

## **Appendix 1**

### **Independent Evaluation of Operation Crackdown**

A copy of the full report is available in the MPA library, however this appendix summarises the methodology and main findings of the report.

#### **Methodology**

The evaluation took place in two phases. During the first phase, information relating to individual operations was analysed from details obtained from the Proactive Assessment Tasking (PAT) forms. Interviews and a focus group were held relating to four boroughs (Hackney, Haringey, Lambeth and Southwark) involving 34 police officers and drug agency workers. In addition, crime data in the immediate area of each operation was analysed on the four boroughs.

The methodology of phase 2 involved focus groups and interviews with a range of people from local authority community safety units, drug services and MPS staff (11 people in total), crack “experts”\* (5), and recent or current crack users (10).

#### **Main findings of the report**

Local drugs market - The report found that the impact on the local drug markets appeared to be limited. There was no discernible added difficulty in obtaining Class A drugs and the price locally did not alter. A number of street markets were disrupted, although some only for a short time.

The report concluded that the main reason for the relative lack of disruption to local drug markets appeared to be due to the growing scale of demand for, and supply of, heroin and crack cocaine in particular. The high profits that could be gained from selling drugs means that there appeared to be no shortage of people wishing to become involved.

Impact on crime rates – the report considered that significant changes in trends in drug-related crime would not be expected if the Operation succeeded only in slightly denting supply in some areas over a very limited time. Specifically on robbery, the report expressed doubt that the majority of street robberies in London were drug related, and felt that that the majority were committed by young offenders who were unlikely to be drug-dependent. However, the report continued that some robberies are committed by older drug-dependent offenders, and drugs operations targeting areas in which patterns of drug related crime occur may impact on robbery; this may have happened in Haringey.

Critical success factors – the report found that the co-ordinated nature of Operation Crackdown did not appear to increase its impact. It found that the lack of flexibility inherent in a centralised approach may have reduced the effectiveness in some areas and led to an increase in other forms of criminal activity from which resources had been taken.

Community safety -the report concluded that although there may have been a limited impact on local drugs markets, Operation Crackdown would remain vital to tackle low level dealing, not least for the community safety gains that could be made with a real reduction in fear of crime for local residents.

The way forward - The report suggested that an approach that emphasises sustained local enforcement activity might be the most effective, and that the critical success factors for such an approach could include the following:

- A dedicated drug squad with members remaining for a minimum of 12 months;
- Inter-agency co-operation, with close links with local authority housing and community safety departments, and drug treatment agencies;
- A good intelligence set-up, with an emphasis on a tightly-run source unit which acts swiftly on intelligence and rewards sources promptly to keep them on board;
- Intelligence analysts who focus on areas where a significant proportion of robberies are committed by adults;
- Raids undertaken by officers fully trained in search methods;
- Targets of two-four weeks between notification and closure of crack houses; and
- Improved cross-borough co-operation.

The report highlighted that the majority of enforcement activities undertaken under Crackdown were directed against crack houses or street markets. Although these were clearly legitimate targets for a wide range of reasons, the report stated that it was important to remember that most class A drugs appeared to be sold via delivery arranged by mobile phone. There was a need for more enforcement activity to be targeted against this means of drug distribution.

## Appendix 2

### Arrest Referral Monitoring: LA

LA	Contact only		Assessed (not referred)		Assessed and Referred		Total	
Barking and Dagenham	178	74.2%	9	3.8%	53	22.1%	240	2.1%
Barnet	267	82.9%	32	9.9%	23	7.1%	322	2.8%
Bexley	47	33.6%	48	34.3%	45	32.1%	140	1.2%
Brent	1048	88.6%	59	5.0%	76	6.4%	1183	10.5%
Bromley	77	26.8%	85	29.6%	125	43.6%	287	2.5%
Camden	188	67.1%	62	22.1%	30	10.7%	280	2.5%
Croydon	434	69.6%	153	24.5%	37	5.9%	624	5.5%
Ealing	93	21.2%	312	71.1%	34	7.7%	439	3.9%
Enfield	90	52.6%	30	17.5%	51	29.8%	171	1.5%
Greenwich	60	32.3%	26	14.0%	100	53.8%	186	1.6%
Hackney	390	73.4%	55	10.4%	86	16.2%	531	4.7%
Hammersmith & Fulham	532	82.0%	62	9.6%	55	8.5%	649	5.7%
Haringey	67	72.0%	15	16.1%	11	11.8%	93	0.8%
Harrow	22	18.0%	43	35.2%	57	46.7%	122	1.1%
Havering	38	52.8%	18	25.0%	16	22.2%	72	0.6%
Hillingdon	173	87.8%	11	5.6%	13	6.6%	197	1.7%
Hounslow	159	41.1%	194	50.1%	34	8.8%	387	3.4%
Islington	167	73.9%	41	18.1%	18	8.0%	226	2.0%
Kensington & Chelsea	113	40.5%	89	31.9%	77	27.6%	279	2.5%
Kingston - Upon Thames	150	67.9%	28	12.7%	43	19.5%	221	2.0%
Lambeth	268	36.8%	141	19.3%	320	43.9%	729	6.4%
Lewisham	164	41.0%	117	29.3%	119	29.8%	400	3.5%
Merton	216	58.4%	78	21.1%	76	20.5%	370	3.3%
Newham	223	48.5%	103	22.4%	134	29.1%	460	4.1%
Redbridge	53	82.8%	3	4.7%	8	12.5%	64	0.6%
Richmond - Upon Thames	64	54.2%	30	25.4%	24	20.3%	118	1.0%
Southwark	153	33.2%	102	22.1%	206	44.7%	461	4.1%
Sutton	195	79.9%	22	9.0%	27	11.1%	244	2.2%
Tower Hamlets	247	53.6%	105	22.8%	109	23.6%	461	4.1%
Waltham Forest	144	91.7%	3	1.9%	10	6.4%	157	1.4%
Wandsworth	125	83.9%	6	4.0%	18	12.1%	149	1.3%
Westminster	467	44.6%	232	22.2%	347	33.2%	1046	9.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6612</b>	<b>58.5%</b>	<b>2314</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>2382</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>11308</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Year Total  
2000/2001**

This table shows a wide variation in the total number of contacts, from 1183 in Brent to 64 in Redbridge. Arrest referral schemes started at different times since April 2000. Variations in arrest scheme size and location influence the number of clients seen and any direct comparison between boroughs should be treated with caution.

The ratio of contacts to assessments also varies widely between boroughs, from over 85% "contact only" in Brent, Hillingdon and Waltham Forest, to below 30% in Harrow, Ealing and Bromley. This may reflect schemes' different definition of a "contact" and direct comparison should again be treated with caution.