



THE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE TWELFTH
REPORT FROM THE HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SESSION 2012-2013 HC 836

The draft Anti-social Behaviour Bill: pre-legislative scrutiny

**Presented to Parliament
by the Secretary of State for the Home Department
by Command of Her Majesty**

April 2013

© **Crown copyright 2013**

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Reduction Unit
Home Office
4th Floor Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

This publication is also available for download at www.official-documents.gov.uk

ISBN: 9780101860727

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

ID 2553727 04/13 28882 19585

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE HOME AFFAIRS SELECT COMMITTEE'S PRE-LEGISLATIVE SCRUTINY OF THE DRAFT ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR BILL

Although levels of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) are falling, we cannot afford to be complacent. Some 2.4m incidents of ASB were reported to the police in the year to the end of September 2012¹ alone, and we know that many more incidents are reported to other agencies or not reported at all.

Much of what is often described as ASB, such as vandalism, graffiti or harassment, is actually crime. However, even incidents that appear minor in isolation can have a devastating cumulative impact when part of a persistent pattern of behaviour, and we know that such abuse is often targeted at the most vulnerable members of our society. Effective powers to tackle ASB are essential for protecting victims and communities, and it is vital that we get our reforms right first time.

Over the past two and a half years we have worked with the police, local authorities, social landlords, businesses, victims and many others to ensure they have all had the opportunity to shape the proposals. Throughout the process of policy development, we have listened to the views of those who have the greatest stake in the success of these reforms to ensure the changes we are making are the right ones, including running workshops up and down the country, testing the proposals with hundreds of frontline professionals including police officers, local authority ASB leads and social landlords.

The draft legislation published on 13 December last year detailed the proposals announced in our White Paper *'Putting victims first'*, published in May 2012². The scrutiny of the draft Bill has formed an essential part of this ongoing process of engagement and we are grateful to the Home Affairs Select Committee for its constructive and insightful report. We welcome many of the Committee's recommendations and the Government's response is outlined below. For clarity, we have used the Committee's own headings and include the paragraphs from the 'conclusions and recommendations' section of the final report in bold.

INTRODUCTION

Anti-social behaviour continues to trouble communities across the country. For some, it is no more than a background irritation, but for others antisocial behaviour can be a debilitating blight on their lives. It can corrode community spirit, creating a breeding ground for more serious crime.

The current anti-social behaviour control regime, though effective in some cases, leaves many people frustrated by a slow and uncoordinated response. Persistent antisocial behaviour, if it is not addressed quickly and conclusively, can mean months or years of misery for the victims. The impact of anti-social behaviour on the individuals and communities affected must not be under-estimated. Perpetrators continue to reoffend and overall levels of antisocial behaviour are stubbornly high. In this context, we welcome the Government's decision to review and rationalise the statutory framework for dealing with ASB. However, as we go on to explain in

¹ ONS Statistical Bulletin *Crime in England and Wales, year ending September 2012*

² <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime/anti-social-behaviour/white-paper/>

this report, dealing with ASB depends on more than just the formal interventions available - it depends on facilitating inter-agency working, providing support services, and providing a speedy and predictable process through the court system. If the Government is serious about tackling ASB, then it will bring forward proposals on these as companion measures during the Bill's eventual passage through Parliament.

Government response:

The Committee is right to highlight the impact that ASB can have on the lives of victims and communities. We also agree with the Committee when it notes that the solution does not lie solely with formal interventions. As we have always made clear, informal interventions such as acceptable behaviour contracts, restorative justice, mediation and warning letters can be very effective. However in those cases where informal measures are not successful or appropriate, it is right that frontline professionals have the formal powers they need to deal with the situation quickly and effectively.

Victims of ASB have told us what they want. First and foremost they want the behaviour to stop, and the perpetrators to make amends. They want the authorities to take their problem seriously, to understand the impact on their lives and to protect them from further harm. They want the issue dealt with swiftly and they don't want it to happen again. Formal powers are an important part of the answer, but the Committee is also right to highlight the importance of inter-agency working, support services and responsive court processes, especially when it comes to giving the public the confidence that agencies will take their complaint seriously.

The reforms we are introducing to local crime and policing - including the introduction of elected Police and Crime Commissioners, street-by-street crime maps and neighbourhood beat meetings - will help, making police forces and their partners more accountable for the way they deal with the issues that matter most to local people. However, the White Paper highlighted a number of other ways in which the Government is working with local agencies to improve the response to ASB, and ensure it focuses on the needs of victims:

- **Better handling of ASB calls from the public:** The Home Office worked with eight police forces and their local partners in 2011 to trial a new approach to handling calls from the public and managing cases to ensure repeat and vulnerable victims of anti-social behaviour were identified and prioritised more effectively and received a better service. There is still more to do but the eight forces reported encouraging initial results from the trials – including better working relationships with other agencies, an improved service to the victim and the start of a shift in culture, with call handlers responding to the needs of the victim, rather than just ticking boxes. We are working with police forces and partners to share the lessons from the trials so that every community can benefit.
- **Coordinated approach to high-risk cases:** Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) are action-oriented sessions where agencies come together to agree specific tasks to help protect vulnerable victims. They were initially developed as a way of dealing with domestic violence, where many different agencies were likely to be involved in supporting one family, but many areas are now using this methodology to deal with high-risk ASB cases. We will continue to encourage other areas to adopt this approach.

- **County Courts:** We have made changes to the county court system in the Crime and Courts Bill which will provide for greater flexibility to move cases around to take advantage of a court which has greater capacity as compared with its neighbour. The single county court seeks to remove the geographic and jurisdictional boundaries to provide a single court with a national jurisdiction for England and Wales irrespective of where the court is convened.
- **Community Harm Statements:** We will continue to promote Community Harm Statements, making it easier to demonstrate the harm caused to victims and communities by ASB. This will ensure that terrorised communities' voices are heard in the court room and will inform agencies' decisions on what action to take.

ELECTRONIC FORMAT OF THE DRAFT BILL

We recommend that the Leader of the House of Commons ensure that in future all draft Bills are published in a form in which the normal features of the chosen format are enabled, so that users can make full use of search, copy and paste, and text-to-speech features. This is not just a matter of convenience - though convenience alone is a compelling argument - it is about providing information in the most accessible format possible.

Publication of the draft bill was delayed by over a month compared with the timetable initially proposed to us by the Home Office. This left us just six working weeks for our inquiry, an unacceptably short period for pre-legislative scrutiny. This was a particular problem for witnesses, who in effect had only the Christmas period to produce submissions to us. It was clear from several responses to our call for evidence that witnesses were basing their responses on the White Paper and had not yet had time to reflect on the detail of the draft Bill. Moreover, the Government will continue to consult on the Community Remedy until 7 March 2013, so its position on this important component of the bill is not yet formed.

Government response:

The draft Bill was published on 13 December by The Stationery Office. The Government welcomes the Committee raising this issue and will be looking at ways to ensure future publications are accessible.

On timing, frontline professionals from across the country have played a crucial role in developing the new powers over the past two years and will continue to shape the reforms so we can get the legislation right first time. However, it is clearly a concern if witnesses did not feel they had sufficient time to comment on the draft Bill.

As a result, we have considered all the written evidence published alongside the Committee's report and also organised a number of workshops with interested parties. This includes the police, local authorities, social landlords and victims of ASB so that views could be explored in detail ahead of formally introducing legislation to the House.

The Committee notes that the Community Remedy consultation³ closed on 7 March, three weeks after the publication of its final report. This was to enable a full 12 weeks of public consultation.

³ <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/about-us/consultations/community-remedy-consultation/>

While the Committee was not able to consider responses to the consultation in preparing its report, we note that many of the written responses submitted to the Committee included views on the remedy. We will ensure that changes identified as part of the public consultation are considered alongside the Committee's recommendations before legislation is brought forward.

PENALTY

Breach of an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) on application was a criminal offence, but breach of an Injunction to Prevent Nuisance and Annoyance (IPNA) is not. We welcome the move away from automatic criminalisation for breach in the case of the IPNA, which is likely to be the main tool in the new ASB regime.

However, breach of this civil injunction could still ultimately lead to imprisonment. It is therefore concerning how much easier it is likely to be to obtain an IPNA than an ASBO. The IPNA is available on a lower standard of proof than the old ASBO on application, and available to more agencies than the old Anti-Social Behaviour Injunction (ASBI). Widening access to the IPNA risks imposing severe restrictions on more people and additional safeguards must be applied. For the IPNA, the threshold of "conduct capable of causing nuisance or annoyance" is far too broad and could be applied even if there were no actual nuisance or annoyance whatsoever. A proportionality test and a requirement that either "intent or recklessness" be demonstrated should be attached to the IPNA, as well as the requirement "that such an injunction is necessary to protect relevant persons from further anti-social acts by the respondent".

We also believe that there should be a specific requirement for any individual prohibition or requirement to be necessary and proportionate for the purposes of addressing the behaviour that led to the application for an injunction.

We note that there is a mechanism to allow offenders over 16 to shorten the period a Criminal Behaviour Order applied for if they complete an approved course. We see no reason why someone younger should be debarred from this option.

We note that there is a specific exemption from dispersal powers for peaceful picketing and recommend that this be extended to cover all forms of peaceful protest.

Government response:

The Crime Prevention Injunction (referred to as the IPNA by the Committee⁴) was designed as a purely civil order that agencies could secure quickly, in a matter of days or even hours if necessary, to protect victims and stop an individual's behaviour escalating. While the Committee welcomes the lack of criminal sanction on breach, it notes that ultimately, breach of the new injunction could result in a prison sentence on a lower standard of proof than the current Anti-social Behaviour Order.

⁴ The Crime Prevention Injunction is referred to as the Injunction to Prevent Nuisance and Annoyance (IPNA) on the face of the legislation.

However, the draft Bill imposes a second condition that must be satisfied before an injunction can be granted, namely that the court must consider that it is “just and convenient” for such an injunction to be granted “for the purpose of preventing the respondent from engaging in anti-social behaviour”. Within this test, the court would consider issues such as proportionality, harm and intent as part of its decision. Housing practitioners who use the current Anti-social Behaviour Injunction (ASBI) have told us that the courts rigorously apply considerations of proportionality. We believe this would continue to be case with the new injunction. Ultimately, we believe the court is best placed to decide on the proportionality and necessity of both an injunction and any prohibitions and positive requirements that it includes, and will do so as a matter of course.

Our rationale for adopting the current ASBI test⁵ of ‘nuisance and annoyance’ is that it is supported by 15 years of case law and is well known by the county courts and many ASB practitioners (including many councils and police forces where they work closely with housing providers). Adding to the test could jeopardise that clarity, and slow the injunction process down, without adding any additional safeguards in practice.

However, the principle that the injunction should be used proportionately and, in most cases, after informal measures have been tried, is one we whole-heartedly agree with. We will make very clear in accompanying guidance that the new injunction should only be used when it is appropriate to do so and necessary to deal with the behaviour of the individual. We will also continue to stress the important role that informal interventions can play in dealing with anti-social individuals, making clear that, in most cases, these should be considered before formal court action is taken.

The Committee highlighted the fact that for the Criminal Behaviour Order, approved courses are only available for those over the age of 16. We agree that, in principle, this measure should also apply to under-16s. However, there are also significant equality considerations to take into account. It would be unfair if under-16s who had the means to pay for an approved course could shorten the term of their order, whilst those who did not, could not. On the basis that this measure should apply equally or not at all, we will amend the legislation so as to remove the section on approved courses and instead make it clear in guidance that the court can ultimately decide on whether the length of an order should be varied on completion of a specific course, regardless of age or means.

We also accept that an exemption from the dispersal power should extend to all forms of peaceful protest. This will be included in the legislation and will directly replicate the provision in Section 30 of the **Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003**, which the new dispersal power replaces.

OTHER INSTRUMENTS

Each time successive Governments have amended the ASB regime, the definition of anti-social behaviour has grown wider, the standard of proof has fallen lower and the punishment for breach has toughened. This arms race must end. We are not convinced that widening the net to open up more kinds of behaviour to formal intervention will actually help to deal with the problem at hand. A duty to consult local authorities must be included in the dispersal power

⁵ As outlined in Part V, Chapter III, Section 152 of the Housing Act 1996.

where it is applied for a period of longer than six hours. Public Spaces Protection Orders must include a requirement for six monthly interim approval. There should also be a clear exemption to dispersal powers where there is a genuine need to travel through the area.

Government response:

As the Committee itself acknowledges in its report, even apparently ‘low-level’ ASB can have a devastating impact. As such, we believe that the response to ASB should focus on the harm the behaviour is causing, not on some proscribed list of ‘anti-social’ behaviours. One of the mistakes of the past was to introduce new legislation every time a new, potentially harmful, behaviour was identified, leaving frontline professionals with a bloated and confusing set of powers designed to deal with very specific problems. These reforms aim to put that right by rationalising the powers available to practitioners, providing maximum flexibility to deal with the issues that matter to the public, whilst retaining appropriate safeguards. In doing so, we have sought to build on those elements of the current legislation that we know work. As a result, many of the definitions and sanctions in the draft Bill are already in use. We are seeking to make the powers and sanctions more effective, rather than to lower the threshold for what is considered ‘anti-social’ or introduce disproportionate punishments.

The new dispersal power is designed to be a dynamic tool, allowing the police to deal with ASB quickly and effectively on the spot and provide short-term (up to 48 hours) respite to communities being blighted by groups or individuals. It is likely that this power will be used in the evenings and at weekends, when the right representative from a local authority may not be available to consult. It is also important to note that, whilst local authorities are currently consulted on the designation of a ‘dispersal zone’, they are not consulted on the case-by-case use of existing dispersal powers within that zone, which are operational matters for the police. As a result, we believe the Committee’s recommendation would severely constrain use of the new power to protect communities, and goes well beyond the current consultation arrangements.

We do, however, accept the Committee’s argument that the proposed dispersal power would benefit from additional safeguards to ensure use is proportionate and appropriate. We will change the legislation to state that use of the dispersal power should be approved in advance by an officer of at least the rank of inspector. This will ensure that the wider impacts on, for example, community relations, can be considered properly before use.

We agree with the Committee’s recommendation that a dispersal power should not be used where there is a genuine need to travel through the area and will make sure the legislation allows for this.

We do not agree that the new Public Space Protection Order should be reviewed every six months. The new order will replace three existing orders that do not currently require any formal review and as such, introducing a requirement to review every three years (as drafted in the legislation) is already a proportionate safeguard. Where a decision is taken locally about issues such as dog fouling or drinking in public places, we do not believe it would be right to impose a requirement to review the decision every six months. However, we do accept that there are some situations where a local authority may itself want a shorter review period, particularly

where an order is being used to deal with short- or medium-term issues. We will make clear in guidance that local agencies need not wait for three years before reviewing the order and should consider this on a case by case basis.

YOUNG PEOPLE

Anti-social behaviour measures must be a short, focused nudge for young people to set them on the right track, not a millstone that will weigh around their necks for years to come. The bill must include an annual review of all formal ASB interventions imposed on under-18s to ensure that restrictions are not continued unnecessarily if behaviour has changed.

For under-18s, IPNAs should be available for a maximum of 12 months and should only be available after attempts to resolve the issue through informal support and acceptable behaviour agreements have failed.

Government response:

When we published the White Paper, we did not propose a minimum or maximum length of injunction for young people. Feedback from the consultation on this point was mixed and so we agreed to consider the issue further as part of the process of pre-legislative scrutiny.

The Committee makes a compelling case to limit the length of the injunction to 12 months for those under the age of 18. Given that the injunction is specifically designed to be a civil, preventative power (complimenting the Criminal Behaviour Order for more serious anti-social behaviour), I believe this limit would be proportionate. 12 months will provide victims and communities with the respite they deserve, send a strong message to young perpetrators that their behaviour is not acceptable and provide sufficient time for them to work with local agencies to address any underlying issues driving their behaviour, such as substance misuse. As such, we are content to accept this recommendation and will amend the legislation accordingly.

While we agree with the Committee that in most cases, informal interventions should be tried before more formal sanctions, there may be a minority of cases where immediate court action is the right option and frontline professionals must have the flexibility to protect victims in such circumstances. We will therefore make clear in guidance, rather than legislation that informal measures should be considered before applying for an injunction.

With regards to the Criminal Behaviour Order, it has always been our intention to replicate the current annual review process for those under the age of 18.

“NAMING AND SHAMING”

Young people’s sense of identity can be influenced by labels at a formative stage in their lives. ASBOs have been both a stigma and a badge of honour because of their infamy - both can undermine the effectiveness of the intervention. However, we are happy to leave the decision not to name a young person to the discretion of the judge, as envisaged by the draft bill.

Government response:

We welcome the Committee's recommendation that the court should decide on whether it is right to name a young person when issuing an order. From our discussions with ASB professionals, we are aware that the decision to name an individual under the age of 18 is rarely taken, but can be necessary in certain circumstances. As such, we agree it is right that a final decision should rest with the court in those circumstances when it is right to identify an individual for the protection of victims and communities.

COMMUNITY REMEDY: RESTORATIVE APPROACHES

The Community Remedy is a welcome addition to the ASB response, if it can help to achieve an outcome that satisfies victims and helps to mend the ways of perpetrators without exposing them to the criminal justice system. However, the Community Remedy must not become the modern pillory or stocks. Additional safeguards are needed to ensure that officers have the discretion to choose alternative disposals, where appropriate. Additional assurances are also needed to ensure that victims are not drawn into the process without their full consent and understanding.

Government response:

We welcome the positive statement made by the Committee about the Community Remedy. It is right that the disposal should be proportionate and appropriate to the situation. That is why the Police and Crime Commissioner will need to agree the menu of options with the Chief Constable. In addition, the constable considering the use of the Community Remedy will be ultimately accountable for ensuring that the option chosen by the victim and offered to the offender is proportionate. They will also be able to use their discretion and agree an alternative approach with the victim where it is right to do so.

It is also right that victims choosing an option from the menu are fully aware of the overall process and its limitations before taking that decision. We will continue to work with the police to ensure this point is addressed through a combination of adequate training and guidance for officers and awareness for victims.

THE COMMUNITY TRIGGER

We agree that some element of local flexibility is a helpful feature of the Community Trigger, but it will not be an effective backstop against neglect of ASB unless there is a common failsafe. A guaranteed response to ASB must not be dependent on where you live. We recommend a national maximum of five complaints as a backstop for the trigger, with an option to set a lower threshold at local level. We recommend that this quantitative measure must be combined in all cases with a review of the potential for harm, taking into account the nature of the activity and the vulnerability of victims.

If the trigger is activated and a response deemed necessary then agencies should be obliged to agree a timetable for dealing with the problem which they must share with the victims

involved. Without a clear timetable for dealing with persistent ASB, then the Community Trigger would be little more than a gimmick.

The Community Trigger needs a bullet - it must be clear not only what the trigger is, but what response will happen when it is activated. The Minister told us that it will be activated when something has gone wrong and there must be a way of holding agencies to account when they repeatedly fail to act. Otherwise, there is a risk that the trigger could delay action, as authorities wait for the trigger before taking action.

But this must not be a disincentive for the trigger to be activated. Police and crime commissioners should therefore be kept informed each time the national backstop of five complaints is reached and audit the case review meetings. In areas where the trigger is set at fewer than five complaints, the involvement of PCCs should come if there are further complaints subsequent to the agreed trigger action. Local councils should be obliged to publish the number of times the trigger is activated on a six-monthly basis.

Government response:

In the 2011 public consultation on these reforms, we suggested a threshold of three complaints from one individual and five complaints about the same issue from different households in a particular neighbourhood. There was, however, strong feedback that a national threshold was too prescriptive and agencies needed the flexibility to set a local threshold that best suited their own communities' needs. This feedback is reflected in the draft Bill, but we believe the Committee's recommendation of a backstop, rather than a national threshold, provides a suitable safeguard for victims and communities whilst retaining maximum flexibility for local agencies. We will include this backstop in the legislation but will do so at the lower level of three complaints. This is consistent with the maximum threshold set by the four community trigger trial areas.

We agree that the potential for harm should also be a consideration when setting a trigger threshold and will amend the legislation accordingly. We will also make clear in the guidance that a timetable for action should be agreed with the victim, where appropriate, to ensure individuals fully understand what is likely to happen and when.

Local authorities and the police have a statutory duty to deal with ASB when it is reported and not wait until a certain number of calls have been made. However, we are not proposing to amend the current complaints mechanisms to deal with local agencies if victims feel that the process has not been followed. There is no formal legal sanction for an area that fails in its community trigger duties, but we have built accountability into the legislation. Agencies will have a duty to consult the Police and Crime Commissioner when devising the procedure and to publish data on how many applications for community triggers are made, how many meet the threshold and how many result in further action. We believe that this is the 'bullet', and consequences for agencies should flow from local accountability, rather than Government.

The Police and Crime Commissioner will have an important part to play in establishing the process to be used in their area. As they are democratically elected, we do not think it is right to dictate from the centre the level of input they should have as this will depend on issues locally.

Some will wish to be more involved in the trigger process than others and that should be their decision to take and justify to those who elected them.

SPEED OF RESPONSE: COURT JURISDICTION

Current court timescales do not reflect the misery caused by ASB. The Government must not exacerbate delays by limiting ASB proceedings on IPNAs to County Courts. The bill must provide for proceedings to take place in Magistrates Courts as well. There must be a strict timescale of 28 days for Courts to deal with any breach of conditions.

Government response:

It is important that the Crime Prevention Injunction is acknowledged as the purely civil order that it was designed to be. As such, straddling the civil and criminal courts could add confusion and we therefore believe that the injunction should remain clearly in the civil jurisdiction. However, we note the point about unnecessary delays and draw the Committee's attention to the amendment made to the Crime and Courts Bill which would provide for greater flexibility to move cases around to take advantage of a court which has greater capacity as compared with its neighbour. The single county court seeks to remove the geographic and jurisdictional boundaries to provide a single court with a national jurisdiction for England and Wales irrespective of where the court is convened.

We accept the Committee's recommendation that there should be a strict 28 day limit for courts to deal with breaches, mirroring the current rules for ASBIs used by the housing sector. This will be made clear in the relevant court rules.

INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION

Victims of anti-social behaviour should receive the correct service, from the correct agency, at the first time of asking. To deal with ASB effectively, there must be good inter-agency working, intelligent information sharing and a network of services to support victims and tackle the underlying causes of anti-social behaviour before it can manifest itself. This early intervention helps to protect the public and helps to keep those who may be prone to committing ASB from setting out on a course that could lead them into trouble.

This draft bill does nothing to strengthen these vital networks of support. That objective cannot readily be achieved by legislation. However, the bill comes at a time when frontline services tackling ASB - such as youth offending teams - are beginning to feel the effects of the current fiscal climate. If they are to continue to be effective, they must find new and effective ways of working in partnership together, adapting models of best practice to their own local circumstances and building strong local alliances in the fight against anti-social behaviour.

In order to support the identification and dissemination of best practice, we recommend that the Government establish a National Anti-Social Behaviour Forum - headed by a chief constable, a housing association chief executive, and a local council leader for a term of two years - to identify "what works" in ASB reduction on the basis of cost-benefit evidence and local best practice.

Government response:

The Committee is right to identify the importance of strong inter-agency relationships to an effective response to ASB. As mentioned previously, one way to address this is through encouraging the use of Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences. Many areas are already using these forums to discuss high-risk cases and agree interventions to protect victims and communities from further harm. We will continue to promote this kind of approach. In addition, the Home Office runs an effective practice area on its website where agencies can share examples of successful approaches to crime and community safety issues. It includes details of the Tilley Awards, which recognise problem-solving approaches to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.

On the important issue of information sharing, we have made clear in the legislation that bodies must share information in relation to the community trigger when requested to do so as long as this is in line with the **Data Protection Act 1998** and Part 1 of the **Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000**. This goes further than existing legislation in forcing local agencies to work together to deal with ASB incidents.

We note the Committee's recommendation to establish a National ASB Forum to look at 'what works' in dealing with ASB. However, in light of the changes being made to the wider landscape, particularly the establishment of the College of Policing, we do not believe this is necessary. The College of Policing will have five core areas of responsibility:

- Setting standards and developing guidance and policy for policing;
- Building and developing the research evidence base for policing;
- Supporting the professional development of police officers and staff;
- Supporting the police, other law enforcement agencies and those involved in crime reduction to work together; and
- Acting in the public interest.

Identifying and sharing best practice will be central to the work of the College. The College are considering a range of activities, from working more closely with universities and academics to build the evidence base for effective practice, to more innovative solutions looking at how technology can support frontline police officers and staff.

In support of its core areas of responsibility, the College of Policing will be hosting the What Works Centre for Crime Reduction. The Centre's role will be to identify the best available evidence on approaches to reducing crime and potential savings. The College will work with academics, police and public bodies involved in community safety work, including local authorities and housing associations, to review the evidence base and get the results into the hands of decision makers, including Police and Crime Commissioners.



information & publishing solutions

Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

Online

www.tsoshop.co.uk

Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries: 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-Call: 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

Email: customer.services@tso.co.uk

Textphone: 0870 240 3701

The Houses of Parliament Shop

12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square

London SW1A 2JX

Telephone orders: 020 7219 3890/General enquiries: 020 7219 3890

Fax orders: 020 7219 3866

Email: shop@parliament.uk

Internet: <http://www.shop.parliament.uk>

TSO@Blackwell and other accredited agents

ISBN 978-0-10-186072-7



9 780101 860727