

## Analysis of whether there was displacement of rough sleepers as a result of Operation Adoze – for MRSG, 24 February 2016

GLA worked with the CHAIN team to establish whether, how often and in which borough(s) the rough sleepers encountered by ICE officers through Operation Adoze were seen sleeping rough after they were (first) encountered through this operation.

The analysis covered 169 of the 217 rough sleepers encountered by ICE as part of Operation Adoze between 3 November 2015 and 29 January 2016 – those whom GLA was able to identify on the CHAIN database. This cohort accounted for 78% of individuals encountered through Operation Adoze and 77% of the 235 encounters that took place. 92% of the rough sleepers covered were EU nationals.

59 of these 169 rough sleepers (35%) were seen sleeping rough after they were (first) encountered through by ICE, during the period up to 19 February 2016. Of those seen after they were (first) encountered, 46% were seen once, 22% twice, another 22% between three and five times, and the remaining 10% between six and nine times.

CHAIN records suggest that these 59 rough sleepers were sleeping rough in the following boroughs at the time when they were encountered by ICE officers:

| Borough            | Number seen sleeping rough | Percentage seen sleeping rough |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Camden             | 1                          | 1.7                            |
| City               | 7                          | 11.9                           |
| H&F                | 3                          | 5.1                            |
| K&C                | 6                          | 10.2                           |
| Southwark          | 1                          | 1.7                            |
| Westminster        | 40                         | 67.8                           |
| Westminster or K&C | 1                          | 1.7                            |

So, more than two thirds were first seen sleeping rough in Westminster.

CHAIN records also indicate that in the huge majority of cases (49 out of 59, or 83%), it was in the borough where a rough sleeper appears to have been sleeping rough at the time when they were (first) encountered by ICE that they were subsequently seen sleeping rough. All but one of the exceptions are detailed below. (In the case not shown, it is unclear from CHAIN whether the individual was sleeping rough in Westminster or K&C when they were encountered by ICE.)

| Borough where individual was sleeping rough when encountered by ICE | Borough(s) where individual was subsequently seen sleeping rough and number of times seen |     |         |             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------|-------------|
|                                                                     | City                                                                                      | H&F | Lambeth | Westminster |
| City                                                                | 1                                                                                         |     |         | 6           |
|                                                                     | 2                                                                                         |     |         | 3           |
|                                                                     | 1                                                                                         |     |         | 1           |
|                                                                     | 2                                                                                         |     |         | 2           |
| H&F                                                                 |                                                                                           | 1   |         | 1           |
|                                                                     |                                                                                           | 1   |         | 1           |
| Westminster                                                         |                                                                                           |     | 2       |             |
|                                                                     | 3                                                                                         |     |         |             |
|                                                                     | 1                                                                                         |     |         | 1           |

This indicates greater displacement to than from Westminster and shows seven of the nine individuals seen in other boroughs after they were first encountered by ICE were also seen again in the borough where they were encountered. So, there is no evidence to suggest Operation Adoze caused significant displacement of rough sleepers between boroughs.

It is possible that, while encounters with ICE did not prompt individual rough sleepers encountered to move to other boroughs in order to sleep rough, some rough sleepers not encountered may have moved from Westminster and other areas where enforcement action occurred in an attempt to evade ICE officers implementing Operation Adoze. However, CHAIN data provides no indication that this took place on any significant scale. As the table below shows, the proportion of EEA nationals seen sleeping rough in Westminster and in (an)other borough(s) during the third quarter of 2015/16 was only marginally greater than the proportion seen in the same quarter of 2014/15.

| Period     | Number of EEA nationals seen sleeping rough in Westminster | Of whom, also seen in other boroughs |            |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
|            |                                                            | Number                               | Percentage |
| Q3 2015/16 | 524                                                        | 45                                   | 8.6        |
| Q3 2014/15 | 443                                                        | 35                                   | 7.9        |