Appendix A

LGA review of the future of community safety services: Draft summary report

Introduction

In autumn 2016, the Local Government Association (LGA) undertook a high-level review of councils' role in providing community safety services. Set in the context of significant changes to the landscape for local community safety services over recent years, the review was initiated with the aim of assessing the current picture, looking at how local authorities and partners have begun to respond to some of the challenges this new landscape presents, and ultimately encouraging further strategic thinking at individual authority and sector-wide levels about how best to shape services for the future. While the focus for the review was on local government's role in delivering community safety services, this cannot be done without considering the broader multi-agency framework of statutory Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and County Strategy Groups (CSGs) within which this sits.

The objectives for the review were to:

- Consider local government's role in delivering safer communities, within the context of wider partnership working
- Explore how best councils and partners can work together in the new landscape, identifying examples of good practice
- Consider options for the future of community safety services and CSPs/CSGs.

To deliver this review we:

- Undertook a survey of Community Safety Managers in England and Wales
- Drew on comparative data from an IDeA survey of Community Safety Managers in 2009
- Drew on findings from previously commissioned LGA research and other published reports to develop a discussion paper setting out some of the key issues and questions for exploration with stakeholders
- Ran two stakeholder workshops with representatives from a range of local authority departments and external partner agencies to seek their views on these issues
- Invited additional written submissions from stakeholders in response to the discussion paper.

This report sets out:

- The background and broad context within which the review took place
- A summary of the key findings from the research and stakeholder group discussions
- The LGA's response to these points and next steps.

Context

Councils have worked with multi-agency partners to address local crime and disorder issues for many years. Statutory partnerships were originally formed under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, with

councils making up one of now six responsible authorities[1] on local community safety partnerships (CSPs)/county strategy groups (CSGs).

Various legislation has had an impact on the precise make-up and role of CSPs over time, but they remain statutorily responsible for identifying local priorities via a strategic assessment, and reducing crime and disorder (including anti-social behaviour), substance misuse and re-offending in each local authority area. There are also statutory requirements for CSPs regarding sharing information and engaging and consulting with the community about their priorities, and monitoring progress in achieving them. Under section 17 of the 1998 Act, there remains a duty on local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications of all their day-to-day activities. CSGs remain responsible for drawing up a county-level community safety agreement setting out how responsible authorities in the county will work together. Often CSPs and CSGs have senior representation through the council leader, council chief executive or police borough commander.

CSPs have traditionally been administered by council-funded community safety teams, which have played a key role in bringing together partners from across the local authority, other responsible authorities, and beyond and coordinating work across agreed strategies and priorities. CSPs have brought many successes, including increased data sharing across agencies and better joint working, which has ultimately had a significant impact on crime and disorder and reducing reoffending within local areas[2].

However, the environment within which they sit has changed significantly over recent years; these changes provide the context and impetus for the LGA's review. Recent years have witnessed the election of Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), changes to funding, legislation and policy, devolution, and increased recognition of the role councils and their partners can play in tackling a range of community safety and public protection issues, all of which have raised questions about how best local authorities might deliver their community safety functions.

Police and Crime Commissioners

The introduction of PCCs from November 2012 has had a significant and far-reaching impact on community safety partnerships. PCCs have assumed overall responsibility for policing, reducing crime within a police force area, and determining how budgets should be allocated across the force area, accompanied by a shift in decision-making and accountability for local policing away from police authorities, as well as central and local government.

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 set out a number of ways that PCCs and CSPs should work together, including a mutual duty to cooperate to reduce crime and disorder and reoffending and a requirement that the PCC and CSP must have regard to each other's priorities within their respective plans (these duties does not apply to devolved areas of responsibility in Wales). In addition, PCCs are held to account by police and crime panels (formed primarily of elected councillors), while Overview and Scrutiny Committees for Community Safety scrutinise the work of the CSP as a whole (and are unique in that they can call in representatives from the other responsible authorities on CSPs to be held to account).

With the introduction of the Policing and Crime Act 2017 there is the potential for PCCs to expand their role in local services further, to take on governance of fire and rescue authorities where a business case is made – and the role of PCCs may grow yet further in future.

Funding

[1] The six responsible authorities are: the local authority, police, fire and rescue service, community rehabilitation company, national probation service and clinical commissioning group

[2] See eg https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/116549/horr52-report.pdf which analyses the effectiveness of partnership working

Councils continue to face the twin challenges of both growing demand for services, particularly in complex areas requiring a resource-intensive response, and significant reductions in budgets. Councils have seen the funding they have available to contribute to CSP work, and to either deliver or commission services themselves, cut. English local authorities had a net expenditure of £297 million for community safety services in 2015/16. This is a decrease of 46 per cent in real terms since 2009/10. Community safety services in councils have seen up to a 60 per cent reduction in mainstream funding since 2010 - and there is less scope for investment from other partner agencies, as they also face resourcing pressures.

Historically, councils received a number of different funding streams from central government to help support work around community safety, from which they were able to develop services in house and/or commission other services. However, with the introduction of PCCs, these streams were replaced with the un-ringfenced Police Main Grant, from which PCCs commission policing services and any broader community safety projects they see fit. Most councils have successfully bid for PCC funding to deliver particular services or projects, often in recognition of their knowledge and experience of responding to particular issues – but the funding picture is patchy across areas. Grants are often one-offs or provided on an annual basis, which can make it difficult to plan ahead and maintain capacity (funding for PCCs is similarly allocated on an annual basis), and as police funding fell until 2015, very few receive the same amounts of funding from the PCC that they used to. Some areas have indicated that the CSP's priorities have been aligned to the PCC's simply in order to secure future funds.

While there remain some central government or Welsh government funding pots which local authorities may be invited to bid into, these are sporadic and usually only offered for innovative projects that are testing new approaches, which can mean it is difficult to retain core provision. Inevitably reductions have seen cuts to staffing levels; the survey findings suggested that just over two-thirds of authorities who responded had cut their community safety staff since 2010.

Diminishing resources is mirrored across partners; for instance between 2010 and 2015 central government funding for the police reduced by £2.2 billion (22%) in real terms[3], with police staff reducing by 18 per cent between 2010 and 2016[4]; and funding for fire and rescue authorities fell by between 26 per cent and 39 per cent between 2010 and 2016[5].

Changing priorities

The focus for national government and local agencies around tackling crime has evolved substantially in recent years. Overall levels of crime, particularly acquisitive crime, have fallen substantially since the mid-1990s, and while community safety partners continue to prioritise domestic abuse and anti-social behaviour, they have moved increasingly away from looking to address volume crime to focussing on more complex areas that include child protection, managing persistent offenders and safeguarding vulnerable adults, and have been encouraged by the Home Office to do so.

Councils, who are often the focal point for complex service users, have been taking a lead on partnership approaches to many public protection issues for some time, through trading standards, environmental health, licensing, child and adult safeguarding, and emergency planning. However, issues such as child sexual exploitation; female genital mutilation; counter-extremism and the Prevent duty; modern slavery; and serious and organised crime have become priorities for national government over recent years, and all require a significant response from local government. Furthermore, there has been increased focus across agencies on prevention and early intervention, identifying and managing risk, and concentrating resources on high risk individuals and areas. The

[3] https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Financial-sustainability-of-police-forces.pdf
[4] https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/police-workforce-england-and-wales
[5] https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Impact-of-funding-reductions-on-fire-and-rescue-services-summary-A.pdf

need for local government to play a core role in addressing these issues is well recognised, by central government and other partner agencies.

This new emphasis on complex priority areas, often necessitating intensive and longer-term interventions, places further demands on resources across partners. However, for many of these issues, limited (or no) additional funds have been made available by central government to local areas - with those that are offered as one-off grants or focussed on councils centrally identified as 'priority areas'.

Wider reforms
Responding to changes to the community safety landscape cannot be done without considering wider public sector reforms. The Localism Act 2011 was introduced with the aim of devolving more decision-making powers from central government back to communities and local councils. While early devolution deals were focused on growth and economic policy, this now provides a backdrop for broader reform. In Greater Manchester, the role of Mayor now incorporates the PCC's duties, with plans for further devolution of criminal justice and offender management. Other city regions may follow suit in combining the roles of PCC and Metro Mayor, and some areas have considered additional devolved powers around criminal justice and community safety as part of their devolution bids. However, combined authority structures are unlikely to be appropriate everywhere and will depend on local circumstances.

Review findings

Do councils have a role in community safety?
Given PCC's statutory responsibility for reducing crime, the starting point for the review was whether councils had a role in delivering community safety services. Sitting in the heart of communities, with an understanding of the broad range of issues affecting their neighbourhoods, the answer to this question from those involved in the review was a resounding yes. There was no support for scrapping councils' statutory community safety duties - rather the question was how best local areas might fulfil those responsibilities. It is clear that how these duties are currently met, and what activities are undertaken beyond the statutory requirements, differs significantly across areas. There were calls from some during the review for additional guidance on the minimum functions of CSPs, with commensurate benchmark standards.

The impact of the changes to the landscape outlined above, and a desire to improve the delivery of services, has seen local authorities develop a broad range of different models, across different authority types, for delivering councils' community safety activity and working with partners. These have included fully integrated co-located multi-agency teams seeking to provide holistic approaches to crime prevention and disruption, through to community safety teams becoming commissioners of services rather than delivering them directly and coordinating other local government services to respond to particular issues. Some have viewed CSPs as an unnecessary structure, and that focus should be on operational delivery, others view the community safety role within councils as much more strategic, vital in providing a wider context and oversight, and coordinating multiple but related agendas across a number of different agencies to provide a more joined-up response – with a group of key CSP partners already established.

It is evident that the shift in focus towards new outcomes around effective safeguarding, reducing vulnerability and risk, and prevention, makes local government's role even more important. The survey undertaken as part of this review asked CSPs and CSGs to list their main partnership priorities. Of those that responded, the top priorities were on addressing domestic abuse (listed as a priority for 79 per cent of counties; 67 per cent districts, and 85 per cent of single-tier authorities) and anti-social behaviour (35 per cent of counties, 72 per cent of districts, and 64 per cent of single tier authorities). However 34 per cent of authorities now include child sexual exploitation (CSE) as a priority for their CSP (21 per cent of counties, 41 per cent of districts and 28 per cent of single-tier); 32

per cent include safeguarding vulnerable people (29 per cent of counties, 35 per cent of districts, 28 per cent of single-tier); and modern slavery also appears as an increasing priority, particularly at county level where 29 per cent of county respondents included this as a current priority for their partnership (listed by 6 per cent of district authorities and 3 per cent of single-tier authorities).

Working with others and the importance of effective relationships

There can be little doubt that dealing with these complex issues will form much of councils' community safety focus into the future. Addressing them requires a strong multi-agency response – not only across agencies and statutory partners within the CSP but also in links with other bodies. How best to navigate this complex framework and establish effective and well-developed relationships with others formed much of the focus for the review.

Mature relationships will help to exploit the collective skills and resources across different agencies. It is apparent that limited resources have encouraged local areas to think more about who is best-placed to undertake specific tasks and lead on particular areas, consider how capacity can be managed collectively across all agencies, and what the risks might be of such an approach. They have also started to think differently about crime and community safety with a shift in emphasis on tackling particular crime types, such as burglary and anti-social behaviour, to working with individuals, their families and wider populations, with an increasing focus on prevention and early intervention to reduce crime.

Police and Crime Commissioners

The review found that relationships between local councils and their PCCs were varied. It was clear that in some areas relationships are well established with close working between the PCC/OPCC and the CSP; there is good collaboration regarding plans, data from the CSP's strategic assessment is used to inform the PCC's Police and Crime Plan and funding is made available. In others relationships have proved more difficult to establish and there is very little contact, particularly where local CSP and PCC priorities differ; there may be a sense that police and crime plans have taken precedence over local partnership plans and left the CSP unclear about the relevance of their own local strategy; or the CSP's strategy aligns with the PCC's simply in order to attract future funding. Given that PCCs look set to stay for the foreseeable future, with indications that this may include increased devolution of criminal justice responsibilities and budgets, this reinforces the need to councils to forge effective relationships with local commissioners wherever possible.

Many councils have secured grants from their local PCCs for community safety work. Where relationships are good, there are commitments from some PCCs to fund CSP activity over extended periods. However in most cases, funding is provided on a one-off or annual basis (as are central government allocations to PCCs), which can make it difficult to plan ahead and maintain capacity. The National Police Chiefs' Council, Association of Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society have expressed similar frustrations about financial clarity from central government and its impact[6].

Working with CSP partners

Similar variations were reported regarding the strength of local authority relationships with other statutory CSP partners. In some areas there are excellent relationships in place; representation at (and chairing of) meetings is consistent, allowing relationships to flourish; communication is good across partners, and information is shared. However it is clear this is not universal; in other places some partners may be more engaged than others, and there continue to be concerns in some areas about silo working and core issues such as data sharing – which are critical in efforts to ensure public

[6] http://www.apccs.police.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Joint-APCC-NPCC-Submission-to-the-Efficiency-Review-November-2016.pdf

safety. Working with partners who do not share coterminous boundaries presents additional challenges. Given limited resources and pressured budgets across partners, it is even more important to address these concerns.

Recent reforms to some partner agencies, for example probation and health services, have aggravated this - minimising the ability of these services to be flexible and adaptable to local needs. Many CSPs report a mixed picture in engagement by clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) and probation services, despite their statutory obligations. In the council survey, respondents were asked about partners' influence over the community safety partnership's current priorities: 43 per cent said that the national probation service had a great or moderate influence over the CSP's priorities; 38 per cent for community rehabilitation companies (slightly higher for single-tier and county authorities) and only 34 per cent overall for CCGs (higher for single-tier areas, followed by districts then counties).

Other areas reported that community safety issues are seen as integral to health services – for instance where public health officers take a lead on preventative activity relating to substance misuse and violence and abuse against women and girls, allowing for greater synergy, integrated work streams and opportunities for pooling resources and joint commissioning.

The benefits of co-location with CSP partners were raised several times, aiding closer working and information sharing across agencies, often with partners managing staff from other agencies. In other examples, bespoke multi-agency services or teams have been established to tackle particular issues. In Greater Manchester for instance, partners have developed an integrated multi-agency team around tackling serious and organised crime, bringing together a large team from agencies including, police, fire, safeguarding, immigration enforcement, DWP, with others such as trading standards involved at a local level.

However it is clear that closer proximity and structural changes alone are not enough to address all the challenges raised – for some areas, more needs to be done to tackle more endemic 'cultural' attitudes to issues such as data sharing and collaboration.

A complex framework for complex issues

One of the key questions for CSPs and CSGs is their fundamental role in dealing with some of the complex new priorities around addressing vulnerability considered above. Alongside CSP partners, a broad range of statutory and non-statutory groups occupy a similar space, including Local Safeguarding Children Boards, Adult Safeguarding Boards, Health and Wellbeing Boards, Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs and Local Criminal Justice Boards, prompting questions about how to navigate links between these different bodies, where community safety fits amongst these other groups and what it can offer.

Community safety managers reported that establishing and facilitating relationships, across all these partners, forms an essential part of councils' community safety function. In particular, having a unique and broad oversight of a number of separate, but related, issues, making links across these issues, 'greasing the wheels' across partners and coordinating their collective responses was identified as one of the function's key strengths.

The importance of links with Health and Wellbeing Boards in particular were raised by several stakeholders. The public health outcomes framework includes a number of indicators that cover issues related to community safety, including domestic violence, reducing violence and reducing reoffending, providing scope for better links around early intervention. At a local level, joint strategic needs assessments (JSNAs) provide an opportunity to incorporate community safety outcomes into health and wellbeing plans.

Again, there are indications there is further work to do. Areas reported various levels of engagement with these groups and some concerns were expressed about 'ownership' of particular issues. It is clear that strong relationships here are particularly important; with partners needing to be able to

engage in open conversations about who will lead on particular issues or strands of work regarding those issues, and how reporting structures might work. Local authorities such as Central Bedfordshire and Oldham have developed joint protocols between their safeguarding boards, Health and Wellbeing Boards and CSP about ownership of particular issues, holding each other to account and linking this to pooling resources at strategic levels. In Norfolk a Public Protection Forum has been established to coordinate work around vulnerability and public protection across a range of statutory and non-statutory boards.

In Wales, there are efforts to streamline local leadership and decision-making across broader areas through the introduction of local wellbeing plans. These plans, which will be drawn up by new statutory Public Service boards, can be used to incorporate community safety strategies alongside the Children and Young People's Plan, the Health, Social Care and Wellbeing Strategy.

There were calls from some as part of this work to review the statutory membership of both CSPs and other Boards and groups to support links across these areas. At a national level too there may be steps taken to ensure closer working between PCCs and Health and Wellbeing Boards. Councils too will want to ensure they are part of this broader picture.

A local approach – where appropriate

One of the main areas for discussion amongst stakeholders was localism and its 'best fit' around community safety issues. Some areas have looked at how they can operate at different area levels, identifying where it makes sense to work, and where to link up, at 'greater than CSP' level, whether very locally, with other authorities, amongst combined authorities, across two-tier areas, or at force level.

It was recognised that with variations in local demographics and across neighbouring authorities some issues such as anti-social behaviour are likely to be very specific to a locality, and it may not be appropriate to use a single approach. Conversely, for other issues that span CSP areas it may not make sense to reinvent approaches or duplicate, particularly in the context of limited financial and staffing resources – where this approach is taken, there may still be scope for local nuances if appropriate. Again the importance of strong and mature relationships was cited as critical in broaching the best solutions for local circumstances.

<u>Two-tier collaboration</u>

There were specific discussions about working across two-tier areas. Currently, levels of engagement and collaboration across district and county areas are diverse. At a simple level, often counties will prepare strategic assessments for local district areas, but in more collaborative arrangements the strategic focus is provided at county level, with districts providing a more operational approach, and information flowing across the tiers. This may make more sense for issues such as Prevent, domestic abuse, serious and organised crime, with operational delivery at local level – given the scale of these issues and links to safeguarding. The findings from the survey noted on page 4 suggest that there is a mixed picture in terms of how county and district areas structure their involvement around safeguarding-related issues, with more district authority respondents listing CSE and safeguarding vulnerable people as current partnership priorities than county (or single-tier) respondents. Conversely some issues may sit better at district level, where there are closer community links and greater understanding of local complexities.

Some local authorities in two-tier areas have looked to join-up commissioning arrangements; for instance agreeing that the county will take on the role of single point of contact with the Office of the PCC (OPCC) across the area, managing the negotiation of contracts and future funding proposals - supporting the view from some OPCCs, often with small teams and facing their own capacity issues, who have indicated a preference for commissioning services at force level to avoid providing different levels of service (or no service at all) in different areas, reduce duplication and achieve economies of scale, and spread best practice.

Several CSPs have taken the decision to merge, in some case across two-tier areas. In North Yorkshire there is a single CSP with 'local delivery teams', comprising operational managers from the responsible authorities who coordinate the delivery of the partnership plan at district level.

Redesigning collaboration

Drives for greater local collaboration, fuelled by funding cuts and diminishing staffing resources across local agencies have encouraged local areas to consider other ways to collaborate. Pooled budgets are being utilised in some areas, often established around specific issues - in Surrey for instance, funding for domestic violence services is pooled across the police, the OPCC, children's services, adults services, housing and community safety. There is a single common commissioning framework which includes common commissioning principles, outcome principles and a common performance management process.

In some local authorities there are calls to develop income generation models. Social enterprise models have been used in some areas, including the public-sector mutual model used in Glasgow for several years, where all community safety services are 'spun out' from the council, and then recommissioned. This model has been considered outside of Scotland, but has not been adopted so far for delivering all services. More bespoke social enterprises have developed elsewhere, for instance around prevention and intervention activities, but there are questions about whether it is viable for victim-based services to operate for profit.

The review also considered a 'lead authorities' model, with specific community safety priorities held by lead authorities across the country, working in partnership with a national board, with responsibility to disseminate approved practice and lead on coordination of service delivery. This is similar to the model adopted by the Barnardo's/LGA National FGM Centre for providing social work interventions around female genital mutilation, and National Trading Standards teams which support council trading standard officers, or undertake independent investigations (it should be noted that both these examples are currently backed by central funding). One authority reported that it takes an informal lead on gangs and girls, but it was acknowledged that there can be substantial practical issues in establishing more formal arrangements.

Beyond this there was enthusiasm from some workshop attendees to consider much more substantive changes to the provision of local community safety services, rethinking what outcomes should be delivered for the future and adopting 'whole systems' approaches. Some of this looked at establishing 'partnerships of place', creating partnerships across a number of agencies who share a common ambition for a locality around several themes (eg to create healthier, safer and more prosperous communities), and who work together to assess need, and plan and deliver service.

There was further consideration about designing services around a place; the key elements of which were identified as pooled budgets, ensuring community representation, and joint planning, principles and risk assessment across agencies. This place-based approach aims to give public service partners the freedom to work together to reduce fragmentation, work less in silos and reduce duplication – and supports the shift in focus of many community safety agencies towards reducing risk and prevention.

In Greater Manchester agencies are seeking to develop a 'one public service' model to be much more place-based, using community budgets to develop local capacity. The aim is to engage the community at the lowest possible levels, based on a belief that the community of that place, working in partnership with public agencies, understands more than anyone else what that place needs to grow.

It is worth nothing here too that the Troubled Families programme, which launched in 2012 building on similar previous initiatives, was introduced with the aim of providing more integrated holistic approaches to working with families with complex needs – and the introduction of health Sustainability

and Transformation Plans (STPs) presents another shift in public policy making towards designing services based around the needs of local areas.

More broadly, it is clear that the devolution agenda presents opportunities, both in terms of system design and on a more practical local level, for instance in vastly reducing the number of local partner agencies that need to be engaged with. It remains to be seen how this agenda will develop, however reaching agreement on how this might operate over large geographical areas and multiple agencies will certainly present a number of challenges.

The importance of effective leadership

There can be little doubt that strong and effective leadership is essential in responding to the current challenges, demonstrating the value of councils' role in delivering safer communities, and in driving forward reforms at a strategic level – particularly for larger-scale changes and implementing new models which, alongside structural modifications, require fundamental and sustained cultural shifts over many years. For some involved in the review, strong leadership was focussed on council political leadership, acting as effective 'leaders of place' - or as scrutineers, monitoring change in practice, with the ability to scrutinise the work of all community safety partnership authorities. For others, this focussed on the role of the PCC in bringing together a broader agenda or a wider set of partners; and some discussed the potential for a broader systems leadership model, for instance in utilising the role of the OPCC Chief Executive.

It was also suggested that there was a need to develop local councillors' knowledge of community safety and its links to other agendas, and of local issues on the ground.

LGA response and next steps

What is clear from the review is that councils, along with their partners, have responded to the changing landscape and challenges facing CSPs by experimenting and evolving. They are developing new practices and ways of working as well as building stronger links with other relevant partnerships. There is an emerging focus on prevention and early intervention, with the emergence of partnerships of place to work with both offenders and victims. However the tough financial climate local government will continue to face, along with the complexities of the issues CSPs are grappling with, means there is a role for the LGA in supporting councils to learn from each other and their partners, in developing innovative solutions, driving forward locally-led initiatives, and in addressing the policy and operational barriers which lie beyond the direct control of local government.

With different areas operating under different resource constraints, using different structures and arrangements, facing different issues, and working with different communities, the LGA's approach will have to be flexible and capable of adapting to local circumstances and needs, rather than looking to steer councils in the direction of one particular solution.

There are well established principles though that can inform both the LGA's work and that of partnerships. Multi-agency working is fundamental to success and going forward councils will have to working even more closely with partners. With there likely to be little opportunity in the next few years to change statutory frameworks as parliament's time is taken up with the legal provisions needed for the UK to leave the European Union, systems leadership and the development of whole systems approaches across places will have a significant role taking partnership working to a new level. At the same time CSPs cannot forget that successfully tackling crime requires the identification and management of risk, harm and the vulnerability of victims, while ensuring addressing issues around offenders and locations are also at the core of their work.

The LGA will therefore:

- explore whether existing LGA leadership programmes provide sufficient support to elected members, in particular around making links between community safety and related areas such as safeguarding and health and wellbeing

- develop and publish the discussion paper used as part of this review, to help frame local discussions
- commission more detailed case studies of some of the examples cited in this report – in particular, incorporating examples of how areas are making links to safeguarding and health and wellbeing boards
- look at how to offer further peer support to local areas
- explore further lobbying opportunities around the provision of longer-term multi-year funding arrangements to support local services and joint-working across partners
- explore the potential for local areas, in particular combined authorities, to look at how the range of local partnership boards can be brought together to best effect with CSPs to address vulnerability, promote early intervention, prevention and community resilience and fill any gaps around safeguarding and health.
- develop further some models around the more substantial reforms outlined in the draft report, such as whole systems approaches
- lobby the new government to undertake broader pilots (outside of a combined authority area) that test the one public service/partnerships of place model as part of broader service transformation
- continue to advocate on behalf of local government around the vital importance of sector involvement in delivering safer communities.