

London Crime Reduction Board

Minutes of Meeting

Monday 20 June 2011, 3pm at Mayor's Office, City Hall, GLA.

PRESENT:

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

Lead Officers

Tim Godwin	Deputy Commissioner	MPS
Steve Rodhouse	Commander	MPS
Jane Harwood	Deputy Chief Executive	MPA
John O'Brien	Chief Executive	London Councils
Will Tuckley	Chief Executive	LB Bexley
Heather Munro	Chief Executive	London Probation Trust
Alison Saunders	Chief Crown Prosecutor	Crown Prosecution Service

Apologies: AC Ian McPherson

Presentations: Item 3 - Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service) and Christian Steenberg (GLA)

Secretariat and supporting officers: Jude Sequeira (MPA), Joe Mitton and Roisha Hughes (Mayor's Office), Doug Flight and Kevin Taylor (London Councils).

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1. The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

2.1 Agreed.

3. REDUCING RE-OFFENDING

3.1. Lucy Bogue and Christian Steenberg provided an outline of the London Justice Re-investment programme's latest developments.

3.2. LB explained her role which is to lead the London payment by results projects for NOMS. She briefed the board on the aims and context of the Financial Incentives Model pilot in London. She reported that a co-ordination group has been set up to support it and that the group had agreed to re-name the pilot as the Justice Re-investment Pilot. She referred to the difference between the London and Manchester pilot and how the 5 boroughs will offer different approaches testing how local actions can reduce demand on other parts of the criminal justice

system. This will include a youth element to the model in Hackney.

- 3.3. CS reported each of the 5 boroughs has now signed the Memorandum of Understanding with the MOJ. He provided a summary of the challenges that the pilot's design and its evaluation presented and he advised that consultation on the evaluation model is commencing in the next two weeks.

Discussion

- 3.4. The Mayor sought clarity about who the contract was between and what's in it for the boroughs. It was explained that different providers would bid for the work and a cash reward, albeit insubstantial, would be given to the boroughs. The pilot would test whether the financial incentive was sufficient.
- 3.5. JP said he was content with the pilot. He continues to hold concerns about the risk for perverse incentives but felt the pilot was a win-win for Hackney since it will be in line for money for doing things it would do anyway and there are no default penalties.
- 3.6. TG felt the model did not go far enough towards a justice reinvestment model and that the model didn't properly represent demand reduction. He welcomed Lucy Bogue's role. He accepted that there is a need to work with the model and that the accountability arrangements that he would have welcomed were not feasible within the current financial context facing the MOJ and its need to make significant savings.
- 3.7. LB acknowledged these points, making the case that the pilot is a start to help move London into broader ambitions for justice re-investment.
- 3.8. The Mayor wished the pilot well.
- 3.9. **AGREED:** Pilots to proceed. Co-ordination group to report into LCRB.
- 3.10. **ACTION:** DMG to receive progress updates.

4. MULTI-AGENCY SAFEGUARDING HUBS

- 4.1. Steve Rodhouse introduced the proposal to pilot co-located multi-agency teams in premises that allows secure access to each agency's data systems. The first phase would test this in 14 boroughs. He explained the benefits in terms of decision-making and problem-solving and having real-time immediate access to data and input from other partners. He sought the board's endorsement for this proposal and offered to bring back a business case for with funded options. He also referred to the need to get health sector buy-in to co-location and data-sharing.
- 4.2. The Mayor asked who would house the teams and whether the model was principally about computer systems. He wanted to understand the funding requirements and why it would cost £100-150k per borough. He agreed to take up the matter with health partners.
- 4.3. SR explained the cost was largely to deal with data security provision but the objective was enabling fast-time decisions in a partnership context. He suggested that Council premises were the favourable

option.

Discussion

- 4.4. CB argued that co-location wasn't a pre-requisite for better information-sharing. He checked whether this model was focused on the safeguarding of children. SR explained it would go further than children and include vulnerable adults and families.
- 4.5. CK stated that the arrangement in Haringey was massively valuable allowing a 360 degree view in real-time. However, she warned that the experience also demonstrated it could create new demands and resource implications in the short-term.
- 4.6. TG agreed that the difficulty is offering the pathways once individual needs have been identified. He drew comparison to the re-offending work which also requires moving funds upstream.
- 4.7. The board considered the funding implications. The Mayor asked if there were cost-savings to be gained. CK referred to the £5m and whether there was any co-incidence with the amount held in next year's Community Safety Fund (CSF) grant for London. CB made the point that there could be more cost-effective ways of achieving this outcome. TG argued the board should be considering whether proposals like this were good investments to make for London using the CSF. JP invited partners to visit Hackney's team and stated that whilst it did incur a cost to set up, the benefits – both in case outcomes and closer working arrangements – have justified the investment.
- 4.8. The Mayor agreed the proposal was a sensible one and so asked that the board receives a business case with costed options. He supported the case that the pilot should test different approaches such as using police accommodation and examine systems and protocols that also achieve effective data sharing without the IT costs incurred. He accepted the reasons why the shared accommodation cost-savings would be minimal but also wanted the pilots to look into achieving back-office savings.
- 4.9. **AGREED:** Pilots to proceed exploring comments about use of police premises, back-office savings and non-co-location models.
- 4.10. **ACTION:** The Anti-Violence Partnership to commence development of the pilot, testing different approaches and to prepare a business case with funding options for the board to consider.
- 4.11. **ACTION:** The Mayor to make representation to health partners to engage with this proposal.

5. PROSECUTION OF GANG RELATED CASES

- 5.1. Alison Saunders outlined a proposal to pilot dedicated and specialist prosecutors to work with the police and other agencies to prosecute gang related crime and that these pilots may be rolled out in line with Operation Connect boroughs. She explained how the use of specialists would allow a regular point of contact to improve the

gathering of evidence related to public interest and community impact statements used in court.

Discussion

- 5.2. JP warmly welcomed this proposal and AS's responsiveness to the issues he had raised at previous board meetings. He reinforced the value of having nominated officers who would assist with identifying the appropriate tools and powers to use against high harm individuals such as violent gang leaders. He said they also serve to identify measures to improve witness support relating to gang-related and youth-offending cases.
- 5.3. TG agreed the proposal would help to improve the CPS' ownership of such cases and its role in seeking a problem-solving outcome.
- 5.4. JP thanked everyone who contributed to this development.
- 5.5. The Mayor expressed his support to the proposal. He suggested that the development was something to be publicised as an LCRB outcome.
- 5.6. **AGREED:** CPS pilot to proceed.
- 5.7. **ACTION:** Statement to be prepared and publicised about pilot arising from Mayor Pipe's idea and taken forward by the LCRB and CPS.

6. Violence Against Women and Girls Services

- 6.1. Will Tuckley referred to the report and progress regarding the work to map refuge provision and commissioning arrangements in London. A research study has been commissioned and proposals will be reported to the next LCRB meeting. He referred to the data which demonstrated the flow and transfers of women seeking refuge between boroughs.

Discussion

- 6.2. Heather Munro added that the work to look at keeping women at home and moving perpetrators away was also underway and will be reported in due course.
- 6.3. AS reported on work that local criminal justice boards are doing to understand and address the variability in attrition rates in different boroughs.
- 6.4. KM stated that some boroughs expressed performance issues being linked to access to specialised DV courts or even access to local courts. AS considered Independent Domestic Violence Advocates may have a stronger link to performance.
- 6.5. TG also stressed the timeliness of court cases being a factor.
- 6.6. AS said the work will look into boroughs whose attrition rates are in the outlying ranges and review the factors that may account for this.
- 6.7. **AGREED:** Refuge commissioning proposals to be reported to September 2011 meeting.

6.8. **ACTION:** AS to report findings of attrition rates review to DMG.

7. **Community Safety Fund 2012/13**

7.1. JH presented options being considered for allocating the community safety fund in 2012/13. She suggested the issues fall in two categories: 1) what is the fund used for? and 2) how is it divided up? She said the reports seeks to open dialogue to inform the 2012/13 budget planning round and advised that further work is needed to understand the impact any change would have on existing arrangements.

Discussion

7.2. The Mayor queried if this £5m fund needed such deliberations.

7.3. KM said it was important to have a conversation over this diminishing resource. He said it was important to maintain specific delivery areas, such as Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy work but that it was right to review the outcomes attained from projects. So he sought to understand how the fund was currently used and whether it could be better used to lever in other funds.

7.4. JP stressed that some boroughs with lower levels of crime relied heavily upon this fund for their crime reduction activity. He feared some community safety teams would cease without this funding.

7.5. CB added that boroughs needed to deal with fear of crime as an issue so that whilst borough policing resources was there to deal with crime activity, the fund supported the work boroughs could do for issues such as ASB.

7.6. WT reported that the fund provides considerable additionality to Bexley's work.

7.7. The Mayor summed up saying the board needs to decide the extent it seeks the fund to take a borough or pan-London approach. JP said he would resist prescription applying to any centrally-held slice. The Mayor agreed there is a need to avoid ring-fencing this fund to tightly.

7.8. **AGREED:** Dialogue to continue through DMG.

7.9. **ACTION:** A borough impact assessment to be carried out to inform opportunities for change.

8. **OTHER MATTERS RAISED**

8.1. Jules Pipe asked to raise two matters on behalf of London Councils.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams

8.2. Firstly he expressed concerns about the proposed changes to Safer Neighbourhood teams and the reduced numbers of sergeants. He said this has caused much concern in boroughs.

8.3. KM said the new model was proposed in response to the flexibility boroughs had sought.

- 8.4. TG said the proposals were not seeking to destabilize safer neighbourhood teams. They would retain the non-abstraction principle but offer more flexibility and opportunity to boroughs seeking to re-configure their neighbourhood teams and cross-ward working.
- 8.5. The Mayor said the police authority was discussing the changes at its meeting on 30 June 2011.

Community Conversations

- 8.6. JP also raised local difficulties arising from the Mayor's recent 'community conversation' event held in Hackney. He reported that the community views that were expressed at the meeting had adversely affected police and partnership morale. He therefore queried the benefit of these meetings. He was also critical of the lack of involvement of local partnership members on the panel. A request for panel involvement had been refused prior to the meeting but subsequently the local youth services representative was called upon when the lack of local input was noted by the audience. He therefore argued the joint planning could have been improved.
- 8.7. The Mayor thanked him for the feedback. He said that only 2 further events remain to be held. He didn't think the criticism was fair, arguing that any public meeting could have unpasteurised results. He thought it is generally useful for officers to hear the public's views and that he found the debate interesting, challenging and stimulating. Of all the events to date, this was the first borough to which such feedback had been given. Nevertheless he shared JP's anxiety, agreeing that the views expressed hadn't duly acknowledged the noteworthy work that Hackney has achieved in the last 10 years.
- 8.8. With regards the panel, the Mayor said this was the same format used in previous meetings and borough representatives are always invited to attend the event.

9. CLOSING REMARKS

- 9.1. The Mayor thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

The meeting finished at 16.20

Date of next meeting: 12 September 2011, 3pm, City Hall