

# Reshaping the Partnership Landscape

Briefing Note 3 - November 2010



## Coalition Plans for Policing and Community Safety

### Introduction

The context for partnership working (and indeed the landscape around it) is rapidly changing. Alongside substantial cuts in public spending, councils and their partners are responding to the emerging Localism and Devolution agenda, the 'Big Society', significant Health and Policing reforms, a changing regional and sub-regional landscape (including the replacement of Regional Development Agencies with Local Enterprise Partnerships), and the introduction of Community (Place-Based) Budgets (initially across 16 local areas) as announced in the Spending Review.

Given the significant changes in public policy, Local Government Improvement and Development (LGID) has seen a gradual increase in the number of enquiries about what the future holds in store for partnerships (and requests for information about what other Councils and their partners are doing). In response, LGID is developing a partnership 'resource' with the sector that places can use to inform/challenge their own thinking.

### Partnerships resource

The resource comprises of a series of linked briefing notes/slide sets on topics ranging from how councils and their partners are responding to the new context, to a more in-depth look at some of the key issues (see at foot of this note).

### Timescales and methods for dissemination

The briefing notes/slide sets will be disseminated in 'bite-size' chunks between now and the end of March 2011.

All of the briefing notes/slide sets will be disseminated via existing networks (both regional and national), and will also be published on the **Partnerships** (plus any other relevant) '**Community of Practice**': <http://www.communities.idea.gov.uk>

### Other briefing notes in the series available now

**Briefing Note 1 – How are councils and their partners responding to the changing context?**

**Briefing Note 2 – Coalition plans for Health and Wellbeing**

## Coalition Plans for Policing and Community Safety

How will Government plans and proposals impact on current local partnership working?

“What I am doing today is launching a consultation document, which heralds the most radical reform of policing in this country for 50 years. We'll be replacing the bureaucratic accountability that has been for too long police forces looking up to Whitehall, and targets and bureaucracy, with democratic accountability: the election of a police and crime commissioner for each police force. So the people have a say in the individual who can then represent their needs, in terms of ensuring that policing is responding to their needs locally.”

**Theresa May July 2010, launching Policing for the 21<sup>st</sup> century**

**This briefing note tries to answer the following questions**

- **what's the background to these latest reforms?**
- **what is the Coalition Government proposing?**
- **What are the main implications for LSPs and local partnership working?**
- **Will the reforms help make it possible to join up decisions and pool funds?**
- **How should LSPs and councils prepare for new relationships with elected Police and Crime Commissioners?**
- **What are the implications for citizen involvement and the Big Society?**

### **What's the background?**

Partnership working between councils, police, and other local agencies goes back several decades. From the late 1970s onwards, joint working on national regeneration initiatives (Urban Partnerships, Inner Area Programmes, Action for Cities) brought together councils, police, and other local agencies, particularly in urban areas.

The early 1980s saw economic recession and civil unrest. The Brixton riots in 1981 were followed by disturbances in Toxteth, Handsworth, Moss Side and several other inner city areas. The response by police forces became a focus of national attention during this period.

The Scarman Report on the Brixton riots found evidence of the disproportionate and indiscriminate use of 'stop and search' powers by the police against black people. As a consequence, a new code for police behaviour was put forward in the *Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984*.

Some local councils at that time developed an adversarial relationship with their local police. Several set up 'police monitoring committees' in an effort to increase accountability over the actions of their local force.

Others recognised the need to strengthen relationships between councils and senior police in the area, at a political and managerial level. There was growing acceptance that problems of crime and antisocial behaviour could not be solved by the police alone. Experience from the USA on problem-oriented policing had an impact.

The Home Office Safer Cities Programme worked with a number of local inter-agency groups in the 1980s. The Morgan Report (1991) was influential in defining a wider role for work on community safety, extending beyond crime prevention. A deeper level of partnership working, including sharing of data and operational information, was by then growing.

### **Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships**

The 1998 Crime and Disorder Act placed new duties on the police and local authorities. They were required *together* to carry out a local crime and disorder audit, prepare a strategy, and to establish a partnership to oversee implementation.

The Police and Justice Act 2006, coupled with the Local Govt and Health Act 2007 expanded the Responsible Authorities to include PCTs, Fire and Rescue, Police Authorities and Probation (from 1 April 2009) and replaced the crime audit with a strategic assessment and rolling partnership plan.

The resultant partnership bodies (renamed from Crime and Disorder Partnerships to Community Safety Partnerships as from 2010) have since operated in district, borough and unitary areas.

### **What happens at county level, in two tier areas?**

Following the start of local area agreements in 2004, county councils and county-level LSPs became more interested in establishing partnership arrangements, to work on community safety and crime prevention issues.

Most counties have in recent years operated with a county-wide alliance or partnership body, to oversee work on community safety and crime prevention. Some are now reviewing the future role and work programmes of such bodies, in the context of the abolition of LAAs and the need to find expenditure cuts. Mergers with other parts of the local partnership landscape are now possible (see below).

### **Impact of local area agreements and 'place-shaping'**

The work of Community Safety Partnerships became more integrated with that of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) from 2005/6 onwards. Targets on crime reduction, and wider wellbeing and safety, were an important part of LAAs.

Under the previous Government, the Home Office operated with a high-level of 'top-down' oversight of CSPs. National strategies for crime prevention were issued and updated. Following a 2006 review of the Crime and Disorder Act, detailed standards and 'Hallmarks' for partnership working were set from above, and monitored via Government Offices. The achievement of LAA targets, and the adequacy of links with local Criminal Justice Boards, Youth Justice Boards, Youth Offending Teams and Childrens Trusts, were all assessed as part of the National Performance Framework.

Guidance on partnership working (including statutory requirements and running to 130 pages) was issued by the Home Office to CSPs, councils, and other partners.<sup>1</sup> The Home Office has now moved away from this top-down and prescriptive approach.

### **New proposals from the Coalition Government**

Changes proposed since the May 2010 General Election are potentially radical, although most of these have yet to be put into effect.

The June 2010 Budget and October Spending Review set the financial context for these changes, with deep budget cuts for policing and Home Office and Ministry of Justice services.

The overall financial settlement for local authorities, for 2011 onwards, involves 26% reductions over the next four years. Government predicts that council spend will reduce by 14%, once OBR predictions for council tax increases are taken into account.

For the police, funding is planned to reduce by 14% in real terms by 2014-15, taking into account central government funding and OBR forecasts on precepts.

Closer to home for CSPs, cuts in BCU funding and in Area Based Grant look likely to take their toll on community safety work. Many support posts for partnership work are funded from ABG or BCU funds, rather than from mainstream local authority or police budgets. The level of cuts is thought likely to have a particularly damaging effect on work to tackle anti-social behaviour.

### **Home Office Business Plan**

Each Government Department published their Business Plan in November 2010. These plans are designed to inform the public of Government intentions, and to provide a transparent process through which citizens can track progress through specified 'milestones'.

---

<sup>1</sup> This guidance has now been archived by the Home Office at:  
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100413151441/http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/regions/regions00.htm#standards>

The Plan for the Home Office includes a series of initiatives relevant to the work of LSPs and CSPs.<sup>2</sup> Included are the following two commitments:

- Empower the public to hold the police to account for their role in cutting crime (introduce directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners and make police actions to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour more transparent)
- Free up the police to fight crime more effectively and efficiently (cut police bureaucracy, end unnecessary central interference and overhaul police powers in order to cut crime, reduce costs and improve police value for money. Simplify national institutional structures and establish a National Crime Agency to strengthen the fight against organised crime)

Many of these proposed measures feature in the Home Office consultation document *Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*<sup>3</sup>. As with other Departmental Business Plans, a series of 'input indicators' and 'impact measures' are defined within the plan.

### **What will be the impact on partnerships of directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners?**

The abolition of police authorities (which date back to 1964) and their replacement with directly elected commissioners is a far-reaching proposal. The Home Office plans to publish the necessary Bill shortly, **with the first elections for Commissioners taking place in May 2012.**

There has been general support for the Home Office view that Police Authorities in the current form 'remain too invisible to the public'. **But there is less agreement on what should be put in their place. Proposals for directly elected commissioners are widely seen as carrying risks of 'competing mandates' and 'silo democracy', when set in the context of current local partnership working.**

The Home Office plan is for a single Commissioner to be directly elected at the level of each force in England and Wales with the exception of the Metropolitan Police (where the Mayor for London is seen as fulfilling this role). There are no specific proposals to review the existing structure of 43 forces in England and Wales, unless through voluntary mergers which prove to have local support.

---

<sup>2</sup> Home Office Business Plan 2011-15 at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/about-us/corporate-publications/business-plan-2011-15/business-plan?view=Binary>

<sup>3</sup> This can be downloaded at: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/policing-21st-century>

'Commissioners will be enabled to play a considerable role in wider questions of community safety. We are considering creating enabling powers to bring together CSPs at the force level to deal with force wide community safety issues and giving Commissioners a role in commissioning community safety work'.

### **Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

As a 'check and balance' on the role of Commissioners, the Home Office propose to create Police and Crime Panels in each force area, drawn from locally elected councillors from constituent wards and independent and lay members. These panels will have powers to put the Commissioner's proposed precept to a public referendum. Increased scrutiny at neighbourhood 'beat' meetings is also proposed.

There are concerns about the costs of elections for Commissioners, and organising and supporting Police and Crime Panels. Support arrangements will be needed in both cases, and it is not yet clear how these will be organised or where costs will fall.

The Home Office consultation has said little about the direct involvement of Commissioners in CSPs. The general line is that CSPs should be given more freedom to work as they choose (see below). But the creation of Commissioners raises obvious questions as to how these individuals will relate to existing local partnership arrangements.

Home Office expectations are that Police and Crime Commissioners will not statutorily sit on or chair any CSP, but can do so if invited. Neither will they be able to dictate the structure of CSPs in the force area – but they will have to agree to any proposed changes and mergers.

In terms of LSPs, Police and Crime Commissioners will sit on these if the LSP invites them (but may not see this as a priority for their time if there are many LSPs in force area). Prescription from the centre will be limited, and it will be left very much to local areas to determine their arrangements.

It is not yet clear what relationship Commissioners will have with council leaders and portfolio holders, at county, unitary and district level. This is likely to depend on local context, and local politics. Councils and LSPs may need to consider what should happen where strong differences of view emerge, as to how local communities should be policed, between the Commissioner and local councilors. What part could, or should, LSPs and CSPs play in providing a forum for resolving such differences?

## Policing and partnership working

'CSPs and other local partnerships have played a strong role in preventing crime, and we want them to continue to do so. But we intend to free local partners up as much as possible. We do not intend to simply redraw the landscape in a different, yet still prescriptive way, but we will make the most of what works well, and leave as much local freedom as possible.

Local people should have more say over the way that services are provided. We want local solutions to local problems. We will strip away unnecessary prescription and bureaucracy by repealing some of the regulations for CSPs, whilst retaining the helpful core statutory duty on those key partners to work together. We want your views on how best to achieve this. The government has already stripped away the myriad of targets on Local Criminal Justice Boards thereby allowing them to focus on local issues.

### Chapter 5 of Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

Reduced top-down prescription on the working arrangements for CSPs will be welcomed in many parts of the country. But where community safety work is less well-established, the dismantling of any central framework may lead to activity slipping down the agenda and being marginalised.

## Response to the Government's plans

The Home Office received over 800 responses to its consultation. Amongst these:

**The LGA** supports the principle of greater local democratic accountability for policing, but differs on the form this should take. It argues for alternative arrangements to directly elected Commissioners, suggesting instead the reintegration of police accountability structures into local government by the creation of Local Government Policing Executives to replace police authorities in England. Councils would appoint two policing champions to sit on the Executives, with the Executives being held to account by a joint overview and scrutiny committee drawn from councils in the area. Details of this model are available from the LGA website<sup>4</sup>.

**The Welsh LGA** is supportive of moves to increase police accountability and make the police more responsive to local people. However they strongly oppose the plans to replace police authorities with Commissioners, taking the view that in Wales there is already a strong connection between the police and the public and the Commissioners.

---

<sup>4</sup> LGA response at <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelId=13876249> and publication Reporting to You at <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/publications/publication-display.do?id=14565882>

**The Association of Police Authorities (APA)** does not believe that the proposed model for police governance will bring about the improvements to policing that the government expects. It argues that the model remains untested, uncosted, and without a clearly evidenced business case. Alternative options are suggested.<sup>5</sup>

*'There is a potential risk of creating two electoral mandates on community safety issues, one for local councillors and one for the PCC, with a consequent risk of destabilising successful working relationships between councils and police'*

#### **APA response to consultation**

**The Police Foundation** has expressed reservations over directly elected commissioners, pointing out the inconsistency of these proposals for the 12 major cities for which the Government is also planning to introduce directly elected mayors. The Foundation also has concerns that for large force areas (over 2 million population) commissioners will be as remote from the public as the police authority which they replace.<sup>6</sup>

#### **The current statutory position – do areas still have to have a CSP?**

These partnerships are often described as 'statutory bodies'. This is true in the sense that they have been established as a result of legislation. But they are not in fact legal entities in their own right (as is a council or a company). The statutory duties carried out are laid on the police, local councils, and other partner bodies, as 'responsible authorities'. Legal powers to spend public funds, or employ staff, continue to rest with each partner rather than with the partnership itself.

Having said this, the statutory underpinning to CSPs has been important in bringing local partners to the table and raising the profile of work on crime prevention and community safety.

The Police and Justice Act 2006 introduced new duties relevant to CSPs, and repealed some others. The new duties commenced in August 2007, and included the framework of national standards that followed the 2006 review of the Crime and Disorder Act. The new Government has committed to repealing these 'prescriptive' requirements on CSPs, with the necessary changes to secondary legislation to be made by June 2011.

---

<sup>5</sup> APA response at: [http://www.apa.police.uk/admin/uploads/attachment/APA\\_Response\\_-\\_Policing\\_in\\_the\\_21st\\_Century-APAreponse-Policing%20in%2021st%20centurySep2010.pdf](http://www.apa.police.uk/admin/uploads/attachment/APA_Response_-_Policing_in_the_21st_Century-APAreponse-Policing%20in%2021st%20centurySep2010.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Police Foundation response at: <http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/site/police-foundation/latest/policing-in-the-21st-century-?>

In the meantime, from 2007 onwards, a number of district-level CSPs have been allowed to merge into larger spatial groupings. Formal mergers still require secondary legislation (at the moment) so many CSPs have merged informally to avoid the bureaucracy. The Home Office now provides a service to undertake the majority of the paperwork and legal sides of mergers, in an attempt to encourage more CSPs to merge formally.

### **Performance management and reporting**

Home Office requirements placed on the police, and on local authority community safety units, have hitherto been amongst the most onerous of any government department. The Coalition Government has committed to a major reduction in centrally imposed requirements, leaving it to local forces and partnerships to keep their public informed. Measures introduced by the previous Government, such as the Place Survey and National Indicator set, have already been abolished.

The government-set target of 'improving public confidence' has also been removed, along with the Policing Pledge introduced by the previous government. Upward reporting of LAA improvement targets has been abolished as of October 2010, leaving it to LSPs to decide which objectives to pursue and how to communicate progress locally.

In this changed context, the LGA has published proposals for '*sector self regulation and improvement*'.<sup>7</sup> These include ideas on voluntary national benchmarking, self-assessment and new forms of peer challenge.

Publishing of regular information for citizens, and achieving accountability through transparency, is high on the Government's agenda. The Government plans to publish new street-level crime data by January 2011. For local authorities, Eric Pickles has announced the planned replacement of the National Indicator Set with a single comprehensive list of all the data that local government is expected to provide to central government.

### **Place-based budgets and Community Budgets**

Following on from LAAs and Total Place, the local government sector has campaigned strongly for the introduction of community (place-based) budgets. These would allow for LSPs and councils to oversee the totality of resources in an area, pooling government funding across different sectors to maximise its effectiveness.

LGA proposals are set out in two recent publications<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Sector self-regulation and improvement at:

<http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelid=13733927>

<sup>8</sup> Place based budgets – future governance of local services:

<http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/publications/publication-display.do?id=12294112>

Local Budgets – building the Big Society from the neighbourhood up:

<http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/publications/publication-display.do?id=14041575>

Government has expressed interest in these ideas, and is introducing some elements via the Spending Review. Ring fencing will be removed from all revenue grants except simplified schools grant and a new public health grant.

Community Budgets will be piloted in 16 local areas from 2011-12. These will involve pooling of departmental (i.e. central) budgets for families with complex needs. CLG plan for other areas to have the chance to follow suit from 2013-14.

CSPs will have an obvious interest in this initiative, given the potential for multi-agency approaches to anti-social behaviour, family breakdown, and reducing re-offending.

### **What will be the overall impact of all these changes, for local partnership working?**

Home Office thinking is that *'by 2012, the Government will have put in place the most radical change in policing for half a century'*.

Two diagrams, currently published on the Home Office website give a Government perspective on the change.<sup>9</sup> They are labelled as 'Big Government' for the 'old' arrangements and 'Big Society' for the new.

In the second diagram, neither LSPs, CSPs, nor local authorities feature on the page (other than in a general category of 'Community Safety and Criminal Justice Partners').

It is not unprecedented for the Home Office to write out of the script local government and LSPs, in its view of public service delivery. Before the advent of LAAs, and the development of the 'family' of local partnerships over the past five years, such a silo-based perspective was a recognised feature of Home Office thinking.

Those who have been trying to achieve 'joined-up' working, and more effective interventions at local level, may have concerns at the way the Home Office now foresee the landscape of policing for the future. As with other aspects of the Coalition Programme there are signs of a re-emergence of traditional Whitehall culture, pursuing policies through departmental silos and hence bypassing multi-agency partnerships such as LSPs.

This is why the LGA has been lobbying strongly against the separatist aspects of the Home Office proposals. LGA members have stated recently that they feel they are making progress on this front.

---

<sup>9</sup> Links to these two diagrams are on the Home Office website (under 'other documents') at: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/policing-21st-century/>

CLlr Richard Kemp (Lib Dem), the LGA's vice-chairman and leader of the Liberal Democrat group, told LGC there was a "meeting of minds" between Home Office ministers and the Local Government Association over reforms to the way the police are held accountable.

"My guess is that the Home Office team as currently instituted wouldn't have chosen this," he said. "The direction is very clearly coming from Number 10," he added.

**LGC 19<sup>th</sup> October 2010**

## Home Office legislative timetable

*Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* was published as a consultation paper, rather than a White Paper (as would normally precede legislation). But the Home Office has adopted a tight timescale and **the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill is due to be published in December 2010**. This Bill will include the proposals for directly elected commissioners, along with stronger powers to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder.

## Citizen involvement: Policing and the Big Society

A requirement for police forces to hold 'beat meetings' forms part of the Coalition Agreement, and relevant measures will be included in the Bill. Neighbourhood Panel meetings already take place in most areas and such meetings were a key requirement of the (now abandoned) Policing Pledge introduced by the last Government.

The transparency agenda is also seen as an important means of keeping citizens informed, and getting them increasingly involved in crime prevention and community safety.

From January 2011, we will ensure that crime data is published at a level which allows the public to see what is happening on their streets and neighbourhoods.

We will require police forces to release this data in an open and standardised format that would enable third parties to create crime maps and other applications that help communities to engage and interact with their local police in a meaningful way.

### **Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Home Office**

The Home Office states that it sees neighbourhoods as 'the key building block for the Big Society' and that its reforms will build on the success of neighbourhood policing. It is thought that the Home Office will shortly introduce ring-fencing arrangements for PCSO budgets, so that these initiatives cannot readily be cut. Even so the more extensive models of neighbourhood policing 'in place' in parts of London (in many cases part funded by local authorities) may well prove unsustainable in financial terms.

We want to see more special constables and explore new ideas to help unlock the potential of police volunteers in the workforce, for example as police 'reservists'. They are a clear manifestation of the Big Society in action, demonstrating the role which individuals and communities have in helping to fight and prevent crime.

### **Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Home Office**

#### **Wider reform of the Criminal Justice system**

The Home Office and Ministry of Justice will be working together on wider reforms of the criminal justice system, which is seen as 'too remote from communities, and lacking transparency'. This will include a new approach to youth crime and tackling ASB, sentencing reform, reducing re-offending, and rehabilitation of offenders.

#### **Reducing re-offending and offender management**

This is a field in which 'localists' and proponents of joined-up working have been making headway in persuading Whitehall of the potential merits of more radical ideas on collaborative working and alternative funding models.

The case that public resources can be saved in the expensive parts of the criminal justice system (prisons, offender management) through early and well-targeted interventions, with all relevant agencies working together, is a strong one. Several of the Total Place projects in several areas pursued this theme and the Home Office and Ministry of Justice have taken note.

Abolition of the Youth Justice Board (which had long promoted devolution of youth custody budgets to local authorities) opens up opportunities for councils and LSPs to take on wider roles in this field, with potential budget responsibilities.

Government is also looking at novel forms of resourcing for such work, including systems based on 'payment by results' and involving mechanisms such as social impact bonds. **Local CSPs will need to keep track of this agenda.**

*'if the government takes a look at the failure of the National Offender Management Service to join up probation and prisons and connect them with local communities, the potential for more radical decentralisation - changing local incentives and breaking down silos - is clear.'*

**Max Chambers, research fellow, Policy Exchange**

## What can LSPs and CSPs be doing now?

- Consider how partnership relationships would change with the arrival of directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners at force level (the implications will vary between district, unitary and county-level partnerships). In what way might the Commissioner be involved?
- Keep track of discussions at your LSP, which may well be reviewing its governance and working arrangements in the light of expenditure cutbacks and the abolition of LAAs and CAA.
- Review your performance management arrangements for tracking progress against targets and objectives. Without top-down targets and National Indicators, what local measures will you want to keep and how will you report on them to local people?
- Look back at the impact of previous periods of recession, and cutbacks in public services, in your area. What was the effect on crime and social cohesion? Are things different this time round, or are there lessons to learn from local experience?
- Begin to think about the implications of Community Budgets, and how they might help in developing more effective interventions for families with complex needs, and for reducing re-offending and offender management.

## Summing up...

Community Safety Partnerships have been making progress on:

- reducing crime and the fear of crime, through Partnership Plans and LAAs
- responding to public concerns at a local level, recognising that crime and community safety remain very high in public consciousness (despite a steady fall in crime rates).
- ensuring that Policing Plans take a more rounded view of the characteristics of 'place' and reflect genuinely local priorities
- providing leadership for behavioural change on issues such as ASB, drugs and alcohol (often with insufficient support from national policies)
- looking for opportunities to pool funding streams
- exploring options for shared services and back office
- strengthening integration with other parts of the criminal justice system, on issues such as re-offending and offender management (despite a history of Home Office separatism on these fronts)
- operating not just at a strategic level, but also delivering measures on anti-social behaviour, youth diversion, and crime prevention.

For those supporting the work of local partnerships, the future outlook is mixed. The spending cuts will dominate the activities of partners for months (and potentially years) to come. The final outcome on directly elected police and crime commissioners will have a direct and significant impact on local partnership working. The Coalition Government remains committed to partnership working, and the new arrangements will involve some rethinking of political and managerial relationships around the LSP table.

LGID will be continuing to disseminate information and updates on how councils and local partnerships are responding to this new context for joint working between councils, the police, and other agencies within the criminal justice system. The LGA publication *The lean Community Safety Partnership* looks at how structures can be simplified, meetings run more effectively, and savings made.<sup>10</sup> Local insights on how these relationships are changing or developing would be very helpful.

**Please make use of the Partnerships CoP and the Community Safety CoP or email direct to:**

<p><b>Rachel Litherland</b>  <b>National Advisor - Partnerships</b>          Email: <a href="mailto:rachel.litherland@local.gov.uk">rachel.litherland@local.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>Julie Richards</b>  <b>Partnerships Advisor (LGID)</b>          Email: <a href="mailto:julie.richards@local.gov.uk">julie.richards@local.gov.uk</a></p>
<p><b>Chris Williams</b>  <b>Community Safety and Partnerships Advisor (National Policing Improvement Agency)</b>          Email: <a href="mailto:christopher.williams@npia.pnn.police.uk">christopher.williams@npia.pnn.police.uk</a></p>	

### Briefing notes to follow

Over the coming weeks colleagues across LGID will be working on a series of further briefing notes/slide sets – focusing in more detail on some of the outstanding questions and key issues impacting on future arrangements for partnership working.

### Further topics likely to be covered include:

- **Future governance ‘models’/arrangements** (taking account of the changing focus for partnership working; the changing regional and sub regional landscape; the role of elected members (and the directly elected police and crime commissioners); and the introduction of community/place-based budgets...)
- **Emergence of “Big Society”**
- **Changing role for the Voluntary and Community and Private Sectors**
- **Two/three tier working** – (with particular reference to the role of Districts in a changing landscape for partnership working)
- **Area-based performance management (in the absence of CAA)**
- **Analysis of the forthcoming Localism Bill**

<sup>10</sup> The lean Community Safety Partnership at <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/14566886>