



Contextual Factors

Rationale

- Hampshire within 20 areas nationally with highest rates of serious violence
- Recognition of multiple partners responding to serious violence but not always working together
- Recognition of lack of robust shared data sharing arrangements
- Complex and varied drivers for serious violence, associated with vulnerability to other poor life outcomes
- Evidence supporting a whole-systems, public health approach to respond to serious violence
- Gaps in the national evidence base of what is effective for reducing drivers of serious violence

Assumptions

- Partners regularly and meaningfully engage with the VRP
- Partners share data with the partnership
- Communities are willing to engage to share their views
- Communities engaged include those most affected by violence
- Young people identified as at-risk are willing and able to engage with interventions
- There is sufficient capacity and resource across the partnership to deliver the response to serious violence
- The response to serious violence is continued in any future absence of VRU funding

Other contributing factors

- Wider response and prevention policy and activity affecting the drivers of SV (e.g. county lines and theft) alongside VRP-driven activity
- Co-interventions such as statutory support e.g. social care, received by young people engaging the VRP commissioned interventions

Contextual factors

- Complex and varied geographical landscape
- Complex web of partners with multiple local authorities within VRP
- Data required is often sensitive and lack of continuity with key gatekeepers impedes Information Governance developments and continual sharing
- Risk factors have been amplified and complicated by Covid-19 and the cost of living crisis
- Devolution – the transfer of powers and funding from national to local Government by creating regional Strategic Authorities with an elected Mayor
- Local Government Reorganisation – changes in the current two-tier system of counties and district councils and forming new unitary local authorities

Risks

- Competing priorities cause a lack of partner engagement
- Alternate data sharing arrangements are prioritised by partners
- Insufficient data sharing provides the partnership with an incomplete understanding of local violence and risk factors
- Insufficient public engagement limits the partnership's understanding of public sentiment and so the strategy is not accurately informed by this
- Varied obstacles prevent interventions from delivering as planned
- An end to VRU funding leaves a gap in the facilitation of violence reduction activity