

London Crime Reduction Board

Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday 15 March 2011, 2pm at Mayor's Office, City Hall, GLA.

PRESENT:

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

Lead Officers

Jane Harwood	Deputy Chief Executive	MPA
Tim Godwin	Acting Commissioner	MPS
John O'Brien	Chief Executive	London Councils
Will Tuckley	Chief Executive	LB Bexley
Mary McFeely	Director	London Probation Trust

Apologies: Heather Munro, London Probation Trust

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

Notes: Jude Sequeira

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1. The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting. He was concerned the board wasn't fulfilling its potential and set a challenge for the meeting to prove its worth.

2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

2.1 Agreed.

3. MATTERS ARISING

3.1. None

4. A LONDON ANTI-VIOLENCE PARTNERSHIP

4.1. Jane Harwood invited discussion on the update provided on the Anti-Violence Partnership (AVP). The 4 strands were highlighted and included a strand developing multi-agency information sharing.

Discussion

4.2. The Mayor fully supported the closer integration of services including opportunities this presents for sharing costs. He said he had been particularly impressed with developments in LB Harrow for joining

council and police services and felt there should be more of this type of integration. Officers advised that there are a range of co-located activities occurring in all boroughs at different scales. **ACTION:** Tim Godwin suggested it would be useful to map the current leading examples of multi-agency teams/co-working structures that exist in each borough to inform further developments.

- 4.3. The completion of the London Serious Youth Violence Board was discussed and whether youth violence featured sufficiently in the new Anti-Violence Partnership. Will Tuckley explained the LSYVB was a task and finish group and that activity had either completed or been handed onto the partnership. He suggested that serious youth violence should permeate each strand and further consideration should be given to adding short-term interventions into the partnership's programme that deal with current challenges around violence. **ACTION:** The board supported WT's suggestions.
- 4.4. Kit Malthouse sought clarification on the AVP's membership. He was concerned with the balance between police representation and the mix of other partners, and whether the right level of influence attended the partnership or whether it was most effective having its leadership reside with the police alone. **ACTION:** WT agreed to discuss with AC McPherson and consider co-chairing arrangements, along with revisiting the membership.
- 4.5. Jules Pipe enquired whether the new arrangements for community safety funding through the Mayor would be re-configured through the LCRB and the Commissioning Group in support of violence and other priorities.
- 4.6. KM confirmed that the funds would all be passported to boroughs for 2011/12. For 2012/13, he said the halving of the fund to £5m presents a major challenge. He feared that spreading the diminishing pot too thinly could have an indiscernible effect and opened discussion on the option of targeting it towards, say, 3-5 priorities.
- 4.7. JP considered this would be appropriate if strategic priorities were applied in a local or geographical sense.
- 4.8. Claire Kober said this needs clarity soon but felt much of the grant will have to be used just to maintain service commitments before considering what balance is leftover for such priorities.
- 4.9. Colin Barrow asked do we know the best approach to use the fund, say, towards a reduction in violence such as give it to everyone, prioritise ways it is spent or target it in key areas?
- 4.10. KM added we should also look at how to use it to promote local match funding and support innovation.
- 4.11. The Mayor agreed we need an answer to CB's question. **ACTION:** TG offered to bring a report back with indicative options that can inform how the Mayor's decides to invest the 2012/13 fund. This will look at the current challenges to local authority budgets and which local funding commitments may be particularly at risk next year.
- 4.12. JP raised the value of having a dedicated CPS unit for dealing with youth violence to promote specialists in dealing with such cases and

improving conviction rates. **ACTION:** KM asked for this to be picked up with the CPS.

5. Violence Against Women and Girls Services

- 5.1. KM introduced the item explaining that further data is needed to develop the proposition for refuge provision and understand the picture for 2011/12. He argued that this was a local authority matter but the impact that any gaps could have upon conviction rates and policing has led to this interest and GLA wanting to commission a further study. KM acknowledged that when he raised this matter at a recent London Councils Executive Group meeting, the response to his presentation was very negative.
- 5.2. CK clarified that boroughs weren't opposing the issue nor its importance but that they needed more understanding of what constitutes a quality service and whether the financial case stacks up.
- 5.3. JP agreed with CK but was concerned with the degree of variability in bed spaces across the boroughs. He explained too that the timing of the discussion at London Councils when budgets had already been fixed, may have led to the blank response.
- 5.4. The Mayor argued this matter is a cross-borough issue because of the demand flows between boroughs. He questioned whether reciprocal arrangements were sufficiently robust and if bed spaces were fairly distributed.
- 5.5. TG expressed a view that the discussion and system generally focuses on moving the victims away from the home, disrupting their lives significantly, whilst perpetrators are left in place. Wider discussion followed on how the criminal justice system could support perpetrator-based re-housing options.
- 5.6. The Mayor supported this saying it would be better use the funds to support keeping those who are seeking refuge at home.
- 5.7. JP re-iterated the need to see the data and supporting case. He referenced the similarities in the issues of evenness of distribution and crossovers with hostel provision and suggested this is also factored into the review.
- 5.8. **ACTION:** The Mayor asked for 2 reports: one covering the demand and supply of refuge and hostel provision including details of bilateral arrangements; the second to outline existing and feasible criminal justice options and solutions for re-housing perpetrators.

6. Reducing Re-Offending

- 6.1. TG provided a brief position update on the Financial Incentive Model (FIM) pilot which is progressing in London. He suggested the board needs to establish where the pan-London perspective sits between the MoJ's national involvement and local borough interests? He took the view that FIM is principally about stopping people going to court, less so about reducing re-offending. As such there is a perverse incentive not to catch, prosecute and convict offenders. In doing so this risks

penalising better police performance. The deal between the MoJ and boroughs is now firming up but he was concerned whether the chances of successful pilots under the current proposal are limited. He also reported that the final evaluation of the Diamond Initiative was showing a 20% reduction in the offending rate of the Diamond cohort excepting those involving drug offences. **ACTION:** TG offered a report on Diamond and development of a toolkit to share on good practice from the initiative.

Discussion

- 6.2. KM agreed that FIM is developing as a performance measurement model. It was not specifically focused on reducing re-offending and the measures stack up against making arrests. He considered its main savings will come from court closures which could then create backlogs and a slower court throughput and that such savings may take years to materialise. Also he was not sure how well the youth justice pilot is developing concurrently.
- 6.3. CB had concerns with the FIM performance model too as it used measures aggregated at a borough-wide level which may be more difficult to deliver upon. He preferred a system which rewarded success in terms of addressing individuals or related groups. This he felt was more in keeping with the individually tailored intervention programmes that services tend to adopt with single offenders, groups or families. He feared that boroughs with a high inflow of people from outside their boundaries who may attract or be involved in crime, could have their performance outcomes adversely affected by such factors outside of their control.
- 6.4. Mary McFeeley offered the view that FIM addresses re-offending as it promotes the integrated offender management approach and fosters early intervention. JP and TG however shared a concern that the current budgetary context will threaten early years, youth diversion, up-front investment and alternative income sources. JP acknowledged the MoJ constraint of not being able to offer the rewards unless its throughputs and costs were reduced.
- 6.5. JP referred to the discussion at the last meeting which captured and covered these same points and he highlighted the risks of encouraging borough outflows of offenders. He felt the aspect of cross-border churn necessitated a regional input. KM understood the MoJ to be cutting out the strategic level input and that borough take-up was not good.
- 6.6. WT needed the fuller picture from the different pilots alongside the learning from Diamond, to inform local decision-making.
- 6.7. John O'Brien advised that some boroughs are favourable towards the model and going for it. He referred to the light touch strategic co-ordination role being developed, as outlined in the written update. He recommended the board to support this for negotiations with the MoJ.
- 6.8. KM listed the opportunities that a more strategic approach could offer to the pilot, including a broader base by which to absorb the investment risk. CB said he could be persuaded to pool funding if the case for

doing so demonstrated measurable results.

- 6.9. The Mayor sought agreement on where to go from here and what message needs to be given to the MoJ. He wanted to see a reduction in re-offending without the perverse incentives identified. He wanted a focus on both deterring offending and reducing re-offending.
- 6.10. KM proposed the following activity:
 - 6.10.1. Seek the MoJ to insert a strategic level in the FIM pilot.
 - 6.10.2. Suggest to MoJ amendments to the model that would better counter the perverse incentives and inject a more targeted approach towards individuals, groups and families.
 - 6.10.3. Explore a longer term model which could be around the Mayor holding the budget for prison places in London, which itself would provide a financial motive towards pump priming and reducing prison demand.
 - 6.10.4. Assess the impact of the YJB model going local rather than regional.
- 6.11. JP welcomed the proposal for improvements to the model, and for this to be worked up with boroughs and offering a range of options. KM added the options should reflect borough's differing appetites for investment risk.
- 6.12. WT emphasised the need for a co-ordinating function to support this work.
- 6.13. **ACTION:** The Mayor asked for a future report on progress on the above proposals, including which boroughs are signed up, what other resources are needed and what are the key risks to success.

7. COMMISSIONING GROUP

- 7.1. The group discussed the officer structure needed to support the board in the light of how the board has so far developed.
- 7.2. TG said the meeting had identified the quality of product required and that settlements of budgets will now allow for asset to be identified to resource this activity. As Chair of the Commissioning Group he agreed to undertake a look at the infrastructure and programme of work and to bring the products requested to future meetings. JH confirmed there will be one group reporting to the board – the Commissioning Group.

8. CLOSING REMARKS

- 8.1.1. The Mayor thanked everyone for their contributions and closed the meeting.

The meeting finished at 15:00

Date of next meeting: 20 June 2011, 3pm, City Hall