

# London Crime Reduction Board

## Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday 7 December 2010, 4pm 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
Ian McPherson	Assistant Commissioner - Territorial Policing	MPS
John O'Brien	Chief Executive	London Councils

**Apologies:** Deputy Commissioner Tim Godwin

**Presenting:** Valerie Brasse (MPA), Steve Bloomfield (MPS)

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

**Notes:** Jude Sequeira

### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1.1. The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting.

### 2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

2.1 Agreed.

### 3. MATTERS ARISING

3.1. KM asked for an update with regards to the Commissioning Group and Funding. JH advised that the development of the Commissioning Group is still in progress and hopes this will be in place by the next meeting. With regards funding streams, she said the Home Office has been helpful and we will continue to explore options particularly after the Treasury makes its announcements on funding later in December. KM referred to a conversation he had with Nick Herbert, the Home Office and MOJ Minister, who said consideration is being given to future funding for community safety being directed through the proposed Police and Crime Commissioners. The Mayor welcomed this direction.

### 4. A LONDON ANTI-VIOLENCE PARTNERSHIP

4.1. AC Ian McPherson presented Item 4. He sought the LCRB's support

for the creation of an Anti-Violence Partnership and the work strands proposed in the covering report.

- 4.2. IM provided a summary of the proposals and outlined how these had been arrived at through a series of meetings with partners. He commended the work for taking a pro-active partnership approach.
- 4.3. IM also informed the board of Operation Connect. This is a 2 year programme to address gang issues, capitalising on surveillance and joint intelligence activity in critical locations but particularly involving the back-up and co-ordination of multi-agency activity in order to address longer-term needs.

#### Discussion

- 4.4. The Mayor welcomed both the Anti-Violence Partnership proposal and Operation Connect. He agreed with Operation Connect's focus to build upon suppression tactics through dealing with the causes of violence in partnership. He asked whether the proposals depended on the LCRB and a new partnership structure. He also wanted assurance that the work is connected with the plethora of existing youth initiatives and interventions. He expressed surprise that children services had not been involved before.
- 4.5. CB saw strong links with the family intervention work, fearing the activity could lead to 2 styles of approach, with funding coming from different streams. JO'B explained that the partnership was plugged into current practice. CB favoured looking at more targeted activity e.g. linking with the family interventions work, rather than providing generic models. CB was also struck by the plethora of boards that the Appendix showed and hoped the new partnership's work wouldn't be diffused in this scheme.
- 4.6. CK was encouraged by the proposals, considering the outline a good framework. However, she asked to see the actions that would attach to the framework.
- 4.7. JP was interested in the information-sharing strand, acknowledging that much of this is about database synergy issues. He raised the need to review IT security thresholds if co-locating police with other agencies was part of establishing multi-agency information hubs - particularly to improve the lead-in times that police staff need to co-locate equipped with their IT.
- 4.8. JP also stressed the deterrence value of violent offences being taken to court. At a later item in the agenda he elaborated upon this. Here he illustrated how a multiple offender was only tried and charged with lesser offences whilst significantly more serious allegations didn't pass the CPS case evidence threshold. He suggested this was another approach to the early intervention work and suggested consideration be given to setting up dedicated CPS teams with expertise around youth violence.
- 4.9. KM agreed that developing more crime type specialist teams would be of value, referring to the example of the new sexual violence command unit. However he acknowledged the difficulty for the CPS with the budget cuts it faced. KM said this is also about the quality of the

sentencing of serious offenders and removing their persistent demand upon enforcement services for respite periods of time.

- 4.10. IM addressed the various points raised. In summary, this included
  - 4.10.1. (Re. 4.4) the issue is not just one for the police but dependent on other partners. The proposal is about sustainability and it is of the board's interest because it transcends borough boundaries. The spread in the leadership of the strands will ensure everyone is involved and connections are made.
  - 4.10.2. (Re. 4.5) With the local intelligence hub and use of the Victim, Offender Location and Time model, we can be better co-ordinated in the targeting of activity and so reduce duplication.
  - 4.10.3. (Re.4.6) Will come back next time with what needs to be achieved and how we are going to do it.
  - 4.10.4. (Re. 4.7) The uniformly applied IT security threshold is being re-visited for all operations.
  - 4.10.5. (Re. 4.8-9) Referred to the example of the dedicated court system in Liverpool which has enabled repeat offenders to be better identified and dealt with by the courts. Agreed it ultimately comes down to funding.
- 4.11. The Mayor concluded that the proposals were supported and asked that the board be advised of what is going to be produced from the work and how the map of bubbles can be reduced, not just added to by a new board i.e. the Anti-Violence Partnership.

## **5. Violence Against Women and Girls Services**

- 5.1. Valerie Brasse, (MPA Member, deputy chair of the Violence Against Women and Girls Panel and co-chair of the MPA Domestic and Sexual Violence Board) introduced Item 5.
- 5.2. VB welcomed the previous anti-violence partnership discussion on Item 4 and acknowledged there needs to be co-ordination between the work falling under the proposed AV Partnership and the area of work she is introducing.
- 5.3. VB referred to a number of statistics and issues as well as current policy and service direction relating to Violence against Women and Girls services in London. In doing so, VB set out the rationale as to why a co-ordinated pan-London approach to providing some VAWG services should be led by the board. She highlighted unmet expectations from victims, as well as the risks that budget cuts could impact upon specialist, secondary tier and high cost – low critical mass VAWG services. She referenced findings from NOMS and OFSTED reports showing the links across agendas, namely offending and early intervention.
- 5.4. VB led into the propositions contained within the agenda report. She argued pan-London co-ordination would help improve delivery efficiencies and help counter the impacts of funding cuts to VAWG services. She identified the areas, informed through her VAWG chairing roles, that she understood were worth considering as

appropriate for joint commissioning across London, either on a pan-London or sub-regional basis, namely:

- 5.4.1. Refuge provision;
  - 5.4.2. Rape Crisis Helpline(s);
  - 5.4.3. Specialist services for specific victim needs e.g. for gang, BME, substance misuse, trafficking and prostitution industry related victim groups.
- 5.5. VB acknowledged central government's localism framework and referred to the Home Office's recent announcement of £28m being earmarked towards specific domestic and sexual violence programmes, for example towards advocacy support. She suggested the board could take a role in bidding for London's share of the £28m and/or to assist with channelling it effectively within London.
- 5.6. Regarding London Councils grants provision, it was established that a level of VAWG funding is likely to continue to 2012 but that there wasn't duplication with the proposal here as the London Council's grant focus is on specialist third sector service provision.
- 5.7. VB concluded that the proposal to develop a multi-borough scheme co-ordinating refuge service provision was an opportunity for the LCRB to test its joint commissioning role. The refuge option was offered as a manageable test project, paving the way for further LCRB joint commissioning initiatives, including other selected VAWG services. Service leads from 14 boroughs attended a meeting held at the GLA at which there was a broad consensus in favour of bringing this proposal to the LCRB.

#### Discussion

- 5.8. KM welcomed the proposal suggesting that the South London Rape Crisis Centre project was a useful model that could be used for refuge provision. He understood that many boroughs have bi-lateral agreements developed, but in an ad-hoc way across London and not always in a form convenient to victim service users.
- 5.9. CK expressed some reluctance to providing a refuge scheme, instead supporting placing more focus upon keeping people at home. She felt that victims who had to resort to refuges had been failed by the system.
- 5.10. CB countered this view saying that staying in the same environment through community care support was not always a practicable option. He asked whether the demand for refuge places is known, by boroughs and pan-London. He asked is there a waiting list. To these questions, he suggested a supply and demand map is produced.
- 5.11. VB responded to the points made, agreeing that further mapping was needed. She offered to bring a business case to the next LCRB meeting.
- 5.12. The Mayor agreed that this matter should be taken forward, asking for a map of demand to be developed. He supported a business case being presented to the next meeting. He asked this covers schemes for specialist/generalist services that the LCRB could commission and that costs are included along with model for recharging boroughs.

## **6. Financial Incentives Model**

- 6.1. Stephen Bloomfield presented Item 6. He introduced 3 areas for discussion:
  - 6.1.1. The current evaluation and findings of the Diamond Initiative
  - 6.1.2. The MoJ's Financial Incentives Model (payments by results)
  - 6.1.3. Youth Justice Pathways.
- 6.2. SB presented a handout of slides and advised that support from the LCRB was sought for a pan-London approach to these matters.
- 6.3. SB outline the Diamond model, comprising dedicated, multi-agency teams set up with the objective of supporting offenders from the time of their release from custodial sentences of less than 12 months. This model is working in 6 districts in London.
- 6.4. SB explained the rigorous evaluation that has been carried out using independent academic consultants. In doing so, the methodology identified a closely matched cohort of offenders from non-Diamond areas to compare with the offenders supported under Diamond. The findings in the handout were from the latest interim evaluation of the programme (covering the programme's first 12 months). The programme is currently funded until the end of March 2011.
- 6.5. SB gave a broad outline of the Key Findings. Members attention was raised to data that indicated that the Diamond cohort had a higher re-offending rate of 46.3%, to that of the control group London cohort (45.3%). SB highlighted that this was considerably less than the national re-offending rate of 61.1%. SB referred to the slide showing the analysis by type of offending. This showed a better rate for Diamond compared to the control group cohort for violent reoffending. The only other significant comparison was the drugs possession rate for which Diamond compared adversely against the control group cohort.
- 6.6. Board members queried the robustness of the data comparison exercise i.e. was it like for like? SB expressed confidence in the evaluation's methodology.
- 6.7. A query was also made about how many people go through the programme in its entirety. SB responded that there have been more than 2500 potential Diamond offenders since the project started but nearly 20% are hard to track post-release.
- 6.8. SB then provided an outline of the Financial Incentive Model (FIM), referring to discussions held last week with the MoJ, and a quick scan of the Green Paper on Sentencing that had been announced just prior to the board meeting. The general outline of FIM is that the MoJ would share a proportion of savings made with partners who reduce their costs across 4 metrics.
- 6.9. Board members sought clarity on what was the proportion of savings and whether the model was aimed at a local or multi-borough basis? SB indicated that planning meetings had been underway with specific boroughs currently included within the Diamond Initiative but that he

considered the MoJ's preference was towards a multi-borough/area-wide basis

#### Discussion

- 6.10. Members were concerned foremost as to why the re-offending rate was higher for those in receipt of the targeted intervention under the Diamond Initiative. It was generally felt that without further drilling down, the evaluation did not provide a convincing business case for renewal of the programme.
- 6.11. JP felt the FIM had a number of limitations and challenges including 1) offering no upfront investment, 2) a poor value of return, 3) the timeframes being used to measure results, 4) dealing with area-wide impacts and churn, 5) not recognising other outcomes achieved through targeted intervention work. He wasn't convinced by the results presented.
- 6.12. KM acknowledged it would be a very brave local authority to take up the FIM offer with the risks attached. He suggested London develops a model and approach the MoJ with what would make this a worthwhile offer.
- 6.13. The Mayor was concerned that we seem to have no evidence in the evaluation of what works around which to develop an offer with confidence.
- 6.14. CB agreed we need to identify where and with which cohort of offenders this model will work.
- 6.15. KM said he understood that many of the offenders under Diamond may be hardened, older offenders, whereas work with a younger age range, say 16-22, like at the Heron Unit, may be a more achievable cohort for change. He agreed we need to drill down further and find a structure to use for this model.
- 6.16. The Mayor concluded that the evaluation was disappointing but that this should not diminish the need to find a scheme that works and which will convince partners to put their investment forward.

#### **Justice Re-investment Pathways**

- 6.17. SB outline the Youth Justice Board's initiative to offer up-front funds to pilot local areas that work to reduce the number of youth custody bed spaces the YJB currently procures in these areas. As well as funding, the YJB will offer a payment by results incentive. However, non-achievement would lead to a funding clawback. He explained this was a transitional scheme before YJB funding was fully devolved to local authorities in a few years hence. Its aim is to incentivise community sentencing of young people and allow boroughs to share in the youth custodial savings. SB used the Diamond District areas as an example of the costs and savings that could be achieved through a co-ordinated approach.

#### Discussion

- 6.18. The Mayor asked about the likely impact upon public anxiety of managing young people with serious offences in the community. He

also stressed the need for courts to have the confidence in community sentencing to make this work.

- 6.19. IM suggested that the drive behind this need is that young people are more malleable to offending behavioural change.
- 6.20. KM argued the 2 year timeframe wasn't sufficient.
- 6.21. JP argued these models need a lot more to make them attractive to local authorities.
- 6.22. KM agreed, especially with regards to meeting upfront costs.
- 6.23. The Mayor concluded, agreeing that the Board develop a model to take forward in London.

## **7. BIG ISSUES**

- 7.1. KB invited the members to identify the key areas for the board to focus upon. He suggested the current areas of focus warranted priority, namely:
  - 7.1.1. Anti-violence
  - 7.1.2. Violence against women
  - 7.1.3. Reducing re-offending/offender management/ payments by results.
- 7.2. He also felt we need a better picture of youth crime prevention work and what works e.g. concerning Daedulus, diversionary and sports activities, schools initiatives and other non-enforcement related programmes. He also supported looking more closely at work with 2-4 year olds.
- 7.3. CB supported this but cautioned against diffusing the focus too widely. He requested we look at these issues with regards their relevance and application to a target group of known individuals that are of joint concern to all services.
- 7.4. IM supported this approach, advising that the joint intelligence picture being built in each borough for violence could be extended beyond this to other issues.
- 7.5. JP referred to a case study which demonstrated how an individual with an extensive record of offences had only been charged and convicted many times for some allegations but never for the violent and serious level allegations. He put this down to the threshold that CPS needs to apply to bring cases to trial. However, he feared that such a series fails to take due account of the cumulative impact of each crime and has an associated risk of not addressing the violent behavior. He argued that this case study was not isolated and that there is work here that the board could lead upon in trying to secure more focus and timely sanctions upon more challenging offenders. He sought the board bringing more pressure upon the CPS and courts.
- 7.6. KM agreed there has to be more focus on quality rather than quantity in the criminal justice system and so in embedding LCJP partners in the work of the board.
- 7.7. IM said that when you overlay such an individual's history with other

services such as housing and the Inland Revenue, their impact on the community goes a lot wider. He welcomed the board having a strong regard to this issue.

**8. CLOSING REMARKS**

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

The meeting finished at 17:30

---

**Date of next meeting: 15 March 2011, 3pm, City Hall**