

# Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub-Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Norwich on Thursday 24 February 2022 at 10 am

## Present:

Cllr Penny Carpenter (Vice-Chair in the Chair)	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
Cllr Alexandra Kemp	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
Cllr Graham Carpenter	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Emma Corlett	Norfolk County Council
Cllr James Easter	South Norfolk District Council
Cllr Adam Giles	Norwich City Council

## Also in Attendance:

Mark Stokes	Chief Executive, OPCCN and Chair of the NCCSP Partnership
Amanda Murr	Head of Community Safety, OPCCN
Liam Bannon	Community Safety Officer, OPCCN
Nicola Jepson	Community Safety Officer, OPCCN
Craig Chalmers	NCC's Community Safety Lead -Temporary
Jo Martin	Democratic Support and Scrutiny Manager, Norfolk County Council (NCC)
Tim Shaw	Committee Officer

## 1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from named members: Cllr Tim Adams, Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris, Cllr Nigel Shaw and Cllr Alison Webb.

1.2 Apologies were also received from substitute members: Cllr Robert Hambidge, Cllr Julian Kirk, Cllr Sarah Butikofer and Cllr Ian Stutely (who had replaced Cllr Cate Oliver from the Norwich City Council) and from Gavin Thompson, Director, Policy and Commissioning, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk (OPCCN).

## 2. Minutes

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2022 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

## 3. Declaration of Interests

3.1 Cllr Corlett declared an "Other Interest" as Chair of Trustees of Leeway.

3.2 Cllr Penny Carpenter declared an "Other Interest" as a member of the Safeguarding Adults Board.

## 4. Urgent Business

4.1 There were no items of urgent business.

## 5. Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Strategy 2021-24: the final Delivery Plan

5.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, which introduced the final Delivery Plan that sets out further details of the delivery structure and strategic links that would enable the Partnership to effectively target each of its priorities.

5.2 Mark Stokes, Chief Executive, OPCCN and Chair of the NCCSP Partnership, in introducing the report said that in response to a Scrutiny Sub Panel recommendation at its previous meeting the Partnership had extended the Delivery Plan period beyond 2024 to provide direction and certainty for partners while the next Community Safety Plan was developed.

5.3 During the discussion that ensued the following key points were made:

- The final Delivery Plan had been agreed by all the partners.
- The Delivery Plan set out a range of ambitious and clearly defined outcomes. These would be performance managed to drive delivery forward and ensure that the impact of the Partnership and its activities were properly measured.
- The Partnership Leads highlighted the development of a website which Councillors would be able to access and the development of a communications strategy.
- The Delivery Plan team met monthly and was working closely with Norfolk Constabulary, District Council local partnership leads and the NHS to provide for a co-ordinated analysis of anti-social behaviour data. The team was looking to identify changing patterns in anti-social behaviour and fill in gaps in data collection and provide for an informed and collective response. This important work was enabling partners to collect and record better quality data.
- For the last 18 months the delivery team had collected acute hospital A&E data for where medical attention might have been sought following an incident of domestic abuse or serious violence which might not have been reported to the Police. Until now, each of the three acute hospitals had collected and stored data in different formats, however, as the pandemic came slowly to an end, by working closely with CCG leads, the team aimed to introduce a cognisant approach and collect data in a way that enabled Norfolk wide, regional, and national comparisons to be more easily made.
- The Sub Panel recognised the importance of data quality and of having a single data collection process and supported the appointment of a data analyst.
- It was pointed out that the delivery team worked with NCCSP Responsible Authorities to ensure that the Community Trigger process complied with national guidance. The review was being done through a task and finish group that aimed to publish an updated process as soon as possible.
- The Sub Panel asked if further information could be provided for Councillors on where the community trigger process had been activated and where communities felt that this had resulted in change.
- To help the Sub Panel's scrutiny, it was suggested that it would be helpful for future reports to provide a clear sense of where the Partnership was nearly meeting the success measures and where it was further away.
- The Sub Panel wanted to better understand whether the referral process at district level around substance misuse prevention and accommodation was

strong enough for those who most needed this kind of help. It was agreed that a written response would be provided.

- The Sub Panel also asked for further information to demonstrate how the wider implications of drug misuse within the local community were being addressed, including an update on Project ADDER, an intensive whole system approach to tackle drug misuse in the Greater Norwich area. Also an explanation of how all agencies were working together to provide wraparound support for individuals, so that Councillors could understand the role of every agency and their input. In particular, how agencies were providing outreach support and whether a Housing First approach was being followed.
- The Sub Panel noted work was being done on an assessment of the integrated offer of help to offenders to ensure that the correct types of early intervention measures were put in place.
- The Sub Panel asked if it would be possible to include in a future report some feedback on which communities were unable to use the community trigger process and why this was the case and where there were gaps with accessibility and what could be done to support those who were affected. This would enable the Sub-Panel to better understand where there were any difficulties and what made for best practice. It would also be useful to the Sub-Panel to have some comparisons made with the position taken elsewhere in the region.
- The Partnership Leads agreed to take back to the Partnership comments about the Independent Member Advisory Group not appearing to be representative of all local communities in Norfolk and whether anything could be done to encourage and capture the voices of those parts of the community who might not be confident to engage.
- It was noted that through the work of the Norfolk Against Scams Partnership, work was being done with partners in Trading Standards to introduce a national multi agency approach to fraud. This would ensure that the Partnership were accessing the correct data sources to understand the issue and review current frauds and provide for better campaign communication systems. Existing methods of communication were being adapted to make more use of face-to-face contact with those affected by fraud who came from hard-to-reach communities.
- The Partnership Leads agreed to provide a written response to a question regarding Delivery Plan action 1.17: whether there was still a prolific offender unit and if this was based within divisions or centrally.
- Councillors asked how they would be able to learn more about the development of a communications strategy, an issue that the Partnership Leads said would be considered at a future meeting.
- Councillors discussed the multi-agency arrangements for the safeguarding of adolescents at risk of county lines activities. The evidence presented to the Scrutiny Sub Panel showed the impact of Partnership activity on tackling county lines and explained how vulnerable young people and Looked After Children were being protected.
- The Scrutiny Sub Panel welcomed the responses set out in the report about the multi-agency procedures that were in place in Norfolk for the identification and screening of young people who were identified to be at risk of exploitation.
- The Scrutiny Sub Panel was informed that the St Giles SOS+ awareness-raising sessions were aimed specifically at pupils, teachers and parents and covered various county lines issues. It was agreed that an evaluation and impact report from the St Giles SOS+ webinars should be incorporated into a future report to the Sub Panel.
- It was also agreed that a written response to the following question regarding Delivery Plan action 1.14 would be provided: What was the Partnership's own self-assessment of how far away it was from the success measure that 'strong referral pathways exist' and was there any geographical variation across the county?

- It was noted that funding for phases 2 and 3 of the Safter Streets project was expected to end shortly following the uptake of funding for phase 4 of the project.

#### 5.4 The Scrutiny Sub Panel:

- 1) **NOTED** the final Delivery Plan.
- 2) **NOTED** that written responses to questions raised in the meeting would be provided and appended to these minutes, and requests for further information would be addressed in reports to the next meeting.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting if the agenda allowed.

### 6 Partnership Priority - Serious Violence

6.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, which introduced the progress being made by the Partnership towards delivering agreed outcomes for the serious violence priority, focusing on domestic abuse and sexual violence.

6.2 The Chair began the discussion by reminding those present and watching the livestream that abuse can and does happen to anyone and is indiscriminate of age, gender, race, profession or social background. The Sub Panel was advised that the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board was about to relaunch the See Something, Hear Something, Say Something campaign with partners. While the campaign would focus on older adults in receipt of care, the Chair emphasised that support services were available to anyone who was experiencing any form of abuse, signposting people to both the Norfolk County Council and Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner's websites.

6.3 The Partnership Leads advised that it was not possible to talk about current Domestic Homicide cases.

During the discussion that ensued the following key points were made:

- The Sub Panel discussed the work of the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Group (DASVG).
- The Domestic Abuse Bill had altered the response to domestic abuse victims nationally.
- Domestic abuse cuts across all areas. It was not specifically the remit of any agency and so could easily be missed.
- The Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS) would see a consortium of specialist support services working together to ensure people living across Norfolk had access to a full range of help and guidance regardless of where they lived.
- It was pointed out that part of the strategy was aimed at looking to use different forms of news media to target certain groups of society more effectively.
- Victims and their families often required additional support from statutory services, including housing, and children's services.
- Project CARA was an intervention designed to raise awareness of domestic abuse through conditional cautions requiring perpetrators to complete (in person) a pair of CARA workshops within a specific time period.
- Norfolk was an excellent example to other counties of the practice of restorative justice.
- Causes of domestic abuse were queried and the impact on children.
- The Sub Panel asked if it would be possible to access the evaluation reports of

perpetrator schemes, particularly those on reoffending rates and the building better relationships scheme. It was agreed that a written response would be provided. The Sub Panel was advised that this response would include any information that probation colleagues are able to release and signpost to published academic studies

- The Sub Panel asked if an update could be provided on where there are gaps in support for victims in Norfolk and how they will be plugged (for example, unmet needs of victims fleeing abuse without recourse to public funds who are unable to find safe accommodation). It was agreed that a written response would be provided.
- The Sub Panel asked for further details regarding the numbers of people who were coming forward for help and felt that things had changed for them, including the numbers of perpetrators who had changed their behaviour because of restorative justice. It was agreed that a written response would be provided.
- Councillors gave their continued support to the HEAR campaign that called on employers to break the silence around domestic abuse and HEAR, help and provide support to their staff on this important issue.
- The Sub-Panel noted that information presented in the report would be of use in raising awareness of contextual safeguarding issues amongst Councillors.

6.4 The Sub Panel:

- 1) **NOTED** the report.
- 2) **NOTED** that written responses to questions raised in the meeting would be provided and appended to these minutes.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting if the agenda allowed.

## 7 Partnership Priority – Prevent

7.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services that introduced the progress being made by the Partnership towards delivering agreed outcomes for the Prevent priority.

7.2 During discussion the following key points were made:

- The Sub Panel asked for the Partnership to provide an update on the Prevent risk review and assessment.
- The Sub Panel asked how the Partnership intended to respond to the newer online methods of radicalisation. There appeared to be a gap in public understanding around how to refer young people and it would be helpful for Councillors to be advised at the June meeting what support was being made available.
- The Sub Panel asked for an update on how the Partnership was addressing hate crime.
- The Sub Panel asked for an update on the feedback and evaluation of the member training sessions on Prevent.

7.3 The Scrutiny Sub:

- 1) **NOTED** the report
- 2) **NOTED** that requests for further information would be addressed in reports to the next meeting.
- 3) **AGREED** to delegate to the Chair and Vice-Chair the task of reporting the outcome of

its discussion to the Scrutiny Committee, through a written report to the next scheduled meeting if the agenda allowed.

## 8 Forward Work Programme

8.1 The Scrutiny Sub Panel received a report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services that set out a proposed Forward Work Programme for the Scrutiny Sub Panel that could be used to shape future meeting agendas and items for consideration.

8.2 The Scrutiny Sub Panel **AGREED** the forward work programme as set out in Appendix A to the report with the following additional items for the June 2022 meeting:

- Partnership priorities: Criminal Exploitation & Serious Violence – a progress update on Partnership actions to target county lines (including evaluation on St Giles SOS webinars).
- Partnership priority: Neighbourhood Crime – a progress update on Partnership actions to target neighbourhood crime, with a focus on Project ADDER and the Community Trigger Process.
- Partnership priority: Serious Violence – an overview of the Domestic Homicide Review process.
- Partnership priority: Prevent – updates requested during the discussion at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 12.05 pm

### Chair



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or Text Relay on 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

**NCCSP Scrutiny Sub Panel  
24 February 2022**

**Questions requiring written responses**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Question and response</b>
<b>Item 5: Final Delivery Plan</b>	
1.	<p>Reference Delivery Plan action 1.14: Is there a strong referral process at district level around substance misuse prevention and accommodation?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>Norfolk Domestic Abuse Partnership Board (NDAPB) within the Support in Safe Accommodation Strategy for Norfolk based on the Needs Assessment undertaken by the Norfolk Office of Data &amp; Analytics (NODA) highlighted the issues there are in relation to those with complex needs such as those who have high levels of substance misuse and who are victim-survivors being referred and accessing safe accommodation. This is particularly relevant to male victim-survivors and those who have protected characteristics because the majority of safe accommodation across Norfolk is for females only. One of the 5 aims of the strategy is to ensure that we provide 38 additional bedspaces and that this new accommodation is accessible to all adults and children that require accommodation and support, but we do not know the level of demand from those that are considered to have complex needs such as those with high levels of substance misuse in terms of specialist support they may require. To help resolve this gap we are working with our health colleagues to see where this tips into health or an integration between health and social care. The new Norfolk Integrated Domestic Abuse Service (NIDAS) will ensure support for those who are considered medium to high risk (including those who substance misuse) within the community. Although we acknowledge there is a strong referral process for women in particular, we are working towards meeting the gap in terms of all other groups including those with more complex needs. We are working on bringing some case examples to identify the different referral pathways and where experiences have worked well and those areas that need to be improved. It may be of note to also mention the strong links between DA services and Change, Grow, Live to address the issue of substance misuse.</p> <p>Public Health Norfolk, the commissioner of the Change, Grow, Live local drug and alcohol support service stated that referrals into the service are appropriate, and people are aware of when to referral people in need of drug and alcohol support to services. District councils were asked to assess the strength of the referrals received by early help hubs. Again, their assessment is that referral routes are fit for purpose and advice and information is already available on a local level for</p>

	<p>making referrals. There is local variation in how early help hub operate on districts, but all responders confirmed that referral routes where in place and working well.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Reference Delivery Plan action 1.17: Is there still a prolific offender unit and is this based within divisions or centrally?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>Norfolk &amp; Suffolk have a joint Integrated Offender Management (IOM) function. Throughout the region, the provision and structure of IOM varies greatly. Some forces have functions sitting within intelligence, or neighbourhood policing, some incorporate their Public Protection Unit (PPU) into IOM and some also include DA offenders. In Norfolk and Suffolk, the IOM function has retained a degree of separation.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Reference Delivery Plan action 1.14: What is the Partnership’s own self-assessment of how far away it is from the success measure that ‘strong referral pathways exist’ and is there any geographical variation?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>NCCSP partners have worked collaboratively to ensure there are referral pathways between police, local authority, fire and rescue authority, probation provider and Clinical Commissioning Groups to mental health services and substance misuse services. Change, Grow, Live (CGL), the substance misuse service provider in Norfolk, receive referrals from all statutory providers that enable them to provide support to those who need it. They work with referrers to maintain strong referral pathways and to ensure referrals received are appropriate. Dual Diagnosis (co-existing mental health and alcohol and drug misuse problems) referrals can pose a challenge to substance misuse services due to complexity of support requirements. CGL work collaboratively with mental health services to support those clients effectively. No significant variation in strength of referral pathways in different geographical areas of Norfolk have been identified. CGL are able to effectively assess referrals and provide support to those who need it.</p> <p>Both early help and accommodation support are offered on a district basis, with each district having capacity to deliver their offer uniquely to meet statutory objectives. Generally, the early help and accommodation support offer in each district have strong referral routes designed to meet the local need. Further, the majority of responsible authorities have a duty to refer to housing authorities when service users may be homeless or threatened with homelessness, as set out in the <a href="#">Homelessness code of guidance for local authorities</a>.</p> <p>Early help is also offered to families through Children Services who stated: Early Help is an integral part of everyone’s role. It is the initial response offered by all services in contact with children, young people and families when they need extra support to flourish. It is not a specific service or team. Children’s Service contributes to the Early Help offer by providing a targeted intervention service for families who don’t require Section 17 or Child Protection Social Work response but need</p>



	<p>support to address complex and persistent worries via the Family Support Teams. Requests for this service are made through the Children’s Services front door, Children’s Advice and Duty Service (CADS). Children’s Services through the Partner &amp; Community Focus Teams offer training, coaching and information &amp; guidance to support all professionals in the Early Help system to ensure families get the right support at the right time. This helps professionals who have the relationship with the family to complete an Early Help Assessment and Plan with the family to identify and coordinate the support required. Info on this support is available <a href="http://www.norfolkscb.org/people-working-with-children/early-help/">www.norfolkscb.org/people-working-with-children/early-help/</a>.</p> <p>All Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust (NSFT) services can be referred into by the GP or other professional, patients can also self-refer to services such as the crisis team, Wellbeing Services, and contact the First Response 111 telephone service. Details are available <a href="#">NSFT’s website</a>. There is no barrier to people with drug and alcohol issues or who are at risk of offending, or have offended. In respect of those who have been arrested NSFT have teams within the Police custody suites who will triage, signpost and/or refer into secondary mental health services or request a Mental Health Act Assessment for detention if indicated. NSFT also have community forensic teams who will take on patients who have an offending background. There is a mental health worker assigned to the police who will go out in a police car to support where police think a person may be displaying mental illness, there is also a mental health team within the police control room to assist and advise police where mental illness is an issue.</p> <p>Overall, the partnership feels that it has strong referral are in place. Public Health Norfolk, the commissioner of the local drug and alcohol support service stated that referrals into the service are appropriate, and people are aware of when to referral people in need of drug and alcohol support to services. District councils were asked to assess the strength of the referrals received by early help hubs. Again, their assessment is that referral routes are fit for purpose and advice and information is already available on a local level for making referrals. There is local variation in how early help hub operate on districts, but all responders confirmed that referral routes where in place and working well.</p> <p>For response relating to accommodation support, please see response to question one.</p>
<p><b>Item 6: Serious Violence</b></p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Would it be possible to access the evaluation reports of perpetrator schemes, particularly those on reoffending rates and the building better relationships scheme?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>The Domestic Abuse Bill Consultation, Home Office (2018) revealed the necessity to identify innovation and best practice from a national audience regarding perpetrator intervention, prevention, and protection, which is key to stop repeat and serial perpetrators from reoffending and reduce crisis intervention. It must be remembered an intervention programme cannot exist</p>

in isolation; they need to work with current embedded partner agencies and services as part of a whole service approach protecting all who are at risk of abuse.

The following 2 approaches have been developed in Norfolk.

Project CARA (Conditional Cautioning and Relationship Abuse) - developed and run by Hampshire Constabulary and The Hampton Trust, with the permission of the Director of the Public Prosecution (DPP), allows the Police to use out of court disposals, conditional cautions for reported first-time domestic abuse incidents. The perpetrator must comply with attending a short rehabilitative awareness programme which addresses abusive relationship behaviours. If the offender fails to comply, then they may face prosecution for the original offence. Acceptance to the DA Conditional Cautioning scheme must meet specific criteria as set by the Director of the Public Prosecution (DPP) and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).

The academic randomised control trial Strang et al (2017)<sup>1</sup> established 35% fewer men reoffended against their partner, and reduced further harm to victims by 27%<sup>2</sup>. The evaluation suggests that an effective initial rehabilitation programme delivered at an early stage to low-risk offenders can reduce crime harm and the prevalence and frequency of reoffending, Kerry (2015).

Recent research Feb 22 [The CARA \(Cautioning and Relationship Abuse\) Service: theory of change, impact evaluation and economic benefits study report — University of Birmingham](#) demonstrates the impact evaluation and the economic benefits study suggest CARA Service has a significant impact on recidivism.

This project found that the CARA (Cautioning and Relationship Abuse) Service has a significant impact on recidivism. On average, the CARA Service reduced offences by 81% in the first six months and by 56% in the first 12 months for West Midlands. CARA reduced offences by 39% in the first six months and by 41% in the first 12 months for Hampshire. The economic benefits study suggests introducing a CARA Service into a police force area are significant, even using conservative estimates.

These numbers are conservative estimates of the true impact of CARA effect (i.e., the actual benefit of CARA could be greater).

Norfolk Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Partnership Approach (DAPPA) - The specification for this service is to deliver an accredited Behaviour Change Programme which assists the perpetrator to address their abusive behaviours, prevent reoffending and reduce repeat victimisation and vulnerability. Perpetrators will be identified through an evidenced based approach by the Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Partnership Approach (DAPPA) team. Individuals will be assessed for

<sup>1</sup> Strang et al (2017) *Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing*.

<sup>2</sup> Using the CCHI, the team calculated that the recommended number of prison days under English sentencing guidelines for reoffenders in the year following the first arrest was an average of 8.4 days for the CARA attendees, compared to an average of 11.6 days for offenders not sent to CARA.

suitability to engage in the Behaviour Change Programme by The Change Project in consultation with the DAPPA team and the perpetrator.

Similar approaches such as the Northumbria Multi Agency Tasking and Coordination (MATAC) approach, [Davies - Tackling domestic abuse locally OA.pdf \(northumbria.ac.uk\)](#) which has been subjected to evaluation, Drive and other independent perpetrator programs, has already been presented to the DASVG partner agencies and has been used to inform perpetrator intervention progression in the county.

A two-year evaluation of the MATAC ended in March 2017. It utilised a mixed methods approach, comprising four elements: analysis of perpetrator monitoring, case studies, an online survey and semi-structured interviews with MATAC stakeholders, victims and perpetrators. The MATAC is an innovative way to tackle serial domestic abuse perpetrators at the same time as working to protect victims.

The Drive Project was developed in 2015 – to address a gap in work with high-harm perpetrators of domestic abuse. Drive works across England and Wales with local service providers delivering the intervention in local areas. In every site, partnerships with local specialist domestic abuse organisations to design and deliver a programme tailored for the locality. Drive focuses on priority (high-harm and/or serial) perpetrators, as this group carries the greatest risk of serious harm and engagement with available services is low. Drive implements a whole-system approach using intensive case management alongside a coordinated multi agency response, working closely with victim services, the police, probation, children’s social services, housing, substance misuse and mental health teams. This work is done in partnership with statutory agencies such as the police, public health, and children’s social care.

The University of Bristol’s evaluation phase 2 [link here](#) of the project found the number of Drive service users perpetrating abuse types reduced. Drive focuses on reducing risk and increasing victim safety by combining disruption, support and behaviour change interventions alongside the crucial protective work of victim services. The service has been developed to knit together existing services, complementing and enhancing existing interventions.

Currently there is no HMPPS evaluation of Building Better Relationships (BBR), the Ministry of Justice’s Data and Analysis team continues to scope the potential of a good quality re-offending impact evaluation. This area of work has been delayed due to the impact of the pandemic. All programmes remain under review to ensure they remain in line with the evidence and current best practice.

BBR has been accredited in accordance with the standards and criteria set by Correctional Services Accreditation and Advisory Panel (CSAAP), an independent committee of international subject experts. CSAAP attest that the program is designed in a way that adheres to the latest evidence and thinking about what works to reduce reoffending. Further information about the role of CSAAP and the criteria on which they base their recommendation can be found by visiting

	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/offending-behaviour-programmes-and-interventions#accreditation">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/offending-behaviour-programmes-and-interventions#accreditation</a> .
5.	<p>Could an update be provided on where there are gaps in support for victims in Norfolk and how they will be plugged (for example, unmet needs of victims fleeing abuse without recourse to public funds who are unable to find safe accommodation)?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>The gaps in support have been outlined in the strategy Norfolk Domestic Abuse Partnership Board (NDAPB) mentioned above. For example, we know at present that not all refuges provide the same level of support or in some cases do not provide support for children. We are working with key refuge support providers on an updated and improved children’s specification so there is a level playing field across Norfolk. As mentioned above we do not currently have the knowledge in relation to what support is required for males as victim-survivors and/or those with protected characteristics. We are working with the Norfolk Office of Data and Analytics (NODA) to improve our intelligence and be able to respond to this, additionally our work with NESTA on the development of a victim-survivor engagement framework will bring qualitative information that will be helpful in our further shaping and improving of services. In direct response to those with NRPF we are considering a flexible Countywide Pot (that will be outside of that funded through the New Burden’s Funding) so that we are more able to meet these needs of such victim-survivors and be able to pilot specific services as it is likely those with NRPF will be included in any future work in relation to the DA Act and this is supported by the Domestic Abuse Commissioner UK (Nicole Jacobs). We have also established a working group under the NDAPB to consider what needs there may be from those fleeing the crisis in Ukraine and this will be fed up with the Countywide group. In terms of other support gaps, we know that NIDAS is able to support those who are considered medium-high risk in the community and therefore we have a provided 3 grants to providers and supported by districts (one in Norwich is also to lease safe accommodation), to directly respond to this gap and this will be piloted for one year ending March 2023.</p>
6.	<p>Could the Partnership provide details of the numbers of people coming forward for help, the numbers who feel they have been helped and the number of perpetrators who have been helped?</p> <p><b>Response from the Partnership:</b></p> <p>In Norfolk, 22,072 domestic abuse-related incidents and crimes were recorded in the year ending March 2021 (<a href="#">source</a>). Every domestic abuse victim who reports a crime to the police will be offered support through the Norfolk and Suffolk Victim Care Service if they are assessed as standard risk, or through NIDAS, for those assessed as medium and high risk. There will be many repeat cases within this figure, exemplified by 26% of cases discussed at MARACs in Norfolk in the year ending March 2021 being repeat cases. Not all victims and survivors of domestic abuse will report to the police, seeking help from a range of support services, including NIDAS. The number of who feel they were helped is not yet available for NIDAS as the service has only recently mobilised and has not reported on outcomes achieved. When available this information will be</p>

scrutinised by the funding partners, led by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Norfolk and will also be independently audited. Perpetrators are supported to change behaviour through a variety of interventions locally, including Domestic Abuse Perpetrator Partnership Approach (DAPPA); Project CARA; Red Snapper; Probation; IOM; and Children Services' Intensive and Specialist Support Service.

Please note, to provide the detail requested through this question would take many partners a significant amount of time, acquiring permissions to share information and for it to be held in the public domain. To save the partnership time, this data has not been requested.