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Summary

This Report considers the Police service in Wales, and in particular, its role and effectiveness in tackling anti-social behaviour.

The Report welcomes initiatives, introduced by the National Assembly for Wales, to place the delivery of Police services in Wales within the broader agenda of social justice and regeneration. It also welcomes the maturing relationship between the Chief Constables in Wales and Welsh Assembly Government Ministers. However, it expresses our concerns about the quality of the relationships between the Home Office and the National Assembly for Wales, and recommends that those relationships be developed in a more structured and systematic way.

The Report concludes that the Welsh forces are currently performing well and welcomes the Policing Performance Assessment Framework, which measures the quality of police services as well as operational delivery. The Committee also welcomes the development of the National Crime Recording Standard as a means of ensuring the quality of data across forces. However, the Report expresses serious concerns about the onerous burden that a multi-faceted performance regime places on the police. Therefore, the Report recommends that the Government consider a more streamlined approach to data collection and performance measurement.

Tackling anti-social behaviour in Wales is a central theme in the Report. It welcomes the legislation introduced by the Government to tackle anti-social behaviour, but recommends that time is now given for that legislation to bed in to the working practices of the police. It further recommends, that the Government establishes a clearer definition of what constitutes anti-social behaviour so that strategies can be better designed to combat that behaviour.

The Report sets out some initial concerns about the low number of ASBOs issued in Wales compared to England. However, it concludes that the low use of ASBOs is a result of a considered and appropriate response to tackling anti-social behaviour in Wales. The Report welcomes the ‘Welsh approach’ which is based on a strategy for staged intervention which uses ASBOs as a measure of last resort. The Report recommends that the Government establishes a measurement for success which better reflect the Welsh approach. It also recommends that clear guidelines be given to magistrates so that ASBOs can be issued quickly, when considered necessary.

The Report welcomes the successes and achievements of Community Safety Partnerships in Wales, particularly in the areas of crime prevention and reassurance. It recommends that the Government develops a sensitive and flexible performance framework to measure and evaluate those successes rather than just quantitative measurements for crime reduction.

The complex nature of funding for Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) presents a significant hindrance to their success. The Report urges the Government to provide a simple and sustainable funding stream for CSPs. It further recommends that the Government promote awareness of the provision for data sharing in the prevention and
tackling of crime under the Data Protection Act, and encourage effective data sharing protocols between statutory agencies in the Partnerships.

The Report makes a number of recommendations for the dissemination of best practice in Wales. It concludes that the All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum is the most appropriate forum for that role and recommends that it be reinstated with appropriate resources.

The Report also welcomes the citizen-focused, neighbourhood approach to policing being developed in Wales. However, it expresses our concerns about the long-term funding of Police Community Support Officers and the current confusion that surrounds their role.
1 Introduction

1. On 22 July 2004 we announced our inquiry into the Police Service, Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour in Wales.¹

2. We decided that it was important to look at this subject because of concerns in Wales that the new powers conferred on the police to tackle anti-social behaviour—and in particular Anti-Social Behaviour Orders—were not being used as effectively as in England. The inquiry was also timely as the Government was preparing the National Policing Plan for 2005 to 2008. That gave us the opportunity to assess policing in Wales against that Plan. The terms of reference for our inquiry were as follows:

   The National Policing Plan and its relevance to Wales;
   Tackling anti-social behaviour and reducing volume crime;
   Combating serious and organized crime;
   The reassurance agenda;
   Community Safety Partnerships;
   The performance of the Welsh police forces (compared to forces in England); and
   The division of powers and the working relationship between the UK Government and the National Assembly for Wales on policing matters.

3. During the course of this inquiry we took oral evidence from the four Chief Constables in Wales, and visited the North Wales, South Wales, and Gwent police force areas. In addition we met with representatives of the police and communities of Dyfed-Powys. We also visited Holland and Belgium, two countries that have been at the forefront of community policing and which have well-established and sophisticated multi-agency solutions to policing anti-social behaviour.

4. In addition to the oral evidence we received from the four Chief Constables, we took evidence from the Police Authorities of Wales, the Welsh Local Criminal Justice Boards, a number of Community Safety Partnerships, Nacro Cymru, Victim Support Wales, Home Office Officials, Welsh Assembly Government Officials and Hazel Blears MP, Minister of State at the Home Office for Crime Reduction, Policing, Community Safety, Counter-Terrorism and Resilience.

5. We also received a large amount of written evidence from individuals and organisations. We thank all who contributed to our inquiry. We are also grateful for the expert advice we received from our advisers Professor Mike Maguire and Professor Michael Levi from Cardiff University and Glynn Alger, retired Superintendent of Surrey police.

¹ See press notice 18 of Session 2003-04
6. Policing remains a non-devolved issue. However, the National Assembly for Wales has an important role to play in this area as it has responsibility for the implementation of crime reduction programmes, anti-social behaviour and combating drugs misuse. It also has powers over the associated services of health, housing and education. The working relationship between the two tiers of government, and the current structure and funding mechanisms are therefore crucial in the successful delivery of police services in Wales, and in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Therefore, we were disappointed that Edwina Hart, Minister for Social Justice and Regeneration, Welsh Assembly Government, did not give oral evidence during this inquiry.
2 The division of powers between the UK Government and the National Assembly for Wales

Background

7. Policing in Wales is a non-devolved matter over which the UK Government retains control of both the policy agenda and the performance regime for the police service in Wales. However, whilst the police forces and authorities are under the direct policy making of the UK Government, the policy agenda in local government and health in Wales, and more recently the fire and rescue services and transport, falls within the remit of the National Assembly for Wales. The National Assembly also has responsibility for community safety, youth justice issues, domestic violence and substance misuse.

National Assembly Initiatives

Community Safety Agenda

8. There are several examples of the impact of the National Assembly on the practical delivery of police services in Wales. The most prominent example is the Community Safety Agenda. The Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) signified its own approach to community safety in its decision to change the name of their Crime Reduction Unit to the Community Safety Unit in 2003. That complemented the change in name of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). That change was not lost on Keri Lewis, Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership who argued that “the nomenclature implies a difference”. In particular, he saw in it a desire by the National Assembly to adopt a more holistic view of community safety than the narrower focus of crime reduction adopted in England. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police emphasised that, “the Welsh Assembly have particularly looked at the reassurance and regeneration aspects and that ties into one part of our work very clearly”. The most striking example of this is the Welsh Assembly Government’s Communities First Programme.

2 Ev 398
3 Ev 324 and 325
4 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are still known as such in England.
5 Q452
6 Q145
Communities First Programme

9. The Welsh Assembly Government’s Communities First programme is a long-term strategy for improving the living conditions and prospects for people in the most disadvantaged communities in Wales. The programme seeks to ensure that the funds and support available from the Welsh Assembly Government and other public sector agencies are targeted at the poorest areas in Wales. 142 areas are included in the programme and comprise the 100 most deprived electoral divisions according to the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (2000 edition), 32 pockets of deprivation below ward level (or sub-wards) and 10 communities of other interest or with imaginative proposals.7

10. Launched in March 2000, Communities First is a long-term programme, which will run for a minimum of ten years.8 In partnership around the country, local people, community and voluntary organisations, the public and private sectors are working to deliver Communities First. By encouraging creativity and risk-taking, the programme seeks to make a long-lasting difference to disadvantaged communities in Wales.9

11. During our inquiry we saw several examples of Communities First funding making a significant difference to the ability of the police to deliver services in Communities First areas. For example, in North Wales Welsh Assembly Government has provided over £270,000 to North Wales police in order to integrate Community Beat Managers into Communities First areas.10 The South Wales force also have dedicated Communities First policing teams, and Welsh Assembly Government funding has enabled them to employ schools officers within these areas.11

Substance Misuse Strategy

12. A further successful example of the Welsh Assembly Government’s input into the delivery of police services in Wales is the impact of its Substance Misuse Strategy.12 The key to this success has been the way in which the objectives of Operation Tarian,13 a police operation to combat drugs crime in South Wales, were linked to the aims of the Welsh Assembly Government’s substance misuse strategy.14 Chief Constable Barbara Wilding told us that the Welsh Assembly Government had contributed towards funding 30 extra police officers working with the educational side of Operation Tarian.15 She also welcomed Welsh Assembly Government funding for extra support for the treatment of drug abuse, also within the context of that operation.16

7 www.communitiesfirst.info/uploaded/Communities%20First%20Programme.doc
8 www.wales.gov.uk/themes/socialdeprivation/content/comfirsthome_e.htm
9 www.communitiesfirst.info/uploaded/Communities%20First%20Programme.doc
10 www.richardcommission.gov.uk/content/template.asp?ID=/content/evidence/written/police/index-e.asp
11 Q309
12 For further detail see: www.wales.gov.uk/subisocialpolicy/content/direct/Substance%20Misuse%20English.pdf
13 See section 5 for further details on Operation Tarian, paras 98 to 102.
14 Q145
15 Q145
16 Q145
13. **We welcome the positive contribution that the Welsh Assembly Government has made to tackling crime and anti-social behaviour in Wales.**

**The Impact of Devolution on Policing in Wales**

14. Several of our witnesses emphasised the positive impact of devolution on the delivery of police services in Wales. In addition to the Welsh Assembly Government’s initiatives, our witnesses from the police also highlighted the level of accessibility, and the quality of relationships, that the Chief Constables in Wales had developed with Assembly Government Ministers. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom of North Wales police declared:

> “One of the enormous benefits that brings is, because Wales is only a small society, I get to see ministers. I know quite a lot of the ministers rather well, we meet each other regularly, we meet the ministers for social justice as a group of chief constables every quarter. We can actually get to see ministers, who have real power and influence within the Government of Wales Act to make a difference”.17

15. Chief Constable Terence Grange agreed that the relationships between the police forces and the National Assembly for Wales were close,18 while Chief Constable Barbara Wilding emphasised the quality of that relationship. She told us,

> “the four Chief Constables regularly meet with the social justice minister and we are listened to and there is a lot of interaction between us. I believe that our professional judgment is valued and I would like to see that replicated in England”.19

16. Chief Constable Mike Tonge of Gwent police also added, that “the people at the Welsh Assembly Government that I speak to tend to understand the issues that pertain to Wales, in a way that is not always the case at the Home Office”.20

17. **We welcome the constructive relationships that have been developed between the four Chief Constables in Wales and the National Assembly for Wales and the positive impact that this has had on the development of policy, and on the delivery of police services in Wales.**

**The Home Office and Devolution**

18. While our police witnesses were pleased with the relationships that they had developed with the Welsh Assembly Government, they were more circumspect about the level of the relationships and communication channels between the Home Office and the National Assembly for Wales. A key post in that relationship is the Home Office Director (HOD) for Wales. There are currently 10 Home Office Directors in the United Kingdom; nine of which are based in the Government Offices for the Regions, and one which is in the National Assembly for Wales. The Home Office Director in Wales acts on behalf of the
Home Secretary in relation to the Home Secretary’s functions in Wales. Several of our witnesses, including Home Office officials and Chief Executives of Community Safety Partnerships stressed the significance of the post, especially in relation to the development of the Community Safety agenda in Wales. Margaret O’Mara, Director of Crime Reduction at the Home Office was keen to emphasise that in addition to delivering the priorities of the Home Secretary in Wales, the Home Office Director in Wales also informed the Home Office of any difference in approach adopted by the Welsh Assembly Government. She told us, that the Director regularly fed back to the Home Office examples of good or better practice in Wales.

19. In order to reflect the evolution of the Community Safety agenda in Wales, we were told that there would soon be a second Welsh Assembly Government post: the Community Safety Director. Margaret O’Mara explained that while the Home Office Regional Director was responsible for regional issues, and the issues that reflect the Home Secretary and his responsibilities, the Community Safety Director in the Welsh Assembly Government would deal with community safety issues which were the responsibility of the Welsh Assembly Government. Both would have responsibilities for aspects of Community Safety Partnerships in Wales, and therefore there would need to be very close liaison between the two.

20. In November 2004, the Home Office told us that the previous incumbent had retired in August of that year, and that the Home Office was “about to advertise for a replacement”. In the intervening period the position was being filled–on a temporary basis–by the Acting Director of the Community Safety Unit at the Welsh Assembly Government. The reason for the delay in finding a permanent replacement was the redefinition of the post in light of the creation of the new Crime Reduction Director in the Welsh Assembly Government. When the Home Office returned to give evidence in February 2005, we found that the post had still not been filled on a permanent basis. The Home Office asserted that “the replacement is being advertised very shortly,” and reiterated the complications in defining that post in the context of the new Welsh Assembly Government post. At the time of writing this report, the post is still being run–albeit ably–on a temporary basis.

21. We recognise that the Home Office Director is a key role in facilitating communication between Wales and Westminster, and subsequently to the effective delivery of police services in Wales. It is therefore unacceptable that the post remains filled on a temporary basis. We recommend that the Home Office rectify this situation at the earliest opportunity.

---

21 Qq292, 293, 579 and 726
22 Q289
23 Q276
24 Q276
25 Q277
26 Q725
27 Q725
22. Anecdotal evidence strongly suggested that the Home Office remained unaware of major relevant developments within Wales, and we found further evidence of this when the Home Office gave evidence to us. Officials cited examples of close working with both the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Department for Education and Skills as proof of an integrated approach to anti-social behaviour in Wales, despite the fact that significant parts of those Departments’ functions had been devolved to the National Assembly. Furthermore, we were surprised that having repeatedly emphasised the closeness of the working relationship between the Home Office and the National Assembly for Wales, that the Director of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit could not recall the Assembly Government Minister’s name. Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, acknowledged that the relationships between Home Office and Welsh Assembly Government officials were not “particularly well developed” and believed that those relations could be improved upon and developed in “a more systematic way”.

23. We are concerned that there remains a low level of awareness and insufficient understanding of the nature and impact of the devolution settlement on police services in Wales within the Home Office. We recommend that the Home Office address this short-fall and develop its relations with the National Assembly for Wales in a more structured and systematic way.

The Devolution of Further Powers to the National Assembly for Wales

24. Whilst most of our witnesses did not express a view as to the desirability of the devolution of further powers to the National Assembly for Wales, those who did were generally in favour. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom thought that policing should be devolved to the National Assembly. He argued that such a development would represent “a significant simplification and a significant improvement” to the current position. Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys stated there was an expectation that one day the Welsh Assembly Government would be “our government”, though he expressed no opinion on the benefits of that expectation.

25. The Police Authorities of Wales also told us that it was broadly of the view that if the powers of the National Assembly for Wales were increased to include policing then there could be advantages for policing in Wales. However, it argued that “extensive and inclusive discussion and consensus” would be required in advance of any decision to devolve powers over policing.

28 Q265
29 Q264
30 Q291
31 Q411
32 Q86
33 Ev 383
26. The Police Authorities of Wales was also concerned about any future relationship between the National Assembly for Wales and agencies that currently operate on an England and Wales basis – for example, the National Crime Squad and the National Criminal Intelligence Service – following any further devolution of powers. It also foresaw potential problems for training, procurement, and the provision of consistent and compatible IT and communication systems in the event of such devolution. However that had not been the experience of devolution in Scotland. Should those issues be adequately resolved, the Police Authorities of Wales believe that further devolution could have the benefit of allowing the National Assembly to better target issues that were specific to Wales.

27. The Home Office stated that it saw no reason for the devolution of further functions in the area of policing, either in terms of primary or secondary legislation. It emphasised that, given the coherence of the criminal justice system and the requirement for consistent delivery of a quality service in England and Wales, the police service in Wales was currently best served by the status quo. In evidence to the Richard Commission, Edwina Hart AM, Minister for Social Justice and Regeneration, stated that “when we look at the priorities in terms of the Home Office and top slicing of police funding for priorities, those priorities are not Welsh priorities in terms of the agenda. They are very much a metropolitan and city agenda”. Unfortunately, we were unable to explore, at first hand, the solutions to those problems with the Assembly Minister.

28. Opinions over further devolution of powers over the police remain divided. In any future consideration of the devolution of those powers, it will be essential to safeguard the present arrangements for force cooperation at the cross-border, national and international levels.

---

34 www.richardcommission.gov.uk/content/template.asp?ID=/content/evidence/written/police/index-e.asp
35 www.richardcommission.gov.uk/content/template.asp?ID=/content/evidence/written/police/index-e.asp
36 Q411 and Q413
37 www.richardcommission.gov.uk/content/template.asp?ID=/content/evidence/written/police/index-e.asp
38 Ev 322
39 Q294
Funding

29. A potential benefit of the devolution of powers over the police could be the opportunity to address the problematic issues over the current funding system for the police in Wales.\textsuperscript{41} The current policing funding formula is calculated for all police authorities in England and Wales. The formula distributes funding to all Authorities on the basis of estimated \textit{relative} need. That need is calculated on the basis of demand in six key areas.\textsuperscript{42} In general, that is achieved by identifying the relevant workload and the social and demographic characteristics of the force area.\textsuperscript{43}

30. Around half of all central Government supported police funding is provided by the Home Office via the police grant. The balance is provided through the local government finance system, through a combination of revenue support grant, non-domestic rates and police authority precepts on the council tax. In all, central Government provides around 80\%, with local authority council tax meeting the remainder. Where there is a shortfall in funding versus planning, the precept element can be increased as long as Government capping levels are not exceeded. Forces can then top-up through various other funding streams.\textsuperscript{44}

31. Whilst Welsh forces have seen a real increase in funding since 1999, compared with English forces they have fallen behind. Malcolm King, Chairman of the North Wales police authority and representing the Police Authorities of Wales, believed that the current funding arrangement was unsatisfactory and was “a clear disadvantage to Wales”.\textsuperscript{45} Chief Constable Mike Tonge of Gwent police pointed out that while Wales had a 3.75\% increase in funding from central government in grant, English Forces received an average 4.86\% increase.\textsuperscript{46} He further expressed concerns about the limitations placed on the Welsh Assembly Government to fund any shortfall.\textsuperscript{47} However, the Government has introduced an additional ‘Welsh Floor’ grant for 2004-2005 to address that imbalance, which has provided an average increase in budget of 8.1\% in Wales compared with an average for England and Wales of 5.7\%.\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{41} Ev 384
  \item \textsuperscript{42} Call management, Crime management, Traffic management, Public order management/Public reassurance, Community policing management and Patrol. Additional weighting is calculated on the basis of four further components: Security related expenditure, Pensions expenditure, Sparsity and Police establishment.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs/afwgl.html
  \item \textsuperscript{44} These include, Crime Fighting Fund, Counter Terrorism, PN8 Special Priority Payments, Basic Command Units, Community Support Officers, Neighbourhood Policing Fund, DNA, Rural, Airwave Grant, Wales floor and Street Crime.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Q339
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Q678
  \item \textsuperscript{47} Q678
  \item \textsuperscript{48} Ev 314 and 315
\end{itemize}
32. Our witnesses from the Welsh police forces aired their concerns about this piecemeal approach to funding. In particular, they were unhappy with having to cope with multiple funding streams and the disproportionate effort required to gain low levels of funding from these budgets. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom of North Wales police told us, “we have a plethora, a surfeit, of short-term funding options, coming out of government”. He added, “we are in a ridiculous situation of having money parcelled out in small chunks on a temporary basis for conflicting priorities. It really is a bit of a mess”.

33. A further concern for the Police Authorities of Wales was the late confirmation of budgets and the lack of long-term funding linked to planning. Paul Wade, Director of Finance, Administration and ICT, South Wales police told us, “I would like to see some more commitment to longer term funding than 12 months. 3 years is difficult to manage, but it is far easier to manipulate 3 year funding than it is 12 month funding. 12 month [funding] is very, very difficult”. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom added that the short-termism in funding made it difficult for his force to deliver. He concluded that “it cannot be beyond the wit of human kind to plan the size of the overall police budget for three or four years into the future rather than leaving us all guessing”.

34. The Government has signalled its intention to simplify the funding streams for 2005-2006, though the details of that simplification remain unclear. Such a development could offer a single stream of funding which could allow police authorities to effectively fund policing in Wales.

35. We agree with the Welsh police forces that the current funding streams are complex and confusing, and represent a hindrance to effective resource planning. We recommend that the Government review those funding streams at the earliest opportunity, with a view to providing long-term simplified and reliable revenue sources for the Welsh police forces.
A National Police Force for Wales?

36. In the White Paper “Building Communities, Beating Crime: A Better Police Service for the 21st century”, the Government announced its intention to review the current configuration of police forces across England and Wales. In it, the Government acknowledged “if we were starting with a blank sheet of paper we would not necessarily end up with the kind of configuration of 43 forces that we have now”. 55 Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police stated that for example, if starting from scratch, the logic was that Gwent would not exist. 56 However, during our inquiry we found strong resistance to a single Welsh police force. Our witnesses strongly argued that the regional differences of the four police forces in Wales could make a single force unworkable. 57 Malcolm King also argued that North Wales police authority would be “adamantly opposed to any amalgamation of police forces that involved North Wales police force”. 58

37. Hazel Blears MP, Minister of State for Crime Reduction, Policing, Community Safety, Counter Terrorism and Resilience, informed us that although she was waiting for the HMIC review on structural change, she was not “interested in huge structural change for its own sake”. 59 Instead, she believed that greater efforts should be placed on encouraging collaboration in the context of efficiency savings. She preferred to concentrate on finding greater efficiencies from within the current structures: “if there are ways in which forces could collaborate in terms of squeezing out some better value for money in bringing services together, then I think that would be a very good thing”. 60 Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, confirmed that approach and added that the review would concentrate on “capability issues which are not being delivered effectively through the current structure”. 61

38. Cross-force collaboration currently exists between the four forces in Wales. The most striking example of that approach was the collaboration between the three southern forces in tackling serious and organized crime, through Operation Tarian. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding told us that in addition to Operation Tarian the forces in Wales were currently looking at the provision of back-room services, “seeing if we can collaborate on back-room services to make us more efficient and effective”. 62 Chief Constable Mike Tonge added “I am really buoyed up by the collaborative approach of the Chief Constables of Wales in terms of how we deal with […] tackling serious and organised crime and terrorism. We have got to do a lot more collaboratively”. 63
39. Chief Constable Mike Tonge added that collaboration between the forces was already evident, and that it had extended beyond cross Force collaboration. He told us the Chief Officers in Wales had established a forum called the Welsh Association of Chief Police Officers (WACPO). WACPO was convened on an all-Wales basis “where we collaborate now with the ambulance service, the military, the fire service”.

Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, stated that the Home Office was aware of WACPO, and the deepening relationship between the four Chief Police Officers in Wales, both individually with their forces and their authorities, and collectively as a group. He added, that this relationship “actually gives them an added authority about the relationship between policy development and the broader social and political landscape”.

40. **While we see no case for the amalgamation of the police forces in Wales, we welcome and encourage cross-force collaboration within Wales (and indeed with forces in England), in order to deliver an effective and efficient police service. Furthermore, we welcome the establishment of the Welsh Association of Chief Police Officers, and congratulate the four Welsh Chief Constables on their commitment and innovation in seeking to provide the best service possible to the people of Wales.**
3 The National Policing Plan

Background

41. The Police Reform Act 2002 set a requirement upon the Government to lay before Parliament by the end of November each year, a National Policing Plan (NPP) for the following three years.67 The NPP would set the strategic direction for policing in England and Wales and establish a performance framework, including any indicators and targets against which a police force’s performance would be measured and compared to similar forces (the Similar Forces Groups).68 The Plan builds on the system of comparative assessment that groups forces across England and Wales with similar sizes and demographic characteristics so that a meaningful comparison could be made across police forces.

42. The first National Policing Plan for 2003-0669 was issued in November 2002.70 It established a single source for the Government’s priorities for policing; policies for the delivery of those priorities; and the performance indicators for measuring progress against those priorities. Furthermore, the 2002 Plan placed the work of the police in the context of the delivery of the Government’s Public Service Agreements (PSAs). The assessment of that performance would be carried out under the Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF).71

43. The second National Policing Plan for 2004-07,72 was published in November 2003. It represented an incremental change in Home Office expectations for police planning. The Plan set a national framework of minimum standards against which policing should be delivered locally.73 It identified strategic priorities alongside a framework for local police planning, in order to “deliver policing to national standards within a dynamic and increasingly engaged local environment”.74 The 2003 Plan also identified the key priorities of: tackling anti-social behaviour, reducing volume crime, combating serious and organized crime and providing a citizen focused service based on the reassurance agenda.75

---

68 Ev 319
69 Referred to in this Report as the 2002 Plan.
71 Ev 308
72 Referred to in this Report as the 2003 Plan.
73 Ev 309
74 National Policing Plan 2004-07, Foreword.
75 The key priorities of the NPP 2004-2007 very much shaped the scope and focus of this inquiry.
44. The current National Policing Plan for 2005-2008,\textsuperscript{76} stated that the “reduction of crime and the provision of a citizen-focused police service should be addressed by all forces and authorities in keeping with the reform proposals set out in \textit{Building Communities, Beating Crime: A better police service for the 21st century}”.\textsuperscript{77} The 2004 Plan placed a greater focus on community policing and civic engagement, and allowed for individual forces and authorities to determine the weight to be given to the national priorities on the basis of local needs. Furthermore, it also provided scope for individual police forces and authorities to add any other priorities which reflected substantial public concern in their area.\textsuperscript{78} The Home Office argued that the 2004 Plan sought to “provide genuine flexibility for the identification of local policing priorities within a national framework”.\textsuperscript{79}

45. The increased importance of local priorities in the 2004 Plan has significantly changed the relevance of the National Policing Plan to Wales. While local priorities have relevance in both Wales and England, there is now a key difference.\textsuperscript{80} The local arrangements for the delivery of strategic priorities have to reflect the local (or Welsh) context. With devolution, that offered a greater opportunity for Welsh Assembly Government involvement in the delivery of the 2004 Plan. As discussed earlier, while, police forces and authorities remain the responsibility of the UK Government, the policy agenda in local government, health, and the fire and rescue services (which are all key in ensuring the successful delivery of police services in Wales) fall within the remit of the Welsh Assembly Government.\textsuperscript{81}

\textbf{National and Local Priorities}

46. Richard Brunstrom, Chief Constable of North Wales police, gave evidence to us prior to the publication of the National Policing Plan 2005-2008.\textsuperscript{82} He told us that while he was happy with the content of the Government’s strategic agenda contained within the 2003 Plan, he aired a note of caution over the emphasis that had been placed on national priorities. He stressed while there was no conflict between the two, the local agenda was as “equally important” as the national agenda.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{76} Referred to in this Report as the 2004 Plan.

\textsuperscript{77} National Policing Plan 2005-2008 : Safer, Stronger Communities, available at:
www.policereform.gov.uk/docs/national_policing_plan.pdf

\textsuperscript{78} National Policing Plan 2005-2008 : Safer, Stronger Communities, available at:
www.policereform.gov.uk/docs/national_policing_plan.pdf

\textsuperscript{79} Ev 309

\textsuperscript{80} Ev 398

\textsuperscript{81} The role of the National Assembly for Wales and the Welsh Assembly Government is discussed in section 2.

\textsuperscript{82} 3 November 2004.
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47. The 2004 Plan has tried to bridge that divide by providing scope for the creation and measurement of local priorities and targets within the National Policing Plan. The Home Office confirmed that the new National Policing Plan had consciously sought to "strike a balance between local and national priorities, by setting a clear framework of national minimum standards and performance assessment, while leaving sufficient flexibility for locally identified priorities to be addressed".84 Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, argued that the 2004 Plan had been refined to move away from "what many observers felt in its first year was a rather top-heavy and over-prescriptive set of requirements on the police service, into one which makes much more explicit the relationship between national standards and local flexibility and local priorities".85 He acknowledged that questions would remain over the ability of forces to deliver local priorities over and above the national priorities,86 but averred that "much more explicit scope" was given for local priorities in the 2004 Plan.87

48. That shift in direction was acknowledged by our police witnesses. Chief Constable Mike Tonge of Gwent police told us that the new Plan "does shift the context somewhat in favour of what the local public will want".88 Malcolm King, the Chairman of North Wales police authority, representing the Police Authorities of Wales, also highlighted that change in tone, and believed that the 2004 Plan had achieved a better balance between national and local targets.89

49. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police welcomed that change. She told us that "we do put resources towards what have been the national priorities. It is a fact, therefore, that we have not always been able to invest the same sort of resource in those issues that have affected local people".90

50. Mike Tonge, Chief Constable of Gwent police believed that the change of emphasis in the current National Policing Plan could result in a more equal distribution of resources to address local and national priorities. He argued that "what gets measured in any organisation tends to get done and performance issues tend to drive activity".91 With that in mind, Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police, hoped that the new National Policing Plan would also expand performance measurements to include customer focus, customer satisfaction and the quality of service, all of which were centred on more locally based concerns and priorities. She believed that such an approach would also necessitate a more even distribution of resources to enable local as well as national targets to be met.92
51. The National Policing Plans have provided police forces in England and Wales with a clear and focused set of priorities and performance targets for the next three years. However the priorities set out in the first two Plans concentrated on national policies for crime reduction. That gave little opportunity for police forces to address local needs and concerns. The current Plan goes some way to redress that imbalance. We welcome the shift in direction in the National Policing Plan for 2005-08 which offers Welsh police forces a greater opportunity to address local priorities for tackling crime in Wales. We look to the Government to ensure that sufficient funds are provided for the police to address both national and local priorities.

**Flexibility in Targets**

52. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding told us that there had been two further improvements to the 2003 Plan. She believed that previous Plans had been quite narrow in their targets and had been focused mainly on burglary, violent crime and auto crimes:

“It was very narrow, very crime focused, which was great if you lived in an area where they were issues, but where perhaps they were not issues, it meant that we were probably putting our resources more towards those issues that were measured [than towards] local concerns”.

53. During the course of our inquiry a commonly cited example of this was the target to reduce domestic burglary. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves, co-chair of Rhondda Cynon Taff Community Safety Partnership, told us that the number of burglaries in Rhondda Cynon Taff were so small, that “if we are being targeted by central government to reduce burglaries still further it could be a disproportionate focus of our resources on to something which would be almost impossible to reduce still further”.

54. That concern appears to have been reflected in the 2004 Plan, and in the subsequent revision of the Public Service Agreements. Hazel Blears MP, Minister of State for Crime Reduction, Policing, Community Safety, Counter Terrorism and Resilience, told us that:

“In the past the kind of targets we set were around specific crime types – you must reduce burglary by so much, you must reduce vehicle crime...If you are in an area, where robbery, for example, is not a big problem...having a specific target for robbery does not really meet your needs. What I have done now in developing the latest set of PSA targets is to say that there will be a target of reducing crime overall by 15%. Within that 15% it is a matter for local negotiation what the make-up is of that 15%.”
55. The second improvement identified by our witnesses was that the 2004 Plan measured a broader range of issues, rather than simply focusing on crime reduction, and thus, more accurately reflected the multi-faceted nature of police work. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding welcomed this: “we are being measured in a number of other domains [which] more reflects a greater range of police work”.

56. We welcome the change in target-setting from a percentage reduction in individual crimes to a broader percentage reduction in total crime levels. We believe that this will assist Welsh police forces to better combat problem crime in their force areas and to better reflect their performance against those targets.

The National Intelligence Model

57. A further tool for identifying targets and priorities in the local context is the National Intelligence Model (NIM). The NIM was launched by the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS) and was adopted by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in 2000. The National Intelligence Model has enabled policy makers and police to understand the nature of crime at force level, regional level and national level. Forces are then able to draw upon that intelligence to set local priorities.

58. The Model also provides a framework for managing intelligence and the activity which flows from it, be it strategy, tasking and co-ordination, working with partners, managing risk or controlling budgets. North Wales police explained that the Model allows for “information to be collected, researched and analysed in a structured way. It offers the opportunity to have an understanding of the ‘big picture’ of local problems [which] means that we can create strategies that will reduce crime and improve the quality of life in our communities”. Furthermore, it added that the National Intelligence Model is linked clearly to the priorities identified in the National Policing Plan 2005-08, therefore it provided North Wales police with “an excellent opportunity to use this tool as an effective way of tackling [our] priorities”.

59. We welcome the introduction of the National Intelligence Model and are pleased to hear of the positive effect that it has had in Wales. We look to the Government to ensure that best practice under the National Intelligence Model is implemented across police forces in Wales.
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97 The 2004-07 National Policing Plan required forces to adopt the National Intelligence Model.
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4 Measuring the Performance of the Police

A Snap-shot of the Performance of the Welsh police forces

Background

60. During our inquiry we received assessments of the performance of the Welsh police forces. On all performance indicators, both the Home Office and Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC) reported to us that “generally speaking, the Welsh forces are in a pretty good state”.\textsuperscript{101} We have set out below, a brief overview of the current performance of the four Welsh police forces.

Dyfed-Powys police force

61. Dyfed-Powys police covers over half the landmass of Wales and is the largest police area within Wales and England. The resident population is 488,298, but that is supplemented by 13 million visitors annually. At the end of March 2004, the Force consisted of 1,172 police officers (excluding probationary constables) and 509 police staff members.\textsuperscript{102}

62. The force headquarters is located in Carmarthen, and there are four Basic Command Units (BCUs) (also known as Divisions) in Carmarthenshire, Powys, Pembrokeshire and Ceredigion. Since the 1st April 2001, each BCU has been coterminous with the council and Community Safety Partnership (CSP).\textsuperscript{103}

63. For the purposes of performance measurement, Dyfed-Powys is included in a Similar Forces Group with Devon and Cornwall, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, North Wales, North Yorkshire and Suffolk.

64. HMIC performance data indicated an increase in target crimes in the financial year 2003/04:

- 41.7% increase in Domestic Burglary
- 14.6% increase in Vehicle Crime
- 35% increase in Robbery.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{101} Informal briefing.
\textsuperscript{102} Ev 171
\textsuperscript{103} Ev 171
\textsuperscript{104} Ev 319
65. Despite those increases, Dyfed-Powys has the lowest rate of crimes per 1000 population in England and Wales. However, the percentage of offences brought to justice in Dyfed-Powys fell by 4.3% and the percentage of offences detected and sanctioned fell by 33.2%.\textsuperscript{105} Increasing compliance with the National Crime Recording Standard has contributed to a large increase in crime numbers and a reduction in detections per crime from the previous year. However, performance on Investigating and Reducing Crime is still considered to be above that of the most similar forces.

66. The Home Office told us that Dyfed-Powys’ performance was better than its peers in all domains except Resource Usage (sickness levels). It also told us that Dyfed-Powys was rated as “excellent” in dealing with Volume Crime, Hate Crime and Community Safety Partnerships, but rated as “poor” in Human Resource Management by the HMIC baseline assessment. In all of its other performance domains Dyfed-Powys was rated as “good” or “fair”.\textsuperscript{106}

\textbf{Gwent police force}

67. The Gwent police force polices over half a million people. The force area includes several Valley towns and communities, and includes the large towns of Monmouth, Caerphilly, Pontypool and Ebbw Vale, as well as the city of Newport. The County Borough Council areas of Caerphilly, Torfaen and Blaenau Gwent fall into the EU Structural Funds, Objective 1 areas. All the wards in Newport County Borough contain areas of economic hardship that qualify for funding under the EU Structural Funds, Objective 2 or other transitional programmes for social and economic regeneration. Newport also has a multi-ethnic population and a vibrant social scene. The force area is policed by 1,375.7 police officers supported by 629.3 police staff. The force headquarters is located in Cwmbran, and there are three Basic Command Units (BCUs) (known locally as Divisions), Newport, Torfaen and Monmouthshire, and Caerphilly and Blaenau Gwent. Each BCU is coterminous with one or more council and Community Safety Partnership.\textsuperscript{107}

68. For the purposes of performance measurement, Gwent is included in the Similar Forces Group with Durham, Hertfordshire, Humberside, Kent, Lancashire, Northamptonshire and South Wales.

69. HMIC performance data shows a mixed picture across the target crimes in the financial year 2003/04:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 6.6% increase in Domestic Burglary
  \item 7.1% increase in Vehicle crime
  \item 16.7% decrease in Robbery.\textsuperscript{108}
\end{itemize}

\begin{footnotes}
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\item[107] www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/gwentbaseline1004.pdf p. 9
\item[108] Ev 320
\end{footnotes}
70. The Home Office told us that in Gwent, the percentage of offences brought to justice rose by 2.7%, while the percentage of offences detected and sanctioned fell by 11.7%. Whilst Gwent’s performance remained higher than that of its peers in Reducing Crime, Investigating Crime and Promoting Public Safety, the Reducing Crime and Investigating Crime domains have seen a decline in performance since 2002/03.\textsuperscript{109}

71. We were also informed that sickness rates for police officers and other staff in 2003/04 were the highest in England and Wales, and had increased from the previous year. However, Gwent was considered ‘excellent’ in dealing with Reassurance by the HMIC baseline assessment. All other performance domains were considered ‘good’ or ‘fair’.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{North Wales police force}

72. North Wales is responsible for policing a resident population of just over 660,000, which increases significantly with an influx of tourists, especially during the summer months. The force contains a large rural area, including the Snowdonia National Park, and conurbations surrounding Wrexham and the ferry port at Holyhead. The Force area is policed by 1555 police officers supported by police staff.\textsuperscript{111}

73. The force headquarters is located in Colwyn Bay, and there are three Basic Command Units (BCUs) (known locally as divisions). Each BCU is coterminous with the local authority and Community Safety Partnership boundaries: the Western Division with Ynys Môn and Gwynedd Councils, the Central Division with Conwy and Denbighshire Councils, and the Eastern Division with Flintshire and Wrexham Councils.\textsuperscript{112}

74. For the purposes of performance measurement, North Wales is included in the Similar Forces Group with Devon & Cornwall, Dyfed-Powys, Gloucestershire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, North Yorkshire and Suffolk.

75. HMIC performance data indicated significant improvements in performance in the current financial year (2003/04), with year on year comparisons showing:

- 23% decrease in Domestic Burglary
- 5.9% decrease in Vehicle crime
- 10.3% decrease in Robbery.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{109} Ev 320  
\textsuperscript{110} Ev 320  
\textsuperscript{111} www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/nwalbaseline0604.pdf p. 9  
\textsuperscript{112} www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/nwalbaseline0604.pdf p. 9  
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76. Home Office figures also indicate that the percentage of offences brought to justice rose by 6.1% and that North Wales was performing better than its Similar Forces in the area of Reducing Crime. While it had an above average reduction in the number of target crimes, performance was slightly below average in the other 5 domains. However, investigating crime figures showed an improvement from the previous year, with an increase in the proportion of offences brought to justice. North Wales was considered ‘excellent’ in dealing with Critical Incident Management, while all other performance domains were considered ‘good’ or ‘fair’.114

**South Wales police force**

77. Whilst South Wales police force area occupies only 10% of the landmass of Wales, it contains 42% (1.3million) of the population, and includes the rapidly expanding cities of Cardiff and Swansea. South Wales police force is the 11th largest police force in Wales and England, with an establishment of 3,313 police officers and 1,715 civilian staff. During 2003/05, South Wales Police dealt with 52% of all 999 calls and 40% of immediate response incidents in Wales.115

78. The force headquarters, and one of seven Basic Command Units are located in Bridgend. The other BCUs are located in Cardiff, Merthyr Tydfil, Neath and Port Talbot, Rhondda Cynon Taff, Swansea and the Vale of Glamorgan. Each BCU is coterminous with at least one council and Community Safety Partnership.

79. For the purposes of performance measurement, South Wales is included in the Similar Forces Group with Avon & Somerset, Durham, Gwent, Humberside, Lancashire, South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire.

80. HMIC performance data indicated improvements in performance in the current financial year (2003/04), with year on year comparisons showing:

- 9.7% decrease in Domestic Burglary
- 11% decrease in Vehicle crime
- 4.2% decrease in Robbery.116

81. The percentage of offences brought to justice rose by 3.1%, and the percentage of offences detected and sanctioned fell by 1.3%. In 2003/04 South Wales performed better than its peers for the domains of Reducing Crime, Investigating Crime, Citizen Focus and Promoting Public Safety, and has seen an improvement in performance from the previous year. Performance on Resource Usage and Providing Assistance was slightly below average, but sickness rates have fallen slightly from the previous year. South Wales was considered ‘excellent’ in dealing with Hate Crime, Professional Standards and Community Safety Partnerships. All other performance domains were graded ‘good’ or ‘fair’.117

---
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Measuring Police Performance

Background

82. The assessment of the Welsh police forces, summarised above, indicates that in the main, they are performing reasonably well. However, the Police are measured under a number different regimes. While the traditional HMIC reports remain a crucial element in considering the performance of the Welsh police forces, the National Policing Plan has also introduced a new performance structure which measures performance over a much wider number of indicators than previous performance frameworks.118 We set out the various performance regimes below.

HMIC Performance Monitoring

83. For over 50 years, Her Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary (HMICs) have been charged with examining and improving the efficiency of the police service in England and Wales. HMIC reports on the efficiency and effectiveness of each force, the extent to which it achieves the best results with the resources available and that those results are the right ones. In carrying out its reports, HMIC takes into consideration: the Government’s Public Service Agreement performance targets for policing; the objectives set locally by Police Authorities; other priorities determined in consultation with the Home Office; and issues determined by HMIs, based on trends identified during the inspection process.119

84. On the 14 June 2004, HMIC published baseline assessment reports for all 43 English and Welsh forces, offering a statement of each force’s relative strengths and weaknesses. As the Audit Commission in Wales told us, the baseline provides a point against which progress can be measured and an early warning of performance deterioration. It is designed as a self-assessment process, with the degree of validation/reality checking undertaken by HMIC increasingly dependent on a force’s performance and the rigour of its internal assessment.120 The HMIC baseline reviews have shown that all Forces in Wales are not performing below their counterparts in England.121

85. The Police Performance Monitoring report for 2003/04, published in September 2004, looked at performance over 6 domains of policing. The report showed that performance in North Wales and South Wales was generally improving, while performance in Gwent and Dyfed-Powys showed an apparent decline. However it did note that in the domains of ‘Reducing Crime’ and ‘Investigating Crime’ both Gwent and Dyfed-Powys remained above the average for comparable forces.122
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119 www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/hmicrole.pdf
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**Policing Performance Assessment Framework**

86. The Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) is an initiative led by the Home Office. In addition to focusing on operational effectiveness, the PPAF provides measures of satisfaction and overall trust and confidence in the police, as well as measures that put performance into context in terms of efficiency and organizational capability. The PPAF is used to help demonstrate success in achieving the five key priorities of the National Policing Plan for 2004-07 and of 2005-08.123

87. The Policing Performance Assessment Framework arose from an acknowledgement that police activity incorporates a huge range of functions, and that comparisons based on crime management alone are misleading. The PPAF incorporates a much wider range of work undertaken by the police.124

88. The 2002 National Policing Plan explained that the Home Office, in partnership with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), the Association of Police Authorities (APA) and other key stakeholders, would develop a balanced performance assessment framework for policing – the ‘Policing Performance Assessment Framework’. The PPAF facilitates the monitoring of policing performance across seven key domains: citizen focus; reducing crime; investigating crime; promoting public safety; providing assistance; resource usage; and local priorities. The Home Office sets Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) for the first six domains and police authorities set indicators for the local domain.125

89. The PPAF was broadly welcomed by the Chief Constables in Wales. Mike Tonge, the Chief Constable of Gwent police asserted, “I think the way performance indicators have gone is they have moved from the quantitative, chunking sort of indicators to more qualitative indicators that reflect what the public want to see from its police service and that will allow, I think, the police service to get back to its basics of being locally based and dealing with local issues and I welcome that”.126
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125 Ev 318
126 Q224
The National Crime Recording Standard

90. The Audit Commission in Wales drew our attention to a further key assessment of police performance; the measurement of the quality of data available to inform decision making on policing matters; to reassure the public on the level of crime; and the success of the various agencies in reducing crime. The National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) was designed in order to improve the quality of crime data that was recorded. The standard was introduced for adoption by all police forces in April 2002. The Standard is victim orientated and requires all police forces to record incidents brought to their attention as a crime. The new system is widely regarded as more stringent than previous systems, and since its introduction most forces who have implemented it have experienced a rise in recorded crime rates.

91. Forces measured are given an NCRS grading; Red indicates some serious problems to be resolved; Amber indicates moderate performance but that further work is needed in key areas; and Green indicates a good or satisfactory level of performance has been achieved and that no further action was required other than to maintain performance.

92. In 2004, North Wales police was assessed overall as Green in both the last two years while the overall assessment for Dyfed-Powys police improved from Red in 2003 to Amber in 2004. Both Gwent Police and South Wales police were assessed overall as Amber for both years. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom told us that hitherto, there had not been an agreed method of measuring the standard of crime recording that was comparable across police force boundaries. He argued that this had “held back the development of policing at Government level and professionally within the service” and was confident that new performance measurements were addressing that problem.

Processing Performance Data

93. A common concern amongst the four Chief Constables in Wales was the number of departments and agencies that required performance data from the police. Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police highlighted this problem. He told us that he provided information to “umpfteen departments in the Home Office”, and averred that one part of the Home Office rarely knew that another part of the Home Office had already requested that information. He also listed the Policing Standards Unit; the Audit Commission; Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary; and the Health and Safety Executive as further bodies that demanded information. In total he believed there to be nine separate bodies to which he had to submit information. Chief Constable Mike Tonge of Gwent police agreed that the provision of information was a heavy burden. He argued that:

---
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“in my previous force we used to provide about a thousand pages of information to the police authority alone, but if you then add to it Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary, the Police Standards Unit, the Home Office and all the other agencies that we deal with then it is a lot of data. Then you couple with that data to our partners whom we work with, which is very important. It is a huge amount of effort.”

94. Barbara Wilding, the Chief Constable of South Wales police highlighted the cost implications of providing that level of information. She estimated that the cost to the force, was £328,000 in “just the people we employ to receive the data and marshal it”. Furthermore she explained that that figure did not include the opportunity costs of those who initially gather the data. She strongly argued that it was an awful lot of the public’s money that is being gathered to fulfil this complete plethora of different ways that people want the same data gathered. If you had one structure that managed everybody’s concerns we would probably be able to release more of the publics money to put into operational policing”.

Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police confirmed that the burden also had an impact on his staffing costs as he had a couple of staff members in his Corporate Services department who “spend virtually all their time gathering this information to pass it on to various governmental departments”.

95. Chief Constable Mike Tonge was concerned that the 2004 Plan had only added to that burden:

“The Government did say last year, actually, the new National Policing Plan will have less targets and monitors in there and they will be more qualitative, but I have to say, having read it, there are even more measures in there and not many have dropped off the agenda.”

He believed that the police were now “over-taxed” in terms of providing data to those departments and agencies. However he saw an opportunity to reduce that burden in the long term though the shift from the quantitative to the qualitative type indicators.

96. During our visits to the forces in Wales, we witnessed, first hand, that this issue was not restricted to headquarters and management staff. Anecdotal evidence from Cardiff indicated that Community Beat Managers now spent a significant part of their time reproducing the same information on separate forms to be fed to separate agencies and into separate databases. This was a common complaint in all the force areas we visited.
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An outline programme for the visit can be found at Annex A.
We agree that the measurement of performance is both necessary and desirable to gauge the success, or otherwise, of the police forces in Wales. However, we share the concerns of the Welsh police forces that the collection of data for the wide number of performance regimes represents an onerous burden. We recommend that the Government look closely at that burden and consider a streamlined approach to data collection that would reduce the impact on the police time.
5 Serious and Organized Crime and Operation Tarian

98. Whilst Serious and Organized Crime was one of the terms of reference for our inquiry, (as it was one of the priorities identified in all of the National Policing Plans), it is very much an issue that is dealt with at the England and Wales level. Therefore, we focused on Operation Tarian, the all-Wales Regional Task Force set up to combat level two or cross border crime in Wales.140

99. Operation Tarian was initially created in 2002 to provide intelligence led, joined up law enforcement by integrating the services of three Welsh police forces, to tackle drugs crime. In addition to Dyfed-Powys, South Wales and Gwent police forces the operation included partnerships with the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS), and the Regional Asset Recovery Team.141 On the 22nd March 2004, Operation Tarian+, based at the South Wales police headquarters in Bridgend, was launched to co-ordinate the response to serious and organised crime in Wales. Tarian+ represented an enhanced version of the original operation and included financial support from the Welsh Assembly Government for the non-enforcement aspects of that operation. It now boasts a unique set up, that not only continues to tackle organised crime groups and Class A drugs, but also targets drug abuse, crime, and those who have accumulated wealth through criminal activity. Tarian+ also includes three additional strands in tackling drugs: families, treatment and education.142 Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, told us that the Home Office strongly supported its “multi-pronged strategy” which was enforcement-oriented, but also took account of education and prevention.143

100. Despite the fact that Operation Tarian had only been fully operational since the 1st January 2004, it has been described as being at “the cutting edge of the fight against organised crime”;144 and has been welcomed as a success. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding told us, “I am able to cite very clearly that Operation Tarian has been highly successful in stopping the spread of gun crime coming into the cities of Wales as a whole, particularly in South Wales. We have not seen the drive-by shootings, we have not seen the activities that Nottingham has seen, Bristol has seen, Birmingham has seen, Manchester has seen, yet we have dealers coming from each of those areas into our area”.145 Furthermore she added that Operation Tarian outstripped each of its targets for both seizures and asset recovery, which she estimated had resulted in 17 less deaths from drugs in the South Wales force area.146

---

140 Force level crime is categorised as Level One crime; cross border (Force) crime categorised as level two crime and national or international crime categorised as level three crime.
141 There was also close cooperation with Avon and Somerset police force.
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101. *Operation Tarian* is an example of successful co-operation between the Home Office and the National Assembly for Wales in delivering police services in Wales, and successfully combines enforcement with education, which is essential in tackling drugs crime.\(^\text{147}\) For example, the Welsh Assembly Government has funded extra police and seconded teachers to the project, and dedicated three years funding for the treatment programme.\(^\text{148}\) However, there is current uncertainty with regard to the future of funding for *Operation Tarian*.\(^\text{149}\) Stephen Rimmer told us that the future of Tarian would have to be considered within the context of the creation of the new Serious and Organized Crime Agency.\(^\text{150}\)

102. We welcome the objectives and achievements of *Operation Tarian* in tackling drugs crime in Wales. We further welcome the joined up approach the UK Government and the Welsh Assembly Government have taken in tackling both the enforcement and prevention aspects of organised crime in Wales. We recommend that the Home Office commits to the long-term funding of *Operation Tarian* in Wales.

---

147 Q 242
148 The funding started in August 2002.
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6 Anti-Social Behaviour

Background

103. In September of 2003, the Home Office undertook a one-day count of anti-social behaviour to obtain a snapshot of reported anti-social behaviour in the UK. Over a single 24-hour period, 66,000 reports of anti-social behaviour were made to participating organisations – police service, fire service and local authorities – in England and Wales.\textsuperscript{151} That was equivalent to approximately 13.5 million reports of anti-social behaviour per year – or one report every two seconds – at a cost to the agencies involved of roughly £13,500 per day or £3.375 billion per year.\textsuperscript{152}

104. In its written evidence, Dyfed-Powys police force estimated that in terms of officer hours, time spent dealing with anti-social behaviour amounted to 22% of total incident-related activity.\textsuperscript{153} The problem of anti-social behaviour was highlighted by Malcolm King, Chairman of the North Wales police authority and representing the Police Authorities of Wales, who argued that anything up to 70% of a police officers time could be spent dealing with anti-social behaviour and related incidents.\textsuperscript{154}

105. In both local and national surveys, anti-social behaviour and quality of life issues were consistently rated highest in terms of cause of concern to people. Anti-social behaviour was also one of the key factors in perpetuating fear of crime within the UK.\textsuperscript{155}

Government Strategy: Legislating for Anti-Social Behaviour

Legislation

106. The Government has embarked on an extensive programme of legislation in order to tackle anti-social behaviour. Since the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, it had concentrated on legislation that enabled the police and local authorities to have a wider, more flexible range of powers to meet their existing responsibilities and respond to the needs of their local communities.\textsuperscript{156} That new legislation – which is set out in Table 1 below – provides for a greater number of methods available to the police for dealing with anti-social behaviour, set out in Table 2.
Table 1: Government Legislation on Anti-Social Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Disorder Act 1998:</td>
<td>The Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) was first introduced under this Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5 of the Act placed on local authorities and police a joint responsibility for the formulation of crime and disorder reduction strategies and put a legal obligation upon police authorities, probation committees and health authorities to co-operate fully in this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001:</td>
<td>Fixed Penalty Notices were first introduced under this Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police Reform Act 2002:</td>
<td>This Act provided powers to accredit non-police employees involved with the provision of community safety with powers to undertake certain functions to support the police. police community safety officers (PCSOs) and Accredited Warden Schemes were created as part of this Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003:</td>
<td>This Act was designed to ensure the police have the appropriate powers to deal with anti-social behaviour. It introduced new powers for tackling the problem of premises used for drug dealing and for dispersing intimidating groups. It allows the police to deal with the nuisance caused by young people with air weapons and has banned the possession of imitation firearms and air guns in public without good reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has provided powers for local authorities and their partners to deal with anti-social behaviour in local communities and a means for schools, local authorities and youth offending teams to work with the parents of children who are behaving anti-socially, also creating the mechanisms for enforcing this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Act extends local authorities’ powers in relation to cleaning land, including extending the measures that can be taken to remove graffiti, and restricting the sale of aerosol paint to children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further provisions to tackle anti-social behaviour were made under the Licensing Act 2003 and Fireworks Regulations 2004.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North Wales police

---
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Table 2: Key Powers in Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour.

- **Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)** (Crime and Disorder Act 1998). These may be applied for, either in isolation (‘stand-alone’) in Magistrates Courts as a civil proceeding, in County Courts during related proceedings, or in Magistrates Courts in conjunction with convictions for other offences (‘Fast-Track ASBOs’, or ‘Criminal ASBOs/CRASBOs’).

- **Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs)**. Voluntary contracts which are drawn up between the individual involved in ASB, parents/guardians, police officers dealing with the case, members of the local Youth Offending Team (YOT) and other agencies involved in dealing with such behaviour, e.g. local authority/registered social landlords, schools and health services.

- **Penalty Notices for Disorder (PNDs)** (Sections 1-11 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001)

- Power to enforce restrictions against anti-social public drinking, following designation of an area by senior police officers in agreement with the LA for that purpose. *(Sections 12-16 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001)*

- Power to escort young people under sixteen years to their homes after 21:00 hours, if they are seen acting in an anti-social manner in a public place where ASB is a recognized problem, and if they are not accompanied by an adult. *(Section 30: Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003)*

- Power of closure of premises where drugs are being used (‘Crack Houses’). *(Sections 1-11: Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003)*

- Power to arrest individuals carrying air weapons or imitation firearms in a public place. *(Section 37: Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003)*

- Power of seizure of vehicles driven in an anti-social manner *(Section 59: Police Reform Act 2002)*

- Increased powers to disperse ‘rave’ gatherings and remove trespassers *(Sections 57 & 58 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003)*

Source: Dyfed-Powys
107. In January 2003, the Government established the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit within the Home Office to co-ordinate Government efforts to tackle anti-social behaviour. In March 2003, it published ‘Respect and Responsibility – Taking A Stand against Anti-Social Behaviour’,159 which outlined the main steps undertaken by the Government. Those steps included increasing the number of police officers, introducing community support officers and wardens, creating Community Safety Partnerships and putting in place Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and Fixed Penalty Notices to address anti-social behaviour. The Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 also gave new powers to the police, local authorities and other agencies, including social services, environmental health officers, schools and businesses in order to tackle anti-social behaviour.160 The most high profile of all of those initiatives was the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO).

ASBOs are civil orders that exist to protect the public from behaviour that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress. An order contains conditions prohibiting the offender from specific anti-social acts or entering defined areas and is effective for a minimum of two years.161

108. In October 2003 the Home Office published “Together: Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour”162 and launched the TOGETHER campaign to improve performance on tackling anti-social behaviour across England and Wales.163 The policies included new monies to every area of England and Wales – £11 million in 2003/04 and in 2004/05, split across all Crime and Disorder Reduction and Community Safety Partnerships to strengthen their response to anti-social behaviour; a new assessment for all police forces on their response to the problem, backed with programmes of training; ‘Anti-Social Behaviour prosecutors’ – a new national team in the Crown Prosecution Service that specialises in the prosecution of anti-social behaviour offences and sentencing guidelines for magistrates on anti-social behaviour offences.164

109. Home Office officials told us that the Government’s response to anti-social behaviour could be summed up as a ‘twin-track’ approach that both provided help and support to individuals and communities in dealing with anti-social behaviour; and provided a full range of powers to ensure acceptable standards of behaviour were upheld.165

159 Cm 5778. For further information see www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs2/asb_Respect_and_Responsibility.pdf
160 See Table 2.
162 www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs2/ASB_Action_Plan.pdf
163 Further information on the Together campaign can be found at www.together.gov.uk/home.asp
164 www.together.gov.uk/home.asp
165 Ev 310
110. The legislation was welcomed by the Chief Constables in Wales. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police told us that the new legislation, and in particular the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, was to be commended for allowing interventions at an early stage.\(^{166}\) Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom of North Wales police, also welcomed the fact that the Government have given the police and local authorities the necessary tools required to tackle anti-social behaviour.\(^{167}\)

111. While acknowledging that there was still much to be done in the fight against anti-social behaviour, Malcolm King, of the Police Authorities of Wales, argued that “the tide has turned. […] I think we are beginning to win it”.\(^{168}\) The Chief Constable of North Wales police argued that the Government had effectively called for a cultural change, both amongst the police and law enforcement agencies, in their attitudes towards anti-social behaviour. He further argued that it signified an increase in the responsibility of communities to become more willing to take a stand against anti-social behaviour.\(^{169}\)

112. Some of our witnesses, however, expressed caution in terms of the speed with which the new legislation had been introduced. In his written evidence Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police stated:

“A concentration of new measures available to police forces and Partnerships in dealing with the problem have been introduced in a relatively short space of time, rendering it difficult for them to be assimilated within Force Policy and Practice”.\(^{170}\)

113. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom also appealed to the Government to allow a period of time for the new legislation to bed in, stating that “belief, organisation, commitment (and) ownership” amongst participating agencies and authorities was now necessary for success, rather than further legislation in the area of anti-social behaviour.\(^{171}\)

114. We welcome the Government’s initiatives to tackle anti-social behaviour. In particular, we welcome the new legislation which provides the police, local authorities and other statutory agencies with new powers and methods to respond to anti-social behaviour. We agree with the police in Wales that a period of consolidation is now necessary and we look to the Government to ensure that they are given sufficient time to master their new powers.

\(^{166}\) Q114  
\(^{167}\) Q395  
\(^{168}\) Q310  
\(^{169}\) Ev 227  
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\(^{171}\) Q395
Definition of Anti-Social Behaviour

115. Whilst our witnesses broadly welcomed the Government’s drive to tackle anti-social behaviour, several of them raised concerns about the lack of a clear definition of anti-social behaviour. As the Chief Constable of South Wales police noted in her written evidence, “there is currently no national definition of what constitutes anti-social behaviour and no national measurement framework that compares policing performance”.

116. Whilst the legal term for anti-social behaviour is not strictly defined, the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998 describes the conditions that must be met to permit action against offenders. The central condition is to demonstrate that:

“a relevant person acted in a manner that caused, or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more people who are not of the same household as the relevant person”.

The Chief Constable of Dyfed-Powys police told us that the definition in the 1998 Act had been generally adopted by police forces and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) throughout Wales and England, as the working definition of anti-social behaviour.

117. The Government White Paper *Respect & Responsibility – Taking a Stand against Anti-Social Behaviour* (12th March 2003) expanded on the definition in the 1998 Act, and provided the following guidance:

“Anti-social behaviour means different things to different people – noisy neighbours who ruin the lives of those around them, ‘crack houses’ run by drug dealers, drunken ‘yobs’ taking over town centres, people begging by cash-points, abandoned cars, litter and graffiti, young people using airguns to threaten and intimidate, or people using fireworks as weapons”.

118. In its written evidence to the Home Affairs Committee’s inquiry into anti-social behaviour, the Crime and Society Foundation argued that in practice the definition of anti-social behaviour lacked clarity and was “based on a subjective judgement about impact rather than an objective definition of any particular acts”.

119. Louise Casey, the Director of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit at the Home Office, explained that initially, the Government was keen to provide the practical tools to enable the police and other authorities to tackle anti-social behaviour, rather than engage in a lengthy academic exercise to define what constituted anti-social behaviour. However, since the legislation was now in force, the Home Office’s Anti-Social Behaviour Unit was now focusing on refining the definitions of anti-social behaviour.
120. Hazel Blears MP, Minister of State for Crime Reduction, Policing, Community Safety and Counter-Terrorism at the Home Office, acknowledged the subjective approach to defining anti-social behaviour. She argued that a victim based definition – although innovative and controversial – was appropriate given that anti-social behaviour meant “different things to different people”.\(^{179}\) However, whilst she emphasised the need for a victim based definition, she also stated that the Government was now defining “a set of behaviours that we then want to use an anti-social behaviour order to prevent happening, which is a civil order rather than a criminal prosecution”.\(^{180}\)

121. The Chief Constable of South Wales police argued that there was a need for a national definition of what constituted anti-social behaviour. She believed that this would promote a better understanding amongst partner agencies of each partner’s responsibilities and the role that each could play in combating such behaviour.\(^{181}\) We saw successful examples of this multi agency approach, based on a common definition of anti-social behaviour in the Belgian town of Dendermonde and the city of Ghent.\(^{182}\)

122. In a similar vein, the Chief Constable of North Wales police emphasised the need for a shared understanding between the partner agencies, communities and North Wales police about the definition of anti-social behaviour in a specific area, and the role that each agency would play in tackling it.\(^{183}\) He also believed that it was necessary to recognise the importance of local people’s involvement in deciding what aspects of behaviour were causing them the most difficulties. He asserted that “negotiation with communities as to how to prioritise and address local issues must become the norm”.\(^{184}\)

123. Whilst several witnesses expressed the need for clarification around a definition of anti-social behaviour, they also noted that the task was fraught with difficulties. In his written evidence, Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police stated that:

“This widespread usage of what is essentially a non-specific description reflects the inherent difficulties which prevent the formulation of a comprehensive and consistent definition of what constitutes ASB, and also reflects the subjective nature of the way in which the problem is perceived by individual members of the public, depending upon their age, circumstances and disposition”.\(^{185}\)
124. Kevin Wong, Assistant Director of Nacro Cymru, argued that using anti-social behaviour as a “catch all” term without clearly defined behaviours, only served to increase the fear of crime.186

“It [anti-social behaviour] may be something that people can more easily understand, but it therefore fuels that sense of concern about crime because you are lumping so many things together. If the Government is trying to make sure that agencies have an impact on anti-social behaviour, they should break it down and say what those things are so that it is reducing the number of young people causing annoyance and it is reducing the amount of drug-dealing on the streets and reducing the level of graffiti, because those are tangible things you can lock on to”. 187

125. However, Malcolm King, Chairman of the North Wales police authority and representing the Police Authorities of Wales, told us that while he acknowledged the huge difficulties in defining anti-social behaviour he believed that a clear definition was essential because, at present, there was “a huge variation in definition, both with the public and within the police forces, and that makes a difference as to how we deploy resources”.188

126. We acknowledge the difficulties that the Government has faced in defining anti-social behaviour. However, we conclude that further clarity on what constitutes anti-social behaviour is an essential requirement for the police and Community Safety Partnerships to devise and deliver successful strategies to tackle anti-social behaviour. Whilst we welcome the emphasis that the Government has placed on the victim in any definition, we recommend that it gives urgent thought to a clear workable definition under which the police forces and their partners can operate. We further recommend that the Government in its development of a definition for anti-social behaviour ensures that there is sufficient scope for local input and flexibility.

Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour: The Welsh Approach

127. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) identified the success of local authorities, the police and the courts, in tackling anti-social behaviour in Wales and argued that, for the most part, ASBOs in Wales had been greeted warmly by the public, particularly by those communities who have suffered the consequences of anti-social behaviour.189 However, it argued that ASBOs should be regarded as a measure of last resort and suggested that greater emphasis needed to be placed on early intervention to tackle the issues which could lead to anti-social behaviour.190 That approach has been developed by the four police forces, and their partners, in Wales.
128. South Wales police formally launched their “Anti-Social Behaviour Framework – a Partnership Approach” – in June 2004. The Framework is a four stage approach which is based on early interventions, with an ASBO only being issued at the fourth stage and as a measure of last resort.

South Wales police Anti-Social Behaviour Framework: a Partnership Approach

Step one involves a warning letter being sent requiring the person to stop the behaviour. If the problem persists, step two would include a follow-up letter and a home visit by members of the partnership and a police officer. This visit would aim to identify and address any aggravating problems, such as difficulties within the family or at school, which might underlie the behaviour. If a third referral is received and the individual has not engaged with the process a case conference is called drawing together all the agencies and the individual to try to find a way forward. This would result either in an Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) being drawn up or an application for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO). (The ABC is a contract that identifies the behaviour that is required to be addressed and how this will be achieved. It is a formal document that is signed by the parties involved. Whilst it is not legally binding it provides additional evidence should there be a need to apply for an ASBO).

Source: South Wales police

129. Figures for Cardiff Basic Command Unit (BCU) area have demonstrated the effectiveness of early intervention: between January 2003 and January 2005, 729 first warning letters were issued; 167 second warning letters were issued; 56 individuals were involved in third warning meetings with a Chief Inspector, of which 32 signed Acceptable Behaviour Contracts; and 20 ASBOs were ultimately issued. Assistant Chief Constable Francis of South Wales police cited another example of the Swansea BCU area, he said:

“3,000 stage-one letters were issued, 500 stage-two letters and visits, 43 stage-three visits and 75 acceptable behaviour contracts. You see the drop off from the 3,000, the early intervention, the confronting the young people, meeting with their parents, explaining the impact and explaining consequences, we would feel that taking that approach, the preventative early intervention approach, is very important indeed, and the 69 (ASBOs), you could strongly argue, is a reflection of success in taking that proactive approach at an early stage”.
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130. Similar examples of this approach have been introduced throughout Wales and we saw it at first hand during our visits to Wrexham and Rhyl West.\textsuperscript{196} Ian Miller, Joint Chairman of Denbighshire Community Safety Partnership stated that in the North Wales force area:

“We prefer not to go for an ASBO as our first response. We would prefer to avoid it if at all possible and use the ASBO very much as the last line of defence”. \textsuperscript{197}

131. The North Wales police force had also adopted an innovative strategy in tackling anti-social behaviour called \textit{Dyna Ddigon} (\textit{That’s Enough!}). The campaign combines a philosophy of community policing with best practice from the tactics of a zero tolerance engagement.\textsuperscript{198} It was launched in three pilot sites in North Wales in July 2003, and as of August 2004, has been operational in twenty one sites in the North Wales police force area.\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Dyna Ddigon} combines appropriate and innovative methods, and creative use of new powers, for example, the Yellow Card scheme,\textsuperscript{200} with a multi-agency and co-operative approach to action, and is subject to continuous and rigorous monitoring.\textsuperscript{201}

132. Our witnesses highlighted many advantages of using the ASBO as a measure of last resort. Keri Lewis, Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership, told us that early interventions helped to identify problems, build relationships, and help divert people – especially young people – from continuing on “a slippery slope towards crime”.\textsuperscript{202} He believed that: “the sustainability of turning around potential ASBO candidates is greater by the long-term interventions than it is simply by virtue of the actual order itself”.\textsuperscript{203}

133. Mike Tonge, Chief Constable of Gwent police agreed. He argued that early intervention schemes were crucial, as “any criminologist or expert researching the field will say your long-term opportunities to right that person’s behaviour or do something with them is much improved by going down the non-criminal, intervention route”.\textsuperscript{204}

134. A further benefit of using ASBOs as a last resort was highlighted by Bryan Heard, acting Inspector, during our visit to Swansea.\textsuperscript{205} He argued that having relatively low numbers of ASBOs prevented them from becoming ‘a badge of honour’, and that too many ASBOs had the potential to render them meaningless. He also argued that lower numbers of ASBOs were easier to monitor and supervise, which enabled the police and local authorities to retain firm control of the worst offenders.\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{196} An outline programme for the visit can be found at Annex B.
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At the outset of our inquiry, there were some concerns that the apparent low numbers of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders in Wales in comparison with certain areas of England represented a failure in Wales to use effectively the new Orders. That perception was highlighted by Sue Hall, the Chair of the South Wales Criminal Justice Board, who noted the fact that “a bit of a postcode lottery” was developing around ASBOs. In particular, she argued that the evidence was clear that “in some parts of the country they are used much more frequently than in other parts of the country”.

Our inquiry, however, has demonstrated that this was not the case in Wales. Both in oral evidence and on our visits to the Welsh force areas, we have been impressed by the commitment and drive evident in tackling anti-social behaviour in Wales. Moreover, we are convinced that the lower number of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders is the result of a successful staged early intervention approach adopted by the forces in Wales, rather than a general reluctance to use them. It should be noted that success in Wales has been acknowledged by HMI who considered, South Wales police’s Anti-Social Behaviour Framework as being National Best Practice.

We welcome the models of best practice devised by the police forces in Wales to tackle anti-social behaviour. We agree that ASBOs should be issued as a last resort and welcome the Welsh forces’ proportionate and appropriate approach to anti-social behaviour. We further recommend that mechanisms be put in place to ensure that best practices of the Welsh police forces are shared across Wales.

We further recommend that the Government consider the approach taken by Wales in addressing anti-social behaviour and, where appropriate, disseminate that best practice across England and Wales.

Measurement of Anti-Social Behaviour

One of the main concerns expressed to us with regard to the lack of a definition of anti-social behaviour was the subsequent difficulties that arose in measuring and comparing performance in tackling anti-social behaviour. It was a point that was acknowledged by the Home Office in its Report: “Defining and Measuring Anti-Social Behaviour”, which stated that “by describing the consequences of behaviour rather than defining the behaviour itself, the definition lacks specificity and measurability”.

---
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140. In her written evidence to the Committee, Chief Constable Barbara Wilding stated that:

“A clear definition would enable a performance monitoring regime to be introduced that would allow for meaningful comparisons to be made. Unfortunately, the current lack of a nationally agreed definition means that alternative measures are sought. The worst example is the use of the anti-social behaviour order as an indicator of success.”212

141. That concern was not alleviated by our evidence from the Home Office. Louise Casey, Director of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit at the Home Office told the Committee “I actually think the growth in the number of ASBOs is incredibly heartening”.213 While Hazel Blears MP was at pains to point out that tackling anti-social behaviour was not merely a numbers game, she did not offer any alternative means of measuring success in tackling anti-social behaviour.214

142. The Home Office currently uses two ways of measuring anti-social behaviour. The first is the Home Office Public Service Agreement No.2, which is based on public perceptions of anti-social behaviour, and has been developed using data from the British Crime Survey (BCS).215 Using this measure, the proportion of people estimated to perceive a high level of anti-social behaviour in their local area fell from 21% to 16 % between 2002/03 and 2003/04.216

143. The second measure is based on seven indicators of anti-social behaviour as measured in the BCS. These include abandoned and burnt-out cars, noisy neighbours or loud parties, people being drunk and rowdy in public places, people using or dealing drugs, teenagers hanging around on the streets, rubbish or litter lying around, vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property. Between 2002/03 to 2003/04, as well as the overall fall in perception, all of the seven individual anti-social behaviour measures showed a decline.217

144. Nacro Cymru argued that the use of perceptions did not give a fully accurate assessment. It argued that while perceptions reflected people’s reaction to a problem, it did not indicate whether or not the problem itself had increased or decreased. Furthermore, the level of use of ASBOs may well influence that perception without any knowledge of the actual level of anti-social behaviour.218

---
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Therefore, the lack of an appropriate indicator for the measurement of anti-social behaviour almost inevitably resulted in ASBO numbers being used as a crude proxy measure. That was inappropriate for Wales as all Welsh Forces emphasised the ASBO as a last resort. Keri Lewis, Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership, confirmed that position when he told us that success in tackling anti-social behaviour was “far from being just a matter of mathematics”.\textsuperscript{219} This is a real problem with practical significance. Malcolm King, Chairman of the North Wales police authority and representing the Police Authorities of Wales, told us that “the Home Office have said that these sorts of unspecified incidents can absorb up to 70 per cent of police time, and that is in an unmeasured way”.\textsuperscript{220}

Whilst we acknowledge that the number of ASBOs testifies to the success of legislation in the sense that it is being used, we are concerned that in the absence of any other measure, the number of ASBOs issued will be considered a proxy measure of success. Such a measurement would discriminate against Welsh police forces who have implemented successful strategies that have not needed high numbers of ASBOs. We look to the Government to promote a clear message that the number of ASBOs should not, on its own, be regarded as a measure of success of anti-social behaviour strategy, but should be considered alongside other measures for tackling anti-social behaviour.

The breach of ASBOs: criminal sanctions for non-criminal behaviour?

In her evidence to us, Hazel Blears MP confirmed that an Anti-Social Behaviour Order was a civil order rather than a criminal prosecution.\textsuperscript{221} Nevertheless, those found in breach of an Order face the possibility of a custodial prison sentence. We received differing views on the desirability of a custodial sentence for a breach of an ASBO. Chief Constable Terence Grange acknowledged the necessity of sanctions but remained unconvinced that sending individuals to prison for breaching an ASBO was the correct solution:\textsuperscript{222}

“It worries me that you can be frankly a complete pain in the neck and a bureaucratic device is used to control you and then you become incarcerated because you do not comply with it. People should go to prison for crimes and I think they should only go to prison for crimes. Prison is the appropriate place for them to be. There are other ways of dealing with anti-social behaviour and there are other ways of managing people”.\textsuperscript{223}
148. However, that was not the view of the other Chief Constables in Wales. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom argued that “If people do not behave, they are told, "Your behaviour is not acceptable. If you do not stop, in a nutshell, you will go to prison" and that is what is intended to happen and that is why we have prisons, to send criminals there”.

149. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police stated that she did not disagree with an individual appearing before a civil tribunal, being made subject to an order and then failing that order, going to prison: “It has happened for yonks-people who are debtors and all sorts - from a civil action, absolutely; because if they have got to that point with our process, I am absolutely confident that, had we been able to intervene and deflect them into a better way of life, it gives them absolutely every opportunity”.

150. The multi-stage approach taken to anti-social behaviour in Wales, means that an ASBO is only issued as a last resort. Therefore, the individual is presented with several opportunities to right his or her behaviour. While it may appear unfortunate that a custodial sentence can be given for a breach of an ASBO, we conclude that, in Wales, it is an appropriate punishment.

Magistrates and the Judiciary

151. Despite the relatively low level of ASBOs in Wales, several witnesses noted an unwillingness among magistrates in Wales to grant the Orders. Chief Constable Grange told us that he believed there was “a marked unwillingness in Powys to use [ASBOs], with youth offending teams dubious about them and the magistracy unwilling”. That experience was echoed by Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom who averred that there was a “reluctance in the Court Service at every level I think to engage in this”. He believed that it was the responsibility of the Department for Constitutional Affairs to provide better guidance on how the process was intended to work in court.

152. Louise Casey, Director of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit explained that her Unit worked closely with the Department for Constitutional Affairs and that the Department was responding to the need to make sure that magistrates’ courts were more effective in this area and that when people come before them, that they followed sentencing guidelines. She argued that together with the Department for Constitutional Affairs the Unit provided “specialist help and specialist ways of making sure that the courts work more effectively”. That assistance extended to sentencing guidelines for ASBOs.
153. Progress has been made in Wales in this area, and Sue Hall told us that in South Wales, there was closer working between the Community Safety Partnerships and the local authorities. The appointment of an anti-social behaviour prosecutor in South Wales, and the creation of the South Wales ASBO Legal Group had helped to ensure that consistent standards of legal advice are offered across their seven CSPs.231

154. *We welcome the developments in South Wales to bring together all the agencies involved in the application for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and the creation of the ASBO Legal Group. We recommend that similar groups be established throughout Wales, and that a national forum be established to allow for the dissemination of best practice across Wales.*

155. *The Welsh forces have developed effective policies to combat anti-social behaviour in Wales, which include the use of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders as a sanction of last resort. Therefore, it would be unfortunate should an Order not be granted in Wales for lack of guidance. We recommend that the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit redouble its efforts with the Department for Constitutional Affairs to provide guidance and training to raise awareness of the new legislation amongst magistrates and the judiciary.*
7 Community Safety Partnerships

Background

156. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002), set out statutory requirements for authorities to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and drugs misuse in their area. In England, that joint working is carried out through Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships. In Wales, it is carried out through Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). The CSPs comprise the police, local authorities, fire authorities, police authorities and, as of April 2004, the health authorities in Wales. Many Community Safety Partnerships in Wales also work closely with the voluntary and business sectors.

157. The Welsh Assembly Government is designated under the Crime and Disorder Act as one of the bodies working in co-operation with the Partnerships. That designation recognised that, although responsibility for crime reduction was not devolved, the National Assembly had direct responsibility for a number of the bodies involved in that partnership approach.

Community Safety Partnerships in Wales

158. There are 22 Community Safety Partnerships throughout Wales, which are coterminous with local authority boundaries. Keri Lewis, Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership, told us that each Partnership had developed detailed strategies for combating crime and anti-social behaviour. Those strategies were objecive-led and included short and long-term performance targets, which drew on the analysis of local problems, identified crime hot spots and took account of public feeling.

159. The Audit Commission in Wales informed us that it had conducted a number of audits and inspections of Community Safety Partnerships throughout Wales. That work identified the strong and significant role of the police and police authorities in the Partnerships, however it concluded that other agencies within the Partnerships needed to take a greater role to increase the effectiveness and outcomes of partnership working. It identified several key areas for improvement, which included:

- greater involvement from all agencies and not just statutory partners;
- overcoming problems associated with the use of data and limited information sharing;
- greater understanding and application of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act (which requires a Council Chief Executive and a Chief Constable to ensure that the...
160. Along with other partners, local authorities have had to undergo significant cultural changes in the way that they operate in order to ensure the long term success of multi-agency partnership working in the area of community safety. In its written evidence to the Committee the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) told us that since 1998 the Community Safety Partnerships had faced increasing demands, by both central Government and the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), as further legislation and guidance had been published. For example, Monmouth CSP told us that between 2001-2003 the Partnership’s responsibilities had been extended to include substance misuse and domestic violence. The Chairman of Blaenau Gwent Community Safety Partnership told us that cultural change took time, and that the extension of its responsibilities created the danger that CSPs were “rapidly losing the ability to keep pace”. However, overall, the WLGA maintained that local authorities had successfully risen to the challenge. It asserted that “since their inception, CSPs in Wales have steadily progressed in their development and operation, and have accumulated many successes.”

161. Mike Tonge, the Chief Constable of Gwent police told us that there were three critical factors for successful partnership working: “real accountability, a proper performance management framework and relationships” adding that “structures and systems in themselves do not deliver”. Barbara Wilding, Chief Constable of South Wales police also stressed the importance of “clear objectives, joint objectives, joint resourcing, joint expectations and deliverables”.

**Targets and Priorities**

162. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) told us that one of the biggest challenges faced by Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) was the tension between the need to respond to local needs and requirement to meet national targets. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves of the Rhondda Cynon Taff BCU, agreed that there were potential pitfalls with regard to national targets. He told us that “the majority of our national targets tend to be quantitative and not qualitative. […] It is not just about bean counting, it is about the quality of service that people are actually given”. That was also identified as a key issue by the WLGA, which argued that the emphasis on quantitative crime reduction targets did not adequately take account of the successful initiatives of CSPs, such as diversionary activities, substance misuse education programmes or crime prevention programmes. The Association argued that not all of the work and priorities of CSPs were measurable by a percentage reduction in crime and that the work that the CSPs...
did in relation to crime prevention and the reassurance agenda was of “paramount importance”. 244

163. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves believed that the targets need to be balanced in a tiered way through regional and local structures so that CSPs were able to exercise “a little bit more freedom,” so that they could apply priorities based on local needs within the broader national targets. 245 The WLGA supported that view and stated that CSPs needed to be able to “meet national priorities and targets in a flexible manner which best meets local needs and situations”. 246

164. The Government acknowledged the tension between national targets and local priorities for CSPs, and earlier in our report we welcomed the Government’s change from targeting reductions in individual crimes to a reduction in overall crime. 247 That shift in focus was already being implemented in Wales at the Partnership level. Margaret O’Mara, Director of Crime Reduction at the Home Office, told us that the Welsh Assembly Government was currently in negotiations with the Community Safety Partnerships in Wales, as to what their own figure will be. She explained that within the overall target there would be local sub-targets which would be decided on the basis of the audits which each of the CSPs were currently conducting. 248

165. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves recommended that a further stage be added to that process. He argued that while the national target would be to reduce overall crime by 15% over the next three years, 249 “the sophistication is in looking at all the different partners within the partnership to see how they can contribute to that overall objective and a tiered level of indicators supporting the overall objective”. 250

166. Owen Watkin, Chairman of Ceredigion Community Safety Partnership, was concerned by the existence of a multiplicity of different targets for the individual partners, which included Home Office targets, the National Probation Service targets, the Youth Justice Board targets and potentially, Local Criminal Justice Board targets. He argued that “there is a number of performance indicators, therefore, in the field of community safety and crime reduction. It seems to me that it needs to be simplified in order to make sense and to operate much more effectively”. 251 Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police highlighted the problem of individual partners working to their own statutory targets arguing that “working in partnership with the police on something, which is not one of your performance indicators, is going to get less important for you”. 252

---
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Complementary Targets

167. One suggestion to improve that situation was for the Government to set common or complementary targets for all the statutory agencies involved in Partnership. The WLGA stated that:

“There are a myriad of targets in relation to community safety and crime and disorder across different services, bodies and organisations. There would be some benefit for all agencies to have common or complimentary targets set at the national level. At the same time, however, it is imperative for CSPs to have local priorities as their key drivers and any move which would undermine this would not be beneficial to local communities. The key is ensuring a balanced approach where CSPs have flexibility to meet local needs whilst at the same time contributing to meeting national targets.”

168. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves acknowledged that in some areas common objectives could work, but cautioned against going too far along that route. He argued that “I do not think we can get away from the fact that we have got different organisations joining this partnership and not all our objectives are necessarily focused on community safety. I think we must not lose sight of that…we must not forget that the health authorities have got other objectives and other targets which are not necessarily community safety related”. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom agreed that setting targets across agencies would result in a “tendency to get far too tactical, far too detailed from the centre”.

169. Chief Constable Barbara Wilding made a case for joined up government, rather than artificially imposed common targets. She argued that as targets crossed government departments there should be a greater coordination of those targets at a governmental level. She argued that such an approach would allow for partners to “naturally work together and not feel that by spending time here they are going to be failing here. It is a truism: what gets measured gets done, so that is where I would like there to be a wider perspective”. Chief Constable Mike Tonge of Gwent police supported this view stating that “targets have to work together collectively to improve the quality of life in an area”.

170. We conclude that the new Public Service Agreement Target at an overall crime reduction figure of 15%, allows sufficient scope for local priorities and target setting within the Community Safety Partnerships. However, we remain concerned that a significant part of the Community Safety Partnerships’ work on crime prevention and delivering the reassurance agenda is not being taken into account. We recommend that the Government devise a means of more adequately measuring those core aspects of the work of Community Safety Partnerships in Wales and that they be reflected in the targets of the individual partners.
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Partnerships and the police

171. Owen Watkin, Chairman of Ceredigion Community Safety Partnership raised a specific concern about the proposed new performance regime for Partnerships which would be different to the performance regime for police performance. He argued that this would result in “different drivers going in different directions”, thus potentially creating problems for the full integration of the police and other agencies within the Community Safety Partnerships. Margaret O’Mara, Director of Crime Reduction at the Home Office, informed us that she had received several deputations on precisely that issue. However, she was at pains to point out that the new Partnership monitoring regime would in no way have a negative impact on the role of the police in Partnerships. She explained that “in terms of our policing performance assessment framework and so on… there are targets about improving police…and we are looking at a slightly different thing in terms of the Community Safety Partnerships’ targets.”

172. However, we heard anecdotal evidence that hinted at a need for improved integration between the Police Standards Unit and the Partnership Performance Unit within the Home Office, to ensure consistency across both performance monitoring regimes. Again, Margaret O’Mara reassured the Committee that this was no longer the case, stating “we have been working extremely closely. I have to admit that I do not think this has always been the case… but we are working very closely now.”

173. Stephen Rimmer, Director of Policing Policy at the Home Office, added:

“it would be a legitimate criticism of the way in which the Home Office dealt in silos … in the past we did tend not to get this alignment around police performance and partnership performance…Certainly particularly in the last six months or so, we have integrated both in terms of the people with shared responsibilities for this, the data sets that we are looking at, the overall strategy by which we are seeking to get alignment and what matters about all that is that it gets played out to forces and partnerships in a coherent fashion.”

174. Home Office officials informed us of other initiatives currently being undertaken to ensure the participation of police within Community Safety Partnerships. The Government’s White Paper Building Communities, Beating Crime outlined proposals for a new responsibility on police authorities to ensure that policing plans are reflective of Community Safety strategies. The WLGA welcomed these proposals, which, it argued are a “recognition of the new thinking in relation to CSPs especially of their ability to identify local priorities”. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom added his support, stating
that these proposals ensure that Community Safety Partnerships are “going to be enormously influential in ensuring that local policing is tailored to local needs”.

175. We welcome the Government’s proposals for closer working between the Police Standards Unit and the Partnership Performance Unit. However, the Government will need to actively promote close working for it to be a success, and we look to the Home Office to take an active lead in promoting that close working. We ask that the Government ensure that the development of two separate performance regimes for both the police and Community Safety Partnerships does not hinder the role of the police in Community Safety Partnerships in any way.

176. We welcome the proposals for further integration between Community Safety Strategies and Local Policing Plans. We look to the Government, the police authorities, police forces and Community Safety Partnerships to place a greater importance on coordinating their strategies and in particular, in coordinating the timing of the publication of their relevant documents.

Statutory Enforcement

177. The Welsh Local Government Association told us that:

“Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 is of pivotal importance in ensuring that community safety issues are addressed holistically. Moreover, mainstreaming community safety is imperative to the ability of public bodies to deliver safer communities in Wales and within the UK. There is significant concern, however, that in spite of this statutory responsibility, not all public bodies are committed to the community safety agenda to the same degree. Many attribute this to the fact that s.17 comes with no enforcement mechanism i.e. it has ‘no teeth’.”

178. Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom of North Wales police told us that while “there is a clear duty placed upon partners, there is as yet no effective sanction for any of those who choose not to play”. He believed that what was missing was “some sort of last resort draconian enforcement measure to make partnerships work […] there is nothing in law at the moment to make that partnership happen”. He offered the precedent set by Parliament in the Civil Contingencies Act as a possible route for a remedy:

“the Civil Contingencies Act in Section 10 brings in a really quite extraordinary enforcement regime. It creates a statutory partnership. It places duties upon the agencies—one of which is the police—but the extraordinary nature of this, which I have never seen the like of before and very much welcome, is a last resort enforcement regime. It is called "a Category 1 Responder". I can go to the High Court and complain about any other Category 1 Responder in my area that, in my view, is

265 Q366
266 Ev 428
267 Q367
268 Q375
not pulling their weight in dealing with civil contingencies, and, interestingly, they could do the same to me.”

179. Despite describing this as “the nuclear option” Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom went on to argue that the regime set out in the Civil Contingencies Act provided an interesting precedent for any future iteration of crime and disorder legislation. While he believed that cooperation between statutory agencies was improving in Wales, he saw merit in stating clearly to those agencies that “this is not optional, people: you really have to collaborate to an exceptional standard”.

180. Our visits to Community Safety Partnerships throughout Wales demonstrated that the situation was improving. While cooperation with the statutory health partners was often cited as one of the weaker links in the partnership, we received a number of examples of effective engagement with those agencies throughout Wales. When we visited Cardiff and Swansea we witnessed the success of close co-working between the Local Health Boards and other agencies within the Partnerships in the successful deployment of the Mobile Response Units in both Cardiff and Swansea city centres over the Christmas period 2004.

181. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves expressed regret at the suggestion of further strengthening that sanction. Instead, he offered an alternative approach:

“I suppose what the whole thing needs is some sort of carrot and stick approach to it really. There has to be some incentive for people to engage and work hard in partnership.”

182. During our visits to CSPs, a range of personnel, from practitioners to Chief Executives made the point that the key to encouraging participation in partnership was for the relevant agencies to see that they could achieve something through partnership in a more efficient and effective way than they could if they operated alone. Ian Miller, Joint Chairman of Denbighshire Community Safety Partnership, supported that position. He argued that there were sufficient established intervention powers affecting local government that were already in place. Furthermore he also stated his concerns over the impact of such sanctions. The Chairman of Ceredigion Community Safety Partnership, Owen Watkin agreed. He argued that any financial sanction had the potential to impede the work of a Partnership, and had the potential to be detrimental to the relationships within a Partnership.
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183. At present, we do not consider it necessary to strengthen sanctions in order to force agencies to fully participate in Community Safety Partnerships. However, we look to the Government, in close co-operation with the Welsh Assembly Government, to actively encourage statutory agencies to fully participate in Community Safety Partnerships in Wales.

Funding of Partnerships

184. At present Community Safety Partnerships in Wales receive core funding from three separate sources: the Home Office’s Building Safer Communities Fund, the Substance Misuse Action Plan, and the National Assembly for Wales’ Safer Communities Fund.\(^{278}\) In addition, most Community Safety Partnerships receive ad hoc funding from different grant schemes and initiatives, and funding from their Basic Command Units.\(^{279}\) However, while our witnesses were grateful for those resources, they aired their concerns about the way in which those resources were administered. Several witnesses complained that the funding streams were neither consistent nor reliable.

185. The WLGA informed us that the biggest challenge that faced Community Safety Partnerships was that funding allocations were “short term, announced late in the financial year and are unduly bureaucratic”.\(^{280}\) The Association explained that CSPs were currently required to produce three year strategies, but that the funding was awarded on a 12 month basis. That situation was compounded by late allocation of funding which made long-term planning difficult.\(^{281}\) Chief Constable Barbra Wilding testified to those difficulties and argued that it was difficult to embark on “long-term solution fixing” when the funding was only available for 12 months.\(^{282}\) Keri Lewis added, that “there is not a sustainability of assurance of longevity, and therefore long-term planning is inhibited as a consequence”.\(^{283}\)

186. Blaenau Gwent CSP cited the following example of the difficulties that it faced with the current funding streams:

“In 2001/2 we had the Partnership Development Fund (PDF), Safer Communities Initiative (SCI) and Communities Against Drugs (CAD). These were supposed to be three-year funding streams, although allocations were announced annually and the potential for carry-over was limited. In 2003/4, just two years into these three-year funding streams, they were replaced by Building Safer Communities, with new terms and conditions to abide by”.\(^{284}\)
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187. That short-term planning also presented CSPs with recruitment problems. Owen Watkin, Chairman of Ceredigion Community Safety Partnership, told us that Ceredigion, like all CSPs, had to fund posts out of its budget and that such funding gave “little certainty of the continuation of that work”.285

188. The WLGA also argued that the current funding streams were “overly bureaucratic” and “heavily prescriptive” which made it difficult for CSPs to obtain funding to tackle locally-identified needs. The Association was of the view that “the current capital-revenue split does not mirror the financial needs of CSPs”. It argued that the CSPs were in need of “increased revenue support and far more flexibility around the capital spend”.286 Blaenau Gwent Community Safety Partnership told us that there is a current minimum requirement of 27% to be spent on capital “when many of the partners are in desperate need of revenue support for new initiatives”.287

189. Ian Miller, Joint Chairman of Denbighshire Community Safety Partnership, told us that the White Paper, Building Communities, Beating Crime: A Better Police Service for the 21st Century, 288 included a proposal to introduce a single funding stream for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in England, through the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund.289 However, he stated that because of devolution, a similar arrangement had not been proposed for Wales.290 Keri Lewis, Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership also noted that whilst “it is assumed that funding streams for CSPs in Wales are also due to be merged, no detailed plans and timescales have yet been announced”.291

190. The disparate funding streams for Community Safety Partnerships in Wales represents a significant hindrance to their effective organisation and planning strategies. While similar funding problems in England appear to have been resolved, that is not the case in Wales. We recommend that the UK Government, in cooperation with the National Assembly for Wales, consider the establishment of a single, long-term funding stream for Community Safety Partnerships in Wales.

Sharing of Information

191. The ability to share information between the relevant agencies in the Partnerships was raised as a concern by Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police. He believed that the Partnerships could become more successful if they were able to access information and, in a controlled environment, to share that information openly between partners.292
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192. Throughout the course of our inquiry we have both seen and heard of several examples of data sharing, that have had a positive and far reaching impact on the fight against crime and anti-social behaviour. Jan Pickles from the Cardiff Women’s Safety Unit and Detective Inspector Steve Bartley told us that they had developed a risk assessment tool that enabled them to undertake early intervention in potential high risk domestic violence cases. As a result, around 70% of those high risk cases no longer needed further police call outs. During our visit to Swansea, we were also told that a shared anti-social behaviour database had been created where all agencies referred incidents of anti-social behaviour to a central database, which was managed by an anti-social behaviour coordinator. Swansea Community Safety Partnership were currently working on a protocol for information sharing amongst all agencies throughout the Partnership. The WLGA acknowledged the benefits of such information transfer and believed that it would help to ensure that a “holistic” approach was taken improving community safety.

193. When we visited the Netherlands, we were told that Dutch agencies involved in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour were able to easily share information between them. Furthermore, legislation was currently being considered that would enable agencies working in the area of crime prevention to orally share information about individuals. We were told that this was inspired by the clear success of partnership working in tackling anti-social behaviour, multi-agency co-operation, and information sharing. However, the sharing of information in the United Kingdom is more difficult. Chief Constable Terence Grange told us that the Data Protection Act presented problems, but that those problems were more to do with interpretation than with restrictions in that Act.

194. The WLGA told us that protocols for data sharing had been put in place in North Wales through Project Dragon. It anticipated that this would serve as a pilot scheme leading to a pan-Wales protocol, although, to date, that had yet to be realised. Owen Watkin, Chair of Ceredigion CSP told us that while data sharing protocols had developed significantly, more work needed to be done to ensure the smooth flow of information between partners.

195. We welcome the groundbreaking work carried out in many Community Safety Partnerships in launching new initiatives and developing protocols which facilitate the sharing of information amongst partner agencies. To assist that work we recommend that the Government actively seek to raise awareness of the provision for information sharing under the Data Protection Act, and to promote and facilitate the development of protocols and dissemination of best practice in this area.
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Co-location of Partners

196. During our visit to the Netherlands, we had a tour of the Veiligheidshuis\(^{301}\) in the city of Tilburg. That building housed secondments from all the agencies involved in combating anti-social behaviour under one roof. The partners are the police, the Juvenile Probation and After-Care Service, the Child Care and Protection Board, the Netherlands Probation and After-Care Foundation, the Municipality of Tilburg, the Youth Care Office, the Victim Support Centre, the Public Prosecution Department, Novadic-Kentron\(^{302}\) and Bureau Halt.\(^{303}\) We were struck by the way in which individuals from those agencies told us they were working for the ‘Partnership’ as opposed to their own individual agency. Furthermore they all highlighted the benefits of co-location as offering the ability to provide both a fast and comprehensive service to combat anti-social behaviour and to assist in the rehabilitation of offenders.

197. In January 2004, a similar approach was adopted in Wales, as the new Integrated Community Safety Service was launched at Fairway Court in Treforest, Rhondda Cynon Taff. The facility has brought together staff from South Wales police, the local authority community safety team, education, children’s services (including the Youth Offending team), the health service, South Wales fire and rescue service, and the local crime prevention panels, under a single point of management and co-ordination. The service was the first of its kind in the UK and has already attracted considerable interest from the Home Office and Cabinet Office, amongst others, as an innovative model of good practice, with obvious benefits in terms of improved service delivery.\(^{304}\)

198. The Partnership has been successful in attracting external grant funding (of over £2 million a year), which has enabled it to extend its activities, and to introduce a range of innovative new projects in local communities.\(^{305}\) The Partnership was the first to operate with a pooled budget, and with resource allocation decisions being taken (annually) by the strategic leadership group. It is also the first to receive regular (quarterly) detailed performance monitoring reports.\(^{306}\)

\(^{301}\) The literal translation of Veiligheidshuis is Security House.
\(^{302}\) Drugs support.
\(^{303}\) A community policing initiative.
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199. More importantly, the Partnership argues that there is clear evidence that its approach has had a significant impact in reducing levels of local crime, and in increasing public reassurance within Rhondda Cynon Taff. While we are unable to validate that claim, the latest crime figures testify that crime has reduced:

- House burglary has reduced by 23%
- Auto crime has reduced by 13%
- Violent crime has reduced by 3%
- Overall reported crime has reduced by 10%.\textsuperscript{307}

200. Chief Superintendent Brian Greaves highlighted the advantages of co-location. He stated:

“It has brought us together. It does enable us to problem-solve more effectively. One of the big problems with the Partnership is that each organisation has its own data collection systems, computers and different things, and they do not speak to one another, there is no compatibility with the data. Of course what we have got at Fairway Court now is all our different computer systems actually linking in to the unit, so whilst we might not have access to all the different systems it is only just down the corridor to find out a little bit about something you might need to know”\textsuperscript{308}

201. Other Community Safety Partnerships across Wales are now seeking to replicate the arrangements of Rhondda Cynon Taff. Chief Constable Terence Grange told us that the Carmarthen Community Safety Partnership was opening a building in Crosshands in which the council, the police, probation and other partners would be located in the same building. He argued that the arrangement represented “the best example of shared working you can get”.\textsuperscript{309} Bridgend Community Safety Partnership also told us that they were currently seeking similar arrangements.\textsuperscript{310} Chief Constable Barbara Wilding of South Wales police also testified to the success of Rhondda Cynon Taff and was eager to replicate the Treforest facility, confident that any evaluation of the facility would confirm its benefit to crime reduction.\textsuperscript{311}

202. We consider the co-location of the agencies involved in Community Safety Partnerships a demonstration of the clear commitment to joint working by the statutory agencies involved in Community Safety Partnerships in Wales. We are convinced of the benefits of housing representatives of those agencies under one roof and look to the Rhondda Cynon Taff facility being used as an example of good practice that could be replicated across Wales.
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All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum

203. The All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum was established in 2001 to address strategically, crime and disorder agenda issues between key partners on an all Wales basis. Members of the forum felt it was a useful vehicle in terms of information exchange between all partners involved in combating crime and developing community safety and in lobbying on issues of mutual interest. The membership of the All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum consisted of Chief Executives of local authorities, Chief Probation officers, Chief Constables, NACRO Cymru, HM prison service, the WLGA, and more recently the National Assembly for Wales Crime Reduction Unit and fire services. The secretariat was provided by Bridgend County Borough Council, via the Chief Executive.

204. Keri Lewis, the Chairman of Bridgend Community Safety Partnership informed the Committee that due to lack of funding, the forum had not met for a significant period of time. He told us that he had made approaches to the Welsh Assembly Government and was happy to continue to take a lead on the forum, but that it needed a resource base to support it.

205. Many of our witnesses strongly stated that this Forum should be revived and adequately supported in terms of resources. The WLGA supported that position, and stated the need for a strategic Wales-wide forum addressing community safety issues. It added, “such a forum could support the work of CSPs at the local level, and the formal and informal mechanisms that currently exist at the regional level (for example, the South Wales area Overarching Leadership Group).” Kevin Wong, the Assistant Director of Nacro Cymru, agreed that the forum would offer the opportunity to take a multilateral, multi-agency view about policy on criminal justice and community safety across Wales. Furthermore he believed that it could also be tasked with co-ordinating innovation within Wales.

“It is a way of funnelling information together and also developing policy ideas and innovation, and co-ordinating that across the whole of Wales...We would be keen if possible to find ways of getting something together to support that.”

206. Keri Lewis argued strongly that the forum offered the opportunity for all parts of Wales to gain valuable insights into developments across Wales. He also believed that “institutions at Home Office level would be more engaged if there were to be that one voice speaking on behalf of principality institutions through Welsh Assembly Government. I think that would be a very vocal position to adopt.”
207. The All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum has the potential to provide a much needed forum at which best-practice and innovation could be disseminated across Wales. We look to the UK Government, in conjunction with the Welsh Assembly Government to provide the necessary support to give the All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum a long-term future.
8 The Reassurance Agenda

Background

208. The National Policing Plan for 2005–08 stated that police forces must “provide a citizen-focused police service” which responded to “the needs of communities and individuals especially victims and witnesses, and inspires public confidence in the police, particularly among minority ethnic communities.”\(^{318}\) It argued that this citizen-focused approach would “improve public reassurance and confidence in the police and improve satisfaction amongst those who come in contact with the police.”\(^{319}\)

209. The public perception of crime is a central factor in the reassurance agenda, and a common theme of our evidence was that although the incidence of crime was reducing, the fear of crime had not followed suit.\(^{320}\) Reassurance policing therefore has focused on using community-focused policing to target visible crime and disorder.

British Crime Survey

210. Measurement of public perceptions of crime is carried out through the British Crime Survey (BCS). The BCS measures the amount of crime in England and Wales by asking respondents about crimes they have experienced in the last year. The Survey includes crimes which are not reported to the police, and is considered by the Home Office as “an important alternative to police records.”\(^{321}\) The BCS also looks at people’s attitudes to crime, including how much they fear crime and what measures they take to avoid it.\(^{322}\)

211. Kevin Wong, Assistant Director of Nacro Cymru, voiced concerns about the typical ‘fear of crime’ measure included in the British Crime Survey (BCS). He argued that if you tracked the responses to the British Crime Survey over the last twenty years about fear of crime “the level is not significantly up or down over the period, regardless of how high the levels of reported crime are”.\(^{323}\) Kevin Wong believed that this could be a result of methodological problems around the hypothetical nature of the questions asked in the survey. He argued that instead of using hypothetical questions, a more precise measure of ‘fear of crime’ would be to ask people about their actual experiences. Furthermore he believed that performance targets should not be linked to fear of crime measures, but “about the quality of life and the ability of people to have a freer life and more choices”.\(^{324}\)

---

\(^{318}\) National Policing Plan 2005-05, p12.

\(^{319}\) National Policing Plan 2005-08, para 3.20.
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The National Reassurance Policing Programme

212. The National Reassurance Policing Programme is a joint Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and Home Office programme. It aims to establish whether a reassurance policing model based on the concept of ‘signal crimes’ can impact upon the public perception of risk and insecurity. The NRPP has been set up to test the theory that there are certain signal crimes and disorders that, if tackled, have a positive and disproportionate impact on public perceptions of safety and levels of crime and disorder. If the theory holds true it could provide the key to reducing the gap between levels of crime and the public’s perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour.

213. The National Reassurance Policing Programme has five key elements:

Public confidence in, and collaboration with the police in prioritising problems and finding solutions is essential for a greater sense of security. Only the community can define its own concerns and remedies;

Prompt, visible control of anti-social behaviour and its consequences is necessary to maintain the public confidence noted above;

A targeted, intelligence-led approach is required, focusing the most effective action against the relatively few incidents that cause greatest damage to a community’s security. Wherever possible this should be in participation with public and partners;

Joint action with statutory crime and disorder partners and other agencies is essential to produce peaceful neighbourhoods. The solution to crime and disorder is only partially in the hands of the police; and

Resources of the police and others must be allocated to delivering reassurance. Tackling incivility, disorder and dereliction is additional work. It requires a specific additional allocation of resources from the police and other agencies to make it work.

214. On our visits throughout Wales, police officers of all ranks welcomed the focus on reassurance, and suggested that it is a profound culture change in the way in which the police think and operate. However, Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom told us, “I do not think community policing or reassurance policing is yet fully embedded in all our staff. It is growing rapidly but it is not secure yet”.

215. We welcome the innovative approach to policing as exemplified in the National Reassurance Policing Programme, and encourage the speedy national rollout of that programme.

325 Ev 313
326 www.reassurancepolicing.co.uk/faq.asp#faq0
327 www.reassurancepolicing.co.uk/fivekeyelements.asp.
328 Q164
Community Engagement

216. Increasing community engagement underpins the drive to increase the citizen focus of the police service and implement neighbourhood policing across all forces. The aim is to mainstream community engagement so that it becomes a part of core business for all forces. This is about involving all communities in the process of identifying local priorities, finding solutions and being able to hold local police and agencies to account for their actions.\(^{329}\) We found several examples of innovative methods of community engagement across Wales. Both Sue Hall, Chair of South Wales Criminal Justice Board and Chief Constable Terence Grange of Dyfed-Powys police drew our attention to Citizens Panels in Wales, one managed by the local authority in Carmarthen and the other, funded by the Welsh Assembly Government.\(^{330}\) South Wales police has also been engaging with the public outside shopping malls and entertainment complexes.\(^{331}\) Chief Constable Grange, Dyfed-Powys police also cited the fact that his force had used the Royal Welsh Show as a means of engaging with the public.\(^{332}\)

217. We welcome the breadth and depth of initiatives in Wales to engage with the community and solicit their views.

Neighbourhood Policing

218. The Home Office told us that effective and responsive policing at neighbourhood level was essential to sustaining the confidence and trust of the public and tackling crime and anti-social behaviour.\(^{333}\) A key component of that policy was the establishment of dedicated neighbourhood teams of police officers and Community Support officers working in concert with wardens and other members of the extended police family to drive down crime in local communities throughout England and Wales.\(^{334}\) The Home Office view was that above all, there was a need to change the relationship between the individual citizen, the local neighbourhood and the police service so that they worked in partnership to deal with crime and anti-social behaviour.\(^{335}\)

219. We witnessed several encouraging examples of neighbourhood policing throughout Wales. In South Wales community based policing teams were integrated into the Communities First Initiative, while Gwent police had established ward level policing teams.\(^{336}\) Similarly in North Wales, community beat managers in Wrexham had developed first-name relationships with local residents and also participated actively in community events.\(^{337}\)

\(^{329}\) Ev 312  
\(^{330}\) Q551 and Q68  
\(^{331}\) Q126  
\(^{332}\) Q68  
\(^{333}\) Ev 312  
\(^{334}\) Ev 312  
\(^{335}\) Ev 312  
\(^{336}\) Ev 286 and Q659  
\(^{337}\) An outline programme for the visit can be found at Annex A.
Police Community Support Officers

220. Police community support officers (PCSOs) are police authority employed support staff who perform a high visibility, patrolling role to provide reassurance to the communities which they serve. The PCSOs complement the work of police officers by focusing predominantly on lower level crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour. The Police Reform Act 2002 allows Chief Officers of police to delegate to PCSOs, limited enforcement powers to enable them to effectively tackle those issues. PCSOs also play a key role in freeing up police officer time by undertaking those functions which need a police presence but do not necessarily require the full skills and expertise of a police officer.338

221. The Police Authorities of Wales told us that the introduction of police community support officers proved to be “one of the most pioneering and innovative aspects of the Police Reform Act 2002”.339 Chief Constable Richard Brunstrom believed that PCSOs were “phenomenally successful”,340 while Chief Constable Grange argued that the public wanted to see more police on foot, and that they “will happily accept community support officers”.341 Furthermore, the Police Authorities of Wales agreed, stating that all the indications to date are that police community support officers were extremely popular with local communities.342 Those sentiments were unanimously shared by police officers during our visits to the other three police force areas in Wales.343 Whilst there is no data from Wales, research carried out by the metropolitan police service suggested that the introduction of PCSOs had been highly effective and indicated that 50-70% of residents felt more reassured about their safety after the introduction of PCSOs.344

222. However, some of our witnesses expressed their concerns about the sustainability of funding for PCSOs. Paul Wade, Director of Finance, Administration and ICT at South Wales police, argued that while PCSOs would be 100% funded during 2005/6, that funding would be reduced to 75% funded during 2006/7”.345 The Police Authorities of Wales echoed that concern. It argued that the initial time-limited, ring-fenced central funding for PCSOs had “inhibited authorities from integrating PCSOs into long-term policing strategies”.346 Furthermore Chief Constable Tonge believed that those funding problems had an “impact on the quality of people who put themselves forward”.347

---

338 www.policereform.gov.uk/implementation/community_support_officers.html
340 Q215
341 Q66
343 Outline programme for the visits can be found in the Annexes.
344 Ev 313
345 Q148
347 Q660
223. Chief Constable Mike Tonge also highlighted a level of confusion in the public’s eyes regarding the respective responsibilities of PCSOs and police officers. His force had piloted the use of PCSOs with wider powers to detain individuals. He was concerned that those powers could blur the role of PCSOs and have a negative impact on their effectiveness. The Chief Constable argued that only fully-trained and equipped police officers were in a position to make arrests or take professional judgements on more serious matters. Furthermore, he believed that involving PCSOs in those activities would draw them in to the court process taking them away from their key role as a highly visible arm of the police. He strongly argued that “we have to reinforce [with] the public the distinction between the two”.

224. We welcome the introduction of police community safety officers, and the positive impact they are having on public reassurance and the quality of life in communities throughout Wales. However, we share the concerns expressed by our witnesses that the current funding regime for PCSOs has the potential to undermine their effectiveness. We look to the Government to give a clear commitment to the long-term funding of PCSOs in Wales.

225. We further recommend that the Government not extend the powers of PCSOs, so that they can continue to be used effectively as a high visibility response to low level crime and public disorder.
Conclusions and recommendations

Welsh Assembly Government Initiatives

1. We welcome the positive contribution that the Welsh Assembly Government has made to tackling crime and anti-social behaviour in Wales. (Paragraph 13)

2. We welcome the constructive relationships that have been developed between the four Chief Constables in Wales and the National Assembly for Wales and the positive impact that this has had on the development of policy, and on the delivery of police services in Wales. (Paragraph 17)

Relations between the Home Office and the National Assembly for Wales

3. We recognise that the Home Office Director is a key role in facilitating communication between Wales and Westminster, and subsequently to the effective delivery of police services in Wales. It is therefore unacceptable that the post remains filled on a temporary basis. We recommend that the Home Office rectify this situation at the earliest opportunity. (Paragraph 21)

4. We are concerned that there remains a low level of awareness and insufficient understanding of the nature and impact of the devolution settlement on police services in Wales within the Home Office. We recommend that the Home Office address this short-fall and develop its relations with the National Assembly for Wales in a more structured and systematic way. (Paragraph 23)

Further Devolution of Powers

5. Opinions over further devolution of powers over the police remain divided. In any future consideration of the devolution of those powers, it will be essential to safeguard the present arrangements for force cooperation at the cross-border, national and international levels. (Paragraph 28)

Funding

6. We agree with the Welsh police forces that the current funding streams are complex and confusing, and represent a hindrance to effective resource planning. We recommend that the Government review those funding streams at the earliest opportunity, with a view to providing long-term simplified and reliable revenue sources for the Welsh police forces. (Paragraph 35)
A Single Welsh Police Force

7. While we see no case for the amalgamation of the police forces in Wales, we welcome and encourage cross-force collaboration within Wales (and indeed with forces in England), in order to deliver an effective and efficient police service. Furthermore, we welcome the establishment of the Welsh Association of Chief Police Officers, and congratulate the four Welsh Chief Constables on their commitment and innovation in seeking to provide the best service possible to the people of Wales. (Paragraph 40)

National Policing Plan

8. The National Policing Plans have provided police forces in England and Wales with a clear and focused set of priorities and performance targets for the next three years. However the priorities set out in the first two Plans concentrated on national policies for crime reduction. That gave little opportunity for police forces to address local needs and concerns. The current Plan goes some way to redress that imbalance. We welcome the shift in direction in the National Policing Plan for 2005-08 which offers Welsh police forces a greater opportunity to address local priorities for tackling crime in Wales. We look to the Government to ensure that sufficient funds are provided for the police to address both national and local priorities. (Paragraph 51)

Local Targets

9. We welcome the change in target-setting from a percentage reduction in individual crimes to a broader percentage reduction in total crime levels. We believe that this will assist Welsh police forces to better combat problem crime in their force areas and to better reflect their performance against those targets. (Paragraph 56)

National Intelligence Model

10. We welcome the introduction of the National Intelligence Model and are pleased to hear of the positive effect that it has had in Wales. We look to the Government to ensure that best practice under the National Intelligence Model is implemented across police forces in Wales. (Paragraph 59)

Data Collection

11. We agree that the measurement of performance is both necessary and desirable to gauge the success, or otherwise, of the police forces in Wales. However, we share the concerns of the Welsh police forces that the collection of data for the wide number of performance regimes represents an onerous burden. We recommend that the Government look closely at that burden and consider a streamlined approach to data collection that would reduce the impact on the police time. (Paragraph 97)
Operation Tarian

12. We welcome the objectives and achievements of Operation Tarian in tackling drugs crime in Wales. We further welcome the joined up approach the UK Government and the Welsh Assembly Government have taken in tackling both the enforcement and prevention aspects of organised crime in Wales. We recommend that the Home Office commits to the long-term funding of Operation Tarian in Wales. (Paragraph 102)

Anti-Social Behaviour Legislation

13. We welcome the Government’s initiatives to tackle anti-social behaviour. In particular, we welcome the new legislation which provides the police, local authorities and other statutory agencies with new powers and methods to respond to anti-social behaviour. We agree with the police in Wales that a period of consolidation is now necessary and we look to the Government to ensure that they are given sufficient time to master their new powers. (Paragraph 114)

Definition of Anti-Social Behaviour

14. We acknowledge the difficulties that the Government has faced in defining anti-social behaviour. However, we conclude that further clarity on what constitutes anti-social behaviour is an essential requirement for the police and Community Safety Partnerships to devise and deliver successful strategies to tackle anti-social behaviour. Whilst we welcome the emphasis that the Government has placed on the victim in any definition, we recommend that it gives urgent thought to a clear workable definition under which the police forces and their partners can operate. We further recommend that the Government in its development of a definition for anti-social behaviour ensures that there is sufficient scope for local input and flexibility. (Paragraph 126)

The Welsh Approach to Anti-Social Behaviour

15. We welcome the models of best practice devised by the police forces in Wales to tackle anti-social behaviour. We agree that ASBOs should be issued as a last resort and welcome the Welsh forces’ proportionate and appropriate approach to anti-social behaviour. We further recommend that mechanisms be put in place to ensure that best practices of the Welsh police forces are shared across Wales. (Paragraph 137)

16. We further recommend that the Government consider the approach taken by Wales in addressing anti-social behaviour and, where appropriate, disseminate that best practice across England and Wales. (Paragraph 138)
Measurement of Anti-Social Behaviour

17. Whilst we acknowledge that the number of ASBOs testifies to the success of legislation in the sense that it is being used, we are concerned that in the absence of any other measure, the number of ASBOs issued will be considered a proxy measure of success. Such a measurement would discriminate against Welsh police forces who have implemented successful strategies that have not needed high numbers of ASBOs. We look to the Government to promote a clear message that the number of ASBOs should not, on its own, be regarded as a measure of success of anti-social behaviour strategy, but should be considered alongside other measures for tackling anti-social behaviour. (Paragraph 146)

Legal Guidance for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders

18. The multi-stage approach taken to anti-social behaviour in Wales, means that an ASBO is only issued as a last resort. Therefore, the individual is presented with several opportunities to right his or her behaviour. While it may appear unfortunate that a custodial sentence can be given for a breach of an ASBO, we conclude that, in Wales, it is an appropriate punishment. (Paragraph 150)

19. We welcome the developments in South Wales to bring together all the agencies involved in the application for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and the creation of the ASBO Legal Group. We recommend that similar groups be established throughout Wales, and that a national forum be established to allow for the dissemination of best practice across Wales. (Paragraph 154)

20. The Welsh forces have developed effective policies to combat anti-social behaviour in Wales, which include the use of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders as a sanction of last resort. Therefore, it would be unfortunate should an Order not be granted in Wales for lack of guidance. We recommend that the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit redouble its efforts with the Department for Constitutional Affairs to provide guidance and training to raise awareness of the new legislation amongst magistrates and the judiciary. (Paragraph 155)

Community Safety Partnerships

21. We conclude that the new Public Service Agreement Target at an overall crime reduction figure of 15%, allows sufficient scope for local priorities and target setting within the Community Safety Partnerships. However, we remain concerned that a significant part of the Community Safety Partnerships' work on crime prevention and delivering the reassurance agenda is not being taken into account. We recommend that the Government devise a means of more adequately measuring those core aspects of the work of Community Safety Partnerships in Wales and that they be reflected in the targets of the individual partners. (Paragraph 170)
22. We welcome the Government’s proposals for closer working between the Police Standards Unit and the Partnership Performance Unit. However, the Government will need to actively promote close working for it to be a success, and we look to the Home Office to take an active lead in promoting that close working. We ask that the Government ensure that the development of two separate performance regimes for both the police and Community Safety Partnerships does not hinder the role of the police in Community Safety Partnerships in any way. (Paragraph 175)

23. We welcome the proposals for further integration between Community Safety Strategies and Local Policing Plans. We look to the Government, the police authorities, police forces and Community Safety Partnerships to place a greater importance on coordinating their strategies and in particular, in coordinating the timing of the publication of their relevant documents. (Paragraph 176)

24. At present, we do not consider it necessary to strengthen sanctions in order to force agencies to fully participate in Community Safety Partnerships. However, we look to the Government, in close co-operation with the Welsh Assembly Government, to actively encourage statutory agencies to fully participate in Community Safety Partnerships in Wales. (Paragraph 183)

Funding for Community Safety Partnerships

25. The disparate funding streams for Community Safety Partnerships in Wales represents a significant hindrance to their effective organisation and planning strategies. While similar funding problems in England appear to have been resolved, that is not the case in Wales. We recommend that the UK Government, in cooperation with the National Assembly for Wales, consider the establishment of a single, long-term funding stream for Community Safety Partnerships in Wales. (Paragraph 190)

Data-Sharing Protocols

26. We welcome the groundbreaking work carried out in many Community Safety Partnerships in launching new initiatives and developing protocols which facilitate the sharing of information amongst partner agencies. To assist that work we recommend that the Government actively seek to raise awareness of the provision for information sharing under the Data Protection Act, and to promote and facilitate the development of protocols and dissemination of best practice in this area. (Paragraph 195)

Co-Location of Agencies

27. We consider the co-location of the agencies involved in Community Safety Partnerships a demonstration of the clear commitment to joint working by the statutory agencies involved in Community Safety Partnerships in Wales. We are convinced of the benefits of housing representatives of those agencies under one roof and look to the Rhondda Cynon Taff facility being used as an example of good practice that could be replicated across Wales (Paragraph 202)
All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum

28. The All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum has the potential to provide a much needed forum at which best-practice and innovation could be disseminated across Wales. We look to the UK Government, in conjunction with the Welsh Assembly Government to provide the necessary support to give the All Wales Crime and Disorder Forum a long-term future. (Paragraph 207)

Reassurance Policing

29. We welcome the innovative approach to policing as exemplified in the National Reassurance Policing Programme, and encourage the speedy national rollout of that programme. (Paragraph 215)

30. We welcome the breadth and depth of initiatives in Wales to engage with the community and solicit their views. (Paragraph 217)

31. We welcome the introduction of police community safety officers, and the positive impact they are having on public reassurance and the quality of life in communities throughout Wales. However, we share the concerns expressed by our witnesses that the current funding regime for PCSOs has the potential to undermine their effectiveness. We look to the Government to give a clear commitment to the long-term funding of PCSOs in Wales. (Paragraph 224)

32. We further recommend that the Government not extend the powers of PCSOs, so that they can continue to be used effectively as a high visibility response to low level crime and public disorder (Paragraph 225)
Annex A: Visit to Cardiff

Outline programme for the visit to Cardiff, 1 November 2004

Informal meeting with the Cardiff BCU.
Informal meeting with Major Events Planning officers.
Informal meeting with Cardiff Women’s Safety Unit.
Informal meeting with representatives of Operation Tarian.
Informal meeting with representatives from the Cardiff After Dark and Licensing Programme.
Annex B: Visit to North Wales

Outline programme for the visit to North Wales Monday 29–Tuesday 30 November

Monday 29 November

Informal meetings at Llangefni police station with police officers and community beat managers.

Informal meetings at Bangor police station with police officers and community beat managers.

Informal meetings at North Wales police headquarters at Colwyn Bay with ACPO officers and headquarters staff.

Informal meetings at Rhyl police station with police officers and community beat managers.

Tuesday 30 November

Informal meetings at Llangollen police station police officers and community beat managers.

Informal meetings at Wrexham police station with police officers and command team members.
Annex C: Visit to South Wales

Outline programme for the visit to Swansea, Rhondda Cynon Taff and Newport Monday 21–Tuesday 22 February

Monday 21 February

Informal meetings at Swansea police station with police officers and representatives of the local Community Safety Partnership.

Informal meeting at Swansea police station with Tenby police, Tenby town council and Tenby Walled Town Residents Association.

Informal meetings at Rhondda Cynon Taff Community Safety Partnership, Treforest, with representatives of the Partnership.

Tuesday 22 February

Informal meetings at Newport police station with police officers.

Informal meeting at the Kaleidoscope project.

Informal meeting at the SOLAS community day centre.
Annex D: European Visit

Outline programme for the visit to the Netherlands and Belgium, Monday 31 January–Thursday 3 February

Monday 31 January
Informal Meeting with HM Ambassador to the Netherlands.
Informal meetings at the Dutch Ministry of Justice officials.
Informal meetings with the KLPD Zoetermeer (the federal police force) and the Nationale Recherche (National Criminal Investigation).
Informal meetings at Europol.

Tuesday 1 February
Informal meetings with the Mayor of Tilburg and his officials.
Informal briefings at Veiligheidshuis, Tilburg.

Wednesday 2 February
Informal meetings with the Ghent police.
Informal meetings with Dendermonde police, Belgium.
Informal meeting with the Federal police in Brussels.
Informal meeting with police officers in Asse.

Thursday 3 February
Informal meeting with the Speaker of the Belgium Parliament.
Formal minutes

Tuesday 15 March 2005

Members present:
Mr Martyn Jones, in the Chair
Mr Martin Caton
Mr Huw Edwards
Julie Morgan
Mr Hywel Williams
Mr Roger Williams

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (Police Service, Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour in Wales), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman’s draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 225 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Annexes agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No.134 (Select committees (reports)) be applied to the Report

Several Papers were ordered to be appended to the Minutes of Evidence.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Thursday 17 March at 1.30pm at the National Assembly for Wales, Cardiff.]
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