

Guidance for submitting proposals for spend (direct allocations) 2022-25

Contents

1.	Background of the London Crime Prevention Fund	2
2.	Changes to the Approach.....	2
3.	The process for submitting proposals for spend (LCPF Direct).....	4
4.	Commissioning principles	4
5.	Police and Crime Plan priority areas, outcomes and minimum standards.....	6
6.	Conditions of funding.....	11
7.	The process for accepting safeguarding board funding.....	11
8.	Timescales.....	12
9.	Frequently asked questions	13
10.	Funding Table.....	16

1. Background of the London Crime Prevention Fund

The London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) was established in 2013, bringing together a number of funding streams that had existed before MOPAC was set up. The fund ran in 4-year cycles in line with the Mayoral administrations.

In 2016, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime made a commitment to sustain the LCPF budget at £72m for a further four years (2017/18 to 2020/21), despite cuts to the overall policing budget. This funding was split between direct borough funding and the co-commissioning fund, with direct funding allocated by a need and demand formula.

The Violence Reduction Unit became operational in 2019 and £4.4m was made available for each of the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years, for direct funding to boroughs to support violence reduction.

Following significant changes in the criminal landscape, and a shift towards tackling violence, the Tranche 2 co-commissioning budget was transferred to the VRU and pooled with Home Office Funding to provide additional funding to boroughs for local violence reduction initiatives.

In 2020, the Deputy Mayor took the decision to extend funding for another year, to the end of March 2022. Both direct and VRU uplift funding allocations were maintained at the same level from 2019/20. This has realigned cycles with the Mayoral administration.

The new decision made in Autumn 2021 allocates funding for the next three financial years, 2022-2025. VRU uplift allocations remain dependent on Home Office funding being made available and further information will be provided in early January, once confirmed.

2. Changes to the Approach

The approach to LCPF direct funding will be kept fairly similar to previous years. However, there are a number of changes being introduced which fall broadly under three intentions:

- To improve our impact narrative for the LCPF
- To align the LCPF with the new Police and Crime Plan (PCP)
- To simplify reporting

2.1 Improve our impact narrative for the LCPF

The project types previously used for direct LCPF funding have mostly been maintained, with some being split out to be more specific, and others reworded for clarity. No project type currently in use has been removed entirely apart from 'crime prevention' which was minimally used. These changes have been made to reflect the projects already being delivered through this funding, so we hope the impact will be minimal.

Some of the most used project types have outcomes which will now be mandated (please see Section 5 for details) however we will leave the exact measures and targets to individual boroughs to maintain flexibility, and other outcomes can be included. Again, these have been drawn out where there is already a high degree of commonality within existing projects. We are also introducing set outputs relating to staffing and numbers engaged with.

This increased standardisation of reporting will assist us greatly in being able to communicate an impact narrative across the fund, rather than just on an individual project basis. It is not being done with the intention of creating any kind of borough comparison. We also appreciate that in many instances, LCPF funding is matching more significant investment from local authorities and therefore the outcomes cannot solely be attributed to the LCPF. This will be reflected in any impact narrative.

2.2 Align with the new Police and Crime Plan (PCP)

The project types have been assigned under the new, emerging PCP priority areas. Namely:

- Victims are better supported
- Violence is prevented and reduced
- Trust and confidence increases
- Protecting people from exploitation and harm

The new PCP will be much more focused on outcomes rather than specific actions, and we would welcome as much alignment as possible between LCPF project outcomes and those in the new PCP. This will also help us to improve our impact narrative. The draft PCP remains out for consultation, so these may be altered, however it still provides a useful direction of travel.

2.3 Simplify reporting

We intend to move from quarterly to 6-monthly spend reporting and payments. This will reduce the reporting burden; however, it will make the end of year projection report in March even more important.

There will also be the opportunity to profile the three years of funding flexibly across the time period to enable de/recommissioning of projects. However, we do require that at least 50% of the annual allocation is profiled in each year. Profile requests will be dependent on there being sufficient funds. We will confirm your request once we have had the opportunity to review all requests and assure ourselves that they are affordable within the finite funds we have available. We reserve the right to refuse a profiling if we do not feel it is supportive of delivery across the three-year period.

It will also not be possible, once the spend profile is agreed, to carry forward any underspend between financial years. Requests to reprofile funding within a financial year will be considered on a case-by-case basis as usual.

We are also procuring a new online grant management system to replace GLA OPS, which we know from feedback provided is not the best solution for LCPF projects. This should be

more user friendly and allow us to be more responsive to technical challenges. In order to progress the agreement of new projects, we will undertake a 'paper' exercise, and then migrate the data onto the new system. This proposal was endorsed at the LHoCS meeting we hosted in September.

If you feel that any of these changes will negatively impact your ability to make effective use of the LCPF direct funding, please get in contact with crimeprevention@mopac.london.gov.uk as soon as possible.

3. The process for submitting proposals for spend (LCPF Direct)

Instructions for submitting VRU uplift proposals will be sent separately.

Local Authorities are not asked to bid for their direct borough funding. The funding levels for each Local Authority are fixed for the financial years 2022-2025. Your allocation is included in Section 10.

In order to access this funding, Local Authorities must provide details of their anticipated uses for the funding by submitting projects using the Excel Project Templates. This template reflects the current template on GLA OPS but will assist in pulling out more detail where needed.

You will also need to agree to the relevant minimum standards, compliance and GDPR statements.

The Project Templates will be circulated in w/c 13th December along with detailed guidance but will be very similar in content to the current project templates on GLA OPS. The exception to this will be the changes to project types and outputs/outcomes, as in Section 5.

The deadline for submitting projects to the Crime Prevention mailbox is 5pm on Monday 31st January. We appreciate that timeline is tight, particularly with Christmas during this period, so please send through any queries or concerns early so we can address them in a timely manner.

4. Commissioning principles

MOPAC has developed a series of commissioning principles which will inform how we undertake commissioning activities under the new Police and Crime Plan. We would encourage Local Authorities to consider how these principles can be reflected in the development and descriptions of LCPF funded projects.

4.1 What Commissioning Means in MOPAC

In our work on commissioning and partnerships, we seek to answer three questions:

1. What is life like now for Londoners? (Understanding individual strengths, needs, communities and markets)
2. What should it look like in the future? (Drawing on evidence and expertise, and developing outcomes which have real meaning to Londoners)
3. What can we change to improve things? (Working within systems, mobilising assets to work towards these outcomes, building on strengths, meeting needs and developing markets)

Commissioning means all the activities we undertake to answer these questions, including using MOPAC's four roles: Convening, Delivering, Overseeing and Communicating.

Partnerships describes the way we work, with a focus on cultivating trusting relationships across systems.

4.2 Our Principles

- We listen to Londoners who are the driving force of our work, enabling us to understand what is important to, and will be impactful for Londoners.
- We are relentless in our pursuit of equality, inclusion and diversity.
- We recognise all assets and strengths, leading through empowering others and enabling outcomes.
- We foster collaboration and coproduction, not competition.
- We use a broad range of evidence to inform commissioning and contributing our own insight through reflection and evaluation.

4.3 Our Culture of Commissioning

- Challenging how we work, embracing and creating conditions for improvement and innovation.
- Discerning what is simple and complicated, and delivering solutions at pace.
- Identifying and being comfortable with complexity.
- Thinking long-term and working in ways which are robust to change.
- Working pragmatically within relevant constraints.

4.4 Continual Application

This definition, principles and culture will be continually revisited. It will take time to embed everything comprehensively, so we will learn over time, sharing that learning both with MOPAC staff and our partners.

5. Police and Crime Plan priority areas, outcomes and minimum standards

5.1 Overarching minimum standards

The following minimum standards are considered universal and must be adhered to in all proposals:

- Projects must deliver crime prevention approaches in partnership with other local and regional agencies.
- Projects must identify communities disproportionately affected by crime types and be based on narrowing the vulnerability gap.
- Projects must be accessible to people with no recourse to public funds.
- Projects which provide services to victims of crime must have due regard to the victim's code of practice.
- Projects adhere to child and adult safeguarding and child protection guidelines and policies, seeking to achieve best practice.
- Projects have had due regard to equality and diversity implications, including intersectionality, so that services are accessible to all.

5.2 Introduction to new project types, outputs and outcomes

Please find below an explanation of the priority areas stemming from the Police and Crime Plan, project types which fall under each priority, and the relevant outcomes and minimum standards.

Please note that the project types have been amended but should still allow for a full variety of projects. You should pick the project type which best fits what you are seeking to deliver. Since these project types are more specific, we will lift the maximum project number of 5 from previous years. However, we still request that you keep your project proposals as streamlined as possible to facilitate simpler review, approval and ongoing reporting.

The PCP outcomes and measures are included here as suggestions for outcomes which may be relevant to the different project types and help align your projects with the PCP.

You will be asked to provide method of measurement, baseline and target for each outcome. We appreciate that often LCPF funding is only part of a project budget and so not all these outcomes can be directly attributed to the funding, but this will be hugely beneficial to both understanding project performance and identifying good practice, and developing our impact narrative.

Some project types have mandatory outcomes listed. These must be included, but the method of measurement, baseline and target remain for you to choose as most appropriate. We have tried to strike a balance between aligning reporting where possible, while maintaining flexibility.

Please be aware that we will also ask for the following outputs for all projects:

- Number of staff FTE being funded directly through LCPF
- Number of individuals to be engaged through the project (target)

Note that if either of these are not relevant to your project type, you can simply enter 0.

5.3 Victims are better supported

LCPF Project Type	Mandatory LCPF Outcome
IDVA service	Increase in victim satisfaction, feeling of safety and/or emotional wellbeing.
ISVA service	Increase in victim satisfaction, feeling of safety and/or emotional wellbeing.
MARAC	None
Specialist VAWG support	Increase in victim satisfaction, feeling of safety and/or emotional wellbeing.
Victim care	None

PCP Outcome	PCP Measure
Victims receive better support from the police and CJ, including in online interaction	Reduce: Victim satisfaction disproportionality (USS and CJ wide) face to face and TDIU
Better Criminal Justice response and outcomes for victims	Increase: Proportion of people supporting investigation (RASSO and DA)
There are fewer repeat victims of domestic abuse, sexual violence and VAWG	Reduce: Repeat victimisation for DA, sexual violence and VAWG

Minimum standards:

- Projects must ensure all Independent Domestic Violence Advocates are working to nationally recognised standards.
- Projects must have regard to national VAWG commissioning guidelines (https://1q7dqy2unor827bqjls0c4rn-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/successful_commissioning_guide.pdf) and The Rape Crisis National Service Standards (http://rapecrisis.org.uk/nationalservicestandards_1.php).

- MARAC projects must adhere to the recent MARAC Review recommendations. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ee0be2588f1e349401c832c/t/61a8d3a26416b90796c31770/1638454206864/Pan+London+MARAC+Review+Report+2021.pdf>
- Projects must pay due regard to overlaps in victimisation and offending, always seeking to take a holistic approach to addressing need.
- Projects must support victims to communicate effectively in their preferred language, either through providing access to interpreters or working in partnership with specialist services.

5.4 Violence is prevented and reduced

LCPF Project Type	Mandatory LCPF Outcome
IOM	None
Integrated Gangs Unit	Reduce reoffending rates for knife and drug offences for managed nominals.
Hate crime	None
Harmful practices	None
VAWG perpetrators	None
Serious organised crime	None

PCP Outcome	PCP Measure
Young people are safer	Reduce: Number of homicides domestic and non-domestic (PRC). Knife crime with injury u25 non-DA (NHS). Lethal barrel discharges (PRC) Reduce: Reoffending rate for the most violent cohort (IOM) and DA and Sexual Violence (PRC) Increase: Women - safe in an area day/night (PAS) Reduce: Hate Crime in person and online (PAS)
Re-offending is reduced in the most violent and risky cohorts	
Women and girls are safer and feel safer	
Hate crime is reduced	

Minimum standards:

- Projects for young people should make use of the Early Intervention Foundations Commissioning Mentoring Programme Checklist <http://www.eif.org.uk/publication/preventing-gang-involvement-and-youth-violence-advice-for-commissioning-mentoring-programmes/>

- Projects should define under 18-year olds involved in serious violence as victims first, perpetrator second.
- All frontline staff working with young people or vulnerable adults must be DBS checked, including externally commissioned providers.
- Projects should explore opportunities to recruit ex-offenders who can act as peer mentors to service users.
- Organisations working to combat hate crime do not themselves demonstrate or promote intolerance or prejudice towards any other communities who are subject to hate crime.
- Projects targeting persistent and repeat violent offenders should align with the revised London IOM framework and agreed ways of working. This should include consideration of local IOM Co-ordinator provision.
- Projects which relate to GPS tagging must be aligned with the regional approach.
- VAWG perpetrator projects should be RESPECT accredited or working towards accreditation and must have the safety of victims and children at the centre of their work.

5.5 Trust and confidence increases

LCPF Project Type	Mandatory LCPF Outcome
ASB & neighbourhood crime – Proactive intervention	Improved perception of crime and feelings of community safety.
ASB & neighbourhood crime – Target hardening/prevention	None
Business crime	None

PCP Outcome	PCP Measure
Public trust in the police is increased, particularly that of black Londoners	Increase: How good a job do you think the police are doing (local)? (PAS)
The Met engage with Londoners and treat them fairly	Increase: The police treat everyone fairly (PAS)
Community safety partners respond to the crime and anti-social behaviour which most concerns Londoners	Increase: The MPS deals with things that matter to the community (PAS)
	Reduce: Equality gap to within $\pm 5\%$ for above (PAS)

	Reduce: Burglary, vehicle crime, robbery, theft, ASB (PAS)
--	--

Minimum standards:

- Projects should utilise local community involvement and engagement, preferably narrowing the gap on confidence and trust within specific cohorts of the community.

5.6 Protecting people from exploitation and harm

LCPF Project Type	Mandatory LCPF Outcome
Substance misuse	None
Youth crime education/ engagement	None
Extremism	None
Female offenders	None
Prostitution	None
Child Sexual Exploitation	None

PCP Outcome	PCP Measure
<p>Young people in the justice system are supported and safe</p> <p>Fewer adults and children are exploited and harmed</p> <p>Londoners are protected in public, private and online</p>	<p>We will take a qualitative approach to assessing impact in relation to protection of vulnerable children and adults. No quantitative measures are proposed</p>

Minimum standards:

- Substance misuse projects must commit to working with strategic health and justice partners, to support London-wide work to improve offender pathways into treatment.
- Projects which seek to counter extremism should align with the national Prevent agenda.
- Projects under female offenders or prostitution must have due regard to the minimum standards under the ‘victims are better supported’ priority area.

- Projects under female offenders should be aligned or integrated with the London Women's Wraparound Service co-commissioned by MOPAC and London Probation Service.
- Projects for young people should make use of the Early Intervention Foundations Commissioning Mentoring Programme Checklist
<http://www.eif.org.uk/publication/preventing-gang-involvement-and-youth-violence-advice-for-commissioning-mentoring-programmes/>
- All frontline staff working with young people or vulnerable adults must be DBS checked, including externally commissioned providers.

6. Conditions of funding

The following are conditions of funding which will form part of the grant agreements:

- That the performance of the project will be measured annually against the SMART outcomes agreed.
- To abide by the minimum standards, unless an exception is agreed with MOPAC and documented as part of the grant agreement.
- That in developing these proposals I have had due regard to the equality and diversity implications of using this funding for the proposed purposes.
- To provide data to MOPAC's Evidence and Insight team in order to assess the impact of the commissioned services.
- That this funding will not be used to fund the Metropolitan Police Service or buy police officers.
- That this funding will not be used for capital purchases above a value of £1,000 (anything greater than this value will require prior approval from MOPAC).
- That no management costs exceed 10% of the total funding allocation.
- That this funding will not be used for party-political or religious purposes.
- To abide by standard financial practices and submit details of spend after 6 months and provide an annual return for each year of the fund.
- To commit to ensuring MOPAC is updated as soon as possible on new information on the delivery of a programme or project.
- To commit to keeping MOPAC updated on changes to the VCS and match funding arrangements.
- That MOPAC reserves the right to conduct an audit of any partners in receipt of this grant.
- That all unspent funding will be returned to MOPAC and there will be no roll over of funding beyond the end of each financial year.

7. The process for accepting safeguarding board funding

As for the last few years, you will need to create a safeguarding board project using a Project Template (to be circulated w/c 13th December). You will just be required to accept the conditions of the funding, which are as follows:

- MOPAC will make a £5,000 per annum contribution to the Local Safeguarding Children Board and Local Safeguarding Adults Board, amounting to £10,000 in each year 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25.
- This contribution is to be ring-fenced for supporting the Boards in delivering their safeguarding duties and is not to be subsumed into the wider London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) Grant.
- Payment should be requested once annually, and it is not necessary to report on performance alongside the LCPF projects.
- Requests may not be made to carry over underspend on this part of the funding.

8. Timescales

1	Local authorities notified of funding and invited to develop project proposals	w/c 6 th December 2021
2	Project templates and guidance for submission circulated	w/c 13 th December 2021
3	Deadline for projects to be sent to crimeprevention@mopac.london.gov.uk	Monday 31st January 2022
4	Feedback provided to local authorities	w/c 21 st February 2022
5	Projects resubmitted following feedback	Monday 14 th March 2022
6	Projects approved	Friday 1 st April 2022
6	Grant agreements produced	By end April 2022
7	Project data migrated onto new online grant management system and guidance circulated	By end April 2022

9. Frequently asked questions

1. Who can put forward proposals to utilise this funding?

MOPAC will only consider proposals from Local Authorities which have been submitted using the correct templates to crimeprevention@mopac.london.gov.uk

2. How much funding can I apply for?

Funding levels are fixed and laid out in the attached letter and in Section 10 below. Any proposals for funding above the funding levels set out will not be considered and the Local Authority will be asked to revise and resubmit their proposals.

3. How many projects can I submit?

We ask each Local Authority to submit a single Safeguarding Board project. Although we have lifted the limit on the number of direct funded projects, we would ask that these be kept as streamlined as possible to facilitate review, approval and ongoing reporting. We may ask you to combine similarly themed projects where appropriate.

4. Do I have to submit all my proposals at once?

As far as possible, please submit your projects together by the deadline of 31st January 2022.

Should your Local Authority require more time to make local commissioning decisions for a portion of the funding allocation due to exceptional circumstances, then by agreement with MOPAC the submission of some proposals can be delayed. Please contact crimeprevention@mopac.london.gov.uk as soon as possible.

We would generally ask however that you complete a project template to the best of your ability and highlight where further detail will be forthcoming. All funding proposals must be agreed by 28th February 2022.

5. How will my bids be assessed?

Borough funding allocations are fixed and therefore the proposals for spend will not be graded or assessed. MOPAC requires information on the proposed uses for funding before project/programme allocations can be agreed in order to ensure the funding will be used for its prescribed purposes and demonstrates value for money, and to gain an overview of services the funding supports.

Projects will be reviewed by policy panels within MOPAC and feedback provided for action before projects are approved.

6. Should one of the proposed uses of the funding not be within the scope of this fund, will MOPAC consider further proposals?

MOPAC will allow local authorities to put forward alternative proposals for utilising their funding however a very strong justification would be required.

7. Is the funding ring-fenced for any initiatives?

Funding is ring-fenced between LCPF direct funding, VRU uplift funding and Safeguarding Board funding. These strands cannot be combined, or funding moved between them, as all reporting must be undertaken separately.

Within each strand however, funding is not ringfenced provided proposals meet the criteria outlined in this document.

8. Can I allocate funding for projects/activity that has yet to be commissioned?

Yes, you can but you need to set this out within the form including the transition arrangements. This should cover what you will be looking to commission and the timeframe. Once a new service is commissioned, the Local Authority are required to update MOPAC on what is being delivered and who the provider is.

9. Can LCPF funding be used for analytical or management resource?

LCPF funding may be used for project-specific evaluation or management, however it cannot be used to fund core Local Authority positions which carry out analytical or management work across the crime prevention and safety brief.

10. What are the monitoring arrangements for the fund? What information will boroughs be expected to provide and how often?

After 6 and 12 months, Local Authorities will be expected to provide details of their spend by project and submit an invoice. MOPAC will also request a spend projection in March 2023 to enable suitable accruals to be made for final payments.

Annually, performance will be measured against the SMART outcomes agreed in the project proposal. Local Authorities will be asked to submit an overall RAG rating and report against each outcome.

11. How flexible will the project funding allocations be in-year?

Upscaling or downsizing of the approved projects as well as proposals to commission new projects/programmes or decommissioning approved projects will require pre-approval from MOPAC. This approval will not be unreasonably withheld; if it is for an activity that works towards the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan and is in line with commissioning best practice then it will be approved.

12. Can I carry over funding?

Previously, there has been an ability to carry funding over between years 1 and 2 of a funding round. However, this time there is a 3-year funding round with no ability to carry funding over, either between financial years or into the next round of funding.

13. What are the terms and conditions of funding?

In addition to the conditions of funding in Section 5 above, Local Authorities will be expected to sign grant agreements as soon as practicable after they are issued in April

2022. The new grant agreements will contain similar terms to previous LCPF grant agreements.

10. Funding Table

	London borough	2022/23 allocation	2023/24 allocation	2024/25 allocation	Total allocation
1	Barking and Dagenham	£451,054	£451,054	£451,054	£1,353,162
2	Barnet	£344,004	£344,004	£344,004	£1,032,012
3	Bexley	£246,754	£246,754	£246,754	£740,262
4	Brent	£511,548	£511,548	£511,548	£1,534,644
5	Bromley	£317,140	£317,140	£317,140	£951,420
6	Camden	£477,581	£477,581	£477,581	£1,432,743
7	Croydon	£598,258	£598,258	£598,258	£1,794,774
8	Ealing	£452,937	£452,937	£452,937	£1,358,811
9	Enfield	£491,165	£491,165	£491,165	£1,473,495
10	Greenwich	£476,128	£476,128	£476,128	£1,428,384
11	Hackney	£584,227	£584,227	£584,227	£1,752,681
12	Hammersmith and Fulham	£357,105	£357,105	£357,105	£1,071,315
13	Haringey	£552,983	£552,983	£552,983	£1,658,949
14	Harrow	£200,271	£200,271	£200,271	£600,813
15	Havering	£266,367	£266,367	£266,367	£799,101
16	Hillingdon	£371,408	£371,408	£371,408	£1,114,224
17	Hounslow	£356,218	£356,218	£356,218	£1,068,654
18	Islington	£519,048	£519,048	£519,048	£1,557,144
19	Kensington and Chelsea	£184,846	£184,846	£184,846	£554,538
20	Kingston upon Thames	£109,875	£109,875	£109,875	£329,625
21	Lambeth	£681,996	£681,996	£681,996	£2,045,988
22	Lewisham	£561,872	£561,872	£561,872	£1,685,616
23	Merton	£181,957	£181,957	£181,957	£545,871
24	Newham	£642,368	£642,368	£642,368	£1,927,104
25	Redbridge	£350,930	£350,930	£350,930	£1,052,790
26	Richmond upon Thames	£76,368	£76,368	£76,368	£229,104
27	Southwark	£555,790	£555,790	£555,790	£1,667,370
28	Sutton	£178,800	£178,800	£178,800	£536,400
29	Tower Hamlets	£662,986	£662,986	£662,986	£1,988,958
30	Waltham Forest	£452,197	£452,197	£452,197	£1,356,591
31	Wandsworth	£340,074	£340,074	£340,074	£1,020,222
32	Westminster	£550,930	£550,930	£550,930	£1,652,790
TOTAL		£13,105,185	£13,105,185	£13,105,185	£39,315,555