

**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO
THE CRIME AND DISORDER (FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
STRATEGY) REGULATIONS 2007**

2007 No.1830

AND

THE CRIME AND DISORDER (PRESCRIBED INFORMATION) REGULATIONS 2007

2007 No. 1831

1. 1.1 This explanatory memorandum has been prepared by the Home Office and is laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

2. Description

2.1 The first set of regulations sets out minimum standards for how Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) should function as they formulate and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder in their communities. Until now, there have been no underpinning national standards for CDRPs which has led to considerable variation in their ability to reduce crime. The second instrument strengthens CDRP partners' existing obligations to share relevant information by specifying the sets of depersonalised information that relevant authorities have a duty to disclose to each other if held by them.

3. Matters of special interest to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments

3.1 None.

4. Legislative Background

4.1 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (the '1998 Act'), as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002 and the Police and Justice Act 2006 (the '2006 Act'), established partnerships between police, local authorities, fire and rescue authorities, Primary Care Trusts and police authorities. The purpose of these partnerships was to ensure that all these agencies work together to tackle local crime and disorder. The 1998 Act placed a central duty on these 'responsible authorities' to, once every three years, produce audits of the area's local crime problems and implement strategies to tackle them.

4.2 The 2006 Act received Royal Assent on 8 November 2006. Paragraph 3 of Schedule 9 to the 2006 Act repealed the duty on CDRPs to produce triennial audits and strategies. In place of this duty, is contained the power to introduce regulations for the formulation and implementation of strategies for CDRPs to reduce crime and disorder and combat substance misuse. These are contained in SI 1830 (the 'strategy regulations') and specify how CDRPs should conduct their business in respect of identifying and addressing crime and disorder priorities, engaging with communities, sharing information and working with other CDRPs where they were part of the same county structure in England.

4.3 Section 115 of the 1998 Act, gave a power to any person or body to share information with partners for the purposes of reducing crime and disorder. This was strengthened by paragraph 5 of Schedule 9 to the 2006 Act that introduces a new section 17A of the 1998 Act which is a duty to share certain sets of depersonalised information as prescribed by the Secretary of State. SI 1831 (the ‘information sharing regulations’) prescribes these information types, the intervals at which such information must be disclosed and the form of such disclosure.

5. Territorial Extent and Application

5.1 The strategy regulations apply to England only. The information sharing regulations apply to England and Wales.

5.2 Policing and crime are devolved matters for Scotland and Northern Ireland. Policing is not a devolved matter for Wales but the Welsh Assembly Government does have devolved authority over both local government affairs and health. In view of this, we will work jointly with the Welsh Assembly Government on a separate instrument to introduce similar national standards for Community Safety Partnerships in Wales within the next six months.

6. European Convention on Human Rights

6.1 As the instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure and does not amend primary legislation, no statement is required.

7. Policy background

7.1 The 1998 Act introduced a new requirement for the police, local authorities and other key agencies to work together to tackle crime and disorder. The 1998 Act and its provisions have been recognised as producing a step change in the contribution of other (non police) agencies on community safety. But the Government thought it timely to review whether the provisions needed updating and to explore how a greater degree of consistency of working could be achieved since some CDRPs were performing evidently better than others. The findings of a review of the 1998 Act provisions were published in 2006 <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/partnerships60.doc>.

7.2 Flowing from this review, the Home Office has a programme of reform in train which has a number of key strands to it. These include adjusting the statutory requirements placed on CDRPs to both relieve unnecessary burdens and to introduce some underpinning minimum standards (namely both these sets of regulations). The programme also looks to produce a revised performance framework (bringing together separate regimes for police, CDRPs and drugs); new guidance for partnerships on how to undertake their core duties; and enhanced arrangements for supporting CDRPs which have performance problems.

7.3 The overall objective of the review of the 1998 Act CDRP provisions and the resulting new sections in the 2006 Act was to make CDRPs more effective, responsive and visible. In particular, the review considered how CDRPs identified and prioritised issues important to local people; how they shared information between partners; how

they planned ahead and managed performance; and how they were accountable to local communities.

7.4 The review found that the triennial audits and strategies were seen by many CDRPs as no longer relevant to how they conducted their work. Instead of relying on information that was up to three years old, many well performing CDRPs were identifying their priorities and re-organising their business through the analysis of information much more frequently throughout the year. The review also identified that it was more important that partnerships were accountable to their local communities than to central government. Further, it was evident that some partners were still reluctant to disclose the relevant information.

7.5 As a result of these findings, we have repealed the duty to produce triennial audits and strategies and an annual report to the Home Secretary. Instead, the strategy regulations outline the minimum elements for effective partnerships. They require that each CDRP shall have an agreed process for sharing information held by partners; produce an annual assessment (using that information) of the issues affecting the local area; make some decisions about what the priorities ought to be based on this assessment; produce a plan which explains how those priorities will be delivered; and have a dialogue with communities to both inform these processes and explain the outcomes. In addition, in two-tier areas, district strategic assessments will need to be incorporated into a county wide community safety agreement in order to identify county-wide priorities and opportunities for cross-border working.

7.6 The information sharing regulations require that certain sets of depersonalised information from police, fire and rescue authorities, Primary Care Trusts in England, Local Health Boards in Wales and local authorities are shared on at least a quarterly basis. The interval is specified in this way in order to give the relevant authorities the flexibility to continue any existing arrangements to share more frequently while also ensuring that a minimum requirement for quarterly sharing is met by all partners. This will ensure that all partnerships have at least the minimum information necessary to identify priorities, map trends and patterns in crime and disorder and manage their performance.

7.7 In terms of consultation following the review, the Home Office arranged twelve stakeholder consultation events in England and Wales involving over 1000 stakeholders from all the different contributing agencies (for example police forces, local authorities, fire and rescue authorities). These events were intended to seek views on what should be included in minimum standards for CDRPs and to ascertain thoughts from as wide a range of participants as possible on how these standards should be framed and to be clear on any pitfalls to be avoided. The briefing papers and the findings and recommendations are available at: <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/regions/regions00.htm> for information. The Home Office was commended for the very inclusive approach which these events embodied and for the investment of time to listen to stakeholders from every part of England and Wales. The formal feedback from these events formed the basis of the development of the regulations and is discussed in the attached Regulatory Impact Assessment.

7.8 This inclusive approach has been continued during the production of both sets of regulations. We have consulted with a broad range of stakeholders from the very earliest

stage of the formal development of the regulations, not only showing them early drafts of both sets of regulations but also inviting their comments on the instructions which policy officials were sending to Home Office legal advisers. Drafts of both sets of regulations were discussed regularly at the meetings of a stakeholder steering group and the Home Office also held bilaterals with all the main interested parties to elicit any particular concerns. In addition, local analysts have assisted in the preparation of information sharing regulations.

7.9 Twenty two written responses were returned on the initial instructions to lawyers and most of these expressed broad agreement with the approach adopted in the regulations. The regulations were drafted to reflect comments and provide more clarity where necessary. Some examples are given below:

- In response to eight questions about how a partnership business process would fit with the existing police business processes, we have ensured that there is enough flexibility in the timing for alignment between these processes.
- In response to five doubts about a requirement for the CDRP to be chaired by one of the responsible authorities, we included in regulations that the CDRP could nominate any of its members to be chair.
- In response to four concerns that a formalised audit of skills and knowledge would be too burdensome, we removed this requirement.
- In response to three remarks that it should be possible for requirements around *face the people* sessions to be met by current arrangements, we will outline this in guidance.

7.10 These regulations will be of limited interest to those not involved in community safety and indeed for many partnerships, they reflect current good practice. For a minority, there will be some concern about how these standards will be met. However, the good practice in many CDRPs demonstrates how resources can be brigaded to meet these standards.

7.11 In order to ensure that the widest number of those who would be affected by the regulations were aware of their development (above and beyond consulting their representative organisations), the Home Office wrote to every CDRP in March 2007 detailing what would be contained in the new regulations. The regulations will be accompanied by guidance for CDRPs that will outline how to meet both sets of regulations and will include examples of good practice. This guidance will be based around the key components for successful partnerships and is being developed in conjunction with contributors from stakeholder organisations. It is the intention that the guidance will be written in plain English with helpful toolkits to assist those CDRPs who wish to model their own practice on what has been identified as working elsewhere.

8. Impact

8.1 A Regulatory Impact Assessment is attached to this memorandum.

9. Contact

Joy Johnston at the Home Office, telephone: 0207 035 4861 or e-mail: joy.johnston7@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk can answer any queries regarding the instruments.

Regulatory Impact Assessment

1. Crime Reduction: Establishing minimum standards for the statutory partnerships in England charged with reducing crime and disorder; and strengthening information sharing provisions between relevant agencies involved in crime and disorder reduction in both England and Wales.

2. Purpose and intended effect / Background

2.1 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) (Community Safety Partnerships – CSPs – in Wales) were first established after the passage of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which placed a duty on local authorities and police (the ‘responsible authorities’) to work together to combat crime and disorder. Subsequent legislation has extended the list of responsible authorities to include Primary Care Trusts, Fire and Rescue Authorities and Police Authorities. The Government announced in its 2004 Police Reform White Paper – *Building Communities, Beating Crime* – the intention to review the working of these provisions to establish the lessons learned and to examine whether any changes to the 1998 Act were required.

2.2 Currently there are 349 CDRPs in England and 22 CSPs in Wales. CSPs have a similar remit as their English counterparts in relation to crime. However, as the devolved responsibilities of the Welsh Assembly cover substance misuse and local government, this means that the delivery of community safety is a shared responsibility between the Home Office and the Assembly. The process of introducing national standards for partnerships in Wales will require further discussions with the Welsh Assembly before commencement. This Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) relates to both England and Wales for the purposes of the information sharing regulations but to England only for the minimum standards. A separate RIA is being produced for the introduction of minimum standards in Wales.

2.3 The review of the Crime and Disorder Act (the CDA review) was published in January 2006. It pointed to the major contributions to crime reduction and community safety that the new partnerships had made. However, it also highlighted a pronounced variation in the capability and effectiveness of CDRPs across the country. The review proposed a number of changes to partnership provisions as set out in statute. In particular, it recommended the repeal of certain obligations on CDRPs that were considered unnecessary and proposed instead to address the variations by proposing new statutory minimum standards which would apply to all CDRPs.

2.4 Some of these changes were included as primary legislation in the Police and Justice Act 2006 and a separate RIA was prepared for these provisions at the time of the Act’s introduction. The Act repealed the requirement on CDRPs to produce audits of local crime and disorder issues and subsequent strategies every three years and repealed the requirement to report annually to the Home Secretary. These had been considered unproductive bureaucratic requirements for CDRPs that were not helping to drive delivery.

2.5 In place of these requirements, the Police and Justice Act 2006 provided for the introduction of regulations that would establish a framework of minimum standards for CDRPs, framed around an obligation on the CDRP to formulate and implement a strategy to address the crime, disorder and substance misuse issues in their area. The aim of these minimum standards is to make CDRPs into the most effective possible vehicles for tackling crime, disorder and substance misuse in their communities. They are based on the findings of the review and consequent consultation with stakeholders

2.6 The regulations set out a number of obligations on the responsible authorities in CDRPs:

- to convene a strategy group comprising all the responsible authorities in the CDRP and others as they choose,
- to prepare a strategic assessment (a document identifying the crime and community safety priorities in the area through the analysis of information provided by partner agencies and the community)
- to produce a partnership plan (which lays out their approach for addressing those priorities)
- to meet minimum standards of community consultation and engagement on issues of crime and disorder and substance misuse
- to ensure that each CDRP has an information sharing protocol in place and that each responsible authority has a designated information sharing liaison officer to promote and facilitate information sharing.

2.7 In addition, where there are a number of CDRPs at the district level within one county, there will be minimum standards for organisation at county level to ensure that there is an appropriate linkage between decisions which might be made at the county level (for example by a Police Authority for a force covering the whole county) and those taken more locally. Further, this coordination at county level will allow the identification of county-wide priorities to feed into the Local Area Agreement and opportunities for cross-border. At county level the minimum standards will be:

- to convene a County Level Strategy Group to help co-ordinate the work of the individual CDRPs;
- this group to produce a 'community safety agreement', based on the strategic assessments produced at district level, that will set out county wide priorities and opportunities for cross-border working and feed into district partnership plans.

2.8 The Police and Justice Act 2006 strengthens the provisions for information sharing amongst partners. Section 115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 gave partners the power to share information to reduce of crime and disorder. The CDA review highlighted that agencies did not always share information. Sharing depersonalised information is of critical importance to local partnerships, as it enables them to carry out evidence-based targeted community safety interventions and to evaluate their impact. Routine profiling of key data sets is also vital for performance and risk management purposes. The provisions in the Police and Justice Act 2006 enable this by making information sharing of certain depersonalised datasets a 'duty' (requirement) rather than a power. Responsible authorities will be under a requirement to share depersonalised information, where this is already collected, and of a nature described by the Secretary of State. The national standards will also support effective data sharing processes by including requirements for each CDRP to produce an information sharing protocol to facilitate the sharing of all information between the responsible authorities.

2.9 In addition to these regulations, the Home Office will be working with all the main stakeholders involved in CDRP working to produce guidance. This will assist CDRPs to understand what the regulations will mean in practice and to support them with good practice examples to assist in implementation.

3. Rationale for Government Intervention

3.1 A great deal has been learned about CDRP effectiveness since the introduction of partnerships following the 1998 Act. Across the partnerships in England, there will be many for whom these new standards will merely embody the normal pattern of how they conduct their business at present. However, we know from the work conducted with poorly performing CDRPs that a number have fewer tangible processes in place for identifying and addressing their community safety issues. There have also been problems around the consistency of information sharing where different agencies have taken different approaches.

3.2 The purpose of the regulations is to address this variation by ensuring that every CDRP has a minimum set of processes in train by which information is shared and intelligence-led decisions can take place. The County Strategy Group will support the delivery challenges presented by the introduction of countywide Local Area Agreements (LAAs). The introduction of LAAs has meant that CDRPs based at district level councils cannot act in isolation, are having to influence decisions taken at a larger geographical level and also take cognisance of decisions made at that level.

4. Consultation

4.1 Stakeholders were engaged throughout the review of the CDRP provisions in the 1998 Act and have continued to be consulted in the development of regulations thereafter. This included supporting the setting of the CDA remit and final draft reviewing process.

4.2 The Home Office, the Local Government Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Association of Police Authorities worked together on the review between November 2004 and January 2005. Over 450 key stakeholders and practitioners were consulted through four regional seminars and many contributed through e-questionnaires and submissions. The CDA benefited from this stakeholder centred approach as many of the recommendation that underpinned the review came from those on the front line of service provision.

4.3 Since the review findings were published, we have continued to engage stakeholders in the development of these regulations. The Home Office and Government Offices for the Regions jointly undertook a large-scale consultation exercise on the prospect of minimum standards over the summer of 2006. In addition to written consultation, over 1,000 stakeholders in 12 locations attended workshops to help the Home Office to decide what the legislation should contain. Two workshops were held in Wales to reflect their different policy issues. These events and the resulting work by stakeholder representatives in project groups drove the development of the national standards. On the basis of this consultation, the regulations depart at some points from the original review findings. Some examples are given below, but the findings and recommendations papers are available at

<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/regions/regions00.htm>.

4.4 The review proposed splitting the strategic and operational decision making responsibilities of CDRPs, with the former sitting at county level. However, at eight of these events, concerns were raised over proposals around strategic/operational split. Therefore, strategic and operational elements will continue to be conducted at district level. A county level group will have a coordinating function concerning cross-border working and feed into to the Local Area Agreement.

4.5 The review recommended that partnerships perform a strategic assessment on a six monthly basis. However, at six of the regional events, concern was expressed about the resources required to produce a strategic assessment every six months and whether this timeframe was most suited from a strategic perspective. For this reason, and to link with the change from six monthly to annual refreshes of the LAA, the regulations now require a strategic assessment at least yearly. The recommendation was made at five of the events that strategic assessments should include information gathered from the local community. This is reflected in the draft instrument.

4.6 The regulations have been framed to ensure that they describe a level of performance that many CDRPs already attain (and mostly exceed) so that the standards address (and target) those CDRPs whose arrangements are sub-optimal. We have also taken every effort to ensure the regulations have been drafted to ensure that areas can implement the minimum standards as they see fit according to their local circumstances rather than central government laying down set of procedures. For example, stating that every CDRP shall appoint a chair and have a process for their selection and removal without stating what this should be.

4.7 The governance structure established to progress the development and implementation of the minimum standards for CDRPs comprises key stakeholders. Members of the governance structure groups reviewed the national standards regulations and guidance at the earliest opportunity and were encouraged to share drafts with those groups they represent. The composition of the governance structure groups brings together representative members of CDRP responsible authorities, co-operating bodies and those agencies that have been invited to participate along with representatives from government departments who support CDRP delivery, including Communities and Local Government and the Department of Health, to ensure both strategic and practitioner oversight of the process of developing national standards and information sharing regulations. The governance structure groups also had sight of this Regulatory Impact Assessment. With the exception of the Local Government Association, no concerns were expressed.

4.8 The Local Government Association initially raised some concerns about the costs of certain requirements. However, on closer examination, it appeared that the concerns that local authorities were expressing pertained to arrangements that were not required by the regulations themselves, for example around information technology solutions. Another example related to the additional costs associated with community engagement. However, it should be noted that the regulations require partnerships to have regard to the community engagement already undertaken by the responsible authorities, particularly in fulfilment of their Best Value obligations. In addition, we anticipate that requirements such as the 'face the people' sessions will already be met by most partnerships. Guidance will give examples of the ways in which many partnerships currently meet the new requirements, for example through joint working and pooling resources across CDRPs.

5. Options for the introduction of minimum standards for CDRPs

The four options listed below set out the different ways in which we can approach the introduction of the powers contained in the Police and Justice Act 2006 and the introduction of minimum standards for CDRPs .

Option 1. Legislate to introduce minimum standards for CDRPs supported by guidance that helps partners to achieve standards

Objective	Risks	Mitigate Risk
<p>1.1a. Reduce bureaucratic burden on CDRPs by introducing minimum standards and guidance by clarifying expectations of performance</p>	<p>1.1b. Some CDRPs may only aim to meet minimum standard and not seek to exceed expectations</p>	<p>1.1c. Produce guidance outlining standards but include examples of good practice and use ongoing monitoring and review to drive up performance.</p>
<p>1.2a. Improve partnership delivery by introduction of standards</p>	<p>1.2b. Could consume additional resources to support implementation of the minimum standards for some CDRPs</p>	<p>1.2c. Stakeholder consultation showed that most CDRPs are functioning in manner outlined by standards and so many will not need to change their practices. Where changes are necessary, they will lead to more effective practices to drive delivery. This work also takes into account other changes introduced through the Local Government and Involvement in Public Health Bill</p>
<p>1.3a To ensure a common approach to delivery of community safety across England and Wales</p>	<p>1.3b Welsh delivery landscape differs from England due to devolved matters</p>	<p>1.3c Work in consultation with Welsh Assembly to develop separate regulations and support appropriate implementation</p>
<p>1.4a. Improve information sharing to support effective work in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>1.4b. Could consume additional resources to support the implementation of the standard for some CDRPs</p>	<p>1.4c. Guidance on how to achieve standard. Represents what many CDRPs are doing already. List only minimal sets in regulations which CDRPs can choose to supplement locally.</p>
<p>1.5a Improve community consultation and engagement undertaken by CDRPs</p>	<p>1.5b CDRPs may regard this as increased burden</p>	<p>1.5c. Standards build on existing work undertaken by responsible authorities and so no additional burdens. Builds on existing good practice work and wider government commitment to increased community involvement</p>

Option 2. Retain provisions outlined in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and not commence provisions in Police and Justice Act 2006

Objective	Risks	Mitigate Risk
-----------	-------	---------------

2.1a. To avoid changing requirements on CDRPs regarding the production of strategies and three-year audits	2.1b. Primary legislation exists and there is a legitimate stakeholder expectation that this will be used to improve delivery amongst CDRPs. CDRP effectiveness reduces due to lack of improved practice Having identified that the 3 year audits no longer serve a useful purpose, we would be persisting with a flawed approach	2.1c. Utilise good practice groups/knowledge management tools to encourage all CDRPs to address the challenges identified in CDA Review
Option 3. Repeal previous duties and do not introduce regulations for CDRPS		
Objective	Risks	Mitigate Risk
3.1a. To provide no framework for CDRPs in terms of how they discharge their delivery of crime and disorder issues	3.1b. Home Office cannot ensure consistency and equality of service provision and CDRPs effectively do not exist	3.1c. Issue guidance to current responsible authorities encouraging them to act jointly to tackle local issues
Option 4. No minimum standards but non statutory guidance on improving performance		
Objective	Risks	Mitigate Risk
4.1a. Introduce light touch approach to avoid adding burdens to CDRPs. Advise partners on how to improve performance without clear expectation of minimum levels of performance	4.1b. Introduces lack of consistency at local level, creating greater burdens for CDRPs as they respond to national and local expectations. Does not support value for money principles	4.1c. Introduce a more robust central performance management of local delivery, thus increasing burdens on CDRPs and going against wider government policy.

6. Benefits: Social, Environmental and Economic

6.1 The work that many CDRPs do on a daily basis has been a major contributing factor in reducing crime over the last ten years. Crime has reduced by 35% from 1997, as measured by the British Crime Survey. During this time, partnerships have developed and improved their contribution towards the reduction in crime. By clarifying the expectations of the role of CDRPs and improving the support offered to them, partnerships have been able to deliver on both local and national expectations concerning community safety. The introduction of minimum standards for CDRPs will support the continued development of partnership working as they face new challenges and produce lasting economic, social and environmental benefits.

6.2 The Home Office and Government Offices for the Regions have worked with underperforming partnerships over the past two years, building on the existing work undertaken with police forces. This programme of work has shown that many of the issues addressed in national standards are the issues facing underperforming partnerships. By introducing these

national standards, those areas with poorer performance can be brought up to an acceptable level of performance. This process will make CDRPs more responsive to local needs and in a better position to deliver services that are more effective.

6.3 More transparent and visible accountability mechanisms will encourage communities to work together with CDRPs. Local communities that understand the role of CDRPs in supporting reducing crime, disorder and substance misuses are more likely to engage with them and as such support improved social and environmental conditions.

7. Costs

7.1 Costs for the entirety of the provisions in the Police and Justice Act 2006 – including those for CDRPs - were covered in a previous RIA for that Bill. However, a specific undertaking was given to produce a further RIA for the introduction of these regulations. In introducing these regulations, the intention is not to increase bureaucracy or to be overly prescriptive about how CDRPs should exercise their duties. Rather, we are recognising and formalising the good work that many partnerships are already doing and placing a duty on those CDRPs who do not meet the standards to re-engineer their processes to drive delivery.

7.2 Furthermore, because the national standards define the minimum expectations of partnerships, compliance with them should be a straightforward process for the majority of CDRPs. Where CDRPs are not approaching the delivery of their business in such a way, then it is questionable if they are operating effectively or using their resources in a cost effective manner. The repeal of previous requirements on CDRPs should also offset any concern amongst CDRPs that the new provisions add to their work.

7.3 However, it is difficult to make assertions of actual costs of implementation of these new requirements. CDRPs are not corporate entities or funded organisations as such. They receive funding from the Home Office through the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) to tackle crime, drugs and anti-social behaviour, with further funding for specific issues, such as the Drugs Intervention Programme or criminal damage. Clearly they also help to brigade resources from partner organisations (such as the police) to conduct their work. These minimum standards put CDRPs in a better position to work effectively within an evolving delivery landscape. The regulations have been developed in consultation with Communities and Local Government and various key local government stakeholders with the express aim of ensuring that any new requirements complimented what partners would be delivering under Local Government White Paper for England

7.4 To ascertain whether our assumptions that the new minimum standards would not involve additional cost, we have conducted an exercise with a cross-section of CDRPs to test whether this was correct. We have sought information on the costs of introducing these changes in five 'average' CDRPs (those have been performing consistently over a period of a 12 month period and performing in line with their most similar partnerships). The five CDRPs chosen are two-tier district (urban and rural), an urban unitary authority, a London authority and a merged partnership. As such, they provide a broad view of the costs of meeting the new requirements. During telephone interviews conducted in February-June 2007, and lasting up to one hour each, they were taken through the new requirements and asked if these presented any new costs or might require a realignment of existing costs. In addition, a CDRP in Wales was consulted regarding the information sharing requirements in case of particular differences in Wales. The results are shown below.

Table 2 CDRPs responses regarding the costs of implementing the new requirements:

	Strategy Group	Partnership plan	Intelligence led processes	County wide co-ordination	Information sharing protocol and new duty to share certain datasets	Community Engagement
CDRP 1 unitary	No additional cost as process already in place	No additional cost as already meeting needs through current funding	No new costs as already have intelligence led business processes	n/a	No new costs , as already have protocol in place No New Costs for provisions to strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of datasets.	No new costs , as already have many different approaches to engaging community
CDRP 2 merged	No impact on costs , as strategy group in place	No new costs , already change plan on a yearly basis	No new costs as already have intelligence led business processes	No new costs , already member of countywide community safety group	No new costs , as protocol in place and other requirements can be met from existing resources. No New Costs for provisions to strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of datasets.	Some additional costs for delivering Face the People sessions, but other approaches already in place
CDRP 3 two tier rural	No impact on costs , reflects current structure	No new costs , already carrying out some of new requirements, plan reviewed annually	No new costs , any new requirements met through current spend	No new costs , already member of countywide community safety advisory group	No new costs expected, any new duties subsumed into existing posts. No New Costs for provisions to	No new costs . Already programme of community engagement in place

					strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of datasets.	
CDRP 4 two tier urban	No impact on current costs	No new costs , formalises what already doing	No new costs meeting requirements through current funding	None , as Local Area Agreement structure facilitates this	No impact as have one in place, may be costs with designated liaison officer. No New Costs for provisions to strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of datasets.	No new costs , as currently use many different engagement methods
CDRP 5 London	No impact on costs.	None as although some of the requirements are new it is something that can be absorbed into current work.	None as needs will be met through current funding.	n/a	No cost expected - The nomination of a DLO was not expected to incur additional costs and would be subsumed within existing posts. No New Costs for provisions to strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of dataset.	No significant additional costs as anything new will mainly incur a time resource cost for those members talking part.
CDRP 6 Wales					No New Costs for	

					provisions to strengthen information sharing as already have access to the majority of dataset.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

7.5 The CDRPs interviewed viewed the new requirements as being revised versions of their current and planned processes. The cost of introducing the new requirements would be the same as the costs they incurred in the way in which they approached their work currently. In many instances, they saw that the new requirements would align with what was asked of them as part of their work on Local Area Agreements. The exception to this was one CDRP who believed that there might be some potential costs in introducing *face the people* meetings. In further discussion, this is likely to be aligned with costs incurred as part of the increased requirements to consult their communities as part of the proposals in the Local Government White Paper and Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill.

7.6 The CDRPs sampled for this exercise also highlighted that they believed that the provisions devised to strengthen the information sharing between partners would support more effective working within the CDRP. The CDRPs sampled reported that they accessed the majority of the information outlined in the minimum datasets, and many reported that they collected more detailed information than was specified within the data sharing provisions. The biggest challenge currently facing information sharing provisions was accessing information from health partners. The CDRP members also reported that they felt that strengthened information sharing provisions would increase awareness amongst all partners of the importance of intelligence in supporting delivery.

7.7 This is re-enforced by the repeal of the previous requirements for CDRPs to conduct audits and strategies, which will release resources previously committed to those activities. This became an increasingly burdensome and resource intensive task to produce documents that became outdated rapidly. The costs involved in producing them were not justified by the impact that they had on improving effectiveness. Repealing the requirement to produce an annual report to the Home Secretary will also save costs for CDRPs, as again this was not a cost that supported effective delivery. By introducing less burdensome processes that reflect the actual operational delivery of CDRP business, as undertaken by the majority, we introduce no new costs. The alignment with requirements undertaken as part of the delivery of Local Area Agreements also means that there are no new costs associated with the implementation of national standards. The conclusion that we have drawn from this work is that the combination of repealing existing provisions and introducing others should not introduce new costs for CDRPs.

8. Communities and Local Government New Burdens Assessment

8.1 CLG had expressed concern that the introduction of national standards, particularly on community engagement, would introduce new costs and burdens on local authorities. They requested that we complete a New Burdens assessment to reassure them that there were no net additional costs to local authorities.

8.2 We emphasised that the regulations require partnerships to consult their communities on crime and disorder issues and their prioritisation and stress that, in arranging to do so, the

responsible authorities should take advantage of other consultation events already in place. This will include public meetings held by local councils and consultation meetings held by police authorities. Clearly, staff and member time would be required to ensure proper preparation for and management of the public events. Given the experience of those areas already adopting this approach, it is entirely reasonable to expect that reallocation and reprioritisation of existing resources will mean that no new burdens will be imposed because of the introduction of these regulations. That being so, requiring face-to-face contact between authorities and their communities is not a new burden either in financial or policy terms and there is no need for local authorities to incur additional costs to meet the requirements in our regulations. Further, the proposals in the local government white paper, *Strong and prosperous communities*, and the subsequent provisions included in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill similarly require councils to consult their communities, for example when conducting community governance reviews (c.95) and again emphasise that existing arrangements could be used. These two approaches are consistent with each other and both intended to avoid imposing any new burdens.

8.3 The minimum standards are already being met by many CDRPs. Indeed, the strong performers often exceed these minimum standards. The work undertaken by the Home Office with poor performers has shown that applying the framework provided by minimum standards, across the board and not just on community engagement, helps them to improve and can be done at no additional cost. This is made possible by reallocation and reprioritisation of existing resources, both financial and human, to achieve the greatest benefit and to make the most imaginative use of the funding that has already been set aside for public consultation and engagement. Indeed, the early adopters of the *face the people* approach within the Respect programme have done just this and, again, achieved the benefits sought without incurring extra cost. It is reasonable to expect that this will be the case for all CDRPs when the regulations come into effect.

8.4 CLG are content with our approach and agreed that the national standards can be met with no additional costs

9. Equality and Fairness

9.1 The response of CDRPs/CSPs to crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse varies across England and Wales. By introducing these regulations, the national standards and the accompanying guidance, we will support a greater equality of service provision in relation to community safety issues that will enable people living in all communities to benefit from the improved effectiveness of partnerships.

9.2 Equality and fairness form also an important aspect of the aims behind national standards. Community engagement has been an area on which many CDRPs have sought further guidance, although there is good work done in many areas. The importance of equality and fairness is recognised and promoted through the inclusion of Community Engagement as a national standard. CDRPs will be expected to consult and engage their communities on a regular basis and to reflect their priorities in their strategic assessment and delivery plans. This is further supported by the emphasis on community consultation and engagement that runs throughout the national standards, which will be further emphasised in the guidance, and will ensure that CDRPs consider the needs of diverse groups living in the areas that they support. In guidance, it will be emphasised that this consultation should include the 'hard to reach' and 'hard to hear' groups. Additionally, CDRPs will have a duty to target their consultation to those who are most

affected by the priorities identified through the strategic assessment, for example young people. Furthermore, the introduction of the duty to share information will enable partnerships to develop a better understanding of the issues affecting their communities and support more effective responses to community concerns.

10. Consultation with small business: the Small Firms' Impact Test

10.1 A Small Firms' Impact Test is not required as the provisions relate purely to service delivery provided by public sector agencies to tackle crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

11. Competition Assessment

11.1 A Competition Assessment is not required in this RIA because the proposal impacts only on the public services.

12. Enforcement and Sanctions

12.1 There are no sanctions for non-compliance.

13. Monitoring and Review

13.1 Much of the current formal monitoring and review of CDRPs centres on performance data and their performance in reducing crime. Government Offices for the Regions have the lead role in supporting CDRP performance and in supporting improvements in that performance. They, on behalf of the Home Office, currently review CDRP performance in reducing crime and in supporting delivery of Home Office policies. There are regular meetings between Home Office and Government Offices for the Regions to discuss and review performance issues and these are informed by the regular contact between the Government Offices for the Regions and CDRPs.

13.2 This role will continue through their monitoring of CDRP performance against the national standards. There is also a specific programme of work undertaken by the Home Office and Government Offices for the Regions to improve the capacity and capability of CDRPs and this will support the implementation of the national standards.

13.3 Future monitoring and review of CDRP performance in reducing crime will be contained within the new single performance framework for crime, drugs and policing. This single framework – operating under the working title of Assessments of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) - is a single cross-cutting assessment framework for crime reduction and community safety that the Home Office is developing in consultation with key stakeholders. The first assessments based on the new framework will be in 2009 and this timescale will ensure that the system aligns with proposals in the Local Government White Paper for England and the new Public Service Agreements coming out of the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review.

13.4 In addition to the quantitative information about crime at partnership level, APACS could also include details of CDRP performance against national standards. The inclusion of performance against national standards in the published assessments offers an opportunity to introduce a shared and transparent monitoring and reviewing regime.

14. Summary of Costs and Benefits and Recommendations

14.1 The Government's proposed approach is Option 1, which is to legislate to introduce minimum standards for CDRPs supported by guidance that helps partners to achieve those standards. This approach enables the Home Office to set out clear expectations of CDRPs as they deliver safer communities, whilst avoiding the prescription that would increase burdens and bureaucracy that would follow from too much detail in the regulations. Work done to clarify the costs of implementing Option 1 shows that, although it is difficult to quantify accurately the costs of implementing these measures, CDRPs should be able to meet the new requirements through existing means and in the saving they make through the repeal of the previous requirements.

14.2 There has been significant stakeholder involvement in the CDA review and the development of these national standards. Failing to introduce regulations and national standards may be seen as renegeing on previous commitments to respond to stakeholder needs. Furthermore, it would place greater burdens on CDRPs as they sought to respond to community and government expectations with no clear idea of what is an acceptable and consistent level of performance. For these reasons, Options 2, 3 and 4 are not seen as acceptable options.