

London Crime Reduction Board

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday 29 September 2010, 3pm at City Hall, GLA.

PRESENT:

Board: Mayor for London Boris Johnson, Kit Malthouse AM, Councillor Claire Kober, Councillor Colin Barrow

Technical Advisor: Sir Paul Stephenson

Lead Officers

Tim Godwin	Deputy Commissioner	MPS
Jane Harwood	Deputy Chief Executive	MPA
Ian McPherson	Assistant Commissioner	MPS
Joe Mitton	Deputy Mayor's Senior Advisor	Mayor's Office
John O'Brien	Chief Executive	London Councils
Will Tuckley	Chief Executive	LB of Bexley
Heather Munro	Chief Executive	London Probation Trust
Siwan Hayward	Deputy Director	Transport for London
Andrew Morley	Chief Executive	London Criminal Justice Partnership
Mike Lockwood	Chief Executive	LB Harrow

Apologies: Rt Hon. Nick Herbert MP, Rt. Hon. James Brokenshire MP, Mayor Jules Pipe, Steve Burton, Jeff Jacobs

Presenting: Chloe Hughes (MPA), Christian Steenberg (GLA)

Secretariat and supporting officers: Jude Sequeira (MPA), Gemma Townsend (GLA), Doug Flight (London Councils)

Notes and Arrangements: Michael Taylor, Pathumal Ali

Other Attendees:

Mike Taylor	MPS
Hamera Asfa Davey	MPA
Natasha Plummer	MPA
Fay Scott	MPA
Susan Doran	MPA
Ron Belgrave	GLA
Paul Kassman	GLA
Max Galla	London Serious Youth Violence Board

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1.1. The Mayor welcomed everyone to the inaugural meeting of the London Crime Reduction Board.

2. THE LONDON CRIME REDUCTION BOARD – SCENE SETTING

- 2.1 The Mayor set out his expectations for the board. He said the idea came from a conversation where he asked the Commissioner what partners could do to support the police on crime. The Mayor stated he saw the London Crime Reduction Board serving as the prime forum for partners to discuss solutions to crime, so that all agencies would take a joined up approach. He also felt it provides an opportunity to rationalise what exists.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE BOARD

- 3.1. Jane Harwood (MPA) and John O'Brien (London Councils) presented an outline of how the board has developed, what its terms of reference are and what needs to happen next.
- 3.2. JH explained the emergence of the LCRB from the London Community Safety Partnership and the London Criminal Justice Partnership. She referred to the draft Terms of Reference set out in the agenda paper.

- a. **To provide leadership and improve co-ordination on strategic working at the regional level on policing and crime reduction delivery in London.**
- b. **To develop a joined-up strategic assessment process in London to identify joint priorities and to help achieve focus and value.**
- c. **To lobby for change and seek to secure/maintain funding for London to achieve crime reduction.**
- d. **To ensure good practice in London on strategic crime reduction issues is appropriately identified and communicated.**
- e. **To assist the sharing of information between organisations and understanding of key crime reduction programmes and improving the synergies between these.**
- f. **To enhance the relationship between police and local authorities for working on crime reduction, as well as facilitating a stronger alignment between crime reduction activity and other strands of local strategic partnerships e.g. health, safeguarding, young people, economic development etc.**
- g. **To provide a consultative link with central government departments on crime strategy developments.**

- 3.3. JH set out the need for a Commissioning Group to develop the board's strategic assessment, priorities and delivery programmes as steered by the political board.
- 3.4. JO'B identified that the terms of reference, accountabilities and decision making processes needed to be formalised after the meeting and that the board would assist with bringing analytical capability together to assist greater joint planning. He also called for a quick, pragmatic approach to move this board forward in the interim whilst the formalising of arrangements and joint analysis were progressing.
- 3.5. JH outlined the next steps which were to set up the commissioning group, to identify the board's priorities, to address funding, particularly to look carefully at how to make the investments we need to. She stated the board needed a secretariat and recommended a working group is set up to look at these matters.

Discussion

- 3.6. CK stated these were challenging times which endorsed the need for partnership working and she agreed that this board would be a key forum. She expressed a strong interest in ensuring criminal justice partners were engaged.
- 3.7. The Mayor agreed that criminal justice partners were important as would be the involvement of education and social services.
- 3.8. CB also agreed that criminal justice was an important component and that the board's role is for exploring solutions that are not delivered by agencies themselves but those that call for partnership solutions. He also agreed it is important to deal with how to get more for less and to join up the dots.
- 3.9. KM re-iterated the need to explore how to do more for less but also with regards to funding, he suggested the need to look at the risks such as the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review upon child protection for example. He emphasised the need for a voice for London and that the board should help shape the way to deal with the unco-ordinated funding streams. The approach for the board would be how to identify and provide the support that agencies need from others and not what the board thinks should be done to them, citing the Joint Engagement Meetings as an example of this approach.
- 3.10. PS was in agreement with the comments from the board. He said the work required political leadership and sought a greater coherence on social policy, which wasn't within his or the police service's remit. He wanted a focus on outcomes, not on policing ones but on crime,

disorder and safety. He welcomed the board as a place where difficult matters could be referred to for decisions.

- 3.11. The terms of reference were agreed with reference to this discussion.
- 3.12. The Mayor agreed the focus was on crime and disorder and not policing, which is the role of the MPA. He concluded the board was essentially a co-operative body, involving three sides of the triangle and would be about agreeing the crunchy issues.

4. A STRATEGIC RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE IN LONDON

- 4.1. KM introduced this item. He acknowledged the board was just starting but that it was important to stick the flag in the sand to get things moving. He recognised there was much more work needed to be done around the collective risks and priorities. He was confident however that in any partnership's list of priorities that issues of violence would be high in that list, especially youth violence. So he asked for the board to consider current work programmes on violence as its opening discussion area.

Joint Engagement Meetings

- 4.2. Chloe Hughes (MPA) gave a presentation on the current round of Joint Engagement Meetings (JEMs) carried out by the MPA which is on the theme of violence and she explained what JEMs had to offer the board. She stated how violence was a listed priority in 24 of 32 boroughs. She stressed that JEMs is key in using data to understand and draw out discussions on the drivers and solutions to violence. She referred to the various data modelling techniques that the JEMS process uses, drawn from data across many organisations, but dealing with individual boroughs.
- 4.3. She presented some of the initial findings and achievements of the programme.

Discussion

- The Mayor expressed an interest in a finding that there were issues of bus service provision at after-school periods to which a discussion ensued. KM clarified this issue was regarding buses refusing to pick up from locations where large clusters of schoolchildren await buses and the disorder tensions this leads to. He said the JEMS process enabled solutions to be developed for moving schoolchildren away from such points in a safer and speedier way involving TfL dealing with frequency and timing matters but, as importantly, through the co-operation of schools and other partners. However, he was concerned that a borough by borough approach has been taken to date and a more strategic approach is needed, including where schoolchildren

travel across other boroughs and accumulate at key interchanges. The shared picture evolving through JEMS helped in addressing the problem.

- 4.4. CB backed up this point and stated the need for a strategic assessment that picks up the issues of people travelling into and across boroughs.
- 4.5. Chloe Hughes completed her presentation summarising the importance of bringing the data together.
- 4.6. The Mayor asked where is the repository to do so?
- 4.7. KM said there were a lot of databases but owned separately.

Intelligence Sharing

- 4.8. PS requested Deputy Commissioner Tim Godwin and Assistant Commissioner Ian McPherson (MPS) introduce their section on this agenda as it related to the intelligence-sharing point just made.
- 4.9. IM suggested many issues and events are predictable. With their analysis and intelligence data, the police are effective at moving resources to deal with these issues, but can't deal with the whole picture on their own. The police service, he argued, would welcome the same level of fluidity with other partners' resources.
- 4.10. He felt some joint analysis between partners has been done but insufficiently, to date. As an example he queried whether there a common picture about 3m Londoners travelling on London Underground everyday and the predictable issues this creates.

Discussion

- 4.11. KM agreed there was huge analytical capability when aggregated between all partners.
- 4.12. The Mayor argued transport safety has improved.
- 4.13. KM clarified that much has been achieved but this has been to heavily drawn upon work between the police services and TfL.
- 4.14. PS extended the debate away from transport saying that we have tended to limit our thinking around such issues. For example we need to factor in health and children services, such as Surestart, more into the predictive analysis. He argued the board needs to do the joint analysis but also to be able to put pressure on agencies where needed

towards a) what can we do to prevent crime and disorder now and what can we do about the long-term e.g. involving parents.

- 4.15. CB stated we mustn't forget the individual e.g. 600 families account for 80% of social services work in Westminster. He called for the need to improve joint focus on vulnerable families.
- 4.16. The Mayor agreed that 600 was not a large number to focus on.

Reducing Re-offending

- 4.17. TG expressed his desire for the board to be about what's new. He called for a joint plan at a strategic level, pulling together health, Local Authorities and others with the Mayor being ideally placed to pull all the partners together.
- 4.18. TG outlined an offer from the MOJ to pay the LCRB if it could deliver a London-wide programme that reduced re-offending. It would require up-front investment that entailed a degree of risk if the results were not achieved. He outlined the aims of the 'rehabilitation revolution' to achieve a reduction in recidivism and depopulate prisons, and to the savings this would accrue. He explained the Diamond Initiative's fit with this model and sought the board to take an interest in the incentive being offered.

Discussion

- 4.19. Members sought clarity about the MOJ proposition and also discussed the Diamond and Daedalus programmes.
- 4.20. **ACTION TG was asked to bring back a full explanation and proposal on a pan-London payment by results incentive scheme for reducing re-offending to the next meeting, including the risks and financial requirements.**
- 4.21. CK requested that it was not enough to bring this proposal alone but that in order to make any decisions, this requires all the proposed priorities to be set out.
- 4.22. **ACTION: Suggested list of priorities to be brought to the next meeting.**
- 4.23. The Mayor summed up the proposal made by the Deputy Commissioner for the Commissioning Group to:
 - 4.23.1. Pursue a pan-London strategy to challenge recidivism

and explore the incentivisation to do so.

4.23.2. Develop a pan-London database around the common cohort of families that we all face as challenges.

4.23.3. Consider how to lever-in the relevant agencies.

London Serious Youth Violence Board

4.24. Will Tuckley (LB Bexley) presented an overview of the work of the Serious Youth Violence Board, which has been successful in bringing a wide-range of partners together and operating several initiatives, including the 99% Campaign which aimed to combat negative stereotyping, establish positive role models, and promote good practice across London.

4.25. WT outlined work with young people involved in violence and on the cusp of offending. He highlighted how the approach has been to harness local effort at a local level. He also stressed the challenges of getting good practice across the Capital quickly. He re-iterated the need to be data-led to drive activity. Many of the projects have been done on a modest scale. The challenge is how to do at a pan-London level and also how to better involve the voluntary sector.

4.26. WT confirmed the LSYVB was a task and finish group but needed to be reviewed under the new context. He suggested that the London Crime Reduction Board presents an opportunity to build on this work across London, and that it is important not to lose the involvement of young people.

Discussion

4.27. PS said one value of this board will be in levering in non-usual partners.

4.28. IM suggested that resources are sufficient but need to be focused. There is a lot of data but he believed London was not good at harnessing or corralling resources around the drivers and that there is too much of a focus on crime types in structuring activity when dealing with violence.

4.29. The Mayor said the fundamental point is the work around violence looked good last year but is a problem this year. There have been considerable successes with knife crime and we need to now consider further what other agencies can do to help the police.

4.30. PS stated that the current situation is still better than 2 years ago.

Time for Action

- 4.31. Christian Steenberg (GLA) gave an overview of the work programme of 'Time for Action'. He said the programme highlighted the difficulty with coordinating multiple organisations across the region in delivering shared projects. Due to the involvement of CJS agencies in its delivery, Project Daedalus has been co-ordinated through the LCJP. The Resettlement Broker model is now being extended to cover all London boroughs, for all young men and women coming out of custody and all 18 and 19 year olds on community sentences.

Discussion

- 4.32. TG stated that one of the issues with the Daedalus programme is that this is a post-code lottery. He asked how could we take a success like this and roll it out across 32 boroughs?
- 4.33. The Mayor said there is huge scope for the board to drive forward Time for Action e.g. the mentoring projects.

5. CLOSING REMARKS

- 5.1. KM suggested holding the next meeting in January. CB argued that for 2011/12 budget planning purposes, the items needed to be discussed no later than December.
- 5.2. It was agreed that the next meeting of the board will be in December.

The Mayor concluded the meeting by seeking progress on:

- 5.2.1. Identifying where the money is?
5.2.2. Agreeing what we need to do.
5.2.3. Selecting the big topics we need to discuss.

The meeting finished at 16:25

Date of next meeting: 7 December 2010, 4pm, City Hall