

#cspfuture

APPRAISAL OF THE FUTURE ROLE OF CSPS

ANDY REED OBE

An Appraisal into the Future of CSPs in the context of the new government strategy *Sporting Future* and Sport England strategy *Towards an Active Nation*

Dear Minister,



Thank you for asking me to appraise the future role of CSPs in light of the new government and Sport England strategies. Given that CSPs have evolved over a number of years in their roles and responsibilities and given that the government strategy points to a very different set of outcomes it is important that CSPs are refreshed to meet this new challenge. Throughout this appraisal I have been single-minded in my forward-looking approach, working with the single lens of the new sport strategy and what CSPs can do to help deliver your objectives. This has not been a look back at past performance but specifically an attempt to align the new strategies, local delivery and creating strategic partnerships at local level.

I am grateful for administrative assistance from Sport England and your DCMS officials throughout the exhaustive process, but I take full responsibility for the recommendations. I was keen to engage with the sector and consulted as widely as possible. I held 6 open sessions in London, Loughborough and Manchester as well as a series of individual sessions with senior stakeholders. I received over 180 formal representations via the website we established and I met with over 200 people. As you will imagine there were a wide variety of views expressed and I have tried to take on board as many of these as possible.

I have taken the series of questions you have posed in the terms of reference and answered them in my recommendations with a short narrative of the responses received and outlined below in this abbreviated format.

I look forward to working with you in reshaping the sector to meet the challenges of delivering *Sporting Future* and *Towards an Active Nation*.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andy Reed".

Andy Reed OBE

Terms of Reference

A headline high-level contextual understanding of what roles are played by different organisations at a local level and will need to be played to deliver the new sport strategy. This should also consider organisations which are not CSPs but which undertake similar roles locally. An understanding of this context will help to frame the future role of CSPs.

2. The role and responsibilities of CSPs, including:
 - a. Are their current roles and responsibilities clear? Do any of these now not fit with the new strategy? If so, in what way?
 - b. What role should CSPs have in delivering the new sport strategy?
 - c. Should there be a one size fits all approach or should there be flexibility for different CSPs to play different roles in different places?
 - d. What should CSPs' role be in relation to school sport (including, but not limited to, use of the Primary Premium, supporting the transition from primary to secondary provision, supporting the transition from school to community sport, and the School Games)? This will link across to the ongoing review of the School Games and SGOs - ensuring the two reviews are complementary.
 - e. What should CSPs' role be in relation to local authorities and other local provision - both sporting and non-sporting organisations (including local healthcare trusts, LEAs, and other local funding opportunities)?
 - f. What should CSPs' role be in delivering national policy and programmes?
 - g. How much central control (e.g. from Sport England) should there be over CSPs, given their sometimes complex funding arrangements with a variety of income sources?
3. The current CSP structure and set up, including:
 - a. Are CSPs appropriately set up and resourced to help them deliver their functions?
 - b. Is poor performance being addressed, what is the approach to self-improvement / self-regulation and how can best practice be shared?
 - c. Which of the requirements expected of funded bodies in the new sport strategy should be applicable to CSPs? (e.g. in terms of governance, open data, etc)
 - d. How can economies of scale be driven across the network to ensure the maximum amount of resource is targeted at frontline delivery and support?
4. The role of the CSP Network (CSPN) in serving CSPs, both in terms of influencing CSPs at a local level (e.g. through sharing best practice, etc) and at a national level by engaging on behalf of CSPs in relations with Sport England, Government and national partners.

This work will conclude with a vision for CSPs of the future, clearly showing how they will help to deliver the Government's new sport strategy, as well as the forthcoming Sport England strategy. The report will set out a number of roles and responsibilities we expect CSPs to deliver going forward whilst recognising the reality that different solutions may be required in different locations. It may also include recommendations for the CSPN, Sport England and other interested bodies. The report will have regard to the constraints on both national and local funding and will not seek to recommend any un-funded new or additional burdens.

THEME	RECOMMENDATION	LEAD	TIMESCALES	LINK TO 'SPORTING FUTURE'
CSP roles and responsibilities				
<p>1. Core role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are their current roles and responsibilities clear? • Do any of these now not fit with the new strategy? If so, in what way? • What role should CSPs have in delivering the new sport strategy? 	<p><i>There is a clear role for a network of local partnerships in the new strategies and CSPs can be at the heart of these new structures. The landscape is changing and CSPs will need to adapt and change to match these new circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>From the consultation CSPs mainly feel clear on what they are required to do for Sport England funding and what their role should be. In contrast other stakeholders in the main are not clear of their purpose, functions and expectations.</i></p> <p><i>I believe there is a continued, but evolving role for CSPs or other local strategic partnerships in the context of the new strategies, but the core tasks of CSPs need to be updated to maximise the impact against the five strategic outcomes set by 'Sporting Future' and carried through into 'Towards an Active Nation'. Not least the shift to focusing greater effort and resource on those who are inactive or do not have a resilient sporting habit.</i></p> <p><i>New partnerships and other new and existing partners will be playing an increasing role in the delivery of the strategy. This is reflected in my recommendations. This will be a process of evolution not revolution but change is inevitable.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>1.1 Sport England should update and consult on a revised core specification of services for CSPs which deliver the outcomes of <i>Sporting Future</i> and <i>Towards an Active Nation</i>. When agreed the specification should be published and promoted widely and CSPs measured against it, with the results published to ensure greater transparency and accountability. For Sport England funding, agreement and publication of a tightly specified list of requirements that all CSPs can deliver, will give greater confidence to the sector about the roles and expectations and about the positive impact CSPs can achieve with their investment.</p> <p>1.2 CSPs will also be in receipt of other funding locally and through other national programmes. It is likely for example that local authorities may contract some CSPs to deliver services. They should be accountable for this funding through their Boards. Sport England should agree with the sector some broad guidelines and expectations of how CSPs should do this, to give confidence to the sector moving forwards.</p>	Sport England	Dec 2016	5. The framework: focusing on the outcomes

<p>1.3 CSPs' core purpose in delivering <i>Sporting Future</i> and <i>Towards an Active Nation</i> should include supporting the local sport and physical activity infrastructure (clubs, coaches and volunteers and local government).</p> <p>1.4 Given the new ways of working that will be required to meet the outcomes of <i>Sporting Future</i> and <i>Towards an Active Nation</i>, CSPs will be required to work with or support a wider range of local bodies including those in the health and private sector and LEPs. Local circumstances will determine how each CSP should work with these groups and there will be some CSPs for whom this is a more important role than others (see below recommendations on local flexibility).</p> <p>1.5 A great deal of capacity has been taken out of the sports development network over the last decade – so CSPs should support (and sometimes, where appropriate, lead) new and existing partners in developing physical activity and sports strategies. In some areas this will be led by local government or other agencies and CSPs should support appropriately in these cases (see 2.4).</p> <p>1.6 CSPs should ensure they are able to demonstrate the effectiveness of their work with the new partnerships and wider networks in their area, which for some CSPs may require different approaches and skill sets. Many new partners will not be from the traditional 'sports' sector so CSPs should be able to demonstrate these new working partnerships are in place and effective.</p> <p>1.7 CSPs should seek to influence emerging devolved structures with a sport and physical activity agenda, and use their strategic leadership role to ensure that devolution and decentralisation policies do not allow sport and physical activity to be removed as local priorities.</p>	<p>Sport England</p>	<p>Dec 2016</p>	
<p>1.8 Branding of CSP and CSPN websites and materials should clearly show that CSPs are part of a network and home pages should include common core information. The home pages should also prominently display both Sport England's and the CSPN logos. This will assist CSPs in clarifying their position and role, and stakeholders to understand who their local CSP is and what level of consistent service to expect.</p>	<p>CSPs / CSPN</p>	<p>Mar 2018</p>	

	<p>1.9 Sport England should be clear that their funding for CSPs is an investment to achieve the five strategic outcomes set within <i>Sporting Future</i>, with the level of funding driven by the quality of each CSP's plans and the outcomes to be achieved. Their investment should ensure that CSPs demonstrate local knowledge, strong leadership and effective partnership working.</p> <p>1.10 The new strategies are very much 'outcome focused' and measurement of the performance of CSPs should reflect this change in emphasis.</p>	Sport England	Dec 2016 & ongoing	
<p>2. Local flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should there be a one size fits all approach or should there be flexibility for different CSPs to play different roles in different places? What should CSPs' role be in relation to local authorities and other local provision - both sporting and non-sporting organisations? 	<p><i>As outlined above, there are some core things that all CSPs should be asked to do in the future, to deliver the outcomes of the government's and Sport England's strategies. Some CSPs can also play a wider and varied role based on local needs and in collaboration with local partners. The key to success is in working in collaboration and not only where the CSP is required to do so. Other partners are clearly capable of taking a lead in many circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>CSPs are not solely Sport England delivery partners – they are locally-led, cross-sector partnerships in themselves and will retain local flexibility and locally determined priorities. So variance needs to be understood and celebrated. But this does not mean underperformance and inconsistency is ignored or not addressed.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure continued confidence in the network CSPs will need to consistently deliver nationally contracted outcomes, meet agreed standards and create an efficient and effective national network. This has been the key challenge of this appraisal – to strike the balance of national consistency and local flexibility.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>2.1 CSPs should have the freedom to work beyond the core specification of services to reflect the needs of their local area where there is local agreement to do so. The clarity of the core specification / core purpose is vital. Their standing will derive from their leadership, collaboration and quality of work.</p> <p>2.2 CSPs should be aware of their publicly funded status and act sensitively with partners like local government and the private sector if finding themselves in competition. This will affect the confidence of partners to see them as 'neutral' strategic partners. Sport England should consult with these other sectors and provide guidance on the parameters within which CSPs should operate with their core funding.</p>	CSPs	Dec 2016 & ongoing	4.2 Local government: local delivery

	<p>2.3 As locally led organisations / partnerships / social enterprises, the extent of local plans, strategies and priorities of CSPs will vary across the country. This is an inevitable consequence of their independence and to be welcomed.</p>			
	<p>2.4 All CSPs should have a clear understanding of what the support needs are of all local authorities in their area and have a rationale for how they are working with them. They should develop and agree plans in partnership with strategic local bodies including all local authorities in their areas and should not be in competition where there is no consensus amongst the partnership. It is expected that genuine collaboration and partnership with local authorities will be the norm alongside their Trust and other Leisure providers. Local authorities, despite increasing financial pressures will have a massive impact on sport, leisure and active lifestyles through all of their services.</p>	CSPs	Dec 2016 & ongoing	
<p>3. Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is poor performance being addressed, what is the approach to self-improvement / self-regulation and how can best practice be shared? What role should CSPs have in delivering the new sport strategy? 	<p><i>It became clear during the consultation that leadership at Director, Chair and Board level is one of the most significant factors influencing a CSP's performance. Leadership is strong in a good number of CSPs but for a significant number leadership still needs to be developed.</i></p> <p><i>Some CSPs fail to provide strategic leadership in their locality. Any network is as weak as its weakest part. Poor leadership in some areas undermines confidence in the overall network. Therefore, leadership in weak or coasting CSPs needs to be strengthened and improved as a priority.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>3.1 Each CSP, supported by the CSPN and Sport England, should review their strategic leadership annually to ensure it is fit for purpose and effective.</p>	Sport England, CSPs & CSPN	Dec 2016 & ongoing	8.5 Leadership & administration
	<p>3.2 Sport England should develop and consult on a more effective way of measuring CSP performance in relation to strategic leadership and then robustly hold CSPs to account.</p>	Sport England	Dec 2016	
	<p>3.3 CSP Boards and management teams need to better demonstrate the skills and experience to be able to work across diverse, non-sport sectors (for example health, education, the private sectors).</p>	CSPs	Ongoing	
	<p>3.4 CSPN have a vital role in leading the work within the network – sharing best practice and providing programmes of improvement. Swift action needs to be taken to improve the quality of leadership across the network where it falls short of the new measures set (3.2).</p>			

	<p>3.5 There are various areas where CSPs can assist in helping others deliver aspects of the new strategies and these should be set out in the new core specification where they are requirements. But the automatic default does not require a CSP to lead on everything. Working strategically means sometimes being the glue, advocating and linking up others to work effectively with little formal recognition. Mature CSPs understand this.</p>			
<p>4. School Sport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What should CSPs' role be in relation to school sport? 	<p><i>There are a good number of CSPs working well with schools and the value they add to physical education and school sport is recognised. CSPs have responded to the School Games and Primary School PE and Sport Premium. However, the consultation confirmed there are inconsistencies and some lack expertise or capacity for some aspects of this important area of their work.</i></p> <p><i>Much stronger local partnerships with education experts need to be developed to maximise the investment into schools. On the wider agenda the DfE need to refocus their attention on the whole school sport and PE offer in light of the new levels of investment likely as a result of the Sugar Levy. Schools and a positive first experience of sport and physical activity are vital. At present it is too fragmented and ineffective – but this is beyond the scope of this CSP appraisal work.</i></p> <p><i>It is essential that School Sport is developed as an integrated element of sport and physical activity for young people, not as a separate strategy or system. The primary objectives, as set out in the government strategy, are about reducing inactivity and increasing activity levels, delivering the personal and wider social outcomes for young people, improving physical literacy and young people's attitudes towards sport and active lifestyles. Schools are also an essential route for engaging children and young people.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>4.1 CSPs should continue to support the School Games (focused around the level 3 county festivals) and their work in the Primary PE and School Sport Premium supported by Sport England. However, they should not seek to expand their remit further into educational elements or duplicate the effort of other local school sport partners - but ensure the complex system, network and market works for schools. This can be achieved through helping with primary premium in conjunction with other partners and the private sector for example.</p> <p>4.2 CSPs should draw on the expertise in the school PE and Sport sector from major organisations as best practice shows where CSPs work in genuine collaboration with these agencies there is greatest impact.</p>	CSPs	Ongoing	6.3 Children & young people: the school games and Primary PE & Sport Premium
	<p>4.3 Given the increased investment from the Sugar Levy the Department for Education should consider what more could be done to share best practice and more robustly hold schools</p>	HM Gov't (DfE)	Autumn 2016	

	<p>to account for their use of their share of the Primary PE and School Sport Premium. Fragmentation is leading to ineffective use of the substantial resources being invested over the coming years. The DfE need to establish a robust plan for the proposed secondary school day extension.</p>			
	<p>4.4 CSPs should implement in full the recommendations of the School Games and SGO Review.</p> <p>4.5 CSPs should take into consideration the outcomes of the School Swimming Review and, where appropriate, agree with local partners what their role could be to support the outcomes of that review.</p> <p>4.6 For many people College sport has become increasingly important. This needs to be integrated into local strategic planning alongside the role of the Universities work funded by Sport England.</p>	<p>CSPs & Sport England</p>	<p>Dec 2016</p>	
<p>5. National programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What should CSPs' role be in delivering national policy and programmes? 	<p><i>Sport England recognises the value in maintaining a national network which does a consistent set of core functions including coordinating delivery of national programmes. In line with the new strategies however Sport England may choose to work with CSPs in different ways – using knowledge of their areas to assist new partners navigate their locality, for example.</i></p> <p><i>The delivery of national programmes should, in keeping with the new strategies, be organisational neutral. Where CSPs are best placed to deliver a programme they should but that won't be the default position in the new strategy. This transparency will be welcomed by many stakeholders engaged in the consultation</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>5.1 Sport England should ensure that, where CSPs are funded to deliver national programmes, CSPs do so based on good insight and through effective local partnerships. This may include working with new, 'non-traditional' partners.</p> <p>5.2 CSPs (along with any other funded partners) will apply and be awarded funding to deliver any national programmes on the strength of their plans rather than 'by right' as in line with the new strategies and based on outcomes, as well as outputs. The locality based partnerships will be more important in future and CSPs will have a role in creating, supporting, assessing and adding insight.</p>	<p>Sport England</p> <p>Sport England & CSPs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Dec 2016 & ongoing</p>	<p>5. The framework: focusing on the outcomes</p>

	<p>5.3 CSPs will need to understand and respond to national priorities from Sport England that are included in an updated core specification. CSPs may not be the lead in all places or in all policy areas but where they are funded to deliver national priorities locally, they should be working to ensure uniformity of delivery across the country.</p> <p>5.4 There needs to be a professional workforce to align to the new strategic priorities and new groups of participants</p>			
CSP structure				
<p>6. Legal Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are CSPs appropriately set up and resourced to help them deliver their functions? 	<p><i>There are a range of successful different CSP models and this is not normally the key determinant of performance. This flexibility should continue. Devolution deals amongst other changes means that the local picture and the boundaries of partnerships are evolving and changing.</i></p> <p><i>CSPs should also be mindful of Sport England preference for the independent rather than hosted model unless there are reasons why hosting is right. Independence does create a different relationship with Sport England and allows flexibility. Hence the need for greater transparency on the new core specification / contractual arrangements with Sport England.</i></p> <p><i>Given the financial constraints most consultees accepted that CSPs were adequately resourced. A series of technical questions need to be addressed over the Sport England funding formula, but these should be addressed in the further work on the core specification or contract.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>6.1 CSPs should proactively review their legal status to ensure they are fit for purpose, deliver the maximum value for money and reflect any local changes for example resulting from devolution deals.</p> <p>6.2 Whilst Sport England prefers incorporated charitable status, under the right conditions the hosted model works. Boards should assess this and test the right model on an annual basis.</p> <p>6.3 Hosted status can offer benefits and be effective and can be supported where the Board and Leadership team assess this is the best local arrangement</p> <p>6.4 CSPs should be open and transparent about their finances and sustainability to local landscape partners and willing to look at alternative arrangements, rationalisation, shared</p>	<p>CSPs</p>	<p>Dec 2016 & ongoing</p>	<p>8.1 Financial sustainability</p>

	services and other efficiencies.			
<p>7. Performance management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much central control (e.g. from Sport England) should there be over CSPs, given their sometimes complex funding arrangements with a variety of income sources? Is poor performance being addressed, what is the approach to self-improvement / self-regulation and how can best practice be shared? 	<p><i>The strategies emphasise ‘public funding is a privilege not a right’. Therefore, Sport England should hold CSPs to account for their use of their public funding.</i></p> <p><i>The current performance regime should be updated and evolve to ensure the maximum impact against the strategic outcomes set in Sporting Future. There should be greater transparency and openness for the sector to have confidence in the Sport England investment into the network.</i></p> <p><i>CSPs in many cases are independent and the management of the Sport England contract need to be proportionate. Local CSP Boards are ultimately responsible for their performance across all their portfolio of funding.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>7.1 Sport England should simplify their performance measurement processes to further reduce the administrative burden while retaining its robustness.</p> <p>7.2 Where a CSP is constantly high performing the measurement and performance management needs to be lighter touch and Sport England should intervene in inverse proportion to success.</p> <p>7.3 Where CSPs are failing or underperforming, Sport England needs to be able to step in more quickly to resolve matters and use a clear and transparent set of sanctions. The strategy makes it clear that funding should go to those best placed to deliver not based on who the organisation is. Sport England should have a final sanction to remove funding and find alternative partners to deliver strategic leadership or programmes.</p> <p>7.4 Sport England should consult both CSPs and their stakeholders on the produced new performance regime so it is widely understood and effective.</p>	Sport England	Dec 2016	5. The framework: focusing on the outcomes 9.1 Measuring sport’s contribution to the outcomes
<p>8. Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the requirements expected of funded bodies in 	<p><i>Some CSPs are unlikely to meet the ‘Governance Code for Sport in the UK’ which is a precursor to being eligible to receive public funding. During the consultation there was almost unanimous agreement that CSPs should be exemplars of good practice. Because of their special relationship with Sport England and their funding model they should comply with new funding requirements being placed on other partners.</i></p>	Sport England	Dec 2016 & ongoing	

<p>the new sport strategy should be applicable to CSPs? (e.g. in terms of governance, open data)</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>8.1 All CSPs should be subject to and meet the requirements of the 'Governance Code for Sport in the UK'.</p>	<p>CSPs</p>	<p>Dec 2016 & ongoing</p>	<p>8.4 Governance: UK Sports Governance Code</p>
	<p>8.2 Where a CSP is non-compliant their board must draw up a time limited action plan to move towards compliance as quickly as possible. Where they do not or where Sport England deems that insufficient progress is being made the individual CSP should be subject to the same sanctions as other partners in future.</p> <p>8.3 In other matters like 'open data' CSPs will be expected to comply with the new rules established by Sport England for their public funding. Further work is required in this area as there are many commercial organisations also in this field.</p>	<p>CSPs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
	<p>8.4 Whilst the proportion of Sport England funding to CSPs varies across the network their receipt of public funding sets them apart. Therefore CSPs should set a high standard of transparency and reporting in governance, data, contracts, commerciality etc.</p>			
<p>9. Efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can economies of scale be driven across the network to ensure the maximum amount of resource is targeted at frontline delivery and support? 	<p><i>There is significant scope for CSPs to drive further efficiencies across and beyond the network of partnerships. For example, reducing back office costs and greater sharing of resources in key business areas (e.g. insight and marketing) will drive down costs and return scarce resources to the frontline.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst local connectivity is essential to the success of CSPs this shouldn't mean every function is duplicated in every CSP and some could be nationally or regionally co-ordinated. This increased collaboration and coordination should apply to Sport England and its landscape partners too.</i></p> <p><i>I have not addressed the specific number of CSPs but this should remain a live question across the network – using opportunities that arise to assess new opportunities to replicate the positive experience of London, South and West Yorkshire CSPs collaborations. All CSPs need to remain 'locally focused' but this does not mean external management structures and collaboration prevent new models emerging.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>9.1 Annually CSPs board and management teams should assess the efficiency savings it can make including but not restricted to sharing services, working across boundaries and reflecting the CSP's roles and responsibilities alongside other local partners and the opportunities for rationalisation, considering the evolution of the local landscape. They should publish their plans and conclusions.</p>	<p>CSPs</p>	<p>Dec 2016 & ongoing</p>	<p>8.1 Financial sustainability</p>

<p>9.2 There should not be a national target for rationalisation but inertia cannot be accepted either. There is a complex and evolving local landscape and so it is expected that during the life of the strategy CSPs will look very different in some parts of the country. These should be locally determined.</p>				
<p>9.3 Sport England should continue to set CSP efficiency targets and increase the transparency of funding in localities. Every opportunity should be taken to measure the most effective and efficient use of resources and using incentives to push new methods of working across boundaries. Sport England should share best practice through CSPN with the network and incentivise new methods of working. However, perverse unintended consequences of the general desire to be efficient should be addressed.</p> <p>9.4 CSPs should be encouraged to develop broader funding streams but need to remain aware of the sensitivity of the possibility of competing with strategic partners.</p> <p>9.5 Further collaboration at local level with partners can lead to more co-hosting, shared services and new networks. Resources shouldn't be used to constantly reorganise but structures created by CSPs to remain agile and responsive to the changing landscape and new opportunities.</p> <p>9.6 Sport England should use its expertise in a coordinated way when working with CSPs and their local partners. They should help any other national funded partners maximise their impact at local level with their insight and resources.</p>		<p>Sport England</p>	<p>Dec 2016 & ongoing</p>	

Role of CSPN

<p>10. CSPN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the role of the CSP Network (CSPN) in serving CSPs, both in terms of influencing CSPs at a local level 	<p><i>There continues to be a need for the CSPN as the umbrella organisation representing the network of individual CSPs. Its role should be focused on supporting the network to improve, sharing best practice and becoming even more efficient.</i></p> <p><i>There is some duplication of roles and responsibilities between Sport England and CSPN for example where CSPN have sought to develop approaches to the use of insight and the development of policy in areas like public health, volunteering and workforce.</i></p> <p><i>The consultation highlighted an appreciation of the difficult role CSPN tries to play. In general stakeholders (including the network of CSPs themselves) wanted greater clarity about what role and function CSPN carries out to avoid duplication, and feel CSPN should be a coordinator of the network rather than another national "landscape partner."</i></p>
---	---

<p>(e.g. through sharing best practice, etc.) and at a national level by engaging on behalf of CSPs in relations with Sport England, Government and national partners?</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p>			
	<p>10.1 CSPN should continue to prioritise supporting the network to improve, sharing best practice, being a voice for the network and acting as a central point of contact into the network of partnerships from external organisations and partners. Sport England should use CSPN to prioritise improvement and efficiency.</p>	<p>CSPN</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
	<p>10.2 The relationship between CSPN and Sport England should be revisited and clearly articulated to avoid duplication of effort. It should be communicated to the sector to offer clarity to all stakeholders in the new strategy periods. The partnership is strong and can be enhanced with a refreshed and carefully articulated understanding of boundaries for both parties. This will give confidence to the sector. It should be carried out simultaneously with the new core specification work.</p>	<p>CSPN & Sport England</p>	<p>Dec 2016</p>	
	<p>10.3 CSPN does not need be an advocacy body or policy-maker. It should provide an access point for national partners to the network to facilitate a single conversation, but it doesn't need to proactively engage, lobby or advocate at a national level.</p> <p>10.4 CSPN should coordinate the dissemination of work and expertise from Sport England and other national organisations where this adds value to the work and supports the improvement of the network of CSPs. This will include current partners as well as many new entrants to local delivery models.</p>	<p>CSPN</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	