lack of formal structure, clear lines of accountability and agreed roles. Structural change can be an unhelpful distraction and can stultify progress.

1.30 Some community-safety partnership members who completed our survey also expressed concerns about the influence of Police and Crime Commissioners. One noted that ‘the relationship between the community safety partnership and Police and Crime Commissioner can be strained, I believe that this is based on changes to funding arrangements when Police and Crime Commissioners came into being and how the Police and Crime Commissioner has delivered those messages to community safety partnership partners..... I think that some community safety partnership members have found these changes difficult to accept and with other changes coming in the future have seen them as threats’. Another outlined concerns that ‘much disruption has been made to our local community safety partnership since the establishment of the regional community safety partnership’ and another that ‘the issue is not the community safety partnership but the complete lack of engagement with the partners and the public.....by the Police and Crime Commissioner.’

1.31 The Home Office provides a link between Westminster and Wales on all areas of Home Office responsibility through their Home Office Wales team. The Home Office Wales team have not formally commented about the move in some areas to dissolve community-safety partnerships and move the responsibility for community safety to local service boards (Public Service Boards now) or introduce regional arrangements. The Home Office Wales team believes that structures have evolved into new formats that are more appropriate and suitable, although due to their limited capacity they do not engage with individual local community-safety partnerships directly and are therefore unable to comment on the effectiveness of these changes.

- 1.32 A number of interviewees raised concerns about the effectiveness of the Wales Association of Community Safety Officers (WACSO¹⁵), the national body for local-authority community-safety officers. Partners mostly felt that WACSO is not effective in driving change and supporting improvement and a number questioned what value WACSO has in its current format, particularly with the growth in regional working and the impact of reduced resources. The role of WACSO, and community safety as a local authority area of activity, is also influenced by the structural changes introduced by the Welsh and UK Governments and the different approaches developed for setting and resourcing priorities. As a consequence, community safety is now seen as less relevant as a core area of activity and is being replaced by new arrangements in Wales which focus on single-priority issues – substance misuse, for example. The change in emphasis concentrates public bodies on working on and improving these single priorities as opposed to the previous approach of community-safety partnerships co-ordinating and overseeing activity in a range of areas.
- 1.33 Many we spoke to however acknowledged that a national body bringing together all the key players – local authorities, police and crime commissioners, police forces, fire and rescue authorities, health bodies and the Welsh Government – is essential and that WACSO has the potential to play an important role within a national framework. However, in the absence of such a national body and the growing trend for regional working, the influence of WACSO is diminishing.

¹⁵ WACSO is made up of the lead community-safety officers across 20 community-safety partnerships in Wales.

Citizens who responded to our survey are not clear on who is responsible for community safety in Wales

- 1.34 The majority of citizens who responded to our survey are uncertain on who is accountable for community safety in Wales¹⁶. Only 41 per cent of citizens who completed our public survey agreed that responsibilities for leading on addressing community safety in their area are shared between the Welsh Government, the Chief Constable, the Police and Crime Commissioners, local authorities and community-safety partnerships. Just under 20 per cent, however, felt that it was their Police and Crime Commissioner who alone is responsible for leading on addressing community safety in their area. A further 14 per cent decided that their local community-safety partnership is responsible and 11 per cent their local authority. Only 3.6 per cent felt that the Welsh Government alone is responsible for community safety in Wales, a finding also echoed in responses to our public survey which recorded low awareness amongst citizens on who is responsible for community safety in Wales.
- 1.35 In terms of the effectiveness of individual bodies, police forces, in particular the chief constable, are seen as being the most effective at leading on community safety with their area. Our public survey recorded that 43.8 per cent of citizens agreed that their local police force is providing clear and effective leadership on community safety in their area as opposed to 19.1 per cent and 23.8 per cent of citizens who felt that the Welsh Government and their Police and Crime Commissioner respectively provide clear and effective leadership. The findings of our citizen survey highlight the complexities of the arrangements and accountabilities for work on community safety. Because responsibilities are split and no single public body has overall responsibility, it can be difficult for citizens to clearly identify who is leading on and dealing with specific community-safety issues in their area.

¹⁶ The survey was made available online and promoted through our communications team. The approach taken does not necessarily guarantee a representative response. For example, we received more responses from North Wales than other areas and no responses in some local-authority areas. Given these limitations, we have only used the survey for illustrative purposes and to report views at an all-Wales level.

Citizens' comments on their awareness of who is responsible for community safety

I don't hear about any community safety ideas/ what is going on etc. Who is responsible?

I realise there are reports and plans and safety bodies I never even knew existed, so communication with the public is really lacking and obviously poor. I work for a Local Authority and didn't know this infrastructure existed.....

All I'm saying is please let the public know more about this work and how to take part.

Information regarding the consultation and engagement undertaken by community safety parties, to deliver plans and strategies for community safety is not well known. If the general public are not being made aware of these policies, then we are unable to comment.

Whoever is responsible for community safety must be invisible as I have neither seen nor heard from them.

I know very little about Community Safety in my area. Perhaps wider publicity would help.

There may well be safety activities going on in our area but I feel the public is not being informed.

Source: Wales Audit Office, Public survey for citizens, November 2015.

Part 2

National, regional and local priorities differ greatly and are not aligned, which risks confusion and unco-ordinated action. There is limited evidence of public engagement to inform the plans



2.1 In the first section of this report we highlighted some of the difficulties with partnership working which national, regional and local public bodies need to overcome. For partnerships to be effective, it is important that strategies and plans for community safety are focussed on the right things and aligned to support delivery. Partners need to be clear about what they are setting out to achieve and about why these achievements are important to local people. In this section of the report we discuss the range of community-safety strategies and plans that are in place. We provide a critique of the current framework and how well aligned activity is.

There is wide variation in the robustness of community-safety plans and the lack of alignment between UK, Welsh, regional and citizens' priorities undermines partnership working and opportunities for improvement

2.2 A number of different organisations work together to affect the overall population level community-safety outcomes. The different approaches and responsibilities for community safety noted in Part 1 are also reflected in the complexities of the planning framework with different public bodies having different approaches. Figure 4 summarises the agencies and the current range of plans for community safety in Wales.

Figure 4 – The responsible bodies and plans for community safety in Wales



- 2.3 Currently the **Serious and Organised Crime Strategy** October 2013 and the **Modern Crime Prevention Strategy 2016** set out how the Home Office will prevent people getting involved in serious and organised crime and how partners will work together to address crime in England and Wales. The Strategies make a number of proposals with regard to partnership working; in particular making it a requirement for the Police Forces and the individual Police and Crime Commissioners to be the lead bodies responsible for crime and safety in an area and highlighting that ‘a sophisticated, modern approach will require co-ordinated action on a number of fronts’¹⁷ to address crime.
- 2.4 However, the strategies do not consider the specific issues of devolution and do not recognise that the Welsh Government has responsibility for many areas of activity which are fundamental to tackling crime and improving community safety. And, because the strategies do not consider the specific issues of Wales and are often developed with little engagement by the UK Government with the Welsh Government, the strategies produced by the Home Office do not recognise, align with or seek to influence the work of the Welsh Government. This is especially salient as the **Programme for Government** predates the election of Police and Crime Commissioners and the Home Office strategies noted above.
- 2.5 The **Programme for Government** was published by the Welsh Government in 2011 and covers the National Assembly for Wales’s term until May 2016. The Programme has 12 priority policy themes, of which Theme 7 is ‘Safer communities for all’. Under Theme 7 the Welsh Government aim is to make our communities safer through reductions in anti-social behaviour, crime (including the fear of crime), substance misuse and the incidence and impact of fires as well as effective co-ordination of emergencies.
- 2.6 Whilst the Welsh Government uses the actions in delivering the **Programme for Government** as its community-safety priorities for improvement, the actions do not amount to an all-Wales strategy to tackle community-safety issues as much of the policy area is not devolved. The **Programme for Government** focuses mostly on the role of Welsh Government, the funding commitments made in its election manifesto and the legislative ideas planned for the National Assembly term in the areas of devolved responsibility.
- 2.7 The Welsh Government itself acknowledges that community safety is a complex policy area with a number of different organisations working together to affect the overall population level outcomes, and success is heavily dependent on UK Government policy decisions on criminal justice and policing. To be successful therefore needs policy makers to collaborate effectively to deliver both devolved and non-devolved services¹⁸.

¹⁷ Home Office, **A Modern Crime Prevention Strategy**, March 2016, Page 7.

¹⁸ The Programme for Government Theme 7: Safer communities for all was published under the 2011-2016 Welsh Government.

- 2.8 We found that because responsibilities for community safety are split between many different public bodies, plans are often not aligned and the Welsh and UK Governments operate independently of each other with respect to planning. For example, the creation of Police and Crime Commissioners by the UK Government in 2011 is not reflected in the **Programme for Government**. Similarly, the Home Office in developing its plans and strategies does not consider the specific requirements of Wales and the role of the Welsh Government on devolved areas.
- 2.9 Whilst the **Programme for Government** clearly articulates the priorities for the Welsh Government, it does not provide a road map for improving community safety identifying the role and contribution of local authorities, community-safety partnerships or other public bodies. The Welsh Government has also not produced any guidance specifically on community safety for its areas of responsibility – fire and rescue authorities, local authorities and health boards – outside of its **Programme for Government** and specific strategies in key areas of activity including a joint Youth Justice Strategy, the Wales Reducing Reoffending Strategy and the Violence against Women, Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (Wales) Act which became law in 2015.
- 2.10 Currently, there is no agreement between the Home Office and Welsh Government on the priorities for community safety in Wales. With no agreed vision for community safety, activities and targets can vary widely and are not integrated. Unco-ordinated activity also results in priorities becoming dominated by service perspectives, rather than based on outcomes desired by citizens, service users and communities. Taken together these have resulted in a lack of agreement and subsequently commitment from partners on what needs to happen and are an obstacle to delivering improvement.
- 2.11 We reviewed the current strategic documents for community safety¹⁹ for the Welsh Government, four police and Crime Commissioners and the 20 community-safety partnerships²⁰. Whilst a wide range of agencies contribute to addressing community safety, the prime responsibilities for setting priorities for community safety in Wales rest with the Welsh Government nationally; Police and Crime Commissioners at a regional level; and local authorities at a local level. We grouped their priorities against the most common themes included in plans. These are:
- Crime and disorder including anti-social behaviour, victims of crime
 - Reducing crime/fear of crime including acquisitive crime
 - Substance misuse
 - Domestic violence/abuse

¹⁹ Whilst a wide range of public bodies can contribute to improving community safety, responsibilities for strategic needs assessments, planning and setting priorities to improve community safety in Wales are vested in the Welsh Government, the Police and Crime Commissioners and local authorities.

²⁰ The 20 community-safety partnerships cover each local authority with the exception of joint arrangements in Gwynedd and the Isle of Anglesey and Conwy and Denbighshire.

- Cohesive communities including tackling terrorism
- Child and adult protection and safeguarding
- Safety in communities (fire, roads)
- Combat reoffending
- Youth offending
- Community resilience (emergency planning)

2.12 Each of the bodies has the power to set its own priorities but we were unable to identify a single priority area that every agency has included in their priorities. We recognise that concentrating on key local needs is an appropriate response to ensure public bodies address the issues that are of importance to the local community. In addition, some authorities will not include specific priorities because of their geographical circumstances (authorities will not include work on coastal erosion where they are land locked with no sea coast). Nonetheless, **Figure 5** summarises our evaluation of the alignment between plans and shows that there is no single area where all community-safety plans have all signed up to the same priorities. For example, two of the community-safety partnerships covering four authorities do not include domestic violence as a priority area despite the Welsh Government's clear commitment and resourcing of agencies to address domestic abuse. Similarly, six community-safety partnerships do not have a priority focus on substance misuse.

Figure 5 – Alignment between the Welsh Government, police and crime commissioners and local authority priorities for community safety varies widely

Priority area	Welsh Government priority area ²¹	Number of police and crime commissioners with priority area	Number of local authorities with priority area
Reducing crime/fear of crime (including acquisitive crime)	Yes	Four out of four	18 out of 22
Crime and disorder including anti-social behaviour, victims of crime	Yes	Four out of four	17 out of 22
Domestic violence/abuse	Yes	Four out of four	18 out of 22
Substance misuse	Yes	One out of four	14 out of 22
Combat re-offending	Yes	Four out of four	Nine out of 22
Safety in communities (fire, roads, etc.)	Yes	Two out of four	Eight out of 22
Cohesive communities including hate crime, tackling terrorism	Yes	None	Eight out of 22
Child and adult protection and safeguarding	Yes	Three out of four	Five out of 22
Youth offending	Yes	Four out of four	Three out of 22
Community resilience (emergency planning, etc)	Yes	One out of four	None

Source: Wales Audit Office, Review of the priorities included in the Programme for Government; Police and Crime Plans; and Single Integrated Plans.

²¹ We have judged the priorities set by the Welsh Government in the Programme for Government 2011-2016 under Theme 7: Safer communities for all. The Welsh Government's policy on hate crime falls under Theme 8: Equalities. This does not include any reference to tackling terrorism. Safeguarding falls under Theme 5: Supporting Communities.

2.13 Whilst local determination is critical in being able to respond to specific needs within local communities, the lack of alignment and absence of a national framework with all bodies pulling in the same direction has created risks of unco-ordinated action and, in some cases, no action by key partners. The lack of alignment between plans and priorities means that there is a risk that the delivery of the Welsh Government's overall population outcomes may be undermined as local community-safety partnerships are not focussing on these national priority areas.

Police and Crime Commissioners generally draw on a wide range of evidence to determine their priorities for action but the approach taken varies and is not always robust

2.14 Police and Crime Commissioners are required under legislation to publish Police and Crime Plans for their areas²². Three of the four Commissioners have published annual revisions to their original plans. Those revised plans have identified new priorities and provide a clear focus for action in the force areas. Our review of the plans found that the Police and Crime Commissioners draw on a wide range of police data and other intelligence about the issues that affect community-safety issues to inform their plans. All of the Commissioners state that they respond to the views of the public when deciding on their priorities, with the Dyfed-Powys Police and Crime Commissioner emphasising that his priorities were those that he was elected on and are not solely driven by data. The three Police and Crime Commissioners who update their plans have consulted with the public on those revisions as well as their police and crime panels.

2.15 The quality and coverage of the plans vary greatly. Two of the four commissioners (South Wales and Dyfed Powys) have very wide-ranging plans which contain very broad priority areas. The South Wales Commissioner also has a delivery plan that identifies how the priorities will be delivered. Actions within Police and Crime Commissioners plans and strategies are well linked to local needs and the local context but details on their implementation together with measures of success for each action could be clearer. For example, the Dyfed Powys Police and Crime Commissioner has a priority entitled 'enhanced access to police services' but other than identifying the need for better access to data, it is not clear what the Police and Crime Commissioner intends from the action. Where priorities do not have robust and established indicators available to support them and a data development issue exists, then plans should set out how these weaknesses will be addressed. The Dyfed Powys Police and Crime Commissioners Plan needs to set out the beneficial impact on citizens to help people understand what they can expect and how they can stay safe.

²² Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011

2.16 Police and Crime Commissioners' annual plans and work programmes provide an overall direction for their work and their police forces. However, whilst there appears to be considerable emphasis on the concept of partnership working we found limited evidence of effective engagement with wider partners, for example, local authorities, to help deliver community-safety priorities. Many community-safety plans are not integrated into crime-reduction plans within police-force areas which is leading to a confused picture of priorities with a risk of duplicating and overlapping activity, as reflected in the findings from our surveys with both community-safety co-ordinators and members of partnership bodies. One respondent noted that 'the PCC's strategies are set by a single person and with political rather than just professional input. The Community Safety strategies respond to local needs taking account of Welsh Government expectations, very often the issues may coincide with those of the PCC though the key responses may differ.'

Most local authorities have adopted priorities for community safety but these are not always clearly set out

- 2.17 In 2012, the Welsh Government published **Shared Purpose – Shared Delivery**, statutory guidance to all local authorities in Wales on integrating partnerships and plans²³. That guidance stated that local authorities should develop Single Integrated Plans to replace the large number of discrete plans, for example, the Children and Young People's plan and the Community Safety Plan. As a consequence of the decision, all bar one of the 22 local authorities now include priorities for community safety in their single integrated plans.
- 2.18 Eighteen of the 20 community-safety partnership co-ordinators who responded to our survey stated that their strategies include appropriate priorities. One stated that their plan did not and a further co-ordinator did not answer. From our review of authority plans we found that 18 local authorities included clear priorities, and 12 of the 16 local authorities which provided evidence showing how they set priorities use a good range of relevant data to identify and agree these priorities.
- 2.19 However, our review identified that the quality and coverage of the measures set varied greatly in quality. A small number of authorities do not clearly set out how they will achieve their community-safety priorities, targets are not SMART²⁴ and those responsible for achieving actions are not clearly identified. In addition, too many community-safety partnerships have a high number of priorities, and too many priorities do not align well with those of the Police and Crime Commissioner and other community-safety bodies. For example, Safer Ceredigion has seven priorities, despite these being rationalised from nine. Community-safety partnerships do not prioritise effectively and priorities could be sharper. If plans lack clear measures of success it is difficult to deliver improvement and judge the results. These weaknesses are further compounded by limited capacity and short-term funding.

²³ Welsh Government website, **Shared purpose – shared delivery**

²⁴ Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound targets that support delivery or priorities.

- 2.20 Having a wide range of priorities can prove a challenge to deliver, especially given the reduced capacity within local authority community-safety teams. A small number of community-safety partnerships have reduced the number of their priorities to take account of reduced funding, for example, the North Wales Safer Communities Board has set out its four regional priorities which it expects community-safety partnerships to also address as well as setting their own priorities.
- 2.21 Likewise, Safer Swansea's has adopted sharper priorities, and measures of success are now in place as reflected in the 2015 update of the **One Swansea Plan**²⁵. Whilst Swansea's original community-safety partnership's 14 priorities from 2011 remain important, they have been sharpened to 'safer night time economy' and 'domestic abuse'. These give greater attention to problems that are tough to deal with, and reflect the Local Service Board's (now Public Service Board) focus on economic development and job creation. The community-safety partnership recognises it needs to do more in matching its work plans and spending to these priorities but a better-quality plan is vital in directing limited resources to those areas that are harder to resolve and cause the public the greatest concern.
- 2.22 Alternately, however, some interviewees felt that the absorption of the community-safety plan into the Single Integrated Plans are seen as weakening the focus on community safety at a local-authority level and has resulted in key activity being lost. In some areas such as Bridgend County Borough Council, not having to produce a discrete community-safety plan has freed up partnership support resources which have been re-directed to implement and manage community-safety actions. Additionally, where community-safety partnerships have strong leadership and engaged members, the partnership has been able to maintain a high profile, identify and work on community-safety issues, and influence the work of their Local Service Board and single integrated plan.

²⁵ City and County of Swansea, **The One Swansea Plan**, 2015.

The majority of local authorities operate an intelligence-led approach to community safety and used relevant data to identify local priorities but half of community-safety partnerships do not regularly update their strategic assessments, which is contrary to Home Office guidance

- 2.23 We found that a number of local community-safety partnerships have updated their plans to reflect changes in legislation, for example, the community triggers for anti-social behaviour under the **Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014**²⁶ as well as the introduction of the Police and Crime Commissioners. Whilst 18 local community-safety partnership co-ordinators stated that the community-safety priorities in their plans are based on good evidence, our review of plans concluded that only nine of the 20 partnerships provided evidence that they regularly update their strategic assessments and 11 did not. Of the nine that did provide evidence, we found six of them to have based their assessment on a wide range of appropriate data and used the information to identify and focus on priorities that reflected local circumstances.
- 2.24 Positively, the majority of local authorities use data from local police forces with a smaller number using data sets available from relevant local-authority services, for example, substance misuse services. Some local authorities also used information from voluntary-sector services and other partners to ensure that all relevant information was considered. For example, Safer Swansea's prioritisation process avoided duplicating other reviews by combining with the Local Service Board's annual Strategic Needs Assessment. Safer Swansea uses a variety of information and intelligence including more localised neighbourhood-level data, and information from businesses, schools, charities and the university. The latest One Swansea Plan lists a set of 'potential future challenges' which are risk assessed and are reflected in the prioritisation process.
- 2.25 The Ceredigion community-safety partnership makes good use of crime data in its annual strategic assessment and review to plan the partnership's future work. The community-safety partnership has robust data-sharing protocols in place and has recently reviewed and updated its information-sharing policies and procedures. They work closely with police-data analysts and cross check things like reporting and recording criteria. The work of the Ceredigion community-safety partnership could, however, be strengthened with better evaluation within the partnership or by using the findings of national programmes such as the Purple Flag initiative²⁷. Nonetheless, we have highlighted the annual strategic assessment approach as good practice – **Figure 6**.

²⁶ gov.uk, **Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014**

²⁷ The Purple Flag scheme has been set up to establish national standards and raise the image of Britain's town centres at night. Purple Flag is an accreditation scheme that recognises excellence in the management of town and city centres at night and aims to raise standards and improve the quality of towns and cities by incorporating all aspects of evening and night-time economy management into a comprehensive framework for local partnerships to aspire to. Purple Flag is supported by the Home Office, Association of Chief Police Officers and the Local Authorities Co-ordinators of Regulatory Service.

Figure 6 – Ceredigion community-safety partnership carries out a comprehensive annual needs assessment

Ceredigion Community Safety Partnership carries out an effective evaluation and annual needs assessment as a means to target diminishing resources effectively and to fully understand the impact of combined efforts.

The annual strategic assessment contains a very detailed review of performance data, crime statistics, community consultation and feedback, ad hoc intelligence, financial information, and a review of any new threats, trends, and emerging issues. The community-safety partnership is constantly gathering and evaluating data and does not see the approach as an annual 'one-off event'. Appropriate information is shared between partners in accordance with its information sharing protocols. Results are collated, reviewed and reported resulting in a new high-level community-safety plan, and integrated into the planning processes of the development of the Local and Public Service Board's Single Integrated Plan. As a result there is a wider appreciation of needs in other areas such as housing, children and young people, and health.

An overview of the community-safety partnership's latest activities and progress achieved is available online. Together with minutes of community-safety partnership meetings it is easy to see how action plans have been developed and what is being learned. For example, the community-safety partnership is engaging a wider group of partners that are focused on the night-time economy in Aberystwyth where anti-social behaviour remains a high public concern. By working with the university and local businesses, violent crime and drink-related crime reduced by 12 per cent in 2014-15, and students and the general public now feel safer at night.

- 2.26 However, a number of community-safety partnership co-ordinators note some difficulties exist with regard to accessing and collating information and evidence from partners to support planning and prioritisation. For instance, one respondent noted that 'there are some areas that are difficult to get good performance measures for'. Despite these difficulties, 17 of the 20 community-safety partnership co-ordinators feel that members of their Partnership provide information to support planning. In addition, 16 of the 20 co-ordinators stated that their Partnership members provide support to the process of producing plans/strategies for community safety in their area.
- 2.27 We also identified that in a small number of authorities the data presented in needs assessments documents only reflected the priorities that were finally agreed. The majority of data included in the original needs assessments was presented at whole local-authority level and a small number of local authorities used ward-level data to identify their priorities, for example, in Cardiff which analysed some indicators at a ward level to identify local 'hot spots'.

- 2.28 Many co-ordinators also responded that resources within the partnership (ie, local-authority officers supporting the partnership) were scarce and impacted on the quality, frequency and level of analysis included in needs assessments and strategic updates. The role of a police analyst was seen by many community-safety partnerships as being vital and in some areas, police forces are providing regional strategic assessments and other regional bodies. For example, the North Wales Community Safety Board, now lead on the activity, primarily as a result of reduced capacity within local authorities to undertake work. Two co-ordinators responded to the survey stating that the link with their police-force analysts is poor and impacts on their ability to source police data for their work, with one noting that they have 'struggled recently with lack of data from police analysts in the form of the annual community assessment'.
- 2.29 In other areas where relationships are good, and where other partners also contribute to the process of sourcing and providing data, innovative work around sharing and developing new datasets is happening. For instance, in Bridgend, a superintendent from South Wales Police chairs a group of practitioners and analysts (which extends outside members of the community-safety partnership) to links data between the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Local Service Board (now Public Service Board) and community-safety partnership. The group is able to identify and respond to changing patterns of crime and offending, and looks at causal effects rather than just symptoms. It also develops new data sets to meet identified gaps and needs in specific areas, such as missing persons – for example, sharing internal police data with local-authority data allowed the group to identify and target those individuals most at risk of going missing, which is allowing agencies to better manage the risk – and identifying hotspots of anti-social behaviour through the sharing of social-housing data on the number of tenants forced to move because of violence issues.

We found limited evidence of effective engagement with citizens and local communities to inform priorities

- 2.30 Welsh Government policy emphasises the importance of effective public engagement and it is widely seen as a crucial aspect of ensuring that all public-sector organisations in Wales develop a more ‘citizen-focused’ approach to the design and delivery of their policies, programmes and services. However, consulting local people about their concerns can be difficult and agencies often underestimate the nature of the challenge.
- 2.31 A number of co-ordinators and community-safety partnership members commented that the cost is a limiting factor in their consultation plans, with one co-ordinator stating that all engagement activity has been stopped in their area because of the cost. Other survey respondents to these surveys noted problems designing consultation activity that engaged effectively with hard-to-reach groups or to ensure a fair distribution of responses covering the wider socio-economic profile of an area. Similarly, how actions are shaped by consultation, and how they have been informed by a better understanding of community needs is not well articulated.
- 2.32 Consulting local people has not typically formed part of the process of identifying community-safety priorities. From our review of key plans we concluded that only six of the 20 community-safety partnerships have effective consultation approaches with the public on community safety and a further eight authorities, whilst undertaking engagement and consultation activity, had some gaps in arrangements. The remaining six partnerships had weaknesses in their engagement with and use of information provided by citizens – for example, making no reference to any public consultation as part of the needs assessment or priority-setting process or relying on out of date survey data to shape priority setting – or did not provide any evidence on their consultation activity.
- 2.33 Community-safety partnerships such as Safer Ceredigion engage widely with communities although capacity problems are restricting their ability to plan ahead and maximise all opportunities. Safer Ceredigion aims to reduce duplication and make the most out of events by co-designing events and sharing results. The community-safety partnership works closely with the local authority’s Community Safety and Civil Contingencies Unit, Age Cymru Ceredigion, Mid and West Wales Fire and Rescue Service, and Dyfed-Powys Police. As a result, a better understanding of local needs is made at a neighbourhood level, which is important when resources are scarce and need focusing on what matters the most.

- 2.34 Despite such activity, citizens still have a low awareness of the local priorities for community safety. Through our public survey, we found that 91 per cent of citizens who responded to the survey stated that they were unaware of how their community-safety partnership consulted or engaged with them when developing their priorities for community safety. Only 23 per cent of those who responded to our public survey knew how and where to access the local-authority plan for community safety covering their area and only 18 per cent felt that the plan reflected what they considered to be the most important community-safety issues. The vast majority of respondents – 83 per cent – said that they were not aware of the consultation/engagement undertaken when developing plans for the area. Only 18 per cent of survey respondents agreed that that their community-safety partnership kept the public informed of progress against delivering the plan’s targets and actions and more than a third did not know. These are all very low levels of awareness and understanding that highlight that consultation and engagement are areas for further work.
- 2.35 Public bodies are also not working smartly and using their existing information resources to better engage with citizens. For example, too many community-safety partnership websites are not an interactive community resource. Safer Ceredigion’s pages have very limited safety information, or self-help facilities, there is no performance information, and there is no type of ‘Have Your Say’ section. In addition, there are no Twitter or newsfeed elements. As a result it is hard to see how the public can take responsibility for their own safety, and it is not clear how the community-safety partnership is performing, which is a missed opportunity to engage with younger people who are a target group for many community-safety partnerships.
- 2.36 Examples of the good practice on community-safety engagement we identified from our review included using large-scale surveys (citizen panels, etc) to gather data about the public’s perception of community safety and what their priorities are. In some instances, data is available at a lower level, for instance, in Cardiff where consultation is carried out at a neighbourhood level. Cardiff’s Partnership Board also has an arrangement where all partners share consultation data and consultations are planned and co-ordinated between partners to maximise their impact and productivity. Some areas used their PACT²⁸ meetings to consult with residents.
- 2.37 Similarly, Wrexham has developed an engagement hub, which is a central library with front-end access for the public and registered users and an interface for local service board members and authorised partners. The hub is searchable for various consultations and data to help minimise duplication and provide a useful source for the Council and its partners. Consultation also works well when there is an emphasis on people’s perceptions and feelings of safety, rather than just focussing on crime rates to identify priorities for work.

²⁸ Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings are open to everyone and give residents the chance to influence what happens in respect of policing and community safety in their neighbourhood.

Part 3

Whilst Welsh Government grants have increased significantly, the complex and short-term nature of funding and real-terms reductions in police and local authority community-safety management budgets impact upon partnership working and delivery of value for money



- 3.1 In this part of the report, we examine the changes in budgets for community-safety activity in the last five years. We also consider the complexities of the different grant regimes and impact of the changes in the allocation and award of grants on delivery. Finally, we summarise the recent changes in police and local-authority community-safety management budgets and how these changes impact on planning and delivering community-safety services on the ground.

The availability and use of grants to fund community-safety activity is intricate and changing but it is not always clear what benefits or positive impact grants are having

- 3.2 Funding of community-safety activity, especially at a local-authority level, comes from a number of different sources including the Home Office, Welsh Government and Police and Crime Commissioners, reflecting the different functions for which each body is responsible. In the last five years there has been a substantial change in how community-safety activity is funded, by whom, for what and how much is invested. Funding is also not always joined up or aligned and resources are being spread widely, which affects agencies' ability to keep people safe and reduces the potential benefits that can arise from better-targeted funding.

The Home Office stopped funding community-safety partnerships and now provides resources directly to Police and Crime Commissioners but there is a mixed picture on how effective grants funding is

- 3.3 In February 2011, the Home Office wrote to the Welsh Government, Chief Constables and local authorities to notify them of their allocation of funding for community-safety work and changes it was planning to make to the funding formula in future years. In 2011-12 the Home Office made available funds totalling £2.5 million for Wales with money paid directly to individual authorities via a distribution formula. The Home Office also provided indicative allocations for future years but stated that these resources would reduce by 60 per cent to £1.2 million in 2012-13 and, in 2013-14, the funding would be combined with a number of other grant programmes into a new Home Office Community Safety Fund²⁹ (the Fund).
- 3.4 Since 2013-14, the new Fund has been provided directly to Police and Crime Commissioners. The Fund is not ring-fenced and Commissioners are able to use the money to contract services that can, for example, help tackle drugs and crime, reduce re-offending, and improve community safety in their force area. Commissioners are also free to use these funds to invest in existing programmes of work but can also pool funding with local partners to maximise impact. How the Fund is used is a decision for individual Police and Crime Commissioners to take locally.

²⁹ The programmes replaced by the Community Safety Fund covered £123 million of expenditure in 2012-13 and included the Drug Interventions Programme; Community Safety Partnership Funding; Youth Crime and Substance Misuse Prevention activities; Positive Futures; Communities against Gangs, Guns and Knives; Ending Gang and Youth Violence programme; Community Action Against Crime; Innovation Fund; and Safer Future Communities.

- 3.5 However, the Home Office decision to combine these grants into core funding and give Police and Crime Commissioners freedom to decide how they wish to use the money has made it difficult to ascertain either how much is being spent on community safety or what specific areas of activity are currently being funded. Whilst these contributions give greater influence – for example, in intervening in improving the governance and performance of Youth Offending Teams – the impact on overall crime and disorder is not clear. Police and Crime Commissioners do not always request an evaluation of impact of their grants and even if they did, local-authority community-safety co-ordinators reported to us that they do not think they have the capacity to do undertake such an assessment properly.
- 3.6 The South Wales Police and Crime Commissioner, like others, provides his funding on the basis of a contribution to the overall partnership rather than to specific initiatives. Through their financial contribution, the Police and Crime Commissioner seeks to ensure that the objectives of the partnership are coherent with the Police and Crime Reduction Plan and that the partnership has mechanisms to monitor the effectiveness of all partnership funding. Similarly, the Dyfed-Powys Police and Crime Commissioner is actively looking at ways to build capacity and improve value for money, and in [Figure 7](#) we highlight the approach to commissioning services as good practice.

Figure 7 – Dyfed-Powys Police commissioning of services

The Dyfed-Powys Police and Crime Commissioner’s team are commissioning services to support the crime reduction plan for 2013-2018. The team has a clear commissioning framework and work to a set of value-for-money principles. For example, Powys Association of Voluntary Organisations was awarded a contract to establish an appropriate adult volunteer scheme. The Commissioner also aims to build community capacity and help people take more responsibility for their own safety by building capacity, protecting front-line services, and utilising local skills and expertise in areas that the police are struggling to resource effectively. For instance, using very specific expertise such as housing support, family liaison, and alcohol diversionary schemes to carry out tasks previously undertaken by uniformed police staff.

In addition, the Police and Crime Commissioner is using his grants to deliver innovative community-safety services. To date, a total of £1.5 million has been allocated for grant funding during 2015-16. The most significant spending has been targeted at preventing and tackling crime and protecting vulnerable people. Other sources of funding are being considered such as joint commissioning, fees and charges, private-sector partnering for some support functions, and other national funding. As a result, the Dyfed-Powys Police and Crime Commissioner is clearly working towards delivering its priority of ‘spending wisely.’ He commissions local firms where possible. Business confidence is important to the Police and Crime Commissioner so working collaboratively to deal with digital crime and cybercrime will remain a clear focus.

- 3.7 The Gwent Police and Crime Commissioner is also promoting funding opportunities to assist charities, voluntary organisations and community groups involved in activities that have a positive impact on the communities in Gwent, whilst at the same time contributing towards delivering the Commissioner's priorities. Funding is made up of monies recovered from the **Proceeds of Crime Act 2002**³⁰ and the **Police Property Act Regulations 1997**³¹ (and where necessary, supplemented by the Commissioner's overall budget). A formalised bid process is administered by the Commissioner's office, with bids scrutinised and recommended by a panel made up of representatives from the Commissioner's office and partners. The Commissioner monitors and evaluates initiatives funded, with some recipients receiving follow-up visits to assess their impact and success.
- 3.8 However, we also found that funding for community-safety projects is not always directed towards the greatest need. Jobs and economic growth are high priorities for national and local bodies but current community-safety funding does not always match these important economic considerations. Business growth is higher in areas such as Cardiff and Swansea and yet these community-safety partnerships get similar funding to those with a lower economic risk. Conversely, areas of high business-related crime do not get particular attention. For example, Caerphilly has a much higher than average rate of non-domestic burglary and yet community-safety-related grants get no special consideration of the impact of theft or burglary on local business growth. Cybercrime and online fraud are a growing national economic risk and yet national and local community-safety bodies are not doing enough to help businesses stay safe. As a result, local economic growth is exposed to unnecessary risk.
- 3.9 Sustainable funding is the highest issue of concern and operational risk for many community-safety partnerships. Grants given to community-safety partnerships are typically one-offs or annual, which makes it difficult for community-safety partnerships to plan ahead and maintain capacity. In addition, the level of grant provided by Police and Crime Commissioners to community-safety partnerships is not based on any well-defined criteria of need or performance or what is required to deliver the intended outcome, mainly a reflection of uncertainties and continued reductions in Home Office funding. For example, Police and Crime Commissioner financial contributions to local community-safety partnerships are largely based on previous levels of Home Office Grant but as the Home Office reduces the grant it provides, it is difficult for Police and Crime Commissioners to continue to sustain the previous levels of partnership funding.

³⁰ The Act provides for the confiscation or civil recovery of the proceeds from crime and contains the principal money-laundering legislation in the UK.

³¹ The Police Property Act Fund is created from the proceeds of the sale of goods recovered by the police that cannot be returned to their original owner. In accordance with the 1997 Regulations all awards from the fund must be for charitable purposes.

- 3.10 For example, the South Wales Police and Crime Commissioner deals with seven community-safety partnerships and is funding five community-safety partnerships directly and all seven youth offending boards. The other two local authorities within the South Wales Police Force area have their Local Service Boards directly funded. Community-safety partnership co-ordinators who responded to our survey noted that ‘reductions/ceasing of grant funding over the years, has brought with it new pressures’ and another that changes in grant funding had resulted in services becoming ‘under resourced locally and more focus on regional platforms means that potential project opportunities are not being picked up’.

The Welsh Government is investing resources to deliver Programme for Government priorities and has increased how much grant it makes available for work that contributes to improving community safety

- 3.11 The Welsh Government has resourced delivery of its commitments in relation to the **Programme for Government** priorities of ‘Theme 7: Safer Communities for all’. One of the major policy commitments in the Programme was the recruitment nationally of 500 Police Community Support Officers. The Welsh Government has committed over £58 million in total since the commencement of the initiative. In addition, the Welsh Government is also investing significant monies to support specific areas of activity through its grants programme. The circumstances in which grants are given and the objectives they meet vary considerably across the different programmes. Undoubtedly Welsh Government grants play an useful role in encouraging partnerships by targeting funding to deliver priorities. Grant funding also enables the Welsh Government to support a wide range of policy-related activities without having to directly manage them on a day-to-day basis. However, too great an emphasis on national-level solutions can encourage community-safety partnerships to chase the money rather than focus on local problems that need addressing.
- 3.12 The Welsh Government has significantly increased its investment in community safety. **Figure 8** summarises selected Welsh Government grants that contribute to community safety. The table shows that the use of these grants to resource community-safety activity increased between 2011-12 and 2015-16, rising in cash terms from £9.9 million in 2011-12 to £63.6 million in 2015-16. In terms of the proportion of the Welsh Government grants expenditure, the level of investment on community-safety activity has risen from 0.5 per cent in 2011-12 and now accounts for roughly five per cent of the total programme budget in 2015-16³².

³² The information shown in **Figure 8** details the grants amount approved in the financial year and is taken from the annual Local Government Settlement produced by the Welsh Government. These grants are not formally classed as spending on community-safety activity by the Welsh Government (because no such classification exists or is used). Because of these limitations, we have based our assessment on the broader programmes of work that contribute to community safety and are taken from **Welsh Government, Local Government Settlement**, 4 February 2015. We have not included other programmes such as Supporting People where the level of financial contribution cannot be estimated with any degree of certainty. In addition, our analysis is based on specific streams of grant funding and is not intended to represent a complete analysis of the total potential public expenditure on community-safety activity. Our analysis also looks at the total cash grant allocated and does not consider real terms spending because of the growth over time in the number of grants, which makes a like-for-like comparison less meaningful.

Figure 8 – Welsh Government Grants funding between 2011-12 and 2015-16

Welsh Government Grant Programme	2011-12 £'000	2012-13 £'000	2013-14 £'000	2014-15 £'000	2015-16 £'000
Local Authorities Flood Funding	0	0		1,577	0
Road Safety Grant	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000
Substance Misuse Action Fund	0	0	0	22,663	22,663
Community Cohesion Grant	1,700	500	500	372	360
Community Fire Safety	2,400	2,400	2,250	2,138	1,030
Domestic Abuse Service Grant	0	0	0	1,236	1,244
Youth Crime Prevention Fund (formerly Safer Communities Fund – renamed in 2013)	4,535	4,535	4,898	4,900	4,900
Community Support Officers	1,287	9,787	15,287	15,787	16,787
Youth Justice Service	0	0	162	296	300
Flood and coastal erosion	0	0	0	12,155	12,155
Lead Local Flood Authority Grant	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
Total	9,922	19,422	27,297	65,324	63,639

Source: Welsh Local Government Settlement, List and estimated amounts of Grants for total Wales, 2011-12 to 2015-16.

The separation of funding, its short-term nature and its focus add additional complexities to the community-safety landscape and do not support medium-to-long term planning nor value for money

- 3.13 The recent changes in the commissioning of community-safety activity has created significant difficulties and barriers. Many of the survey participants are sceptical about these changes. Specifically, they raise concerns over the amount of work needed to apply for grants; the need to apply annually for recurrent funding; the lack of consistency across programs; and the limited co-ordination between agencies. The complexities of funding are also a by-product of the different responsibilities for community safety in Wales. We address this in more detail below.
- 3.14 Applying for grants takes time and many grants come with conditions attached that require careful management. Each funder has their own criteria, priorities and processes, which means every application has to be tailored. Within already stretched community-safety partnerships, managing these additional requirements reduces capacity yet further. One survey respondent noted that the experience of their partnership was that bidding for funding 'requires a lot of administration and time to complete in order to justify public spending, and runs the risk of being rejected. Local issues are not given the same priority when slippage is accrued, and can be lost in a regional setting. It seems whoever holds the purse strings also has further say in how slippage is allocated and which bids are successful - and will also ask for further information for justification'. Another commented that the 'lack of funding and resources to seek funding' and the community-safety function had 'reduced over last few years and largely down to one person'.
- 3.15 Many of the grant programmes are also of a short-term nature and can raise as many practical problems as the money will assist in addressing. One community-safety partnership member responding to our survey noted that 'reliance on external funds promotes high turnover of staff' and another that grant funding is 'very piece meal - affects recruitment and the quality of candidates. Totally unsustainable'. Decisions on awards can also take a long time and the amount of funding provided can be reduced with little notification. For instance, one survey respondent noted that 'It has been extremely challenging when Welsh Government and the Youth Justice Board had proposed making in-year reductions in grant funding when business plans are already in place to support programmes of work.' Views such as these are echoed by the Dyfed-Powys Police and Crime Commissioner who states that annual funding does not help with longer-term planning. The Police and Crime Commissioner's team see pooling budgets as the best way forward, but also felt there is no drive across all public bodies to encourage such an approach. As a result, there is a risk that partners can pull in different directions and opportunities are not being maximised.

- 3.16 In addition, funders have specific priorities for types of activity they want to fund but these do not always correspond with the community-safety partnerships priorities or what will have the greatest benefit for the community. For example, one community-safety co-ordinator noted that 'the capacity for the community safety partnership to respond to issues has been heavily curtailed since the Police and Crime Commissioner came into office. Much of the funding which formerly came to the community safety partnership was fairly distributed on projects which we all considered important, this permitted the community safety partnership to have a very positive effect in our communities. Since Police and Crime Commissioners came into operation the community safety partnership has very little funds to support important and effective local projects and as the Police and Crime Commissioner strategy and that of the community safety partnership is somewhat different those projects are often not funded by the Police and Crime Commissioner or are funded to deliver very different services, sometimes those which might be less helpful in community safety terms.'
- 3.17 Finally, the transfer of funding from the Home Office to Police and Crime Commissioners away from local authorities, is impacting on the viability and effectiveness of local partnerships. The Home Office re-aligned their previous grant funding into their Police Main Grant, which is distributed directly to Police and Crime Commissioners. Combining separate funding streams into the Police Main Grant gives Police and Crime Commissioners greater power to allocate their funds where they see fit, but amalgamating grants can also lead to a reduction in spending on community safety. One community-safety partnership member noted that 'in the past the community safety partnership received dedicated funding from both the Welsh Government and the Home Office. The cessation of these funding streams has impacted the community safety partnership's ability to delivery local interventions.'
- 3.18 Providing value for money is an imperative for publicly funded bodies and is currently in sharper focus given the requirement to cut budgets and streamline processes to achieve efficiencies without undermining effectiveness. It is questionable whether the current arrangements are providing value for money with community-safety partnerships receiving multiple grants often from more than one agency. The time and resources spent reporting on them, especially when administrative support in partnerships has been cut, is not an effective use of resources. The lack of co-ordination between the Home Office, Welsh Government and Police and Crime Commissioners also puts community-safety partnerships at a disadvantage. It adds to agencies' administrative costs and increases the risk of poor targeting and use of public funding. In addition, multiple funding streams make it difficult to understand where the benefits from grants investment are being achieved and whether the costs and benefits, on balance, represent value for money.

3.19 Highlighting these problems with the current arrangements one community-safety co-ordinator concluded that ‘the financial resources for Community Safety are very complicated. We receive funding from many different sources, public sector core budget, Welsh Government grants, Home Office grants, Police and Crime Commissioner grants, Supporting People and Community First grants, third-sector grants. Some of those are split funded, some annual, others one-off non-recurring. Some grants are regionally centralised, others virtually pooled, some ring-fenced, others local grants. Some of the funding secured may not on the surface relate directly to Community Safety, but the work of the post holder indirectly makes a significant contribution to the strategic and operational delivery.’

Real-terms spending on policing has fallen and there has been a three per cent reduction in frontline police numbers

3.20 A public body’s workforce is one of its greatest assets and a significant proportion of expenditure is on staffing. At a time of financial pressures, balanced budgets are often achieved mainly by reducing staff numbers through voluntary early release and vacancy management, where staff that leave are not replaced. **Figure 9** shows that in cash-terms expenditure on policing rose between 2010-11 and 2014-15 by approximately £35 million. However, real-terms spending – the change in expenditure after correcting for the effect of inflation – shows that funding for policing has fallen by roughly £13 million. The reduction in budgets for policing is matched by a fall of three per cent between 2012-13 and 2014-15 in Police Force numbers³³.

Figure 9 – Revenue outturn expenditure by police force between 2009-10 and 2014-15

Police force	2010-11 £'000	2011-12 £'000	2012-13 £'000	2013-14 £'000	2014-15 £'000
Dyfed-Powys Police	106,643	106,650	106,769	100,788	110,778
Gwent Police	130,399	127,361	125,502	126,956	144,489
North Wales Police	154,454	148,088	151,819	156,057	154,416
South Wales Police	275,139	273,766	272,091	291,307	292,040
Total Police – cash-terms spending	666,635	655,866	656,181	675,108	701,723
Total Police – real-terms spending	714,507	679,724	680,051	685,319	701,723

Source: Stats Wales – LGFS0023, **Revenue outturn expenditure, by authority and HM Treasury, National Statistics, GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP: March 2016 (Budget)**, 22 March 2016

33 www.gov.uk, **Police workforce England and Wales statistics**, 20 July 2016

- 3.21 From our public survey, we found that 18.3 per cent of those who responded stated that the amount of council tax allocated for policing is too small compared to the 18.8 per cent of citizens who believe that the proportion of the council tax they pay that is allocated to the police is too high. However, a further 40.5 per cent stated that they would pay more council tax if the extra money was directly allocated to fund additional policing in their area.

Local-authority real-terms expenditure on management of community safety has fallen by 32.7 per cent in the last five years and the reduced capacity is inhibiting activity and improvement

- 3.22 Budgets for management of community safety are not being protected from cuts and local-authority expenditure on community safety is falling at higher rates than the overall cut to authority budgets. We found that Gross Revenue Expenditure by local authorities directly on community-safety activity (defined as expenditure on community safety CCTV; community-safety crime reduction; and community safety – safety services) has fallen by £10.9 million, from £39 million in 2010-11 to £28.2 million in 2014-15. In real terms the reduction is even sharper, a fall of £13.7 million.
- 3.23 **Figure 10** shows that of the 22 local authorities 16 have seen a reduction in funding with the largest real-terms cuts in Isle of Anglesey (83.6 per cent), Swansea (83.5 per cent), Newport (77.8 per cent) and Carmarthenshire (77.4 per cent). Six local authorities have increased expenditure on ‘management’ of community-safety activity. The largest are in Merthyr Tydfil where the budget increased by 149 per cent in real terms between 2010-11 and 2014-15 and Wrexham which has a real terms increase of 104.9 per cent.

Figure 10 – Gross Revenue Expenditure on management of community safety by local authority between 2010-11 and 2014-15

Council	Changes in budget in cash terms					Real-terms change between 2010-11 and 2014-15
	2010-11 £'000	2011-12 £'000	2012-13 £'000	2013-14 £'000	2014-15 £'000	
Merthyr Tydfil	183	483	183	551	488	149.0%
Wrexham	2,598	2,277	2,040	2,306	5,704	104.9%
Caerphilly	982	3,226	2,963	2,756	1,524	44.8%
Flintshire	1,350	948	1,087	2,092	1,599	10.6%
Gwynedd	969	961	845	1,068	1,081	4.1%
Cardiff	4,091	3,391	3,273	4,419	4,395	0.2%
Rhondda Cynon Taf	4,669	4,233	4,658	4,740	4,256	-14.9%
Conwy	2,244	1,819	2,741	1,754	1,860	-22.6%
Bridgend	1,029	813	682	706	695	-37.0%
Torfaen	812	518	509	176	479	-44.9%
Monmouthshire	757	503	512	450	444	-45.0%
Neath Port Talbot	1,229	1,082	840	967	675	-48.7%
Pembrokeshire	217	207	151	145	117	-49.5%
Powys	598	565	338	325	260	-59.4%
Blaenau Gwent	1,866	1,599	1,731	1,741	769	-61.5%
Ceredigion	331	277	233	222	135	-61.8%
Denbighshire	1,664	1,653	1,525	1,409	610	-65.8%
Vale of Glamorgan	1,594	1,258	1,004	482	504	-70.5%
Carmarthenshire	2,345	2,254	2,127	1,923	592	-76.4%
Newport	4,796	2,890	2,771	1,172	1,139	-77.8%
Swansea	3,568	3,187	2,810	628	628	-83.5%
Isle of Anglesey	1,138	1,224	979	149	199	-83.6%
All Wales – Cash terms	39,030	35,368	34,002	30,181	28,153	-27.9%
All Wales – Real terms	41,833	37,327	35,239	30,637	28,153	-32.7%

Source: Stats Wales – LGFS0016 – Revenue outturn expenditure summary, by service and HM Treasury, National Statistics, GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP: March 2016 (Budget), 22 March 2016

3.24 We asked all local-authority community-safety co-ordinators how their council supports them to deliver community safety. Specifically, we asked about their role and the time dedicated to community-safety activity. All of the 20 local-authority co-ordinators responded to our survey. **Figure 11** shows how much time each co-ordinator spends per week co-ordinating and managing each partnerships work on community safety. Of the 20 co-ordinators, eight spend less than half their time delivering on the role of community-safety co-ordinator. Our survey of the 20 co-ordinators also found that only 10 (50 per cent) believe their partnerships community-safety work is adequately resourced. A number of co-ordinators also commented on the reduction in the time they committed to working on community-safety issues in the past three years, which has resulted in them not being able to dedicate as much time to the role of co-ordinator as the role warrants. Reductions in community-safety management capacity are considered by survey respondents to be undermining the councils' leadership and co-ordination role on community-safety issues and weaken the partnerships' ability to effectively work together and plan to deliver improvement.

Figure 11 – Percentage of time spent by co-ordinators on delivering the role of community-safety co-ordinator

Percentage of time per week spent on co-ordination role	Number of co-ordinators
0-24	0
25-49	8
50-74	1
75-100	11

Source: Wales Audit Office, Community safety co-ordinators survey, November 2015.

- 3.25 The shifts in the funding regimes, coupled with a changing policy and operating environment, are impacting adversely on community-safety partnerships to the point that it is questionable whether they are sustainable going forward. According to community-safety partnership co-ordinators who responded to our survey 'the significant funding reductions applied to the community safety partnership in recent years have reduced the impact it has within the community' and another that 'the Community Safety Partnership does not formally exist anymore'. Other respondents noted that 'the community safety partnership must now operate on a local and regional basis with reduced capacity, and still fulfil its statutory duties. How does the Welsh Government envisage the community safety partnership to continue to operate effectively in line with reduced provision?' and another that 'the discontinuation/redirection of both Welsh Government and Home Office community safety funding streams has severely restricted the ability of the partnership.'
- 3.26 From our fieldwork, we found that these reductions are resulting in growing stress on staff and low morale and more time is now focussed on securing alternative sources of funding. Seventeen of the 20 co-ordinators (85 per cent) stated that their community-safety partnership is currently looking for additional funding outside of member organisations to support community-safety work, much higher than the wider community-safety partnership membership where only 45 per cent stated that they are currently looking for additional sources of funding.
- 3.27 The organisation most commonly identified for additional financial support is the Welsh Government with 41.1 per cent of respondents identifying them as the key partner to financially support their community-safety work. Promoting the Welsh Government as the body to provide more monies appears overly optimistic given that the Welsh Government is already funding considerable activity, despite not being the lead or responsible authority for key areas of community-safety work in Wales. The focus on the Welsh Government providing additional monies is especially salient as no survey respondent identified other UK Government departments as potential sources of funding, despite the Home Office having responsibility for the strategic direction of key elements of community safety in England and Wales. Outside of the Welsh Government, 19.6 per cent of community-safety partnership members highlighted that they are seeking financial support from the voluntary sector and charities, 17.6 per cent from the European Commission and 11.7 per cent from the National Lottery.

Part 4

Because of difficulties in defining community safety and weaknesses in data, scrutiny and evaluation, it is challenging for public bodies to demonstrate the impact of their activity




- 4.1 In this final part of the report, we assess performance and public bodies' performance and risk management arrangements for community safety and scrutiny of activity. Our review looks at the information that is used to judge performance by the Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local-authority community-safety partnerships. We also consider the arrangements for scrutinising and challenging performance and how risk is identified and mitigated.

Police records and survey findings suggest that crime in Wales has fallen significantly in recent years but recent reviews have raised issues of concern about the integrity of the data, which makes measurement of community safety difficult

- 4.2 Critical to effective decision-making is using information to make informed and evidence-based policy and operational choices but from our review, we found that this is an area of work that the various bodies struggle with. As noted above, community safety covers many different aspects of life, is broad with no universal agreed definition. Because many different issues and services contribute to delivering community safety and there is no single agency with responsibility for community safety, measuring improvement and managing performance can be difficult. Consequently, there are no statutory indicators or measures for community safety, and performance is primarily based on reported crime.
- 4.3 Police Recorded Crime data³⁴ is published on a quarterly basis and is made available every three months. We have calculated the offences for each 12-month period for the four police-force areas by adding up the appropriate four quarters of each financial year. **Figure 12** (below) shows that Police Recorded Crime fell by 38.5 per cent from 295,000 to 181,000 recorded crimes between 2002-03 and 2014-15.

³⁴ Total police recorded crime covers selected offences that have been reported to and recorded by the police. They are supplied by the 43 territorial police forces of England and Wales, plus the British Transport Police, to the Home Office. Figures from data presented at a police-force level do not necessarily equal national police recorded crime figures presented elsewhere. This is because certain offences (such as those committed at airports) cannot easily be mapped to council areas and are therefore excluded. Equally, British Transport Police data are also not included within the police-force-level data. The Home Office highlights that the data are additive and users should be cautious when comparing figures which overlap in their coverage. For example, it is not always appropriate to compare the number of crimes in two 12-month periods that are only a quarter apart, as three quarters of the data will be the same.


Figure 12 – Police Recorded Crime in Wales March 2003 to March 2015



Source: The Office for National Statistics, Crime in England and Wales, 2002-03 to 2014-15.

4.4 The most recent data for the year ending September 2015 from the Office for National Statistics highlights that total recorded crime for all offences in England and Wales including fraud had increased by six per cent on the previous 12-month period. There were almost 184,000 recorded incidents of recorded crime in Wales. **Figure 13** shows that within the overall six per cent increase in recorded crime for Wales, the highest percentage increases were in respect of interfering with a motor vehicle, homicide, violence without injury, other sexual offences, miscellaneous crimes against society and rape. Conversely, the highest percentage decreases were in the categories of trafficking of drugs, theft from a vehicle, theft from a person and possession of drugs. However, the Office for National Statistics notes that improvements in recording crime may have affected the figures with a greater proportion of crime now being logged since 2014-15.

Figure 13 – Percentage change in individual categories of Police Recorded Crime in Wales between September 2013 and September 2015³⁵



Source: www.gov.uk, **Official Statistics, Home Office Police recorded crime statistics**, 21 July 2016.

³⁴ Longer-term analysis of police recorded crime by individual categories is difficult because of changes to the recording groupings introduced for the financial year 2013-14. For example, new codes were introduced for robbery of personal property, robbery of business property, theft from a vehicle, theft of a motor vehicle, vehicle interference and other theft offences. Prior to 2013-14, these crimes had been grouped within other categories. A like-for-like comparison showing changes in crime that straddles the period before these changes and from 2013-14 onwards is therefore not possible.

- 4.5 There are concerns with the integrity of the police recorded crime data. The coverage of police recorded crime is defined by the Notifiable Offence List (NOL), which includes a broad range of offences, from murder to minor criminal damage, theft and public-order offences. The NOL excludes less serious offences that are dealt with exclusively at magistrates' courts. While the police recorded crime series covers a wider population and a broad set of offences, it does not include crimes that do not come to the attention of the police or are not recorded by them. The gap in reporting is important because issues of concern have been raised with the robustness of the data.
- 4.6 For example, the Public Administration Committee at Westminster³⁶ conducted an inquiry into crime statistics in 2013-14 and reported that although the Police Recorded Crime and Crime survey data for England and Wales were indicating reductions in crime, there was 'strong evidence that P under-records crime, and therefore the rate of decrease in crime may be exaggerated, and is due to lax police compliance with the agreed national standard of victim-focussed crime recording'. One of the key areas of concern for the Committee was the misrecording of sexual offences. The Committee also noted issues relating to police compliance with the agreed national standard of victim-focussed crime recording. In early 2014, the UK Statistics Authority (UKSA) decided to remove Police Recorded Crime data of its designation as National Statistics.
- 4.7 In addition, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) recently conducted an inspection of all 43 police forces in England and Wales judging to what extent police-recorded crime information can be trusted. Based on the inspection of each police force, the Inspectorate concluded³⁷ that 'Victims of crime are being let down. The police are failing to record a large proportion of the crimes reported to them. Over 800,000 crimes reported to the police have gone unrecorded each year. This represents an under-recording of 19 percent. The problem is greatest for victims of violence against the person and sexual offences, where the under-recording rates are 33 percent and 26 percent respectively. This failure to record such a significant proportion of reported crime is wholly unacceptable.'
- 4.8 The Inspectorate highlighted the importance of accurate crime recording for victims and communities to ensure confidence in the police and also for chief constables when making decisions on how to deploy resources and for Police and Crime Commissioners in their role of holding their police forces to account. The Inspectorate also found that the quality of compliance with recording practices across police forces varied. The inspectorate made 13 recommendations in its report and now includes scrutiny of crime data integrity as part of their annual assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy of each police force.

³⁶ House of Commons, Public Administration Committee, **Caught red-handed: Why we can't count on Police Recorded Crime Statistics**, 9 April 2014.

³⁷ Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, **Crime-recording: making the victim count – The final report of an inspection of crime data integrity in police forces in England and Wales**, November 2014.


- 4.9 Another source of data relating to crime and community safety is the **Crime Survey for England and Wales**, an annual face-to-face survey of 35,000 adults and 3,000 children aged 10 to 15 years old who are resident in households in England and Wales. The Survey asks respondents about their experiences of a range of victim based crimes in the past year. The survey covers the following four offences: violence (although murder is not included); robbery; theft (personal, burglary, vehicle, bicycle, other household); and criminal damage. The survey does not cover 'victimless' crimes, such as possession of drugs or motoring offences. However for the population and offence types it does cover, the Crime Survey for England and Wales is a valuable source for providing a consistent picture of crime over time.
- 4.10 The latest data from the **Crime Survey for England and Wales** show that survey respondents' experiences of crime is very different to the police recorded crime data. For example, the police recorded crime data notes a 16 per cent increase in violence with injury in 2014-15 compared to 2013-14 but there was an 11 per cent increase for violence with injury in the **Crime Survey for England and Wales**. However for violence without injury the **Crime Survey for England and Wales** saw an 11 per cent reduction in 2014-15 compared to 2013-14 whereas police recorded crime saw a 37 per cent increase. Theft from the person saw a 13 per cent decrease in the **Crime Survey for England and Wales** but just a four per cent decrease in police recorded crime. Overall, the **Crime Survey for England and Wales** shows a more positive picture of crime than police are recording.

Citizens have mixed views on their quality of life and how safe they feel

- 4.11 The National Survey for Wales³⁸ is a large-scale survey involving over 14,000 adults a year across the whole of Wales and covers a range of topics such as wellbeing and people's views on public services. The results are used by the Welsh Government to help make Wales a better place to live. However, the survey questions change annually in a number of key areas, which makes comparison of performance over time difficult. In addition, the last National Survey findings are from the 2014-15 survey and whilst there was no National Survey in 2015-16, it is planned to restart in 2016-17.
- 4.12 The National Survey includes a range of topics covering the local environment, quality of life and feeling safe. **Figure 14** plots survey respondents' views on the quality of their local-authority area in 2013-14 and shows there is a wide variation in how satisfied citizens are with their quality of life and the condition of their local environment.

³⁸ Welsh Government, **National Survey for Wales**

Figure 14 – National Survey for Wales 2013-14 – Quality of local area



Source: Stats Wales, National Survey for Wales

- 4.13 The questions in the 2014-15 National Survey for Wales do not allow for a direct comparison with the 2013-14 survey. The 2014-15 survey did however include a small number of questions covering what the Welsh Government termed 'community cohesion'. The 2014-15 survey reports that 79 per cent of respondents agree that people in the local area from different backgrounds get on well together. Individual local-authority responses range from 65 per cent in Torfaen to 93 per cent in Ceredigion. In addition, 79 per cent of respondents also agree that people in the local area treat each other with respect and consideration with responses ranging from 67 per cent in Rhondda Cynon Taf to 95 per cent in Powys.
- 4.14 As part of our online survey we asked citizens their views on how public bodies with responsibility for community safety are performing. For the three survey measures – safety in their area, changes in crime and the performance of agencies – the responses varied. In respect of crime within their area, 36.6 per cent of citizens stated that they felt crime had increased in the last year, 10 per cent that crime had fallen and 53.4 per cent that they did not know. Only a quarter of survey respondents stated that they feel safer in their area than they did a year ago compared to approximately 60 per cent who stated that they felt more unsafe than they did last year. The remaining 15.4 per cent stated that they did not know.
- 4.15 With regard to the performance of agencies in improving community safety, responses were more evenly spread with 23.5 per cent stating that bodies were doing a very good or good job; 30.4 per cent an okay job with some good and not so good work; and 23.1 per cent a poor or very poor job. The remaining 23 per cent stated they did not know. Given that many respondents to these three survey questions did not know how well organisations are performing in tackling crime and community safety there are clear opportunities for public agencies to improve how they engage with and inform residents and communities on current levels and standards of performance.

Judging performance and impact in delivering plans is difficult because of wide variations in the quality and range of measures, targets and actions that public bodies use

- 4.16 Having good systems and arrangements to evaluate performance helps the Welsh Government, Police and Crime Commissioners and local authority Members to understand how well they are performing in relation to their strategic goals and objectives. In the broadest sense, it enables organisations and their stakeholders to understand whether they are on track or not. In a time of austerity and reductions in resources, good-quality performance information to judge delivery of activity is also critical. It provides the means by which organisations can gauge whether reductions in expenditure are being managed and mitigated effectively without unduly influencing performance, or highlighting where resources need to be focussed to make the biggest positive impact.

There is a mixed picture of how well the Welsh Government has performed in delivering its priorities of safer communities for all because appropriate measures to judge impact are lacking in some areas

- 4.17 The Welsh Government published annual progress reports on the delivery of its commitments under the **Programme for Government**. Under the **Programme for Government**, the Welsh Government's overall aim is to make our communities safer through reductions in anti-social behaviour, crime (including the fear of crime), substance misuse and the incidence and impact of fires as well as effective co-ordination of emergencies. It sets a series of targets to judge whether it is delivering its objectives and outcomes. The Welsh Government publishes data on the outcome indicators it uses to judge delivery over the period of the **Programme for Government**. These are the measures that judge community safety in Wales and how the individual actions of the Welsh Government contribute to improving community safety within the scope of its powers.
- 4.18 In 2011-12 the Welsh Government published a detailed 48 page scorecard³⁹ to judge progress in delivering its targets. The progress report measures performance against the 20 specific actions agreed and performance against the big 'long-term challenges' facing Wales. The data used is a mix of official statistics published at a UK or all-Wales level as well as information collated from departmental management systems.

³⁹ Welsh Government, **Programme for Government 2012 Update, Chapter 7: Safer Communities for All**

- 4.19 Since 2012-13, the Welsh Government has published various summaries which provide an update on each of the twenty specific action community-safety commitments in the **Programme for Government**. The progress report also acknowledges that some of the performance measures used do not enable performance against the outcome sought to be determined. For example, the Welsh Government reports on the percentage of children and young people in the Youth Justice System in Wales, with identified substance misuse needs, who have access to appropriate specialist assessment and treatment services but does not report on the impact of substance misuse treatment and its benefits. The Welsh Government's most recent annual progress report⁴⁰ showed that by the end of 2014-15, 18 of the 20 commitments had been achieved and two were anticipated to be achieved by the end of 2015-16.
- 4.20 Our review identified some weaknesses with these arrangements. Firstly, the Welsh Government has not established baselines or targets for most of the measures so it is not clear what the anticipated impact of its programme of work will be over the life of the National Assembly. The Welsh Government believes that in some cases it is not appropriate to set targets – for example for how many young people the Welsh Government thinks should be in custody – because it might mean that once the target is met, services may not focus on continuing to keep young people out of custody.
- 4.21 Our review found that over the life of the **Programme of Government** there has been an improvement in performance for 16 measures, 11 have seen a decline in performance and for two it is unclear how performance should be judged. Whilst there are areas where performance has improved significantly, and the positive work of the Welsh Government is clear in driving this improvement, limitations in other areas make it difficult to evaluate the full impact of all the Welsh Government's activity in improving key areas of community safety in Wales.
- 4.22 For example, in the most recent progress report, 2014-15 data was not provided for 14 measures and is based on 2013-14 information, which makes it difficult to track performance. Some of the data used by the Welsh Government is drawn from management records rather than published sources so it is not always clear whether the information is auditable. In addition, good-quality information which could have been used to demonstrate performance– for example, the National Survey for Wales noted above – is not used. In some areas the performance measures are a collation of coverage or usage not impact and benefit, so it is not clear how the actions or activity contribute to or allow for a judgement of improvement. For example, extension of number of properties covered in no-cold-calling zones. The Welsh Government published the figures relating to a post-code exercise which was carried out to gain an overview of the numbers of homes covered by no-cold-calling zones as at 31 March 2015, which was 53,418, an increase of 15,418 since March 2013. However, simply recording the number of homes that are now covered by cold calling zones captures no information on whether the extension of the policy has delivered any actual improvement for residents.

⁴⁰ Welsh Government, **Chapter 7: Safer Communities for All – Update on Commitments in the Programme for Government**

Police and Crime Commissioners' annual plans and programmes provide an overall direction for the work of police forces, however a lack of clarity in some targets, measures and outcomes means that it is not always clear whether they are delivering their priorities

- 4.23 Police and Crime Plans set out a series of priorities for their office and police-force area. However, the priorities in these documents are generally population-wide outcomes with emphasis on crime reduction and value for money from the police forces. Other priorities are focussed on developing capacity to address crime and community-safety issues, for example, the North Wales Police and Crime Commissioner is developing cyber-crime capability and capacity to tackle significant threats, including child sexual exploitation online.
- 4.24 Each Police and Crime Commissioner sets out how they will measure progress in meeting their priorities. In many cases priorities and performance measures are aligned, for example, one Police and Crime Commissioner has set a priority that the local population is protected from serious harm (Gwent) and one of the performance measures for the priority is to increase the proportion of offenders brought to justice for domestic-abuse offences. However, some of the performance measures are not easily measurable nor specific. These weaknesses in the performance monitoring systems mean that it is not always clear whether Police and Crime Commissioners are consistently delivering their priorities, although this is improving with greater information being made available online.

Most community-safety partnerships set clear high-level priorities but the measures set to monitor and evaluate progress are often not clear or appropriate

- 4.25 Almost all community-safety partnerships have set clear high-level community-safety priorities within their Single Integrated Plans. Those priorities are generally population wide outcomes and the partnerships then set out action plans to achieve the overall priorities. Although not all partnerships provided us with clear action plans that demonstrated how the overall priorities would be delivered, including which other organisations would be involved and deadlines for actions.

- 4.26 Whilst 18 of the 20 of the community-safety partnerships stated that their strategies have appropriate outcome measures, we found that performance measures are not always fully aligned to the priorities set out in strategies. For example, Bridgend has three priority areas: further reducing violent crime; reducing drug misuse; and further reducing domestic burglary. However, the performance measures the Authority has set to judge delivery and impact are not aligned with these strategic aims and will not allow it, partners or citizens to judge the effectiveness of its work. The measures used focus on measuring an increase in the percentage of people who think South Wales Police and Bridgend County Borough Council are dealing with issues that matter; an increase in the amount of clean streets and land; and the increase in the percentage of people who feel part of their community. Whilst these are useful measures to judge activity, they do not relate directly to measuring reductions in burglary or drug misuse. Likewise, the North Wales Commissioner acknowledges in his performance report, that joint partnership activity and outcomes are difficult to measure, though working in partnership is important. However, arrangements to assess partnership working have recently been revised and strengthened.
- 4.27 Our review of the strategies found that partnerships use a variety of performance data to measure progress in meeting their priorities. The majority of measures are based on published data, for example, the number of reported anti-social-behaviour incidents. A number of partnerships have further refined their measures to include the rates of incidents per 1,000 population rather than the actual number of incidents, which is a more sophisticated approach to measuring progress. Others use data that capture public perceptions of elements of community safety, including feeling safe after dark in a local area. However, information is not always drawn from robust data sources and in some cases funding reductions have meant that perception surveys are no longer run.
- 4.28 Wrexham Local Service Board's Partnership Delivery Board 3 'Wrexham is a place that's safe and where people feel included' is responsible for community-safety issues. The Board has published two annual reviews of progress against its targets. These reviews contain key information for each of the outcomes set by partners, which allows members of the public to track whether these targets are being achieved. The information includes a 2012 baseline for each target, the progress made in the year of the report and the preceding year as well as the overall target for the life of the plan for 2017. A Red, Amber, Green (RAG) rating is given to help a reader's interpretation of the information. Since April 2015 Board members also receive quarterly information to allow them to monitor performance for 16 of the 21 performance measures. The report includes a short commentary on each of the performance measures comparing performance with a similar family group of local authorities as well as an indication of the trends within the data. Taken together the range of information and the way it is presented allows Board members to challenge and scrutinise performance.

- 4.29 In some local authorities, the rate of referral to services is used to measure progress in tackling specific issues, for example, substance misuse. However, measures such as these are only one means of judging progress in tackling these issues and are often not sufficiently detailed or rounded to evaluate performance. Where more detail is included, for instance in Caerphilly where the number of successful treatment outcomes is also captured, a better picture of progress is highlighted. Additionally, of the eight partnerships that include community cohesion as a priority, three use the level of hate crime as a performance measure, four do not set any measures and one partnership sets the three measures: an understanding of the local threat and risk, a robust prevention strategy, and creating a more integrated and cohesive community.
- 4.30 Measuring delivery of community-safety priorities across Wales has some common shortcomings. More clarity on the intended outcome of each priority and its beneficial impact on citizens would help people understand what they can expect and how they can stay safe. Despite clear intentions to improve reporting and access to information, there is limited baseline data on police performance. As a result it is hard to judge what the community-safety body is aiming for, the results delivered, and what they do well compared to others.
- 4.31 Plans and strategies also fail to link cost and financial information with actions and activity and too many community-safety strategies are not costed. As a result, plans are not as robust as they should be. In some cases the targets set are very simplistic. For example, some community-safety partnerships are seeking to reduce the incidence of domestic abuse, however, others such as Torfaen and the North Wales Safer Communities Board have taken the view that as reporting of domestic abuse has historically been an under reported crime, there needs to be increased awareness, which may lead to an increase in reporting of incidents. However, both of these are also targeting a reduction in repeat victims of such crimes.

Management of risk varies widely and is not always robust

- 4.32 Risk management is an important part of community-safety partners' governance and accountability arrangements and, done well, can provide assurance that the risk of certain kinds of events happening or having an impact on performance are reducing or eliminated. From our review, we found that risk management is developing but is not fully embedded.
- 4.33 Police and Crime Commissioners across Wales generally have sound processes in place for managing risks to the police force. In South Wales and Dyfed-Powys, the Risk Register is continually updated and regularly submitted to various Audit Committees and Boards for scrutiny. Similarly, both the Gwent and North Wales Police and Crime Commissioners have established risk frameworks for community-safety priorities covering a number of partnership and joint activities, although there are some opportunities to improve how all key partnership risks are captured.

- 4.34 In Swansea, a strategic needs assessment document is produced annually as part of a cyclical process and key risks are identified. For example, an increase in substance misuse linked to the effects of the recession is likely to affect acquisitive crime levels, such as shoplifting where thefts are made to fund a drug habit. The use of substances has a knock-on effect on safeguarding in relation to the protection of children and domestic-violence victims where users are part of a family, and will have greater implications for managing anti-social behaviour and disorder. These risks are articulated and shared with partners, although how resources are allocated to these risks lacks clarity.
- 4.35 The impact of scrutiny is unclear and public bodies do not always have effective risk-management arrangements. For example, risks are not written in plain language and tend to get packaged up. Sustainable finances are most community-safety partnerships' top risk to delivery but how these risks are managed and resolved lacks clarity. Community-safety partnerships' risk-management arrangements are also developing too slowly. Whilst risks from new duties and new intelligence are considered by the community-safety partnerships, these are more about threats rather than risks to delivery, capacity and important public-perception issues such as fear of crime.
- 4.36 However, the fragmented nature of responsibilities also makes management of risk difficult. Risk-management arrangements are mostly focussed on individual agencies' responsibilities and consequently do not identify or comment on the role of others in addressing risk. Indeed, Commissioners and community-safety partnerships do not have a handle on or register of all the partners they are dealing with and the potential risks that come with that. A fragmented approach to managing risk does not provide adequate assurance that all the necessary and appropriate actions to mitigate risk are taking place and does not enable adequate scrutiny of performance.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – The statutory basis for management of community safety in England and Wales

Appendix 2 – Responsibilities for community safety in Wales

Appendix 3 – Study methodology

Appendix 4 – Good-practice case studies



Appendix 1 – The statutory basis for management of community safety in England and Wales

The 'Morgan Report' 1991 - The Morgan Report was critical in shaping community safety and the future development of community safety partnerships in England and Wales. It advanced the notion of partnership and recognised the need to bring together key stakeholders in the field of community safety and crime prevention. It recommended linking local authorities with police and others in a multi-agency approach to tackling crime. Following its publication there was wide-scale, voluntary adoption of community safety partnerships across Britain.

Crime and Disorder Act 1998 - The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 gave local authorities and police services duties to work together to develop crime and disorder audits; implement reduction strategies; and to work in partnership with other agencies through Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to tackle the identified problems.

Police and Justice Act 2006 - The Act placed a duty on responsible authorities to share evidenced-based data. This was widened to include the Fire Service, Probation Service, Health Service, local Police Authority and a representative of Registered Social Landlords. The Act also placed a new duty to create a formal strategic group to undertake strategic assessments of levels and patterns of crime and drug misuse and to produce annual rolling 3-year community safety plans. Minimum standards for CSPs was also established.

The Crime and Disorder (Prescribed Information) Regulations 2007 - The Statutory Instrument sets out the specific duties of responsible authorities for developing a Strategic Assessment and its implementation.

Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 - The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 covers five distinct policy areas: police accountability and governance; alcohol licensing; the regulation of protests around Parliament Square; misuse of drugs; and the issue of arrest warrants in respect of private prosecutions for universal jurisdiction offences. The Act also replaced police authorities with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners.

Serious and Organised Crime Strategy 2013 - The Strategy makes a number of proposals with regard to partnership working. Police and Crime Commissioners are the lead bodies responsible for crime and safety and should be supported by new local organised crime partnership boards, including local authorities and agencies to ensure all available information and powers are used. The precise structure for local multi-agency partnerships will vary and it may be best to adapt an existing group for this purpose such as the community safety partnership.

Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 - The act introduces simpler powers to tackle anti-social behaviour to provide better protection for victims and communities. The new community trigger and community remedy empower victims and communities aiming to give them a greater say in how agencies respond to complaints of anti-social behaviour and in out-of-court sanctions for offenders.

Appendix 2 – Responsibilities for community safety in Wales

Home Office

Within England and Wales, the Home Office is responsible for immigration, security, and law and order. As such it is responsible for the police in England and Wales, UK Visas and Immigration, and the Security Service (MI5). It is also in charge of government policy on security-related issues such as drugs and counter-terrorism as well as the strategic policy for community safety in England and Wales.

Currently, the Serious and Organised Crime Strategy (the 'Strategy') published in October 2013 sets out how the Home Office will prevent people getting involved in serious and organised crime in England and Wales. The Serious and Organised Crime Strategy makes a number of proposals with regard to partnership working and makes it a requirement for the Police Forces and the individual Police and Crime Commissioners to be the lead bodies responsible for crime and safety. However, Police and Crime Commissioners should be supported by new local organised-crime partnership boards, including local authorities and agencies to ensure all available information and powers are used. The precise structure for local multi-agency partnerships to deal with serious and organised crime will vary across the country. In some areas it may be best to adapt an existing group for this purpose such as the community-safety partnership.

Welsh Government

Welsh Ministers and the Welsh Government have the competence to pass bills for Acts of the Assembly in a range of areas outlined in schedule 7 of the Government of Wales Act 2006. Whilst the Welsh Ministers and the Welsh Government do not have direct legislative or policy responsibility for crime and safety, they do have responsibilities for many agencies and organisations that play an important role in community safety.

Given the above context, the last Welsh Government recognised that tackling crime and the fear of crime is an important way to help people feel safer in their communities. Consequently, it recognises that its work with the police, Home Office, community-safety partnerships and other key organisations to reduce crime and the fear of crime is extremely important. Through its Programme for Government 2011-2016 and the strategic aim of safer communities for all, the Welsh Government set out its priorities for improvement, aiming to 'make our communities safer through reductions in anti-social behaviour, crime (including the fear of crime), substance misuse and the incidence and impact of fires as well as effective co-ordination of emergencies'.

Police and Crime Commissioners

The core functions of Police and Crime Commissioners are to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force within their area, and to hold the Chief Constable to account for the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan. The Police and Crime Plan must include the Commissioners' objectives for policing, what resources will be provided to the Chief Constable and how performance will be measured. Both the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable must have regard to the police and crime plan in the exercise of their duties.

Whilst Police and Crime Commissioners are not specifically included as members of community-safety partnerships they do have community-safety-related powers and duties including a reciprocal duty to co-operate with community-safety partnerships for the purposes of reducing crime and disorder; a power to bring a representative of any or all community-safety partnerships in the their area together to discuss priority issues; a power to require reports from community-safety partnerships about issues of concern and the Power to approve mergers of community-safety partnerships (on application of the community-safety partnerships concerned). In addition, Commissioners have the Power to commission community-safety work from a range of local partners including community-safety partnerships and community, voluntary-sector or commercial providers).

Local Authorities

Community-safety partnerships) are groups of local organisations working together to reduce crime and improve safety. Community-safety partnerships are led by local authorities and membership includes a wide range of local authority services, Police Bodies, Fire and Rescue Authority, and Health and Probation services. These are the 'responsible authorities'. Community-safety partnerships also work closely with other Criminal Justice agencies, and the voluntary and business sector.

The local strategic management, commissioning of the local community-safety strategic assessments, the development of local delivery plans for crime and disorder reduction and the overseeing of performance against crime-reduction targets and the delivery of services are controlled by the community-safety partnership.

In addition, the wider work of local authorities also makes an important contribution to community safety within communities, in particular in areas such as:

- emergency planning – ensuring that plans are in place to deal with emergency situations such as flooding, heavy snow and ice, civil unrest or terrorist incidents;
- regulation, licensing and trading standards – such as alcohol and entertainment licences to help maintain public order, food-hygiene certification for businesses to prevent food poisoning;
- safeguarding and ensuring the wellbeing of vulnerable members of society through their work in education, social services and housing;
- tenancy enforcement teams tackling anti-social behaviour and neighbour nuisance;
- planning service advising on and approving planning applications for new developments that seek to design out potential crime issues;
- supporting people teams providing advice and support to vulnerable people that help them maintain their accommodation; and
- refuse-collection and waste services keeping areas clean and well-maintained.

Appendix 3 – Study methodology

Review of literature, data and statistics

We have reviewed a wide range of documents and media, including:

- Home Office policies, guidance and research;
- Welsh Government policy and guidance documents;
- Police and Crime Commissioner plans for the period 2012-16;
- local authority plans and strategies covering community safety in all 22 local authorities;
- performance-indicator returns and budget data available online at the Office for National Statistics, StatsWales and the Benchmarking Hub; and
- other relevant research and guidance from government, local authorities, voluntary sector groups and research bodies.

Local authority fieldwork

We visited seven local authorities in Wales in 2015-16. The local authorities selected represented a mix of city, urban and rural authorities which are geographically spread across Wales. These were:

- Bridgend County Borough Council
- City of Cardiff Council
- Ceredigion County Council
- Conwy County Borough Council
- Denbighshire County Council
- Swansea City and County Council
- Wrexham County Borough Council

During the visits, we interviewed a range of community safety partnership members, including police and fire officers, health board, local authority staff and elected members, including members from regional partnerships.

Surveys

We undertook a range of online surveys and we surveyed:

- Community-safety co-ordinators for the 20 local-authority community-safety partnerships between September and November 2015 and received responses from all 20.
- Community-safety partnership members in October and November 2015 and received 51 responses. The survey was promoted via community-safety partnership managers/co-ordinators and we received returns from 31 different organisations across Wales who are members of community-safety partnerships.
- Citizens from October 2014 to November 2015 and we received 468 responses. The survey was made available online and promoted through our communications team. The approach taken does not necessarily guarantee a representative response. For example, we received half of our responses from North Wales and no responses in some local-authority areas. Given these limitations, we have only used the survey to report views at an all-Wales level.

Appendix 4 – Good-practice case studies

Good Practice – How we determine it

These are the parameters we use to judge whether to include a case study as Good Practice:

- A programme, activity or strategy that has proven effectiveness supported by a comprehensive evaluation.
- A programme, activity or strategy that has been shown to produce successful outcomes and is supported to some degree by subjective and objective data sources.
- A programme, activity or strategy that has worked within one organisation and shows promise during its early stages for becoming good practice with long-term sustainable impact.
- A programme, activity or strategy that has the potential for replication among other organisations.
- A programme, activity or strategy that is delivering value for money. Value for money is defined as the optimal use of resources to deliver the intended benefits.
- A programme, activity or strategy that is delivering savings/reductions in expenditure with no or low impact on performance.

Within the body of the report we have identified the following areas of good practice:

- Wrexham Harm Reduction Unit – page 15 (paragraph 1.21)
- Denbighshire Top 20 – page 16 (paragraph 1.22)
- Swansea Help Point – page 16 (paragraph 1.23)
- North Wales Safer Communities Board – page 18 (paragraph 1.25)
- Safer Gwent Group – page 18 (paragraph 1.26)
- Safer Swansea One Swansea Plan – page 28 (paragraph 2.24)
- Cardiff community-safety engagement – page 32 (paragraph 2.36)
- Wrexham Hub – page 33 (paragraph 2.37)
- Dyfed Powys Police commissioning approach – page 36 (paragraph 3.6)
- Gwent Police commissioning work – page 37 (paragraph 3.7)
- 3 Wrexham Plan – page 56 (paragraph 4.28)

In addition, we have also identified the following transferable practice.

Case Study 1 – Cardiff Alcohol Treatment Centre

The Cardiff Alcohol Treatment Centre (ATC) was set up to provide additional capacity to deal with the higher volume of acutely intoxicated individuals (All) attending the University Hospital of Wales (UHW) Emergency Department on Friday and Saturday nights in Cardiff. During peak times, up to 70 per cent of all admissions to the Emergency Department at UHW are alcohol-related. The ACT aimed to divert patients away from the Emergency Department; reduce the burden on ambulance services by dealing with patients in the city centre; and reduce ambulance-handover times at the Emergency Department by reducing the volume of patients accessing services there.

The project was a collaboration between Cardiff Night Time co-ordinators (from the local authority), South Wales Police, Welsh Ambulance Service, Cardiff and Vale NHS Trust, the University of Wales Emergency Department and the Roman Catholic Diocese. Other partners already involved in the night-time economy, including Street Pastors, St John Ambulance, licensees and taxi marshals, were also part of the project.

The project also collaborated with the private sector. Property developers bought the building where the ACT was based from the local authority, but agreed to house the project within their development. The project operated on Friday and Saturday nights, and other specific dates when high levels of All were expected (event days, Freshers' Week, etc).

An evaluation of the project was carried out by Cardiff University in 2013⁴¹. Amongst its findings, the evaluation concluded that the project would become cost-neutral, based on a comparison between the expenditure on staff costs, etc. and the calculated savings resulting from reduced attendance at the Emergency Department saved ambulance journeys and reduced ambulance waiting times. Information gathered from patients entering the ATC provides evidence of 'hot spots' – times and locations where intoxication is concentrated in the city centre.

The project is now funded by the Cardiff and Vale Regional Collaboration Board. Medical staff working on the project also engage with the public at events to promote safety in the night-time economy, for instance at University Freshers' Fayres across the city.

⁴¹ Dr Simon Moore, Dr Vas Sivarajasingam, Marjukka Heikkinen: Cardiff University Violence & Society Research Group, **An Evaluation of the Cardiff Alcohol Treatment Centre Pilot**, May 2013.

Case Study 2 - Wrexham Alcohol Treatment and Welfare Centre

Wrexham Alcohol Treatment and Welfare Centre was set up on a temporary basis during the festive season in 2014. It addressed many of the town-centre anti-social and health problems caused through and by excessive alcohol consumption.

The Community Safety Partnership has produced considerable evidence that directly correlates to fewer people attending A&E and reduced anti-social behaviour during the weekends and periods the centre operated. Following its success, the Partnership and Local Service Board submitted a business case to the Area Planning Board and accessed capital funding to provide a permanent alcohol treatment and welfare centre in Wrexham. The new centre is due to open in November 2015 and will operate every weekend and during popular holiday periods. Volunteers, mainly from the Red Cross, students, including medical and nursing staff, will operate from the centre. Police, PCSOs and street pastors provide support at and around the centre. There are further plans to use the centre during the day as a drop-in point to assist with other welfare issues.

In conjunction with the initiative, the Council and its partnership board have developed good working relationships with licensees in the town centre, which is helping further to deter problems associated with alcohol.

Case Study 3 – Conwy and Denbighshire Community Safety Partnership Taxi Driver Safeguarding training

As a result of the Report of Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council February 2015 undertaken by Louise Casey CB, Conwy's licensing unit reviewed its policies and procedures and considered what additional steps they could take in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and taxi licensing. Amongst other things, it was decided that:

- awareness training on CSE for taxi drivers was needed (Police and Social Services support/input is needed);
- better information exchange between partners/agencies;
- taxi-licensing conditions should be changed to require drivers to hold the BTEC Level 2 Certificate (or equivalent) on the 'Introduction to the Role of the Professional Taxi and Private Hire Driver (QCF)', which includes training on CSE matters.

Officers subsequently commenced liaison and engagement with Conwy's Social Services, Community Safety Partnership, North Wales Police, Barnardo's and the local taxi trade. It was decided that a report to the General Licensing Committee of Conwy County Borough Council would be presented setting out the suggested approach that all currently licensed drivers must attend a mandatory CSE awareness session, and at the time their driver licences were required to be renewed, they must also have obtained the BTEC level 2 Certificate (or equivalent) on the 'Introduction to the Role of the Professional Taxi and Private Hire Driver (QCF)', which enables taxi and private-hire drivers to demonstrate evidence of technical competency and underpinning knowledge in relation to their work activities.

The recommendations in the [General Licensing Committee report](#) were agreed on 21 September 2015, and so in liaison with the above partners, CSE awareness sessions for Conwy's taxi drivers were planned and undertaken on 25 November 2015. The sessions were extremely well received by the taxi trade, with 300 plus taxi drivers getting the important messages given out, which will hopefully lead to greater levels of public safety and awareness/prevention of CSE.

Local providers for the BTEC level 2 have been identified and the taxi trade advised of the new mandatory BTEC requirements. Drivers not attending the CSE awareness sessions, or failing to obtain the BTEC and wishing to remain licensed, would be referred to the General Licensing Committee for a determination of whether they were still 'fit and proper' to hold a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire vehicle drivers licence.

The Criminal Conviction policy for the issuing of Hackney Carriage and/or Private Hire Vehicle licences to drivers was also reviewed and strengthened, following agreement at the meeting where the [General Licensing Committee report](#) was agreed on 16 March 2015.

It is hoped there will be better CSE awareness and information exchange as a result of the above work, which was led and facilitated by Conwy's licensing unit.

Wales Audit Office

24 Cathedral Road

Cardiff CF11 9LJ

Tel: 029 2032 0500

Fax: 029 2032 0600

Textphone: 029 2032 0660

E-mail: info@audit.wales

Website: www.audit.wales

Swyddfa Archwilio Cymru

24 Heol y Gadeirlan

Caerdydd CF11 9LJ

Ffôn: 029 2032 0500

Ffacs: 029 2032 0600

Ffôn Testun: 029 2032 0660

E-bost: post@archwilio.cymru

Gwefan: www.archwilio.cymru