

*Tom Mayo
for action*

COPY FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MINISTRY OF

JUSTICE

WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL

CRIME PREVENTION UNIT

- 8 APR 2003

7 April 2003

Chief Executive's Office
RECEIVED
08 APR 2003

564102

Bob Harvey
Mayor
Waitakere City Council
Private Bag 93109
WAITAKERE CITY 1008

Dear Mr Harvey

Future Directions for the Safer Community Council Network

As you are aware, your Territorial Local Authority sponsors a Safer Community Council (SCC) in partnership with the Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) at the Ministry of Justice. In August and September 2002 a series of regional meetings were held with Safer Community Councils to discuss issues relating to that partnership. Following those meetings a paper reviewing funding and contractual processes was sent to all SCCs for comment.

The submissions received from local communities on the funding and processes review have informed our understanding of how the network of SCCs currently operates, and how this in turn contributes to the aims of the government's Crime Reduction Strategy (CRS). SCC practices and outcomes vary widely across the country. The model continues to work well where the key local decision-makers have remained involved, and where the SCC has continued to influence the agenda of the local District or City Council in relation to community safety and security. The work of effective SCCs is clearly considered to be of immeasurable value to their communities.

Unfortunately, it has become apparent that many SCCs have gradually lost the support of the local sponsors and key decision-makers. SCC coordinators have become increasingly responsible for driving all local crime prevention activity, rather than coordinating the efforts of the community. They sometimes lack both resources and support to do their job. As a result, the annual turnover of SCC coordinators has reached about 25% which is clearly unsatisfactory and compounds the difficulties faced by SCCs.

In response to these problems some communities have decided to replace SCCs with more appropriate local models. In some of the larger metropolitan areas the SCC model has been replaced by a more integrated partnership model (e.g. Auckland city now operates with a partnership between the CPU, TLA, Police and Ngati Whatua), or by a direct project approach (e.g. Wellington and Dunedin). Other communities have not been able to make their SCCs work effectively but, as yet, have not replaced them with an alternative model.

A29

Te Manatū Ture

Future Directions for the SCC Network

Our collective ability to achieve the aims of the CRS, to reduce crime, and to build safer communities, is impaired by the problems outlined above. In order to address these problems, the CPU would like to discuss with communities how we can operate more effectively to meet our collective goals. We need to consider:

- how central government money should be distributed to communities;
- what kind of infrastructure is most appropriate for achieving local crime reduction outcomes; and
- how CPU can best support local efforts.

In considering these questions it is important to note central Government is not intending to reduce the overall pool of funding available for crime prevention initiatives in New Zealand. Rather, this discussion is required in order to establish the most effective infrastructure and ensure the most effective distribution of resources possible, for communities to achieve real crime reduction and safety outcomes.

Discussion Document

To facilitate this discussion CPU has prepared a discussion document (attached) outlining a range of options for moving forward and reinvigorating the crime prevention effort.

This discussion document provides an opportunity for all stakeholders to contribute to the development of future crime prevention delivery mechanisms. We request that you bring this document to the attention of your District/City Council and seek their input.

To facilitate your response, we have included a range of questions to guide discussions, and a submission form, which you may or may not choose to use. Submissions will be accepted in any format. The discussion document and submission forms are also available on the CPU website at www.justice.govt.nz/cpu/index.html.

In order to enable decisions to be made within a reasonable timeframe we require all submissions on the discussion documents to be returned to CPU by **Friday, 30 May 2003 at 5pm**.

I would like to thank you for your support in this matter. The Safer Community Council network has been established for almost ten years, and the initial pilot sites for longer. It is timely for us to look at the achievements we have made to date, and to look at how we can improve our structures and practices into the future to ensure that we continue to make a real difference to local communities.

Regards



Rose O'Neill
Director

cc CEO Territorial Local Authority

A30

Chief Executive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Corporate Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
City Services Moselle	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consultancy Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
ECO - WATER	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic Group	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consent Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
Field Services	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

FUTURE DIRECTIONS
OF THE
SAFER COMMUNITY COUNCIL
NETWORK

DISCUSSION PAPER

31 March 2003

A31

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR THE SAFER COMMUNITY COUNCIL NETWORK

Background

Since 1993 the Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) has worked with local government, Iwi and Pacific peoples to establish Safer Community Councils (SCCs). Sixty-five SCCs now operate throughout the country. The purpose of the SCC network is to enable communities to respond to crime at a local level. Each SCC has the following roles:

- identifying and prioritising local crime prevention issues
- coordinating crime prevention activities
- sharing crime prevention information with stakeholders, and
- supporting (funding, developing and/or managing) and monitoring crime prevention projects.

Achievements to Date

In the last 10 years the network of SCCs throughout the country has achieved a great deal. Every year a total of approximately \$1m is distributed to local communities for crime prevention projects. Many SCCs provide crime prevention service providers with administrative support, advice on accessing other sources of funding, and evaluation expertise. SCCs identify among their strengths, the ability to pool community resources and skills, and the ability to develop effective networks.

In 1999 an independent researcher carried out an evaluation of SCCs¹. That evaluation identified the following characteristics as contributing to a successful SCC:

- the participation of community authority figures
- the ability of SCC members to commit resources to support crime prevention initiatives
- strong leadership within the SCC
- shared purpose among SCC members
- a positive community profile, and
- activities that address local needs.

Communities have benefited directly and indirectly from the work of SCCs. Recently feedback from SCC stakeholders (local government officials, mayors, community groups etc) indicates that SCCs can add considerable value to local crime prevention by driving the community safety strategy (and associated resources) within their city or district council. Moreover, SCC coordinators have been acknowledged by sponsors for the skills and expertise they bring to a range of local authority activities - a contribution that some sponsors would otherwise not have been able to afford.

Many local government personnel say that their relationships with local police have improved because of the SCC initiative. A number of other government initiatives

¹ June Hamilton, Hamilton Miller Partnership (September 1999) carried out the Results Centred Evaluation of Safer Community Councils.

have benefited from the practical support of SCCs. The involvement of many coordinators in the operation of District Truancy Services and the Strengthening Families initiative are two examples.

Issues to be Addressed

Despite these achievements, it has become apparent to the CPU over the past two years that the existing model has some significant shortcomings. Action needs to be taken to address some issues of real substance if crime prevention initiatives at the local level are to be sustained and strengthened over the next ten years.

1. Vision of Partnership

- In the decade since the establishment of the SCC model, the original vision of central government and local government partnerships has been lost and the partnerships have weakened.
- Many SCCs have been unable to retain members from central government agencies or local government who have an adequate level of authority.
- Central government has come to be seen primarily as a funder and contributions from some local governments (in terms of leadership, resources etc) have diminished.

2. Effective Coordination

- In some communities, SCC coordinators lack support and have minimal access to local resources or decision-makers.
- Some confusion has arisen as to the role of the coordinator, their employment status, and their accountabilities.
- Many SCCs have suggested to the CPU that they need assistance with getting decision-makers around the table, so that the profile of their organisation can be raised and the partnership arrangement strengthened.

3. Targeting Funding

- An examination of SCC financial reports during the recent Funding Review by CPU showed that one-third of SCCs were stockpiling funds with no future tag for specific crime prevention projects.
- Discretionary funding grants did not commonly link to local priorities.
- SCC feedback on the issues outlined in the Funding Review (circulated to SCCs in September 2002) identified concerns about inequities in funding distribution across communities. It was widely agreed that changes needed to be made to discretionary funding allocations.
- Clearly funding is distributed too thinly across the SCC network. This has made it difficult to support local crime prevention programmes.

The Way Forward

The 2001 Crime Reduction Strategy sets out government's priorities for activity to reduce crime in New Zealand, focusing on:

- youth offending
- theft of, and from, cars

- family violence (including child abuse)
- organised crime
- other violence (including sexual violence)
- serious traffic offending
- burglary

To better achieve the Government's objectives in crime reduction and make best use of the \$5.9 million of funding available annually to achieve these objectives, the CPU is exploring possible options for the delivery of crime prevention initiatives in the future. This document outlines four different models for your consideration, and feedback:

- Model 1 - Enhancing the existing SCC network
- Model 2 - Needs based allocation of funding
- Model 3 - Regional investment model, and
- Model 4 - A focused CRS approach.

Each model is presented as a broad outline only.

Your input

At this stage we would like your feedback on the practicality and workability of each option. It may be that no single model is the full solution. There may be aspects of each model that you feel should be combined to form a different model.

This is your opportunity to influence the shape of local crime prevention delivery mechanisms for the future.

Please consider each of the options carefully, and provide submissions to the CPU by:

Friday 30 May 2003 (5.00pm).

A submission form is provided at the end of this document. Some questions have been posed to assist with discussions at a local level. In preparing your submission, you may wish to focus on these if you find them useful. They are provided as a tool to assist, but if you wish to construct your submission in some other way, please feel free to do so.

A34

MODEL 1: ENHANCING THE EXISTING SAFER COMMUNITY COUNCIL NETWORK

Features

The existing SCC network would be retained, where this meets the needs of individual communities. Otherwise, alternative local partnership arrangements would be negotiated with CPU.

Partnership Agreements would be changed to reflect:

- jointly agreed priorities
- jointly agreed local actions and outcomes sought
- the contribution of the local authority/sponsor, and/or other parties
- the contribution of the CPU.

Would Require

Increased commitment by the local authority/sponsor.
Increased support and/or resources from the CPU.

Funding Allocations

- Funding for SCCs would become more flexible and longer term.
- The option of pooling coordination and discretionary funding would be available.
- No funding increase has been granted to the CPU for crime prevention services, therefore it would still be necessary to operate within the funding that is currently available.
- A more flexible approach may mean that some high-need communities receive more funding. Communities with lower need may receive less funding. Need would be assessed from a range of information, including reported crime rate, population data, and socio-economic indices.
- To operate a more flexible funding process it would be helpful to move to a three-year crime prevention planning cycle. Each SCC would be funded on the basis of their local plan.
- Accountability requirements and funding release would be managed on a six-monthly basis according to the requirements of the longer-term plan.

What would be different?

Negotiated partnership models

In some areas, the partnership may not need be by way of a SCC. For example, in recent years Dunedin, Auckland and Wellington have developed alternative

partnership arrangements, with a focus on specific projects. Each SCC would need to decide on the most useful ongoing model for their community.

New partnership agreements

This approach allows each party to state very clearly what they can expect from the others, and what each party is contributing to the partnership. Ideally, partnership agreements would be based on three-year terms to provide stability and certainty to the partnership, and allow for long term planning.

The review of partnership agreements would be done every three years, timed to occur three to six months after local body elections. This timing would allow the newly elected local government councils, which may have different priorities from their predecessors, to review and revise the partnership with central Government. It would also align with the three-year crime prevention planning cycle.

The new Partnership Agreement would detail:

The objectives and purpose of the partnership

[Central Government would enter into partnerships with local communities to achieve particular outcomes specified in the Crime Reduction Strategy]

The contribution CPU would make to the partnership

[This would include funding, information, training and other support resources]

The contribution sought from the SCC Sponsor and local community

[This may include funding together with commitments of time, leadership, information and access to existing local networks and infrastructure. Partnership Agreements would recognise the fact that communities have different levels of local resources to contribute to crime reduction activities]

The accountability mechanisms for the funding provided

[This would include such things as the content and timing of business plans and reports, and a certificate of expenditure]

Accountabilities

There would be greater emphasis on outcomes reporting by SCCs. Reporting would be required on a six-monthly basis. Funding would be released on the receipt of the outcomes report and a verified certificate of expenditure.

How would it work?

Role of Local Sponsor	Role of CPU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Increased leadership. ◆ Bringing stakeholders together to identify and reach agreement on local priorities. ◆ Increased high level participation. ◆ Increased commitment to the SCC (funding, resources, information and expertise). ◆ Negotiation of new Partnership Agreements with CPU that reflect jointly agreed priorities and actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Increased leadership and direction regarding the CRS. ◆ Greater local level interaction. ◆ Provision of best practice information to communities. ◆ Tighter contract management processes. ◆ Report under the Public Finance Act to Minister of Justice, Government and Parliament on expenditure of crime prevention funds.

Summary

Possible benefits	Possible limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Builds on existing infrastructure. ◆ Clearer roles and responsibilities. ◆ Jointly agreed priorities aligned to CRS. ◆ More security with longer term planning and funding processes. ◆ Fairer needs-based funding distribution that recognises the needs of larger communities and/or communities with high levels of reported crime. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The majority of available funding continues to be used to support SCC structures. ◆ Less freedom to develop local activities that are not clearly linked to the CRS. ◆ Reduced funding for communities with low reported crime levels. ◆ High transaction costs for CPU to service network adequately.

MODEL 2: NEEDS BASED ALLOCATION OF FUNDING

Features

Current crime prevention funding (\$5.9m) would be invested only in those communities of high need.

Existing SCCs in those areas would be retained, where this meets the needs of individual communities. Otherwise, alternative local partnership arrangements would be negotiated with CPU.

Would Require

Stakeholder consultations to determine the criteria for selecting high need areas.

Negotiations between selected SCCs and the CPU regarding the particular projects that could be implemented to meet the CRS.

Those areas that are not selected to receive funding and that want to keep their SCC would have to find an alternative source of funding to support it.

Funding Allocations

- Under this approach funding would be re-allocated to high-need communities.
- The amount invested in each of the selected high need areas would be significantly greater than the current funding levels. This would require more robust accountability measures between the CPU and those allocated funding.
- To put in place the necessary level of accountability, it may be a case of entering into multiple contracts with one sponsor or programme provider. For example, in Auckland the CPU has negotiated a number of contracts with Safer Auckland to provide crime prevention services. Each contract relates to one project. In this way the use of specific funds can be more easily monitored.
- A needs assessment would be conducted approximately every three years to determine if any change should be made to the priority of communities in need. The distribution of funding would then potentially change to reflect any changes in priority.
- A three-year planning cycle would provide certainty and a basis for long-term planning. Multi-year funding also has the advantage of providing sufficient time to develop, implement and evaluate projects. Projects that are funded would consequently be expected to include an evaluation component, so that any crime reduction results produced can be measured.

What would be different?

Negotiated partnership models

The nature of the Partnership Agreement would be specifically tailored to suit the needs of the local community. This may mean providing funding directly to some programme providers. If a SCC were to be used, many of the improvements and adjustments discussed for Model 1 would need to be adopted.

The Partnership Agreement would detail:

The objectives and purpose of the partnership

[Central Government would enter into partnerships with a SCC or another body such as a local authority or an Iwi to achieve the outcomes specified in the Crime Reduction Strategy]

The contribution CPU would make to the partnership

[This would include funding, information, training and other support resources]

The contribution sought from the partner and local community

[This may include funding together with commitments of time, leadership, information and access to existing local networks and infrastructure. Partnership Agreements would recognise the fact that communities have different levels of local resources to contribute to crime reduction activities]

The accountability mechanisms for the funding provided

[This would include the content and timing of business plans and reports, and a certificate of expenditure]

How would it work?

In consultation with Local Government New Zealand, the NZ Police, Iwi, local community leaders and other key stakeholders, criteria would be developed to determine which geographic areas are in most need of crime prevention services. Statistical information² for each area would be assessed against the criteria to develop a priority ranking of communities in need.

An analysis of government funded programmes operating in communities would be undertaken to determine whether the needs of those communities are already being met through other means.

The local authorities representing the highest need areas, and other stakeholders such as SCCs, NZ Police and Iwi would then be approached to discuss particular programmes and initiatives that could be implemented in that community to meet the CRS. This is very similar to what has been done recently with the NZ Police and CPU joint funding of 'Youth at Risk' projects.

² Indicators would include population-adjusted rates of reported crime considered against the national average, social deprivation indices and youth at risk indicators (e.g. truancy rates).

Role of local sponsor/contracted partner	Role of CPU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Better provision of local information to inform the needs assessment and identify project priorities. ◆ High level participation and leadership. ◆ Increased (or new) commitment to the SCC or other body (funding, information and expertise). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Developing fair and transparent criteria, in consultation with key stakeholders, for determining communities of greatest need. ◆ Ensuring correct local information is collated. ◆ Ensuring assessment criteria are applied to appropriate information about local communities. ◆ Enhancing the information analysis capability in the CPU. ◆ Report under the Public Finance Act to Minister of Justice, Government and Parliament on expenditure of crime prevention funds.

Summary

Possible benefits	Possible limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fairer need-based funding distribution that recognises the needs of communities with high levels of reported crime. ◆ More security with longer term planning and funding. ◆ Partnership Agreements would be project focussed and clearly linked to the CRS. ◆ Agreements would be more flexible and adapted to local circumstances. ◆ Regular reviews of the distribution of funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ May not be able to re-establish effective partnerships in exited low needs areas if they became high need. ◆ Communities with low reported crime levels are likely to receive less funding, or no funding, from CPU. ◆ Less freedom to develop local activities that are not clearly linked to the CRS. ◆ Assessment criteria may favour crime types that have a higher rate of reporting.

MODEL 3: REGIONAL INVESTMENT MODEL

Features

The crime prevention effort is re-focused on geographical regions (eg. along the lines of NZ Police Districts, or local authority groupings).

Each region is provided with funding for crime prevention initiatives based on an analysis of regional need.

A single regional decision-making body would take responsibility for:

- identifying regional crime problems which are in line with the CRS
- agreeing on regional priorities
- agreeing on local crime reduction actions/programmes
- identifying and engaging key stakeholders
- negotiating local resources required to ensure the success of the crime reduction actions/ programmes.

CPU would collate in-depth statistical and best-practice information to support regional, rather than local, crime reduction decision-making.

CPU would provide logistical support to manage service provider contracts.

Would Require

Commitment of key position holders in the region to working together to achieve regional, rather than local, crime reduction outcomes.

Commitment by key position holders in central and local government agencies to participate in a regional decision-making body.

Ability and willingness of regional decision-making body to commit local resources to support crime reduction initiatives (including information, personnel and in some cases funding).

Increased support resources from the CPU.

Funding Allocations

- The funding allocation to each region would be based on the collation of a range of information including geographic size, population size, reported crime against national averages, deprivation indices and other statistical data.
- The criteria for allocation would be developed in consultation with key stakeholders to ensure fairness and transparency.
- Regions would receive significant funding for programmes and projects by rationalising coordination activities at a regional level.

What would be different?

Shift of Focus from 'Local' to 'Regional'

A national network of regional decision-making bodies would replace the existing local SCC network. This model requires local communities to take a regional view of crime reduction, rather than focusing solely at the local level. A good level of regional cooperation would be necessary.

Regional decision-making bodies

The regional decision-making body needs to represent the full interests of the region it covers. Its members could therefore include all, or some, of the following depending on the character of the region:

- Mayors and/or the Chief Executive of each local authority in the region
- Police District Commander and/or Local Area Controllers
- Child, Youth and Family Area Manager
- Iwi representative
- Pacific peoples representative
- Regional managers from other relevant agencies, and
- Representation from other key stakeholders in the region
- CPU attendance.

The regional body would carry out a regionally based analysis of crime prevention issues, and determine what local initiatives should be implemented. It would agree on regional priorities for the use of CPU funding, and other resources.

The CPU would collate and make available information on regional crime statistics, socio-economic factors, and best practice in crime prevention initiatives. Agreements would have to be made between the CPU and NZ Police, Local Territorial Authorities, and other local agencies to access relevant local information, so that good quality regional information can be provided.

A three-year planning cycle would provide a basis for long term planning. Multi-year funding would be allocated to provide sufficient time to allow for projects to be developed, implemented and evaluated.

How would it work?

Role of Regional Decision-making Body	Role of CPU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ To fairly consider the interests of all local communities in the region. ◆ To identify regional crime problems. ◆ To agree regional priorities for action. ◆ To determine, in conjunction with the CPU, crime reduction initiatives to be funded within the region. ◆ To contribute resources (including information, personnel and in some cases, funding). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Provision of resources to support the regional decision-making body. ◆ Collate in-depth statistical and best-practice information. ◆ Develop protocols with NZ Police, Local Territorial Authorities and other local agencies to collate relevant information. ◆ Manage contracts for crime prevention services. ◆ Report under the Public Finance Act to Minister of Justice, Government and Parliament on expenditure of crime prevention funds.

Summary

Possible benefits	Possible limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Less investment in infrastructure, therefore more funds available for crime reduction initiatives. ◆ Utilises the local knowledge and expertise of key stakeholders in the region. ◆ Funding targeted to clearly identified needs, based on analysis of regional information. ◆ Can more effectively distribute funds within a region by concentrating on specific problems. ◆ Would meet the needs of smaller communities and rural areas on a more equitable basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Is dependent on the participation of key position holders in a region. ◆ Is dependent on the willingness of participants to adopt a regional approach rather than concentrate on the interests of their own communities. ◆ May be a perception by smaller communities and rural areas that their needs would be subsumed under those of larger communities. ◆ Depends on the provision of good quality regional information that may not always be available from local sources and/or may be difficult to collate.

A43

MODEL 4: A FOCUSED CRS APPROACH

Features

Current Partnership Agreements would be changed to specify the delivery of crime reduction and prevention activities specifically focused on one or two areas only of the Crime Reduction Strategy (CRS). For example, perhaps a reduction in burglary and a reduction in family violence, or a focus on youth offending and general violence reduction.

Would Require

Consultation to identify CRS goals that would become national priorities for action by SCCs.

Change in focus by SCCs to develop programmes that support the national CRS priority areas.

Greater direction, increased leadership, and the provision of more focused advice and support from the CPU.

Funding Allocations

- Funding would only be granted for projects that relate to the national CRS priorities.
- Funding allocations would be made on the basis of local costs of planning and implementing appropriate programmes.

What would be different?

This model does not propose a practical delivery mechanism. A delivery mechanism would need to be implemented in conjunction with one of the other models discussed in this paper.

Greater Local Focus for Crime Prevention and Reduction Activities

CRS priority areas would provide a focus for the activities of the SCC. A periodic review of the priority areas would occur every three years to align with the Partnership Agreement periods discussed in Model 1. To improve contract management and accountability processes, some of the enhancements suggested for the operation of Model 1 would also be necessary.

A44

A small number of goals (perhaps one to three) from the CRS would be identified as those most likely to be achieved by local communities. This recognises that some areas of the CRS are primarily the concern of central government agencies such as the Police and LTSA. This model focuses community effort on achievable goals.

Target Groups

Target groups for intervention would also be included in this approach. Currently the CRS lists five priority groups (Maori, Pacific peoples, at-risk families, victims and potential victims, and those affected by alcohol, drugs, and gambling). Once national priorities for action have been agreed, the priority groups that SCCs or other partnerships should focus on would be further specified. For example, the emphasis could be on victims and/or at risk families for one period of application.

Menu of Interventions

A menu of projects and best practice models would be provided to SCCs and/or other partnership groups who can select or adapt the most appropriate projects for local circumstances.

How would it work?

Role of Local Sponsor	Role of CPU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Help choose CRS priority areas. ◆ Negotiate locally based initiatives with CPU. ◆ Provide local resources (information, personnel, and in some cases funding) to support agreed locally based initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Consult with SCCs and other key stakeholders on CRS priority areas. ◆ Advise Government on the goals and priority target groups on which local crime prevention efforts are based. ◆ Provide SCCs with projects and best practice guidelines. ◆ Negotiate locally based initiatives with SCCs and other partnership groups. ◆ Provide funding for agreed initiatives. ◆ Report under the Public Finance Act to Minister of Justice, Government and Parliament on expenditure of crime prevention funds.

A45

Summary

Possible benefits	Possible limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Provides more leadership and guidance from central Government about desired crime prevention activity.◆ SCCs or other partnership groups would have a more structured and focused operational environment.◆ Economies of scale can be achieved across the SCC Network by sharing resources.◆ Opportunities to access recognised expertise on specialist crime prevention subjects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ The majority of available funding continues to be used to support SCC structures.◆ Higher degree of central government direction and management.◆ High transaction costs for CPU to service network adequately.

A46