POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE POLICE & CRIME PANEL

Report of POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER

Date 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

Subject COMMISSIONING FRAMEWORK 2015/17 AND 2014/15 ALLOCATIONS

Author SENIOR COMMISSIONING MANAGER

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to present the new Commissioning Framework for 2015/17 and to update the panel on the grants allocated as part of the 2014/15 process.

Recommendation

2. The Panel is recommended to note the contents of the report.

Background

- 3. The current Commissioning Framework was published in October 2013 in response to and in support of the refresh of the Police and Crime Plan 2013-2017. Since that time, a number of changes have taken place and lessons have been learnt about how to work with partners to maximise the use of the available resources.
- 4. Partners have also made suggestions in relation to funding timelines with many stating that it would be beneficial for them to know what funding they will receive for the forthcoming financial year by the end of December, to assist in their planning and to enable staffing implications to be addressed. Work to deliver the actions within the Equality Impact Assessment for the Commissioning Framework has also been completed.
- 5. As a result, a draft Commissioning Framework for 2015-2017 was produced and issued for consultation between 1st July and 15th August 2014. Twenty nine consultation responses were received, many of which included a number of suggestions and/or comments. These were considered and where appropriate amendments made to the Commissioning Framework. The consultation comments, together with responses, are outlined in Appendix A.

Key Changes

6. The final version of the Commissioning Framework 2015/17 is attached in Appendix B. The key changes are:

Change 1

The Commissioning Framework has been simplified into one document. The majority of commissioning intentions are now being delivered through three year contracts and agreements and therefore the detailed commissioning plans for each theme have not been refreshed.

Change 2

In recognition of the valuable contribution made by Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to the delivery of the Police & Crime Plan, the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) available has been increased from £330,000 to £450,000.

Change 3

The Partnership Locality Fund will no longer require the submission of a business case for specific initiatives. This has been replaced by a financial contribution towards the delivery of each Community Safety Partnership Delivery Plan. CSPs will be required to provide a copy of their Plan, together with a budget breakdown and performance framework including quarterly updates from CSPs.

Change 4

The PCC Grant will only be available to community voluntary and social enterprise sector organisations to support the achievement of specific commissioning intentions and related outcomes in identified hotspot locations.

Change 5

In 2014/15, PCC Grants of up to £50k were made available for individual applications. For 2015/16 onwards, applications for up to £25k per annum or up to £50,000 match funding per annum will be considered.

Change 6

The funding available for the troubled/supported families programmes has been increased from £125,000 to £175,000 in recognition of the wide range of strategic priorities that the programmes cover.

Change 7

Further work has been completed in relation to victim support services and relevant commissioning intentions have been developed.

Change 8

It is recognised that a number of initiatives could contribute to preventing child abuse/ child sexual exploitation and reducing the number of missing person reports. The 2014/15 pilot seeks to develop intelligence in relation to children and young people in care homes as this has been identified as an area in which significant outcomes could be achieved. The results will be used to determine future commissioning requirements in line with the budget available. Commissioning intentions have been revised to reflect this flexibility.

2014/15 Allocations

- 7. This report provides an update on the PCC Grant and PLF allocations for 2014/15 and follows detailed consideration of the allocations and processes at the Strategic Partnership Board meeting on the 25 March 2014 which contributed to the thinking for the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework.
- 8. The Panel are assured that allocations made in line with the Commissioning Framework have clear funding agreements, performance frameworks and monitoring mechanisms in place.

Partnership Locality Fund

- 9. The Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) for 2014/15 was allocated to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). The CSPs submitted business cases for the following commissioning intentions:
 - Cl010 Initiatives that pro-actively reduce anti-social behaviour and/or improve the recording of incidents.
 - Cl011 Interventions which increase the reporting of:
 - o Domestic abuse
 - Serious sexual assault
 - Hate crime
 - Cl013a Initiatives that support victims of domestic abuse to cope and recover.
 (2014/15 only)
 - Cl016 Initiatives which reduce the risk and likelihood that the following crimes will occur:
 - Domestic burglary
 - Violence against the person with injury
 - Vehicle crime
- 10. Funding was awarded as outlined in Appendix C and is being monitored through performance frameworks which form part of the funding agreements.

PCC Grant

- 11. The budget for the PCC Grant in 2014/15 was £400,000. The scheme was open to all organisations and a maximum of £50,000 per application was available. Bids were accepted for the same commissioning intentions as those outlined at paragraph 6 above and seventy applications were received to a value of £1.9m.
- 12. As part of the long-listing process, it was noted that PCC Grant applications could potentially duplicate some of the young persons' mentoring co-commissioning arrangements with Leicester City, Leicestershire County and Rutland County Councils. As a result, £50,000 of the PCC Grant was reallocated to young person's mentoring. The co-commissioning budget was reduced and a new pooled budget of £450,000 over 3 years for young persons' mentoring established. The OPCC is currently procuring this service across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
- 13. The PCC Grant applications were long-listed by members of the OPCC, prior to being scored and shortlisted by specialists in the relevant themed areas. Twenty-six

applications were considered by a multi-agency Grant Review Panel and recommendations made to the PCC. There were no successful applications in relation to hate crime and therefore £30k has been set aside to support hate crime initiatives.

14. PCC Grant funding was awarded as outlined in Appendix D and is being monitored through performance frameworks which form part of the funding agreements.

Implications

Financial: The total commissioning budget for 2015/16 is

£4.2m. Details are provided in the Commissioning

Framework.

Legal: None

Equality/Diversity Issues: The actions within the Equality Impact Assessment

for the Commissioning Framework have been

completed and/or implemented.

Risks and Impact: None

Link to Police and Crime Plan: The Commissioning Framework sets out how the

PCC intends to align the commissioning budget with the key themes and strategic priorities in the Police

and Crime Plan.

Background Papers

None

Person to Contact

Sue Haslett, Senior Commissioning Manager

Email: sue.haslett@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk Tel: 0116 229 8705

Helen King, Chief Finance Officer

Email: helen.king@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk Tel: 0116 229 8702

OPCC RESPONSES TO COMMISSIONING FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION COMMENTS 2014

	COMMENT	RESPONSE
GEN	NERAL	
1	How can initiatives be mainstreamed if they prove to be successful?	The pilot referred to was in relation to an operational policing initiative. Ongoing funding would therefore need to be mainstreamed into core Police budgets. In relation to PCC Grants, those organisations who have received a PCC Grant for 2014/15 will be able to apply for funding for a 2 year extension, subject to being able to meet the revised criteria and evidencing satisfactory performance.
2	It is unclear how the funding splits have been allocated.	Funding of many of the commissioning intentions has historically come through a number of routes, in particular from the Home Office via: The Community Safety Grant The Drug Intervention Project Grant (DIP) The Youth Crime and Substance Misuse Grant The Community Innovation Fund Positive Futures Programme Communities Against Guns, Gangs and Knives Programme The Safer Communities Fund The majority of these services and initiatives continue to be supported by the PCC at the same financial level. The funding in relation to victims and witnesses will be provided to the PCC by the Ministry of Justice using a formula based approach.
3	Why is funding for the voluntary sector not available for 3 years as it is for statutory bodies?	Funding to the voluntary sector via direct and co-commissioning processes has been agreed for the 3 years to March 2017. Subject to the availability of funding any new services will also be commissioned until March 2017. PCC Grants will be available for a 2-year period subject to clear evidence of previous successful performance.
4	Concerns that cuts in funding from other statutory partners may impact on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.	The Commissioning Framework outlines how the commissioning budget will be used to support the delivery of the strategic priorities within the Police and Crime Plan. The commissioning budget is not available to fill funding gaps which result from the decommissioning of services or discontinuation of funding by others.
5	Welcomes the simplified commissioning framework that makes further use of existing commissioning arrangements.	None required
6	Suggestion that persons residing in rural locations should be classed as a vulnerable group due to: the lack of proximity to services, including policing; rural locations being quiet and remote;	The comments made do not relate to the Commissioning Framework. The suggestion that persons living in rural communities should be considered as a specific vulnerable group and their policing reflected in Strategic Priorities within any revision of the Police and Crime Plan will be considered in the next

	lack of street lighting.	consultation on the contents of the Police and Crime Plan.
7	Document is helpful and could be incorporated into City Council's	None required.
	Guiding Principles document.	'
8	Easy to understand and made the whole commissioning process	None required.
	a lot easier to follow.	
9	Overall, this commissioning approach is to be	None required.
	welcomed.	
10	Suggestion that independent monitoring of the social impact of	The requirement for Social Return on Investment information has already been
	projects and service providers should be introduced.	built into some of the PCC's larger contracts. Consideration will be given to
		extending this for other commissioning intentions.
11	Welcome the changes that you are proposing and is happy to	None required.
	support these changes.	1.5.5.5.5.4
12	This approach in terms of indication and funding envelope	None required.
	for the next two years in welcomed, the approach provides	
	officers with an early opportunity to plan and co-ordinate	
	projects & initiatives which invariably involve both internal	
	and external partners and need a great deal of work to	
	ensure success.	
13	In funding projects/ initiatives using the "direct" mechanism	The majority of direct commissioning intentions are already in place and being
	for commissioning, the OPCC will need to be clear as to the	managed through agreed contracts. All new procurement will require a clear
	scope and remit for the allocated funding in order to aide	service specification and performance framework.
	planning.	
14	Simplification of the Commissioning Framework into a single	None required.
	document is welcomed.	
15	Direct commissioning over a three year period makes sense and	None required.
16	allows for planning and delivery over the longer term. The need to provide performance updates and to remain outcome	None required
10	focused remains a relevant condition of funding received.	None required.
17	There is a concern that with the proposed changes in policing	The Force policing model heavily factors in community need around threat and
''	resources, there will be a decrease of resources from the Police to	harm in the way that neighbourhood policing resources are allocated and
	support local intentions and activities to achieve outcomes	deployed. It is similar to the way that the commissioning intentions aim to align
	outlined within PCC applications.	resources with need. The model also means that these same neighbourhood
		teams will have more, not less, capability to address local problems because they
		won't be investigating a caseload of crimes or carrying other abstractions in the
		way they are doing now. Neighbourhood policing has been and remains at the
		heart of the Force's policing philosophy and new policing model.

18	We welcome that the framework has been simplified into one document and that service provision will now be delivered through three year contracts.	None required.
19	Welcome the continued emphasis on streamlining and simplifying the commissioning processes.	None required.
20	Harnessing local commissioning expertise has to be the way forward in terms of providing added value and to avoid duplication of effort.	Agreed.
21	Acknowledge the challenge that the OPCC faces in implementing an outcome based approach.	None required.
22	Appreciate the commitment to work with local commissioners to develop performance indicators and measures that can be easily managed and reported upon – it's critical given the ever changing strategic landscape nationally and locally.	Agreed.
23	It seems that the learning and experiences of the first year are being applied to the framework in a gradual, pragmatic and measured way.	None required.
24	Some suggested amendments to reflect the merger of criminal justice commissioning with the wider Substance Misuse Commissioning Board.	Amendments made.
25	Welcome that the framework has been simplified into one document and that service provision will now be delivered through three year contracts	None required.
26	No hesitation in supporting the broad thrust, particularly in relation to the four themes	None required.
27	Some reservations about the potential to secure outcomes in 'making communities and neighbourhoods safer'. The outcomes must be sustainable. The MCN theme is fundamentally important and an accepted part of the Police modernisation programme of service delivery and hence its consolidation is a high priority.	Agreed.
28	Confident that the overall Commissioning Framework structure will contain relevant performance indicators so that any agreed interim and concluding audits will confirm compliance with objectives and outcomes.	All contracts/agreements specify performance measures for monitoring purposes and include details of how the PCC will manage any instances where the outcomes are not being achieved.
	GRANT CHARGO AND THE STATE OF T	
29	In terms of the PCC grant applications the CSP recognises that funding must be targeted in areas of greatest need but there must	The Partnership Locality Fund provides all Community Safety Partnerships with the flexibility to respond to emerging local issues.

	be flexibility to address emerging local issues outside of these	
	areas.	
30	The Partnership is agreeable with the changes to the maximum	None required.
50	value for the PCC Grant which is common practice.	Trono required.
31	There is general support for the PCC Grant being available to community and voluntary sector organisations to support the achievement of specific commissioning intentions and related outcomes in identified hotspot locations. However, there is concern that the funding is limited to the City and the Borough of Charnwood. We understand the reference to the Police's Strategic Assessment however it should be noted that other areas have hot spot locations, relative to their area and it would be worth considering making a sum available for these localities.	It is anticipated that Community Safety Partnerships will identify hotspot locations and include actions within their Delivery plans to address them. The OPCC is happy to support the use of PLF allocations for this purpose.
32	The proposal to only offer PCC grants for applications which 'focus specifically on increasing the number of offences reported' is of concern - It would not be appropriate for agencies to steer all victims towards reporting to the police; rather, we consider that our remit is to ensure that victims are fully informed of their options and that if they wish to seek justice through the criminal justice system, they will be empowered and supported to do so.	The Police and Crime Plan has a strategic priority "to increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences". It is accepted that not all victims will choose to report offences to the Police but it is hoped that focussed work to increase confidence and the victims' experience will help to encourage reporting.
33	With respect to the PCC Grant only being made available to Community and Voluntary Sector Organisations by definition excludes public agencies. This may well be viewed as a negative step as public agencies may wish to put in place initiatives that have a positive impact on the Crime and Police Plan but are unable to do so through lack of funding. Allowing public agencies to apply for funding through the PCC Grant could be considered in exceptional circumstances.	The majority of public sector agencies are key partners on the Community Safety Partnerships. Therefore they can develop collaborative initiatives within the CSP Delivery Plans and as a result utilise the PLF allocation.
34	The reduction of funding grants from £50k to £25k seems to be entirely reasonable given that most applications were below the £25k limit. Allowing for increased funding applications through match funding is a welcome development.	None required.
35	The partnership is agreeable with this change and in the original framework there was an emphasis on organisations identifying match funding for projects and initiatives.	None required.
36	In terms of the PCC grant applications the CSP notes that no hotspot locations have been identified in Blaby or Hinckley & Bosworth. The CSP would also like it noted that our combined	The PCC Grant is available to reduce anti-social behaviour in specific hotspot locations. The locations have been selected according to the number of ASB incidents, and not other crime types, as outlined in the Police Strategic

	area has more households than any other LPU areas identified	Assessments for 2012/13 and 2014. This enables those areas with longer term
	with hotspots therefore more residents who potentially could be	anti-social behaviour issues to be prioritised.
	victims of crime such as domestic abuse, ASB and burglary. We	
	would therefore wish to see the above data taken into account	
	with regard to allocation of funding.	
PAR	TNERSHIP LOCALITY FUND	
37	Full support and welcomed change - The removal of the business	None required.
	case for specifics initiatives made it very bureaucratic – and did	
	not recognise the professionalism of the CSPs.	
38	Putting the local CSPs at the heart of strategic commissioning and	None required.
	delivery is a positive demonstration of that principle.	
39	Would welcome additional funding to Community Safety	None required.
	Partnership but recognise that allocations are based on	
	population.	
40	Locality funds aligning to the strategy will allow us greater	None required.
	flexibility. The priorities themselves align with our strategy quite	
	well so there should be minimal impact.	
	·	
41	We fully support the plan to work more closely through a locality	None required.
	model and the wish to fund initiatives and services in relation to	
	local need.	
42	We particularly welcome the annual review of CSP strategic	None required.
	assessments and feel this fits in well with the current frameworks	
	we have locally that helps us deal with our annual planning.	
43	The new PLF process is welcomed by officers.	None required.
44	The CSP welcomes the additional funding to be given to CSPs in	None required.
	recognition of the valuable contribution they make to the Police &	
	Crime Plan. This will enable us to maintain key services and	
	projects and now look into development areas.	
45	We support this change as each year the CSP reviews its	None required.
1	Community Safety Strategy in light of the strategic assessment	
	and through consultation with our residents. As well as reviewing	
	the strategy we develop action plans for the key priorities	
	identified for the CSP. The action planning events normally start	
	around December in order for the plans to be in place from 1st	
	April. We already have in place a performance framework which	
	requires us to provide quarterly highlight reports to the CSP which	
	are already shared with the OPCC.	
	1 and an early entance in an en e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	l

40	0	All and Community Million of the PLE Of the Control Nation
46	Operationally, the OPCC will need to be clear in terms of	All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes.
	their expectations for accessing the PLF, i.e. within the	
	Commissioning Framework.	
47	Good news and should allow the Community Safety Partnership	None required.
	to plan delivery for 2 years and focus on what we want to achieve	
	as performance will be held against the community safety strategy	
	and it supports our strategic intentions. Locality funds aligning to	
	the strategy will allow us greater flexibility. The priorities	
	themselves align with our strategy quite well so there should be	
	minimal impact.	
48	The increased amount available to the CSP through the	None required.
	Partnership Locality Funding (PLF) is welcomed.	
49	The new approach to the Partnership Locality Fund, for	None required
49	Community Safety Partnerships (CSPS) is particularly welcomed.	None required
	The increase from £330,000 to £450,000 is positive and will	
	enable Partnerships to be more proactive in a climate of fewer	
	resources.	
50	The requirement for CSPs to provide a copy of their 2015/16 Plan,	All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes.
30	together with a budget breakdown and performance framework	All requirements will be outlined in the FEF Outdance Notes.
	rather than a requirement to submit a business case for specific	
	initiatives is a sensible one, cutting bureaucracy and time. It	
	means that CSPs will be required to prepare their action plans by	
	January rather than March and allocate spend to each project	
	within the action plan.	
51	It makes sense to increase the locality fund amount from	None required.
] .	£330,000 to £450,000. Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) are	
	in a strong position to respond to local need and allocate this	
	funding appropriately.	
52	By using the locality fund to make a financial contribution towards	None required.
	delivery of CSP plans, the PCC's allocation will be combined with	
	local partnership budgets to ensure better value for money.	
	Actions plans are already developed and monitored by each CSP	
	so this is an encouraging development to commissioning	
	arrangements. We would however welcome sight of the	
	performance framework at the earliest opportunity.	
53	Submitting a CSP action plan will also give the OPCC the	None required.
	opportunity to review all CSP work carried out in a locality and not	
	just that which he has funded as has been the case in the past.	

This will allow the OPCC to have a more comprehensive picture of all community safety work across LLR. By not having to submit a business case to accompany each individual bid the administrative burden on community safety teams will be greatly reduced. This will free up more capacity to respond to emerging issues and trends and deliver initiatives. Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnerships and the			
By not having to submit a business case to accompany each individual bid the administrative burden on community safety teams will be greatly reduced. This will free up more capacity to respond to emerging issues and trends and deliver initiatives. Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. None required. None required.			
individual bid fite administrative burden on community safety teams will be greatly reduced. This will free up more capacity to respond to emerging issues and trends and deliver initiatives. Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.			
teams will be greatly reduced. This will free up more capacity to respond to emerging issues and trends and deliver initiatives. 55 Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. 57 The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the	54		None required.
respond to emerging issues and trends and deliver initiatives. Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. 57 The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging irends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the			
Improved timelines for commissioning arrangements will support much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56			
much stronger planning processes. Knowledge of funding arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. 57 The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available on CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the partnership and the partnership considered by any partnership and the respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.			
arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. 57 The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.	55		None required.
allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety strategy refreshes. 56 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. 57 The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the			
Strategy refreshes. Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		arrangements well before the start of the new financial year will	
 Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the 		allow for finances to be considered alongside community safety	
Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		strategy refreshes.	
genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.	56	Overall, the proposed changes to the 2015-2017 Commissioning	None required.
Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.		Framework are generally well received as they are viewed as a	
through an appropriate performance framework. The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.		genuine effort to reduce bureaucracy and to provide Community	
The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		Safety Partnerships with greater certainty whilst requiring scrutiny	
recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		through an appropriate performance framework.	
contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 8 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the	57	The increase in funding is viewed as a welcome change as it	None required.
funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. 58 Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		recognises the value of Community Safety Partnerships in their	
funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		contribution towards the Police and Crime Plan. The increase in	
continuation of projects at the grass roots level. Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.		funds available to CSPs will allay some fears around the future of	
Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		funds available and provide a degree of certainty for the	
submit an individual business case for each individual initiative has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		continuation of projects at the grass roots level.	
has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the	58	Removing the requirement for Community Safety Partnerships to	All requirements will be outlined in the PLF Guidance Notes.
their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		submit an individual business case for each individual initiative	
framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		has been well received. CSPs will however need to bring forward	
budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a barrier to funding but as business as usual. The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.		their planning processes in order to meet the commissioning	
barrier to funding but as business as usual. 59 An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the The BCU Fund was discontinued in 2014/15. Additional funding has been added to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.		framework timescales. The requirement for CSPs to provide a	
An area that the partnership would like to highlight that we feel resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the		budget breakdown and quarterly updates will not be viewed as a	
resources both physical and financial should be considered to dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the to the Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) budget for Community Safety Partnerships. The PLF already has a contingency element of up to 10% which could be used to respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.			
dealing with emerging trends or threats that might arise that will not originally have been considered by any partnership and the respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.	59		
not originally have been considered by any partnership and the respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.	1		
ODCC due to the unforced on neture of contain entering transfer			respond to emerging issues and this will be continued in 2015/16.
		OPCC due to the unforeseen nature of certain crime trends.	
60 The discontinuation of the Basic Command Unit (BCU) funding is As above	60		As above
disappointing. The fund was extremely useful in reacting to		disappointing. The fund was extremely useful in reacting to	
emerging threats and issues and provided flexibility to CSPs when		emerging threats and issues and provided flexibility to CSPs when	
doing so.		doing so.	

61	Wanted to raise the issue about there being no Basic Command Unit or contingency funding that CSPs can draw down on to put response plans in place should there be a spike in a particular crime.	As above
YOU	NG PEOPLE	
62	The investment in a young people's mentoring service is welcome and the YOS will seek to engage with the provider to ensure that this service extends its reach to children and young people across the city that meet the eligibility criteria as part of an integrated response to early help identification and prevention strategy.	None required.
63	In relation to the money associated with the commissioning intention: Targeting young offenders with a substance misuse problem. It is proposed that this is directly commissioned with Leicestershire YOS rather than co-commissioned.	Agreed – amendment made.
64	The indicative funding to target young people with substance misuse problems for a two year period from 2015/17 is welcome and will assist with service continuity and planning with the current service providers.	None required.
65	We welcome the continued contribution to supporting a Youth Prevention and Diversion Pathway which targets two specific groups of young people: High Risk Entrants and repeat young offenders. However, it is important to note that a number of the allocations are being significantly reduced in 2016/17 which will impact on the ability to deliver against the expected outcomes.	None required.
66	The intention to enable young people to support and challenge the work of the PCC (Cl025) is welcome.	None required.
YOU	NG ADULTS PROJECT	
67	I welcome the addition of a specific commissioning intention relating to improving outcomes for young adults in contact with the Criminal Justice System (Cl024 -To improve outcomes for young adults in contact with the criminal justice system, including securing reductions in offending and reoffending.)	None required.
68	The proposed allocation of £10,000 for delivery of the Young Adult Delivery Plan will assist greatly in enabling the implementation phase of the project.	None required.

69	I would also suggest that organisations/programmes that receive other areas of OPCC commissioning review their allocation of funds (where relevant) so that there is an appropriate focus on young adults (e.g. in IOM).	Agreed – this will also be considered in all new contracts and funding agreements.
TRO	UBLED FAMILY PROGRAMMES	
70	Welcome the increase in funding available for the troubled families programmes from £125,000 to £175,000. This increase in funding recognises the benefits that the Service will provide to Police activity in the future and the partnership delivery of the Service.	None required.
71	The CSP welcomes the additional funding that has been made available for the troubled families programme specifically as Leicestershire move into phase two of the programme earlier than expected.	None required.
72	Increasing funding available for the Troubled Families Programme is viewed as a positive step forward especially as we are now beginning to see some positive outcomes and also some reduction in demand for frontline officers.	
73	Increasing the money allocated to the troubled families' agenda makes good sense in light of the strong performance being delivered by these teams.	None required.
HEA	LTH	
74	The Public Health department welcomes the plan and recognises the continued commitment of the PCC to partnership working. In particular, we welcome the continued commitment to specific activities that contribute to Public Health priorities, namely substance misuse, mental health and child sexual exploitation.	None required.
75	We welcome the continued commitment to specific activities that contribute to Health priorities, namely substance misuse and mental health.	None required.
76	From 2015/16 police custodial health will transfer to NHSE. We already have commissioning responsibility for liaison and diversion services. We would welcome discussions about aligning these commissioning arrangements with other services commissioned by the OPCC in the custodial environment.	Agreed – the OPCC will continue to develop its relationship with NHSE and is happy to consider all opportunities to align commissioning processes.
77	The proposal to improve outcomes for those with mental health needs is welcome (C1021) is welcome and should include young people who are known to YOS and are in	Agreed – the Mental Health Partnership Group's Delivery Plan is currently being finalised. The Mental Health Partnership Development Manager will engage with all relevant partners to ensure the Plan is delivered.

	the criminal justice system. The proposed partnerships	
	development manager post and group delivery plan	
	should include contributions from relevant statutory	
	services including YOS and CAMHS.	
78	Need to establish sustainable funding for the Mental Health Triage	Resourcing for the mental health street triage car is being mainstreamed through
	Car - request that the PCC's considers funding for Policing	the Force Change Programme (Project Edison) and this is supported by the
	element of Triage Car.	OPCC.
79	The street triage car is currently funded through the police	As above.
	operational budget, and we would welcome the continued support	
CLIII	from the OPCC for this funding to continue.	
	LD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND MISSING FROM HOME	Mambara of the Cofequerding Board hous initially been made aware of the
80	The identification and prioritisation of work with children that	Members of the Safeguarding Board have initially been made aware of the proposed pilot and this will be progressed further as the pilot develops. The
	are missing, at risk of sexual exploitation (CSE) and children	OPCC will seek to work closely with all appropriate partner agencies.
	who are placed in care as part of the strategic priority	Of GO will seek to work closely with all appropriate partner agencies.
	(C1020) to protect vulnerable people is welcome. The	
	proposed pilot should involve relevant services provided by	
	the city council education and children's department	
	together with any commissioned providers.	
81	Is more generic work required to prevent abuse and child sexual	The proposed pilot will take place during 2014/15 and the results will be used to
	exploitation, in addition to developing intelligence in relation to	determine future commissioning requirements. The Commissioning Framework
00	children and young people in care homes?	has been updated to clarify this.
82	We welcome the contributions towards the partnership deliver of strategic priority 15: To prevent child abuse and child sexual	Members of the Safeguarding Board have initially been made aware of the proposed pilot and this will be progressed further as the pilot develops. The
	exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment	OPCC will seek to work closely with the sub regional Child Sexual Exploitation Sub
	for victims and witnesses. However it is imperative that this work	Group.
	sits inside the Safeguarding Boards sub regional Child Sexual	Group.
	Exploitation Sub Group and supports the delivery of the work	
	through the single multi-agency CSE team that is currently being	
	established.	
_		
	EGUARDING	
83	The proposed partnership work to safeguard and	None required.
	promote the welfare of children and adults is welcome	

	and should ensure that it is linked to wider service	
	planning priorities through the local safeguarding boards	
	for both children and adults.	
84	For Cl023, it would be useful to know what work with partners will	Cl023 relates to funding which is provided directly to the Children and Adults
	actually be done and how the budget allocations relate to this	Safeguarding Boards. The PCC's contribution is towards pooled budgets to deliver
	work.	the Boards' Business Plans, rather than any specific activity or service.
DON	ESTIC HOMICIDE REVIEWS	
85	The early indication of funding ring-fenced for Domestic	None required.
	Homicide Reviews (DHR) is welcomed, as it provides	
	partners with a degree of reassurance.	
86	Some reservations about the preparedness of partner	This suggestion will be forwarded to Leicester City and Leicestershire County
	agencies in effecting a response to 'domestic homicide	Councils who are responsible for co-ordinating the DHRs.
	reviews'. A greater collaboration between partner agencies	
	would be welcomed.	
VICT	IMS AND WITNESSES	
87	In terms of the commissioning intensions around Victim &	None required.
07	Witness work, the Council's views have been shared	None required.
	·	
88	separately with the OPCC.	Agroad
00	The strategic priority five (SP5) to increase reporting of	Agreed.
	domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims	
	and witnesses of domestic abuse is welcome. Any funding	
	allocated through the PCC Grant process to support this	
	priority should work closely with the Local Safeguarding	
	Boards for Children and Adults and be integrated into the	
	local domestic violence strategy to ensure maximum impact	
	and reach to vulnerable children and families.	
89	Fully support your principles of promoting good practice and	None required.
	targeting service provision based upon the needs of victims.	
90	Strongly recommend that the PCC take this opportunity to set in	The comments made do not relate specifically to the Commissioning Framework.
	place a Restorative Justice delivery infrastructure for	The suggestion that the use of restorative justice processes by Criminal Justice
	Leicestershire that will be scalable and sustainable.	agencies should be included in any revision of the Police and Crime Plan will be
		considered in the next consultation on the contents of the Police and Crime Plan.
		A consistent approach to Restorative justice will be delivered through the Victim
0.4		and Witness Contact Bureau.
91	Child on parent violence is a sub-set of domestic abuse and	The PCC Grant will be available to voluntary and community sector organisations
	therefore should be considered for funding.	specifically to increase the reporting of domestic abuse. The OPCC will be also be

		commissioning support for victims of domestic violence. This will be for high risk/repeat victim safety and outreach support, and a Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland telephone helpline.
92	The proposal, if correctly understood, that generic victim and witness support services will meet the 'cope and recover' needs of victims, is something which concerns us. We also believe that victims of rape and sexual assault require support from a specialist service.	It is not proposed that cope and recover provision will be generic for all victims. The OPCC will also be commissioning specific support for victims of sexual and domestic violence.
93	If all funding for initiatives which support victims of rape and sexual assault are allocated to SARCs, the needs of many victims/survivors of rape and sexual assault will go unmet.	It is not proposed that the only funding for victims of rape and sexual assault will be allocated to the Sexual Assault Referral Centres. Cl012 relates specifically to SARC funding but additional funding will also be available for specific support for victims of sexual violence.
94	Can we get our partners in domestic abuse to bid for funding if they are not already doing so?	Yes – partners can bid for a PCC Grant to increase the reporting of domestic abuse. The OPCC will also be commissioning specific support for victims of domestic violence.
INTE	GRATION, EQUALITY & DIVERSITY	
95	Request for funding for Prevent initiatives.	The Police and Crime Plan outlines the PCC's expectations of the Police in relation to counter terrorism. Resources are already provided by the Police for PREVENT work in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. Prevent is therefore not covered as a separate intention within the Commissioning Framework. However, the PCC Grant provides an opportunity for organisations to bid for funding to increase the reporting of hate crime.
96	Equality, diversity and human rights (EDHR) is a theme which must run throughout the Police and Crime Plan, we believe that there are particular actions required which would ensure that EDHR is firmly delivered and that confidence is built with the affected communities. The lack of specific actions can leave a sense of soft commitment.	EDHR is not identified as a separate strategic priority in the Police and Crime Plan and therefore is not addressed through the Commissioning Framework. However, all providers are required to provide evidence that equality and diversity issues have been considered as part of their delivery model.
97	The 'integration' agenda formerly referred to as 'community cohesion' is one which the Police must respond to. Integration needs to be a more direct part of the PCC's commissioning intentions.	Integration is not identified as a separate strategic priority in the Police and Crime Plan and therefore is not addressed through the Commissioning Framework. This will be considered in the next refresh of the Police and Crime Plan.



Commissioning Framework 2015-2017

Contents

		raye
1.	Introduction	3
2.	Background	4
3.	Commissioning Budget	4
4.	Commissioning Outcomes	4
5.	Commissioning Framework	5
6.	Funding Mechanisms:	5
	a) Direct Commissioning	6
	b) Co-commissioning	6
	c) Partnership Locality Fund	6
	d) PCC Grant	7
7.	Appendix A - Strategic Priorities	9

8.	Appendix B - Summary of Commissioning Intentions	
	by theme	10
9.	Appendix C - PCC Grant 2015 – 2017	21
10.	Appendix D - Glossary	22

1. Introduction

As the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire, I have some very specific responsibilities which include the following:

- Assuring an effective and efficient Police Service.
- Writing the Police and Crime Plan ('the Plan'), ensuring that it continues to reflect the aspirations and concerns of local people; I am charged with holding the Chief Constable to account in its delivery.
- And, lastly, setting the local precept which is the local tax to help fund the Police.

But there is another, absolutely key, part of my role which is to help the Chief Constable and other partners to drive down crime and anti-social behaviour by fulfilling my statutory duty to commission services in support of the Plan. Actually, I aim to commission 'outcomes' – an aspiration that demonstrates my determination to achieve value for taxpayers' hard-earned money as we continue to develop our commissioning processes.

This Commissioning Framework for the period 2015/17 is directly aligned to the Plan, with each commissioning intention being demonstrably linked to one or more strategic priority. It has been produced in consultation with a wide range of partner organisations, and local communities, who have helped to define not only the commissioning intentions but also the ways in which the desired outcomes will be purchased. I am very grateful to those partners for their inputs, and I look forward to a continued close working relationship with each and every one of them.

This important work will play its own part in our joint contribution towards driving down crime thereby increasing the safety of the residents of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

Sir Clive Loader

Police and Crime Commissioner Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

Cire Leade

1st September 2014



2. Background

2.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Leicestershire is responsible for setting the strategic direction for policing in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) through the Police and Crime Plan. The Plan covers the whole of the PCC's period in office from 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2017. The Chief Constable is responsible for the operational delivery of policing, including the Strategic Policing Requirement. The PCC is responsible for understanding

- and supporting the dynamic relationship between policing and local partner activity in support of the strategic priorities in the Police and Crime Plan.
- 2.2 The priorities set out in the Plan inform the PCC's decisions as to what funding is made available to the police and partners to secure reductions in crime and disorder. The PCC must identify opportunities for reducing crime, enabling communities to feel and be safer, protecting people who find themselves in a vulnerable situation and ensuring that victims and witnesses of crime and anti-social behaviour are positively supported.
- 2.3 The Police and Crime Plan was revised and re-published in October 2013. The Plan outlines four key themes (please refer to section 5.1) and a number of strategic priorities (Appendix A), which provide a clear direction for allocating the available budget to maximum effect. This Commissioning Framework sets out how the PCC intends to align the commissioning budget with those key themes and strategic priorities.

3. Commissioning Budget

- 3.1 The total commissioning budget for 2015/16 is currently an estimated £4.2m. The sections below detail proposals of the estimated allocations across a number of commissioning intentions (CIs). Due to the uncertainty about future funding, it is not possible to be precise about the size of the commissioning budget beyond 2015/16. However, it is the PCC's ambition, as a minimum, to maintain the size of the budget if overall funding allows and positive results from commissioning are demonstrated.
- 3.3 Many of the ways in which the commissioning intentions will be delivered in 2015/17 have already been determined, subject to satisfactory performance and the availability of funding. These are summarised together with details of the funding still available in Appendix B.

4. "Commissioning Outcomes"

- 4.1 The PCC has made it clear that outcomes and not services will be commissioned. With this in mind, this commissioning framework has been created which, as it is used and developed, will ensure future commissioning decisions are focused on the achievement of clearly defined outcomes.
- 4.2 It is recognised that partners may have difficulties in identifying and measuring the impact of their proposed initiative(s) on the outcomes within the Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioning Framework has been designed to be an operational tool that strives to keep performance measurement processes as simple as possible.
- 4.3 It will be the PCC's responsibility, through staff within the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC), to monitor progress for each commissioned activity against the proposed outcomes. A range of performance management systems will be used to do this. The OPCC will continue to work with partners and providers to develop performance indicators and measures that can be easily managed and reported on.

5. Commissioning Framework

- 5.1 The Commissioning Framework is based upon the four themes, and strategic priorities, within the Police and Crime Plan. The themes (within the Police and Crime Plan) are:
 - 1) Reducing offending and re-offending (RO)

- 2) Supporting victims and witnesses (VW)
- 3) Making communities and neighbourhoods safer (MCN)
- 4) Protecting the vulnerable (PV)
- 5.2 The Commissioning Framework provides a clear and consistent way forward for the commissioning of each theme. It outlines how the PCC will commission for outcomes to achieve the priorities set out in the Police and Crime Plan. Four different types of funding mechanism have been developed. These are the ways in which the PCC will purchase the intervention needed to deliver outcomes. Information about the indicative commissioning values from April 2015 onwards is included.
- 5.3 A range of performance measures across all themes and outcomes have been developed and are being used to support contract tender specifications and final approved contracts. The performance management options continue to be developed with partners as measures and indicators are introduced and tested. The performance indicators are used by the OPCC to select the best measure(s) for the interventions they wish to purchase. The OPCC will continue to work with providers and partners to develop meaningful measures that can reliably evidence that progress is being made across all areas.

6. Funding Mechanisms

- 6.1 The PCC has considered the ways in which the initiatives needed to achieve the outcomes in the Police and Crime Plan can be delivered. The following principles have been considered:
 - The existing commissioning arrangements of partners should be used where they are fit for purpose and can deliver the PCC's outcomes within time. This will maximise local commissioning expertise.
 - There should be a focus on value for money, maximising resources and ensuring the impact of the money spent is measured and the value is assessed.
 - Commissioning should take place at regional, sub regional (i.e. Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland) and locality levels. Systems should be fit for purpose and work with existing structures where these are operating well.
 - Best practice in relation to procurement will be applied. The PCC expects all procurement processes to follow best practice and be accessible for any provider, including the voluntary sector, unless a single provider dispensation has been agreed (please refer to 6.2a below). All relevant regulations and legislation will also apply including the Equalities Act 2010 which includes the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 6.2 There are four funding mechanisms as follows:

- a) Direct commissioning the PCC has/ will directly tender or contract with a provider. There are a number of areas where it is more efficient for the PCC to commission directly in order to achieve the desired outcomes. There are some instances where a single provider dispensation will be applied. This relates to situations when there is only one provider who, given the nature of the outcomes to be commissioned, can be considered and contracted with directly. Examples include the Local Resilience Forum, Troubled/Supported Families Programmes and Crimestoppers.
- b) **Co-commissioning** existing commissioners are already commissioning outcomes on behalf of the PCC under contracts. There are a number of both established and emerging commissioning structures which take on all or some of the core commissioning tasks. These include:
 - Reducing Reoffending Board
 - Sub Regional Substance Misuse Commissioning Board (managed by Leicester City Council)
 - NHS England
- c) Partnership Locality Fund (PLF) via the Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) who have a unique role in assessing, analysing, and responding to local need around crime and community safety. As such they have both a proactive strategic function and a reactive tactical function when assessing the threats to individual localities.

In order to benefit from the existing structures and systems in place, the PCC will make a financial contribution towards the delivery of each Community Safety Partnership Delivery Plan. CSPs will be required to provide a copy of their 2015/16 Plan, together with a budget breakdown and performance framework. Meetings will then be held with each CSP to discuss their plan and clarify any issues. Funding will not be provided for any activity/service that duplicates existing provision in the locality.

Timescales for agreeing the PLF will be determined by the CSPs as it is recognised that each CSP produces its Plan at a different time of year. However, all meetings in relation to 2015/16 funding will need to be held by the end of February 2015 at the latest. Funding for 2016/17 can be provisionally agreed at the same time (subject to the documentation indicated above being available). However, it should be noted that 2016/17 PLF funding will be subject to the PCC's overall budget.

An indicative £900k is available over 2 years which will be allocated using the Vulnerable Localities Index (VLI). Further details of this methodology are available at https://www.ucl.ac.uk/jdibrief/analysis/Vulnerable-Localities-Index

	2015/16	2016/17 (estimated)
Blaby	£29,700	£29,700
Charnwood	£67,950	£67,950

Harborough	£23,850	£23,850
Hinckley and Bosworth	£36,000	£36,000
Leicester City	£215,100	£215,100
Melton	£15,750	£15,750
North West Leicestershire	£31,950	£31,950
Oadby and Wigston	£19,800	£19,800
Rutland	£9,900	£9,900
Total	£450,000	£450,000

The PCC Grant - inviting community and voluntary sector organisations to submit applications to support the achievement of specific commissioning intentions and related outcomes in identified hotspot locations (see Appendix C).

Funding opportunities will be based on the threat and risk identified in Leicestershire Police's Strategic Assessment which will be cross referenced to those commissioning intentions which are not addressed through other PCC funding streams.

An indicative £500k is available over 2 years. Applications for up to £25k per annum, or up to £50,000 match funding per annum, will be considered. In exceptional circumstances, applications for up to 2 years of funding may be approved subject to clear evidence of achieving the required outcomes.

Indicative Timeline	Stage
PCC Grant applications and guidance notes issued	Week commencing 1 st September 2014
PCC Grant workshops to be held	Weeks commencing 8 th and 15 th September 2014
Deadline for applications	5pm on 24 th October 2014
Applicants informed of outcome	Week commencing 15 th December 2014

6.3 For all funding mechanisms the PCC will hold contracts/agreements with the successful organisations that specify the detail of what outcomes are to be commissioned and for what value. The contracts/agreements will also specify quality standards around procurement practice, as well as performance measures for monitoring purposes and will include details of how the PCC will manage any instances where the outcomes are not being achieved.

Appendix A

Strategic Priorities

Theme: Reducing Offending and Reoffending

- 1. Preventing and diverting young people from offending
- 2. Reducing reoffending amongst young people and adults
- 3. Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and reoffending
- 4. Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled/Supporting Families programme

Theme: Supporting Victims and Witnesses

- 5. To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of domestic abuse
- 6. To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of serious sexual offences
- 7. To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate crime offences
- 8. To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response to victims of anti-social behaviour
- 9. To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime

Theme: Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer

- To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
- 11. To reduce all crime
- 12. To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences
- 13. To reduce violence against the person with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of violent crime with injury offences
- 14. To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims

Theme: Protecting the Vulnerable

- 15. To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses
- 16. Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs
- 17. To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports

Reducing Offending and Re-offending Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 1 (SP1): Preventing and diverting young people from offending

Strategic Priority 2 (SP2): Reducing re-offending amongst young people and adults

Strategic Priority 3 (SP3): Reducing alcohol and drug related offending and re-offending

Strategic Priority 4 (SP4): Reducing crime and ASB caused by families in a Troubled/Supported Families programme

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
SP1 SP2 SP3	Supporting a Youth Prevention and Diversion Pathway which targets two specific groups of young people: High Risk Entrants and repeat young offenders.	Direct	a) £91,650	a) £72,150	For 2015/17 via: a) Leicester City Council Young People's Service
SP4		Co-com	b) £81,075	b) £63,825	b) Leicestershire County Council's Early Help Services
		Direct	c) £4,700	c) £3,700	c) Rutland County Council Places Directorate
		Direct	d) £147,556	d) £147,556	d) TwentyTwenty to deliver a young person's mentoring service
			Total: £324,981	Total: £287,231	
Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment

CI002	Targeting young offenders with a substance misuse problem.	0.000	.) 000 400	.) 050 000	For 2015/17 via:
SP1 SP2 SP3		Co-com	a) £62,400	a) £52,000	a) Sub Regional Substance Misuse Commissioning Board for Leicester City
SP4		Direct	b) £57,600	b) £48,000	b) Leicestershire and Rutland Youth Offending Service
			Total: £120,000	Total: £100,000	
CI003	Targeting street drinkers, the homeless,				For 2015/17 via:
SP3	rough sleepers and those that are vulnerably housed.	Co-com	£34,000	£34,000	Sub Regional Substance Misuse Commissioning Board for Anchor Centre
CI004 SP2 SP3	Supporting the resettlement of adult offenders post-release from a prison sentence of less than 12 months through mentoring.	Direct	£49,983	£49,983	For 2015/17 via: Derbys, Leics, Notts and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC)
Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment

CI005 SP3	Targeting adult offenders with a substance misuse problem, specifically those tested and identified at point of arrest.	Co-com Direct	a) £412,774 b) £216,405	a) £395,000 b) £216,405	For 2015/17: via: a) Sub Regional Substance Misuse Commissioning Board b) Leicestershire Police for drug testing, Alcohol Liaison Officer and Drug Intelligence Officer
			Total: £629,179	Total: £611,405	
CI006 SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	Integrated Offender Management (IOM) initiatives which target the highest risk offenders, within which there should be a specific focus on: • 16-24 year old offenders • prolific and other priority offenders • adults serving less than12 months; and • members of a Troubled/ Supported Families programme.	Co-Com	£368,000	£368,000	For 2015/17 via: Leicestershire Police to Reducing Reoffending Board
CI007 SP4	Support to reduce offending and ASB caused by families in a Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Troubled/Supported Family programme.	Direct	a) £89,250 b) £78,750 c) £7,000 Total: £175,000	a) £89,250 b) £78,750 c) £7,000 Total: £175,000	For 2015/17 via: a) Think Family (Leicester City) b) Supporting Leicestershire Families c) Changing Lives (Rutland)

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
C1008	Targeting registered sex offenders, violent and other types of sexual offenders, and				For 2015/17 via:
SP2	offenders who pose a serious risk of harm to the public.	Direct	£34,029	£34,029	Leicestershire Police for Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)
C1009	Support to reduce offending by children and young people aged 10 -17 years.				For 2015/17:
SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4		Direct	a) £162,554	a) £162,554	a) via Leicestershire Police - Police Officer support to the two Youth Offending Services
			b) £99,348	b) £84,446	b) Leicester City Youth Offending Service
			c) £91,687	c) £77,934	c) Leicestershire and Rutland Youth Offending Service
			Total: £353,589	Total: £324,934	
CI024 SP1 SP2 SP3 SP4	To improve outcomes for young adults in contact with the criminal justice system, including securing reductions in offending and reoffending.	Co-Com	£10,000	£10,000	For 2015/17 via: Young Adults Project (YAP) Delivery Group to support the implementation of the Delivery Plan

Supporting Victims and Witnesses Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 5 (SP5): To increase reporting of domestic abuse and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of

domestic abuse

Strategic Priority 6 (SP6): To increase reporting of serious sexual offences and ensure a positive outcome for victims and

witnesses of serious sexual offences

Strategic Priority 7 (SP7): To increase reporting of hate crimes and ensure a positive outcome for victims and witnesses of hate

crime offences

Strategic Priority 8 (SP8): To prevent anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to continuously improve the quality of service and response

to victims of anti-social behaviour

Strategic Priority 9 (SP9): To continually improve the quality of service and response to victims of crime

Code	Commissioning Intention	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI010 SP4 SP8	Interventions that pro-actively reduce anti- social behaviour and/or improve the recording of incidents.	Direct PCC Grant	a) £10,000	a) £10,000	For 2015/17 via: Leicestershire Police for Sentinel
			b) £100,000	b) £100,000	
			Total: £110,000	Total: £110,000	
Code	Commissioning Intention	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI011	Interventions which increase the reporting of: - Domestic abuse	PCC Grant	£150,000	£150,000	
SP5 SP6 SP7	- Serious sexual assault - Hate crime				
CI012	Initiatives which support victims of rape and sexual assault, as well as the investigative	Co-Com	£67,906	£67,906	For 2015/16 via:
SP6 SP9	process.				NHS England for Juniper Lodge and St Bernards - Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARCs)
CI013 SP5	To deliver an integrated Victim Service which will:	Direct	£749,080	£749,080	

SP6 SP7 SP8 SP9	 track victims of recorded and self-reported crime; provide information, advice and practical support; and provide access to "cope and recover" services 				
Code	Commissioning Intention	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI025 SP5 SP6 SP9	To provide support to: a) Victims of sexual violence – including the ISVA role (adult and child) & a telephone helpline. b) Victims of domestic violence – including high risk/repeat victim safety outreach support and a Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland-wide telephone helpline.	Co-Com	£260,000	£260,000	These services will be commissioned in partnership with Leicester City, Leicestershire County and Rutland County Councils.
CI026 SP5 SP6 SP7 SP8 SP9	To provide a practical support/ target hardening service for those assessed as vulnerable and/or at high risk of repeat victimisation.	Direct	£45,000	£45,000	

Making Communities and Neighbourhoods Safer Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 10 (SP10): To continuously improve the police service to the communities of Leicester, Leicestershire and

Rutland.

Strategic Priority 11 (SP11): To reduce all crime.

Strategic Priority 12 (SP12): To reduce domestic burglary and ensure a positive outcome for victims of burglary offences.

Strategic Priority 13 (SP13): To reduce violence against the person with injury and ensure a positive outcome for victims of

violent crime – with injury offences.

Strategic Priority 14 (SP14): To reduce vehicle crime and ensure a positive outcome for victims.

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI014	To support initiatives to prevent and detect crime through community intelligence.				For 2014/17 via:
SP10 SP11		Direct	£26,190	£26,190	Crimestoppers National Hub
CI017	To support work with partners to prepare, respond and recover from local				For 2015/17 via:
SP10	emergencies.	Direct	£6,536	£6,536	Local Resilience Forum

CI018	To support the work of partners to reduce domestic homicides.	Direct	£32,000	£32,000	For 2015/17, supporting Domestic Homicide Reviews*
SP11					* 2015/16 contribution paid to Leicester City in 2014/15
Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI019	To support and engage the voluntary and community sector to reduce all crime.				For 2015/17 via:
SP11	,	Co-Com	a) £10,000	a) £10,000	a) Leicestershire Community Infrastructure Organisation contract
		Co-Com	b) £10,000	b) £10,000	b) Leicester City Council 'Supporting the VCS' contracts
		Direct	c) £5,000	c) £5,000	c) Voluntary Action Rutland
			Total: £25,000	Total: £25,000	
CI027	To enable young people to support, challenge and inform the work of the PCC				For 2015/17 via:
SP10 SP11	and ensure their voices help to shape decisions about policing and crime.	Direct	£15,000	£15,000	SHM Foundation for the Youth Commission.

Protecting the Vulnerable Commissioning Intentions

Strategic Priority 15 (SP15): To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses

Strategic Priority 16 (SP16): Improving the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs Strategic Priority 17 (SP17): To reduce the number of repeat missing person reports

Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI020 SP15 SP17	To prevent child abuse and child sexual exploitation (CSE) and provide a safe and supportive environment for victims and witnesses.	TBC	£50,000	£50,000	A pilot study seeking to develop intelligence in relation to children and young people in care homes who are repeatedly missing, and to identify any links to sexual exploitation is being completed during 2014/15. The results will influence any future commissioning. For 2015/17: Contribution to Mental Health Partnership Development Manager post and delivery of Mental Health Partnership Group Delivery Plan.
Cl021 SP16	To work with partners to improve the response, service and outcomes for those with mental health needs.	Direct	£50,000	£50,000	
Code	Commissioning Intention (CI)	Funding Mechanism	Amount 2015/16	Estimated Amount 2016/17	Comment
CI022 SP017	To work with partners to reduce the number of repeat missing person reports.	TBC	£50,000	£50,000	A pilot study seeking to develop intelligence in relation to children and young people in care homes who are repeatedly missing, and to identify any links to sexual exploitation is being completed during 2014/15. This will influence any future commissioning.

CI023	To work with partners to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and	Direct			For 2014/17 via:
SP15 SP16	vulnerable adults	Direct	a) £87,890	a) £87,890	a) Leicestershire & Rutland and City Safeguarding Boards for
SP17			b) £16,470	b) £16,470	Children b) Leicestershire & Rutland and
			Total: £104,360	Total: £104,360	City Safeguarding Boards for Adults

It should be noted that an additional £900,000 is allocated to Community Safety Partnerships via the Partnership Locality Fund (see 6.2c). Their Delivery Plans will support the achievement of many of the commissioning intentions and strategic priorities outlined above and therefore this funding stream is not reflected separately in the tables above.

PCC Grant 2015 - 2017

PCC Grants will be available for the following:

Cl010: Interventions that pro-actively reduce anti-social behaviour in:

- New Parks
- Braunstone Park and Rowley Fields
- Abbey (Mowmacre, Stocking Farm, Abbey Rise, Frog Island and Blackfriars)
- Beaumont Leys
- Spinney Hills
- Charnwood East (Syston, Thurmaston, East Goscote & Queniborough),
- Loughborough Central
- Loughborough East (areas of Meadow Lane, Sparrow Hill, Pinfold Gate, Leicester Road, Lewis Road and large parts of both Derby Road and Alan Moss Road)

Cl011: Interventions which increase the reporting of:

- Domestic abuse
- Serious sexual assault
- Hate crime

The PCC Grant will not be available for support services for victims as this will be covered through other commissioning intentions. Applications should focus specifically on increasing the number of offences reported.

Appendix D

	Glossary
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
ASB	Anti-Social Behaviour
BCU	Basic Command Unit – the largest unit into which
	Leicestershire Police is divided. There is a City BCU and a
	Counties BCU.
CJ	Criminal Justice
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CRC	Community Rehabilitation Company
CSE	Child Sexual Exploitation
CSP	Community Safety Partnership
ED	Emergency Department
EET	Education, Employment or Training

FTE First Time Entrants

IDVA Independent Domestic Violence Advocate/ Advisor Index Offence The proven offence that leads to an offender being

included in a particular cohort (a group of people who have shared a particular event together during a particular time

span)

IOM Integrated Offender Management

ISVA Independent Sexual Violence Advocate/ Advisor

LA Local Authority

LAC Looked After Children i.e. those looked after by local

authority

Locality Blaby District, Charnwood Borough, Harborough District,

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, Leicester City, Melton Borough, North West Leicestershire District, Oadby and

Wigston Borough or Rutland County

LPU Local Policing Unit

LLR Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

LR Leicestershire and Rutland

MAPPA Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MAPPOM Multi Agency Prolific and other Priority Offender

Management

MFH Missing From Home

MSG Most Similar Group i.e. police force areas that are the most

similar to each other using statistical methods, based on demographic, economic and social characteristics which

relate to crime

OAC Output Area Classification

OPCC Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner – the PCC's

staff team

PCC Police and Crime Commissioner

PCP Police and Crime Plan

PPO Prolific and other Priority Offenders

Regional East Midlands which includes Derbyshire, Leicestershire,

Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire

SARC Sexual Assault Referral Centre
SLF Supporting Leicestershire Families
Sub Regional Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland

TFMV Theft from Motor Vehicle TOMV Theft of Motor Vehicle

TF Troubled/Supported Families

VAPWI Violence against the Person with Injury

YOS Youth Offending Service

APPENDIX D

PCC GRANTS 2014/15

Name of Initiative	Name of Organisation	Amount
Warning Zone Year 6 Schools Programme & Early Intervention Group Work	Warning Zone Ltd.	£15,000
Community Action Against Crime	Catch22	£37,000
Targeted Counselling Support for Victims of Domestic Abuse in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR)	Safe Project, Trade and New Dawn New Day	£32,046
Project Go!	Pedestrian Limited	£13,010
To the Hoop	KB in the Community	£13,633
Street Sport	Community Projects Plus	£22,595
Box Smart	Waterfront Sport and Education Academy (WSEA)	£22,000
Tackling Domestic Burglary and Vehicle Crime Hotspots	Leicestershire Police Counties BCU	£9,000
Game Over	Soft Touch Arts Ltd.	£7,960
Textile Project to train disengaged young people	Whitwick Community Enterprises	£10,799
Children & Young Persons Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA)	FreeVA	£46,167
ADAM Project	Women's Aid Leicestershire Ltd.	£43,085
Building Bridges	The Contact Project	£11,904
Catching the Wave	Pedestrian Limited	£29,745
Set aside towards Reporting of Hate Crime		£30,000
TOTAL		£343,944