

REQUEST FOR DMPC DECISION – PCD 421

Title: London Crime Prevention Fund – 2019/20 – 2020-2021

Executive Summary:

MOPAC has powers under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to award crime and disorder reduction grants. The London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) was established in 2013, bringing together a number of funding streams that had existed before MOPAC was set up. The fund ran from 2013/14 to 2016/17 in line with the Police and Crime Plan (DMPCD 2013/96). These arrangements ended on March 2017.

In 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime made a commitment to sustain the LCPF budget at £72m for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21), despite cuts to the overall policing budget (DMPCD 2016/79). This was set out in the Police and Crime Plan which came into effect in April 2017. It was outlined in that decision that a further DMPC decision would be made in 2018/19 to finalise the allocations for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

This report recommends that the overall budget for direct borough funding be increased to £26,210,370 for the two years 2019/20 and 2020/21, with the specific funding allocations to each of the 32 boroughs reprofiled within this total. This is an increase of £1,118,248.

The crime landscape in London has changed recently, with a particular increase in violence and youth offending. It is imperative that funds are allocated to those areas with the greatest need and demand, whilst not destabilising local services which are tackling these priority issues.

As such, this report recommends that all increases in allocation as a result of updating the funding formula be accepted. This will ensure that funding is being directed to those areas in most need according to the data. It also recommends that all reductions be removed, as compared to the previous funding formula allocations (in 2018/19), so that no borough sees a reduction in anticipated funding.

This report also outlines the future of the co-commissioning fund. A separate decision will be made regarding the use of the remaining co-commissioning fund.

Recommendation:

The DMPC is requested to:

- Approve the revised funding formula, having had regard to and taking into account, the Consultation Report (Appendix C).
- Approve the direct borough funding allocations for 2019/20-2020/21 as set out in APPENDIX A.

- Commit this direct borough funding, by way of a grant agreement with each borough, for a two year period (2019/20-20/21), affording boroughs the flexibility to apportion spend over that two year period.
- Protect against funding allocation reductions across both financial years, when compared to the indicative allocations of 2018/19. Maintain all increases in allocation according to the updated funding formula.
- Approve the additional funding of £1,118,248 to be vired from the remaining co-commissioning fund budget.
- To concentrate the remaining co-commissioning funding of £3,381,752 on tackling violence in London, in collaboration with Local Authorities.

Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

I confirm I have considered whether or not I have any personal or prejudicial interest in this matter and take the proposed decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct. Any such interests are recorded below.

The above request has my approval.

Signature

Spivey Under

Date

18/10/2018

PART I – NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE TO THE DMPC

Decision required – supporting report

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 The London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) was established in 2013, bringing together a number of funding streams that had existed before MOPAC was set up. The fund ran from 2013/14 to 2016/17 in line with the Police and Crime Plan (DMPCD 2013/96). These arrangements ended on March 2017.
- 1.2 In 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime made a commitment to sustain the LCPF budget at £72m for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21), despite cuts to the overall policing budget, and to commit the direct borough funding for 2 two-year periods (2017/18-18/19 and 2019/20-20/21), affording boroughs the flexibility to apportion spend over a two year period (DMPCD 2016/79). This was set out in the Police and Crime Plan which came into effect in April 2017. It was outlined in that decision that a further DMPC decision would be made in 2018/19 to finalise the allocations for 2019/20 and 2020/21, based on a review of the formula to reflect need and demand.
- 1.3 This decision also apportioned the LCPF budget between direct borough funding (70%) and funding for co-commissioned services (30%) starting in year 2 of the fund, from 2018/19 to 2020/21. Boroughs are core partners in the development and use of the new co-commissioning funding pot.
- 1.4 In addition, it was decided to uplift funding for those boroughs which were previously allocated less than their share of the LCPF budget in year one (according to an assessment of current levels of need and demand in the first two years of the fund) then redistribute funding based entirely on a need and demand formula for the remaining three years of the fund.
- 1.5 Following the previous decision, boroughs were informed that their 2018/19 allocation should be treated as an indicative figure for funding in 2019/20 and 2020/21. The additional dampening made available in the first year was intended to assist boroughs to manage the change to this new approach over two years.
- 1.6 As outlined in the 2016 decision, the funding formula has now been reviewed and allocations for the next two financial years are recommended in this report.

Funding formula review

- 1.7 A new formula for the allocation of direct borough funding was introduced in 2017/18, the first of the four years of this fund. This ensures that changes in demographics, crime patterns and more broadly need/vulnerability are better reflected in the level of local funding provided by MOPAC.

- 1.8 The previous decision committed to a refreshed calculation of the borough funding formula to be reviewed in 2018/19.
- 1.9 In consultation with boroughs and London Councils, it was decided that the data should be refreshed (the most recent data available at the start of consultation ran up to May 2018), and that the indicators should be amended to better align with the Police and Crime Plan commitments. The indicators and data used for the proposed funding allocations can be found in APPENDIX B, and the list of the proposed new indicators compared to previous indicators can be found in APPENDIX C.

Protection against reductions

- 1.10 The refreshing of data and amendments to indicators used in the funding formula has generated some significant changes to borough allocations. Although dampening was provided in the first year of the fund, to allow boroughs to manage the change to the need and demand formula, it has been made clear through consultation that there is concern among boroughs for those facing further reductions.
- 1.11 The crime landscape in London has also changed recently, with a particular increase in violence and youth offending. It is imperative that funds are allocated to those areas with the greatest need and demand, but it is recognised that there is an overall increase in need and demand across London. This is therefore not the right time to apply the need and demand formula in a way which results in some boroughs facing a reduction.
- 1.12 As such, all increases in allocation as a result of updating the funding formula will be maintained. This ensures that funding is being directed to those areas in most need according to the data. All reductions however will be removed, as compared to the previous funding formula allocations (in 2018/19). This will ensure that boroughs are not presented with unexpected budget reductions.
- 1.13 This reduction protection will cost an additional £1,118,248 and this will be taken from the remaining budget for the co-commissioning fund. A table outlining the effect of this reduction protection on boroughs can be found in APPENDIX C.
- 1.14 The Police and Crime Plan states that *“A portion of LCPF budget – 30 percent from 2018/19 onwards – will form a separate pot of funding intended to support the co-commissioning of services across boroughs.”* The use of a part of this funding for reduction protection in direct borough funding reduces the current percentage by approximately 2%. It is recommended that the DMPC, having had regard to the Police and Crime Plan, makes this minor departure from this commitment for the following reasons:
- 1.14.1 The budget and priorities for Tranche 2 of the co-commissioning fund have not yet been addressed, so this does not undo a previous decision.
 - 1.14.2 This is a very small budgetary change which does not impact on the overall strategic commitment to provide opportunities for co-commissioning in London

- 1.14.3 The majority of the co-commissioning fund budget has already been granted for delivery which began in 2018/19. The remaining budget was already a much smaller pot to bid into.
- 1.14.4 The use of funding for reduction protection will help to ensure that crucial local crime prevention projects are not destabilised by reductions to borough allocations.
- 1.14.5 This reduction protection will in turn better enable the LCPF to continue to provide support for victims of domestic and sexual violence, prevention and early intervention and the rehabilitation of offenders within the community, as laid out in the Police and Crime Plan, as well as tackling youth offending and violence.

Two-year commitment on funding

- 1.15 As in the previous decision, this funding is committed, by way of a grant agreement with each borough, to a two-year period, 2019/20-2020/21. This offers local authorities greater flexibility in utilising their budget over that period, including the ability to request a carry-over of underspend from the first to the second year of the fund. It is not possible for any underspend from 2018/19 to be carried over into this second two-year period.

Monitoring and evaluation

- 1.16 The responsibility for each projects' evidence base and review sits with the Local Authority. MOPAC requests an evidence base to justify the 2 year profiling of the spend, before a grant agreement is arranged. On an annual basis, MOPAC requests a breakdown of all projects' performance data, as well as quarterly spend information to allow for payment in arrears.

Co-commissioning fund

- 1.17 The LCPF budget has been split between direct borough funding and funding for co-commissioning services over the course of 2018/19 to 2020/21. Splitting the budget in this way acknowledged the important role this funding now plays in supporting local community safety and prevention services while also recognising that some London challenges relating to future Police and Crime Plan priorities can be better addressed through either regional or sub-regional commissioning arrangements.
- 1.18 The framework for the use of the co-commissioning fund was developed in consultation with London Councils, boroughs, and wider partners under the leadership of the London Crime Reduction Board in 2017/2018. The fund was split into two tranches.
- 1.19 Tranche 1 of the co-commissioning fund (CCF) had a budget of £10.2m and was eligible for proposals focused on four priorities: Child Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Violence, Female Offending and Youth Offending. Five projects were funded and have started delivery (DMPCD 2018/310).

- 1.20 The cost of the reduction protection for the direct borough allocations will be funded from the remaining CCF budget.
- 1.21 Due to recent increases in violence in London, and through consultation on LCPF (see 2.2), the remaining budget will be reallocated to tackle violence by adding to the commissioning budget for the Violence Reduction Unit. Further discussions will take place and a secondary decision made as to how this funding will be utilised.

Next Steps

- 1.22 If the Deputy Mayor approves the recommendations, MOPAC will inform borough Leaders, Chief Executives, and Heads of Community Safety of their borough allocation, the indicators under the new funding formula as it relates to their borough, and an explanation of the process for providing information to MOPAC on the proposed uses of their funding. MOPAC will hold a meeting for local Heads of Community Safety to support them in putting forward proposals to use the funding.
- 1.23 Once project proposals are agreed, grant agreements will be drawn up for each borough, outlining planned spend and objectives for the next two financial years.

2. Issues for consideration

- 2.1. Links to Police and Crime Plan and MOPAC priorities:
- The previous decision on the future of the LCPF was made prior to the publication of the Police and Crime Plan because local authorities required an early decision to safeguard the interests of service users and allow enough time to effectively commission/de-commission services.
 - The Police and Crime Plan provides a performance framework by which local commissioned services can be measured.
 - The updated indicators in the funding formula reflect the Police and Crime plan priorities more closely than those used previously.
- 2.2. Consultation:
- This consultation took the form of three meetings with the Deputy Mayor, invitations for which were managed by London Councils and went out to political leaders. This followed on from attendance at the co-commissioning fund working group. Presentations, notes and data were circulated to invitees following each meeting. A written consultation was also undertaken, with an explanatory paper and invitation to respond being sent to leaders in all boroughs.
 - This consultation was undertaken regarding the refreshing of the funding formula and consultation was also undertaken regarding the use of Tranche 2 co-commissioning funding. The decision has already been made to allocate funds to boroughs based on the funding formula for 2019/20 and 2020/21.
 - All boroughs are affected by this decision as it pertains to direct funding, and all were provided the opportunity to feed into the consultation. All feedback from this written consultation was shared in full with attendees to the final consultation

meeting, and was also read, collated and discussed by MOPAC and the Deputy Mayor. A consultation report which pulls out common feedback themes and responses and recommendations has been appended. See Appendix C.

2.3. Impact assessments/ implications:

- Equality considerations are set out in section 6 below. In submitting their proposals for spending their borough allocation, each Local Authority is required to have due regard to the public sector equality duty, and set this out in the proposal.

3. Financial Comments

- 3.1. This decision paper will commit MOPAC to providing £26,210,370 to Local Authorities over the course of 2019/20 and 2020/21.
- 3.2. Through the reallocation of some of the remaining co-commissioning fund, this cost can be met from within the current LCPF budget.

4. Legal Comments

- 4.1. MOPAC's general powers are set out in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 (the 2011 Act). Section 3 (6) of the 2011 Act provides that MOPAC must "secure the maintenance of the metropolitan police service and secure that the metropolitan police service is efficient and effective." Under Schedule 3, paragraph 7 (1) MOPAC has incidental powers to "do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the exercise of the functions of the Office." Paragraph 7 (2) (a) provides that this includes entering into contracts and other agreements.
- 4.2. Section 143 (1) (b) of the Anti-Social, Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 provides for MOPAC to provide or commission services "intended by the local policing body to victims or witnesses of or other persons affected by, offences and anti-social behaviour." Section 143 (3) specifically allows MOPAC to make grants in connection with such arrangements and any grant may be made subject to any conditions that MOPAC thinks appropriate. As the proposals in this decision form are about supporting victims, they fall within the parameters of the legislation.
- 4.3. Section 8 (3) of the 2011 Act provides that MOPAC must, in exercising its functions, have regard to the Police and Crime Plan issued by the Office. Paragraph 1.14 of the report sets out the relevant sections of the Police and Crime Plan, and also why it is recommended that the Deputy Mayor, having had regard to the Plan, departs from it for the reasons provided.
- 4.4. Under MOPAC's Scheme of Consent and Delegation the strategy for grant giving, the award of individual grants, all offers made and the award of grant funding are for the DMPC. The decisions in this report can be approved by the DMPC.
- 4.5. Officers must ensure the Financial Regulations and Contract Regulations are complied with.

- 4.6. Officers should ensure that the funding agreements are put in place with and executed by MOPAC and each of the boroughs before any commitment to fund is made.

5. GDPR and Data Privacy

- 5.1. Through the management of this fund, MOPAC does not process, use or receive any personally identifiable information for members of the public and therefore there are no GDPR compliance issues in this regard.
- 5.2. MOPAC does receive, process and use personally identifiable information for professional contacts in each borough. This is required for the management of the fund and is processed under the lawful basis of public task, in the exercise of our official authority as laid out in section 4.1 above.
- 5.3. All providers funded by MOPAC are required to comply with the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018. MOPAC grant agreements require providers to demonstrate that
- They have undertaken a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) to identify, minimise and reduce risks to data subjects;
 - They have met GDPR obligations to ensure the security of processing and will notify MOPAC of any data breaches as soon as they are identified;
 - Staff processing personally identifiable information are subject to duty of confidentiality and have taken appropriate measures to ensure the security of data held;
 - Data subjects who wish to utilise the Subject Access Request to data held in relation to the fund are able to do so;
 - They have a documented process in place for Subject Access Requests outlining how requests from data subjects will be managed;
 - They will submit to audits and inspections and provide MOPAC with whatever information is needed to ensure that they are meeting their Article 28 obligations; and finally,
 - They will immediately inform MOPAC if they are asked to do something which will infringe GDPR or other data protection laws of the EU or a member state.

6. Equality Comments

- 6.1. MOPAC is required to comply with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This requires MOPAC to have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010
 - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and

- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The relevant protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. Public authorities also need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination only against someone because of their marriage or civil partnership status.

- 6.2. The Police and Crime Plan 2017-21 Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) takes into account feedback from the public and stakeholders and makes an assessment of its impact on a number of objectives including Crime, Safety and Security, Equality and Inclusion and Social Integration. It was assessed whether the proposed priorities within the Plan would have any negative impact on any protected characteristics. In conducting the assessment, and in line with the intentions of the Plan, the potential impact has been assessed as positive across all objectives.
- 6.3. It is proposed that the indicators used in the funding formula are changed to align more closely with the priorities in the Police and Crime Plan, as the original formula was created when this Plan was still in development. The intention is that by making this closer alignment with the Plan, the potential impact for the direct borough funding will be positive across all objectives, as has been assessed in the IIA.
- 6.4. The proposed indicators are set out in Appendix B. The first four indicators are deprivation factors, which means that funding is directed towards areas where inequality is more prevalent. The most vulnerable people in London are disproportionately more likely to become victims or involved in offending.
- 6.5. The protected characteristics are particularly addressed in the following ways, by the proposed indicators:

Age – Young people are disproportionately affected by violence, both as victims and offenders (Non DA knife crime, CSE, Gun Crime)

Disability – People with disabilities are at higher risk of victimisation, particularly hate crime (ASB, Hate Crime, Repeat Victims)

Gender reassignment – There is a particular risk of hate crime and issues with access to sexual violence and domestic abuse services (DA Offences, Hate Crime, Sexual Offences)

Pregnancy and maternity – The risk of domestic abuse increases with pregnancy (DA Offences, Repeat Victims)

Race, religion or belief – There are issues with hate crime as regards race and religion, and BAME Londoners are more likely to be both victims and suspects of crime (Hate Crime, Prolific Offenders, Non-DA Knife Crime, Repeat Victims, Volume Crimes)

Sex – Tackling violence against women and girls is a key priority in the PCP (DA Offences, Sexual Offences)

Sexual orientation – Non-heterosexual people are at risk of hate crime (ASB, Hate Crime)
- 6.6. The priority areas for the LCPF direct borough funding are drawn from the Police and Crime Plan priorities:

- Neighbourhood policing
 - Children and young people
 - Violence against women and girls
 - Hate crime and extremism
 - Wider criminal justice system
- 6.7. The 'wider criminal justice system' priority ensures that projects do not only have to be focused on the identified priority areas, and as such funding is available to all cohorts where there is specific local need.
- 6.8. The decision to update the indicators aligns these more closely with the Police and Crime Plan priority areas. This helps to ensure that funding is being sent to those areas where there is greatest need and demand for the priority areas above. In order to ensure that the impact of this change on priority cohorts is mitigated, additional funds have been made available to cap reductions.
- 6.9. The use of co-commissioning funding to support tackling violence also links in with the above priorities as the primary cohorts are young offenders and victims of street violence, domestic and sexual abuse.
- 6.10. Due to the wide ranging nature of the bids received, equality considerations for individual projects must be identified at a local level. Boroughs will be reminded of their responsibilities to have due regard to the equality and diversity implications for each of the initiatives they propose. This is included in the project minimum standards, compliance with which is a condition for funding. Each proposal will be reviewed against these standards and MOPAC will not fund bids unless there is confidence that the borough will mitigate any adverse equality implications.
- 6.11. Each borough is required to have due regard to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations between different groups.

7. Background/supporting papers

- 7.1. APPENDIX A – Direct borough funding allocations for 2019/21 and 2020/21
- 7.2. APPENDIX B – Funding formula (indicators and data)
- 7.3. APPENDIX C – Consultation Report

APPENDIX A – Direct borough funding allocations for 2019/21 and 2020/21

	London borough	2019/20 allocation	2020/21 allocation	Combined 2-year allocation
1	Barking and Dagenham	£451,054	£451,054	£902,108
2	Barnet *	£344,004	£344,004	£688,008
3	Bexley	£246,754	£246,754	£493,508
4	Brent *	£511,548	£511,548	£1,023,096
5	Bromley *	£317,140	£317,140	£634,280
6	Camden *	£477,581	£477,581	£955,162
7	Croydon *	£598,258	£598,258	£1,196,516
8	Ealing	£452,937	£452,937	£905,874
9	Enfield *	£491,165	£491,165	£982,330
10	Greenwich *	£476,128	£476,128	£952,256
11	Hackney *	£584,227	£584,227	£1,168,454
12	Hammersmith and Fulham	£357,105	£357,105	£714,210
13	Haringey *	£552,983	£552,983	£1,105,966
14	Harrow *	£200,271	£200,271	£400,542
15	Havering *	£266,367	£266,367	£532,734
16	Hillingdon *	£371,408	£371,408	£742,816
17	Hounslow	£356,218	£356,218	£712,436
18	Islington	£519,048	£519,048	£1,038,096
19	Kensington and Chelsea *	£184,846	£184,846	£369,692
20	Kingston upon Thames	£109,875	£109,875	£219,750
21	Lambeth	£681,996	£681,996	£1,363,992
22	Lewisham	£561,872	£561,872	£1,123,744
23	Merton	£181,957	£181,957	£363,914
24	Newham	£642,368	£642,368	£1,284,736
25	Redbridge *	£350,930	£350,930	£701,860
26	Richmond upon Thames	£76,368	£76,368	£152,736
27	Southwark *	£555,790	£555,790	£1,111,580
28	Sutton	£178,800	£178,800	£357,600
29	Tower Hamlets	£662,986	£662,986	£1,325,972
30	Waltham Forest	£452,197	£452,197	£904,394
31	Wandsworth	£340,074	£340,074	£680,148
32	Westminster *	£550,930	£550,930	£1,101,860
TOTAL		£13,105,185	£13,105,185	£26,210,370

* 2019/20 and 2020/21 allocations are increased, compared with 2018/19 allocations

All other allocations are equal to 2018/19 allocations. There have been no reductions.

APPENDIX B – Funding formula (indicators and data)

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores - Data ranges period April 17 to May 18 unless stated

- Proportion of the working-age population who claim out-of-work benefits (%) (Nov 2016)
- Population density (per hectare) 2018
- Modelled Household mean income estimates 2012/13
- Percentage of pupils who achieved a 9-5 pass in English and Maths (AY 2016/2017)
- DA Offences
- ASB
- Hate Crime
- Sexual Offences
- Prolific Offenders (NPS cohort Oct 2017)
- Non DA Knife Crime (U25s)
- CSE
- Repeat Victims (Aug-Dec 2017)
- Volume Crimes
- Gun Crime

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores – Data ranges period April 17 to May 18 unless stated

Row Labels	Proportion of the working age population who claim out of work benefits (%) (Dec 2016)	Population density (per hectare) 2018	Modelled household mean income estimates 2017/18	Percentage of pupils who achieved a 9-5 pass in English and Maths (AY 2016/2017)	DA Offences	ASB	Male Crime	Sexual Offences	Public Offenders (NPS cohort Oct 2017)	Non DA Knife Crime (U25s)	CSE	Repeat Victims (Aug-Dec 2017)	Volume Crimes	Jan Crime
King and Dagenham	10.2	58.9	£ 34,090.00	43.1	2637	5743	342	507	94	31	45	1446	12904	
Net	6.0	45.8	£ 54,530.00	60.3	2620	8062	771	685	106	44	26	1803	19824	
ley	6.6	41.3	£ 44,430.00	49.9	1851	5005	284	425	62	26	26	1156	10747	
nt	7.8	77.9	£ 39,630.00	49.8	2994	9632	732	707	106	82	41	2092	21765	
mley	6.0	32.3	£ 55,140.00	47.6	2597	5911	443	555	53	47	44	1546	16023	
den	8.2	115.9	£ 67,990.00	48.3	2049	10716	818	781	85	97	27	2167	31129	
don	6.3	45.2	£ 45,120.00	40.6	3888	9022	666	950	187	102	59	2216	21588	
ng	7.5	63.2	£ 45,690.00	50.7	3163	10478	773	632	89	63	37	1996	20120	
ield	8.8	41.8	£ 41,250.00	42.6	2993	9079	452	637	106	104	47	1726	18015	
enwich	9.1	60.5	£ 44,370.00	41.6	3477	6681	549	724	77	78	39	1987	18011	
oney	10.2	147.9	£ 42,690.00	44.7	2733	9279	830	847	152	72	39	2232	23234	
mmersmith and Fulham	7.6	112.2	£ 62,910.00	52.9	1707	6280	573	420	71	35	23	1412	19925	
ingey	9.1	96.0	£ 45,860.00	43.6	3146	8897	761	716	92	76	41	2349	21963	
row	5.3	50.6	£ 49,060.00	50	1783	4630	345	345	31	52	23	975	10113	
ying	6.8	22.5	£ 44,430.00	46.6	2311	5336	353	473	47	37	25	1403	13775	
gdon	6.2	26.8	£ 44,950.00	45.3	2643	8407	546	564	57	78	45	1701	17092	
inslow	5.1	49.7	£ 44,490.00	46.7	3057	7838	622	535	80	54	20	1833	17706	
gdon	10.1	160.4	£ 54,950.00	43.9	2410	7331	705	675	28	69	14	2008	24190	
ington and Chelsea	6.8	131.4	£ 116,350.00	57.4	1154	5248	540	391	53	46	7	1180	19610	
gton upon Thames	4.6	48.2	£ 56,920.00	61.3	1154	3234	231	315	51	21	12	725	8858	
ibeth	8.2	124.9	£ 48,610.00	39.3	2732	10447	888	925	181	121	44	2276	25841	
atham	9.2	88.3	£ 43,360.00	37.9	3214	7396	521	685	104	81	26	2075	18131	
ton	5.3	55.7	£ 57,160.00	49.2	1525	3838	296	356	14	13	20	841	9913	
atham	7.6	97.6	£ 34,260.00	45.8	3603	8856	673	922	140	104	77	2382	24333	
bridge	5.7	54.2	£ 45,380.00	55.8	2412	6963	490	567	63	62	72	1527	16642	
mond upon Thames	4.1	34.7	£ 76,610.00	57.7	1242	3505	372	372	19	13	16	902	9349	
rdmark	7.7	111.7	£ 48,000.00	47.8	3236	9333	768	877	64	46	33	2255	26073	
ton	4.5	47.3	£ 49,170.00	61.3	1457	3118	290	346	18	17	24	890	9349	
er Hamlets	8.4	160.4	£ 45,720.00	44.3	3092	14535	870	755	81	34	37	2070	24395	
ham Forest	7.8	73.1	£ 39,460.00	41.4	2609	7435	539	584	86	98	25	1579	16234	
idsworth	5.7	94.7	£ 66,220.00	50.6	2475	6595	550	723	47	50	21	1699	18592	
minster	7.3	118.4	£ 80,760.00	59.4	1863	14681	665	1165	53	73	32	2756	46186	

The above table visualises the pre-normalised scores for each borough; this table looks at a number of different measurement types and is not standardised in any way. We can see where boroughs differ but cannot allocate funding using these measures in this format.

LCPF Funding Indicator Scores – Data ranges period April 17 to May 18 unless stated

Postcode	Proportion of the working age population who claim out of work benefits (%)(May 2016)	Prevalence of disability per hectare 2012	Household mean income estimate 2012/13	Percentage of pupils who achieved a 5+ pass in English and Maths (AY 2016/2017)	ANP	State Crime	Sexual Offences	Profile of Offenders (NPS - Observed Oct 2017)	Non DA Value Crime Rates (U25s)	CSI	Repeat Victims (Aug Dec 2017)	Volume Crimes	Car Crime	Min Max Index Score	% Of total funding
Hy and Dagenham	1.0	0.3	1.6	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.5	5.2%	3.2%
Greenwich	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.4	5.6%	2.7%
Y	0.4	0.1	0.9	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	3.6%	1.9%
W	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.9	8.1%	4.1%
Ux	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	5.0%	2.5%
Ux	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.6	0.3	7.5%	3.8%
Ux	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.3	1.0	9.4%	4.8%
Ux	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	6.4%	3.5%
Ux	0.8	0.1	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.6	7.2%	3.9%
Ux	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.2	0.5	7.5%	3.8%
Ux	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.6	9.2%	4.7%
Ux	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.6	4.2%	2.1%
Ux	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.3	1.0	8.7%	4.4%
Ux	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.2	3.1%	1.6%
Ux	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	4.2%	2.1%
Ux	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.3	5.6%	3.0%
Ux	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.1	7.2%	3.6%
Ux	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.4	0.4	7.2%	3.6%
Ux	0.4	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	2.8%	1.5%
Ux	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3%	0.7%
Ux	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.4	1.0	10.2%	5.1%
Ux	0.8	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.2	0.7	8.0%	4.1%
Ux	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	2.7%	1.3%
Ux	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.4	1.0	9.9%	5.0%
Ux	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.4	5.5%	2.8%
Ux	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.4%	0.6%
Ux	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.8	8.0%	4.4%
Ux	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	1.8%	0.9%
Ux	0.7	1.0	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.7	8.5%	4.8%
Ux	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.7	6.8%	3.5%
Ux	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.5	5.3%	2.7%
Ux	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.9	1.0	0.6	8.7%	4.4%

The normalised data table above shows us the max-min scores for each of the indicators by each individual borough. The colour coding allows us to see that each borough retains its high to low value ratio however now each borough receives a normalised score across each indicator. Also note the total index score for each borough alongside the percentage of the total funding the borough will receive according to the formula.

APPENDIX C – Consultation Report

Overview of consultation undertaken on the review of London Crime Prevention Fund need and demand formula, to support allocations of year 3 and 4 of the fund.

Introduction

In 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime made a commitment (DMPCD 2016/79) to sustain the LCPF budget at £72m for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21). A new need and demand formula for the allocation of direct borough funding was introduced in 2017/18, the first of the four years of this fund.

It was also outlined in this decision that a further DMPC decision would be made in 2018/19 to finalise the allocations for 2019/20 and 2020/21, with a review of the funding formula. There was also a decision (DMPCD 2018/310) which outlined the budget for Tranches 1 and 2 of the co-commissioning fund.

Consultation was undertaken regarding the refreshing of the funding formula and the use of Tranche 2 funding. The decision was already made to allocate funds to boroughs based on a new funding formula for 2019/20 and 2020/21, and on the budget for the co-commissioning fund, however the manner of refreshing the formula and the priorities for Tranche 2 remained undecided.

This consultation took the form of three meetings with the Deputy Mayor, invitations for which were managed by London Councils and went out to political leaders. Presentations, notes and data were circulated following each. A written consultation was also undertaken, with an explanatory paper and invitation to respond being sent to leaders in all boroughs.

We received feedback from 20 boroughs. These are: Barking & Dagenham, Bexley, Brent, Croydon, Enfield, Hackney, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Harrow, Hounslow, Islington, Kensington & Chelsea, Kingston, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Redbridge, Richmond, Sutton and Tower Hamlets.

All feedback was shared in full with attendees to the final consultation meeting, and was also read, collated and discussed by MOPAC officers and the DMPC. The DMPC was also provided with all presentations, notes, data, the written consultation and the explanatory paper. This document is intended to pull out common themes and responses and is not an exhaustive list of feedback.

Consultation Feedback

MOPAC posed a series of questions to boroughs (see end), requesting feedback on which set of indicators should be used to refresh the funding formula, whether there were concerns about specific boroughs, and the use of Tranche 2 funding. Set out below are the key themes from the feedback in bold, with responses and recommendations.

1. Data should be refreshed, and indicators updated to align with the Police and Crime Plan (PCP)

Of those boroughs who responded, the following options for indicators were preferred:

- Updating data only: 5
- Updating Indicators to align with PCP framework: 14

Of those who agreed with updating the indicators, 7 were in favour of changing to median income and population projection. 3 were in favour of sticking with the original data measures. Some gave no specified opinion. (See end)

It would appear that there is strong favour for updating the indicators, however opinions on inclusion of projected population and median income are mixed and their inclusion exacerbates the high increases and decreases.

2. Young people and violent crime are insufficiently represented in the indicators

- Young people are reflected within several of the chosen new indicators: Percentage of pupils who achieved a 9-5 pass in English and Maths, Non-Domestic Abuse (DA) Knife Crime (U25s) and Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

3. Data for 'Children who were the subject of a Child Protection Plan' (CPP) should remain

- The CPP data set is a proxy measure for offending and victimisation. It has been replaced by CSE and repeat victimisation in the set of proposed indicators. These are more accurate and can be updated more rapidly. The Non-DA knife crime indicator also covers much of the offending and victimisation which would be addressed through the CPP data set.

Recommendation (1-3) – Update indicators to align with the Police and Crime Plan, do not include additional data sets (projected population and median income).

4. Boroughs should not be penalised for improving the situation for residents in the formula/ this formula encourages poor performance

- The formula is based on both need and demand, and the need indicators are not affected by outcomes but are measures of vulnerability. The range and number of indicators is intended to mitigate the effects on individual measures and provide a broad overview of need and demand.
- Poor performance is not incentivised as all boroughs have targets attached to their agreed spend and must demonstrate performance against these. There are several boroughs who have demonstrated good outcomes from their commissioning over the last two years who are seeing increases in funding from the formula update.

5. Consider capping changes at 0.4% or reduce all changes by half

- These were two similar suggestions, the first of which results in an approximate £20k overspend. However, capping reductions at a level relative to total allocation has been costed and considered.
- The second suggestion could work and would result in no increases/decreases of more than £50k. However, this would not be entirely reflective of the need/demand in boroughs, and would remove funding from those areas where the data is demonstrating there is increased need and demand to be addressed.

Recommendation (4-5) – Remove all reductions to funding, but maintain increases.

6. Possibility of abandoning co-commissioning Tranche 2 and putting the money into the substantive LCPF

- The use of CCF budget to soften direct allocation changes will be considered, but the CCF has been a step forward in terms of commissioning, which the Deputy Mayor is keen to continue.

Recommendation (6) – Utilise some of the remaining CCF funding to remove reductions to the direct borough allocations.

7. Incongruence between the partnership approach to knife crime and the withdrawal of resources from top 10 knife crime boroughs

- At the time of writing, the top ten boroughs for volume of knife crime are:
- Southwark, Haringey, Westminster, Brent, Croydon, Enfield – Seeing increases in allocation
- Tower Hamlets, Islington, Newham, Lambeth – Seeing decreases in allocation (according to funding formula)

8. It would be a good idea to use the Tranche 2 co-commissioning budget to address violence

- This will be seriously considered as violence is a high priority for the Deputy Mayor as well as Local Authorities.

The need to address violence in London came out strongly through the written consultation. This suggestion was then taken to the final consultation meeting, where attendees were in favour of this approach.

Recommendation (7-8) – Utilise the remaining CCF budget to address violence in London. Ensure there are no decreases to local allocations, only increases to reflect increases in need and demand.

Conclusions

Following consultation, the following actions were taken:

9. Reduction protection was costed up to ensure that no boroughs face reductions to allocations.
10. The possibility of funding such reduction protection from the co-commissioning fund budget was discussed.
11. The final proposition was discussed with London Councils on behalf of boroughs.
12. A table was circulated outlining the actual spend in 2018/19 against the 2018/19 allocation and future allocation.

The final recommendation includes the following changes as a result of consultation:

- Funding formula data updated, and indicators aligned with the Police and Crime Plan commitments. Other suggested data sets not included due to exacerbating reductions.
- Reduction protection introduced, so no reductions are seen compared with 2018/19 allocations. This mitigates some concern about the most heavily affected boroughs, including two high knife-crime boroughs seeing reductions from the funding formula.
- Reduction protection will be funded from some of the remaining co-commissioning fund budget.
- Remainder of the co-commissioning fund to be used to address violence.

Questions Posed in Written Consultation

Based on the addition of the projected population and median income, which set of indicators do you want to progress with and why?

Do you have concerns as to how this formula review impacts on specific boroughs, looking particularly to the section above outlining significant increases and reductions? Please note that any changes to allocations would need to come from within the overall funding envelope that was set out within the Decision PCD 79.

Are there any further questions regarding the spreadsheet which highlights all funding from MOPAC, or commissioned services which boroughs benefit from, for 2019/20?

List of old (2017-19) and new (2019-2021) indicators

Indicators remaining the same	Indicators removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of the working-age population who claim out-of-work benefits (%) • Population density (per hectare) –Modelled Household median income estimates • Achievement of 5 or more A*- C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths, • ASB • Non DA Knife Crime (U25s) • Domestic Abuse Offences • Sexual Offences • Prolific Offenders • Hate Crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gang Flagged Offences • Number of youth reoffenders • Children who were the subject of a Child Protection Plan -Rate per 10,000 children aged under 18 years • Number of adult reoffenders • Victim Based Crime <div data-bbox="786 1171 1485 1261">Indicators included</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Sexual Exploitation • Repeat Victims • Volume Crimes (Theft (from MV, shops, person), Non DA VWI, Common Assault, Harassment, Burglary dwelling, Criminal Damage, Robbery person) • Gun Crime

Public access to information

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and will be made available on the MOPAC website following approval.

If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary.

Part 1 Deferral:

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? NO

If yes, for what reason:

Until what date:

Part 2 Confidentiality: Only the facts or advice considered as likely to be exempt from disclosure under the FOIA should be in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

Is there a **Part 2** form – NO

ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION

	<i>Tick to confirm statement (✓)</i>
Financial Advice: The Strategic Finance and Resource Management Team has been consulted on this proposal.	✓
Legal Advice: The TfL legal team has been consulted on the proposal.	✓
Equalities Advice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and diversity issues are covered in the body of the report. The Workforce Development Officer has been consulted on the equalities and diversity issues within this report. 	✓
GDPR and Data Privacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GDPR compliance issues are covered in the body of the report and the GDPR Project Manager has been consulted on the GDPR issues within this report. A DPIA is not required. 	✓
Head of Unit: The Director of Criminal Justice and Commissioning has reviewed the request and is satisfied it is correct and consistent with the MOPAC's plans and priorities.	✓

OFFICER APPROVAL**Chief Executive Officer**

I have been consulted about the proposal and confirm that financial, legal and equalities advice has been taken into account in the preparation of this report. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

Signature

R. Lawrence

Date 18/10/2018