

Confronting Child Sexual Exploitation in London

March 2015

Police and Crime Committee Members

Joanne McCartney (Chair)	Labour
Jenny Jones (Deputy Chair)	Green
Caroline Pidgeon MBE (Deputy Chair)	Liberal Democrat
Tony Arbour	Conservative
Jennette Arnold OBE	Labour
John Biggs	Labour
Victoria Borwick	Conservative
Len Duvall	Labour
Roger Evans	Conservative

Role of the Police and Crime Committee

The Police and Crime Committee examines the work of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and reviews the Police and Crime Plan for London. The Committee can also investigate anything that it considers to be of importance to policing and crime reduction in Greater London and make recommendations for improvements.

Contact

Janette Roker, Scrutiny Manager
Email: janette.roker@london.gov.uk
Contact: 020 7983 6562

For media enquiries:
Mary Dolan, External Relations
Email: mary.dolan@london.gov.uk
Contact: 020 7983 4603

Contents

Chair’s foreword	4
Glossary	6
Executive summary.....	7
1. Child sexual exploitation in London.....	12
2. The role of the Met and MOPAC and future challenges	26
Appendix 1 – Recommendations.....	30
Appendix 2 – Endnotes	31
Orders and translations	36

Chair's foreword



Recent high profile investigations have heightened awareness of the significant scale and complexity of child sexual exploitation. These damning reports have made it clear that the need to protect children and young people from sexual abuse is ever more challenging. Organisations with a duty to safeguard children must learn from these tragedies and face up to the realities of child sexual exploitation.

While the true extent of child sexual exploitation is not known, there is now a greater understanding of how to identify victims and those at risk. The progress made is encouraging. The Met, working in partnership with local authorities and other agencies, has put protocols and policies in place to protect London's children and young people – identifying and tackling more abusers and protecting more young people. However, there is always more that can be done – child sexual exploitation remains a hidden crime and organisations must take a proactive approach to keep London's children safe from harm. Agencies need to listen and learn from all those that have been affected by child sexual exploitation, and partners need to come together to drive forward positive change.

Tackling child sexual exploitation requires a genuine multi-agency approach. Partners need to work collaboratively to ensure that progress at the strategic level filters down to the front line. Identifying and protecting children and young people is everyone's responsibility. Professionals, parents and young people all have a role to play in grasping the nature of sexual exploitation – and ensuring an effective response.

Our report highlights the range of positive work taking place across London to tackle child sexual exploitation. However, many strategies are relatively new and we call upon London's Directors of Children's Services, the London Safeguarding Children Board and local Safeguarding Children Boards across London to be vigilant and continue to strengthen the systems in place to protect children and young people from sexual exploitation. This approach will help increase the chances of preventing and disrupting child sexual exploitation and bringing offenders to justice. Clear lines of accountability are needed to ensure that the system delivers the levels of protection at risk children need.

There is no room for complacency. The lack of understanding and professional tolerance that has been uncovered in recent cases, such as in Rotherham, is unacceptable.

This report examines London's approach to safeguarding children at risk of CSE and the lessons that can be learned arising from the Independent Inquiry into failures to tackle CSE in Rotherham.

We would like to thank everyone that contributed to this investigation.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. McCartney', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Joanne McCartney AM
Chair of the Police and Crime Committee

Glossary

ACPO – Association of Chief Police Officers

CAIT – Child Abuse Investigation Team

CCC – Central Communications Command

CPS – Crown Prosecution Service

CSE – Child Sexual Exploitation

CSP – Community Safety Partnership

IRO – Independent Reviewing Officers

LSCB – Local Safeguarding Children Board

MASE – Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation meetings

MASH – Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub

Met – Metropolitan Police Service

MPS – Metropolitan Police Service

MOPAC – Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime

PHSE – Personal Social and Health Education

SCR – Serious Case Review

SOECA – Sexual Offences Exploitation and Child Abuse

Executive summary

Child sexual exploitation (CSE) is not new, but recent high profile investigations and criminal trials have raised awareness of the possible widespread nature of these offences and the gravity of their impact. Professor Alexis Jay's report, *the Independent Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in Rotherham* (the Jay Report),¹ and cases such as those in Rochdale, Oxford and Derby, have uncovered the previously hidden scale and organised nature of much CSE. Our investigation examines London's approach to safeguarding children in the light of the lessons that can be learned from tackling CSE in Rotherham.

There is an expectation that the local response to CSE is led by Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs).² LSCBs have a statutory duty to bring agencies together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.³ They have a range of functions and play a key role in developing local safeguarding children policy and procedures and scrutinising local arrangements – including CSE.

The multi-agency London Safeguarding Children Board provides strategic advice and support to London's 32 LSCBs. Its membership is made up of representatives from London boroughs, police, health, probation and independent, voluntary and community agencies in London. We would welcome assurance from London's Directors of Children's Services, the lead professionals responsible for the provision of children's services in London, the London Safeguarding Children Board and LSCBs that all London boroughs have robust mechanisms in place to protect London's children and young people from CSE.

No one knows the true scale of CSE. The Jay Report made a conservative estimate that approximately 1,400 children were sexually exploited in Rotherham over the 16 year inquiry period. The Met anticipates it will receive between 1,800 and 2,000 referrals a year. From January 2014 to October 2014, the Met reported 1,612 referrals of CSE, including 265 positive interventions and 55 detections.

High profile cases of CSE have raised concerns about how the police and other services work together to respond to CSE. The Jay Report documented a number of ways the police and partner agencies failed to prevent abuse or prioritise dealing with CSE in Rotherham and the Serious Case Review into CSE in Oxfordshire reported multiple missed opportunities by agencies to act rigorously.⁴

Rotherham had many policies and plans to tackle CSE. However, inspection reports describe how children's social care was typically understaffed, overstretched and struggling to cope with demand. Thresholds for action were identified as very high and there were significant weaknesses in scrutiny and challenge within Rotherham's governance system. Professionals ignored warnings about the scale of CSE and failed to recognise and believe victims and young people at risk of CSE. Similarly, the Serious Case Review in Oxfordshire found that it took agencies too long to recognise CSE, used language that blamed the victims, and a lack of understanding led to insufficient inquiry.⁵

Many London boroughs have made significant developments in their response to CSE over the past few years. Policies and procedures have been developed, multi-agency groups have been established, and investment in training increased.

The Met has shown positive progress in developing its approach to CSE. In February 2014, the Met launched *The London Child Sexual Exploitation Protocol*. The protocol sets out the procedures for the Met and partner agencies for safeguarding and protecting children from sexual exploitation. Our report, *Keeping London's children safe* welcomed the protocol and recommended the Met should review the evidence and impact of the CSE Protocol on reporting and identifying CSE in London, and the level of resource dedicated to tackling CSE. The Met told us it has scheduled a review of the Pan-London CSE Protocol to start in January 2015 and will also publish a good practice guide.

CSE is not a MOPAC 7 priority.⁶ We were told that as borough police are not measured on CSE it becomes less of a "priority" in some areas. This is a concern. MOPAC is establishing a performance monitoring framework for crimes that fall out of the MOPAC 7. However, while the Met has made progress in recording CSE data, MOPAC is yet to establish its performance monitoring framework. MOPAC must set out a clear performance monitoring framework for holding the Met to account on its safeguarding children duties, including CSE, as a matter of urgency.

National guidance requires local areas to have appropriate policies and procedures in place to tackle CSE. We found that CSE is a strategic priority for London boroughs and the challenge is to ensure boroughs work together to deliver a system that can effectively implement strategies, plans and protocols to tackle CSE and safeguard children across the whole of London.

Strategies, policies and procedures need to be robustly monitored and regularly reviewed to ensure effectiveness. While Rotherham had good inter-

agency CSE policies and procedures, members of the Safeguarding Board rarely checked whether they were being implemented or effective. Strong leadership and full commitment from partner agencies is essential. We ask that LSCBs have robust governance mechanisms in place to ensure effective monitoring, oversight and regular review of the local response to CSE. This should include well-defined links with other safeguarding children strategies and robust reporting structures between the LSCB and the Community Safety Partnership and Children's Board.

Agencies must work together to tackle CSE. While we are encouraged by local arrangements and the progress made by the police, local authorities and other partners that have come together to tackle CSE, partnership working is one area where further work is required.

While the LSCB operate at the strategic level, Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) were introduced to improve the way local safeguarding partners work together on the ground. MASH is becoming a well-established referral pathway and allowing for timely intelligence-sharing – assisting in the process of early identification, information gathering and the response to CSE. MASH is also helping to strengthen cross-borough information sharing.

MASH has made promising progress, but it also faces a number of challenges. During our investigation in 2014 we heard how certain elements of the Met's services could be better integrated within the MASH and recommended the Met determine how it can bring CAIT (Child Abuse Investigation Teams) and MASH closer together. The Met has established a project team to look at how it can integrate staff from its CAIT and CSE teams within MASH. We welcome this commitment and ask the Met to progress this as a priority.

The Met has introduced monthly MASE (Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation) meetings in every borough to determine local profiles of CSE. All statutory agencies with a responsibility for child protection are required to attend. MASE meetings bring together CSE leads to share information, review individual referrals and ensure action is being taken – providing a coordinated approach with other London boroughs and an opportunity for professional challenge and learning.

The Met has reported an increase in CSE referrals. The vast majority of these are current as opposed to historic. Boroughs reported the use of MASE and MASH to facilitate sharing of intelligence and information to understand the nature and prevalence of CSE. All London's LSCBs should have a structure in place for mapping CSE – including a detailed profile of victims and offenders, children and young people identified at risk and an overview of any "hotspots". Robust protocols are needed to ensure that information and

intelligence is shared at the local level and across borough boundaries to inform both the operational and strategic response. The London Safeguarding Children Board should take a lead in promoting the development of London protocols for the sharing of information to safeguard children, including CSE, as stated in its terms of reference.

Tackling CSE requires all partners to understand how to identify victims and children and young people at risk of CSE. A range of work is taking place to increase understanding of CSE and training is being delivered across partnerships to enhance knowledge. However, it is suggested that training does not always reach those that need it most and should be targeted on those working with children and young people at risk of or suffering from CSE. We recognise the need to evaluate the impact of training and how it makes a positive difference in keeping London's children and young people safe from CSE.

Missing and looked after children are proportionately more at risk of CSE. While the majority of CSE victims are living at home, children who go missing, in particular from residential care, are more vulnerable to sexual exploitation. We were interested in what local authorities in London are doing to protect looked after children and children who go missing from CSE. Boroughs have tightened recording practices in line with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and Ofsted requirements, and MASE help to ensure that looked after children placed out of borough are protected by the agencies where they are located.

There needs to be greater understanding of the victim's experience. It is important to engage with children and young people that have experienced CSE and ensure they contribute to the local response. We recommend that every LSCB in London establish a forum to engage with children and young people affected by CSE, including looked after children and those that have in the past gone missing, to increase understanding, provide appropriate care and support to young victims and those at risk of CSE, and encourage confidence in reporting.

Boroughs reported a strong and effective partnership with the Met. However, our evidence suggested the Met and Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) could do more to improve the response to CSE on a local and regional basis. Boroughs highlighted the importance of the Met and MOPAC working alongside LSCBs to share best practice and gather and analyse local intelligence – to inform cross-borough operations and pan-London commissioning of services. The Met and MOPAC also have a role in ensuring the right capacity and resources to respond to CSE in London.

It is clear that more needs to be done to prevent and tackle CSE. We heard how important it is to engage with young people who have experienced CSE and ensure they are able to contribute and inform the local response. The lack of consistent data was identified as a challenge and that an agreed and consistent dataset should be established across London. Schools must be fully engaged and take a strong preventive approach to help tackle CSE. We recommend that London's LSCBs take a lead in rolling out programmes across London's schools that inform and tackle the issue of CSE.

We are encouraged by the progress made in responding to CSE in London. However, there is more that can be done. We call upon the London Safeguarding Children Board to ensure the issues identified within this report are responded to, on a local and regional level, across the capital to protect all London's children and young people from CSE.

1. Child sexual exploitation in London

The Police and Crime Committee investigated the Metropolitan Police Service's (the Met) role in safeguarding children in 2014. Our report, *Keeping London's children safe*, looked at how the Met's approach to safeguarding children is working and the structural changes that have taken place in the Met. We also considered the strategic oversight of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and what more the Met and MOPAC could do to ensure their approach fully protects and safeguards children in London. The Met and MOPAC welcomed the report and broadly accepted its recommendations.

This report examines London's approach to safeguarding children in the light of the lessons that can be learned from failures in tackling child sexual exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham. It focuses on the relationship between the Met and other professionals, particularly those in the local authority. In support of our work we wrote to all Directors of Children's Services in London, as the lead professionals responsible for the provision of services that address the needs of young people. Responses were received from 14 London boroughs. While we welcome their contribution to our work, we seek assurance from Directors of Children's Services and the London Safeguarding Children Board that all London boroughs have robust mechanisms in place to protect London's children and young people from CSE.

Partnership working is integral to preventing and tackling CSE. Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) play an important role in developing and coordinating the local response to CSE. Every local authority in London is required to have a LSCB. LSCBs, established by the Children Act 2004, are responsible for bringing agencies together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. They have a range of roles and statutory functions, including developing local safeguarding policy and procedures and scrutinising local arrangements. LSCBs hold partner agencies to account and challenge the effectiveness of local arrangements. LSCBs are seen to be key to improving multi-agency working and are "well placed to identify emerging problems through learning from practice and to oversee efforts to improve services in response."⁷ They are required to be independent and the LSCB Chair should work closely with all LSCB partners, in particular the Director of Children's Services.

The multi-agency London Safeguarding Children Board provides strategic advice and support to London's 32 LSCBs to meet their statutory duties. Its membership is made up of representatives from London boroughs, police, health, probation and independent, voluntary and community agencies in

London. Its responsibilities include: supporting the development of best practice; identifying and developing responses to issues which impact on the safety and welfare of children in London; leading the development of procedures; promoting the development of London-wide information sharing protocols; and ensuring the voices of children and young people are heard.⁸

We would welcome assurance from London’s Directors of Children’s Services, the London Safeguarding Children Board, and LSCBs in London that all London boroughs have robust mechanisms in place to protect London’s children and young people from CSE.

CSE is not new, but recent high profile investigations and criminal trials have raised awareness of the possible widespread nature of these offences and the gravity of their impact. Professor Alexis Jay’s report, *the Independent Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in Rotherham* (the Jay Report),⁹ and cases such as those in Rochdale, Oxford and Derby, have uncovered the previously hidden scale and organised nature of much CSE. As Jay reports: “Until very recently, CSE has not been treated as the priority that events in Rotherham and elsewhere strongly suggest it should have been. As a result, local arrangements to tackle the problem are insufficiently developed and the leadership required in this crucial area of child protection is frequently lacking.”¹⁰

Sexual exploitation is child abuse. Children and young people who are subjected to CSE face huge risks to their physical, emotional and psychological health and well-being. Often, the child or young person does not recognise the coercive nature of the relationship and does not see themselves as a victim.¹¹ The nature of CSE is diverse; at times discreet and subtle, and sometimes brutal and life threatening. As the Jay Report noted: “It is hard to describe the appalling nature of the abuse that child victims suffered. They were raped by multiple perpetrators, trafficked to other towns and cities ... abducted, beaten and set alight, threatened with guns, made to witness brutally violent rapes and threatened they would be next if they told anyone. Girls as young as 11 were raped by large numbers of male perpetrators.”¹²

No one knows the true scale of CSE. The Jay Report made a conservative estimate that approximately 1,400 children were sexually exploited in Rotherham over the 16 year inquiry period¹³ and the Office of the Children’s Commissioner found that at least 16,500 children had been identified as being at risk of CSE between April 2010 and March 2011.¹⁴ In addition, between August 2010 and October 2011, 2,409 children had been confirmed as being victims of CSE in gangs and groups. Its report, *If only someone had listened*, warned the scale of abuse was likely to be much larger.¹⁵ Ann Coffey’s report into CSE across Greater Manchester identified 2,286 pieces of intelligence received by the police between March 2013 and January 2014

and 260 'live' investigations into CSE in June 2014 – “evidence of higher level of awareness amongst the public and agencies.”¹⁶

Historically CSE has been under-reported but referrals are now rising. The Met anticipates it will receive between 1,800 and 2,000 referrals a year. It completed its first overview of CSE in 2014. However, not all boroughs were engaged or recording full data prior to February 2014, and the Met report it will be able to provide more accurate data from February 2015.¹⁷ From January 2014 to October 2014, the Met reported 1,612 referrals of CSE, including 265 positive interventions and 55 detections. Of these 1,612 referrals:

- 78 per cent were **category one CSE reports** – a vulnerable child or young person, where they are being targeted and groomed and where any vulnerability factors have been identified. At this stage there is no evidence of any offences;
- 20 per cent were **category two CSE reports** – evidence a child or young person is being targeted for opportunistic abuse through the exchange of sex for drugs, perceived affection, sense of belonging, accommodation (overnight stays), money and goods etc. The likelihood of coercion and control is significant;
- 2 per cent were **category three CSE reports** – evidence a child or young person whose sexual exploitation is habitual, often self-denied and where coercion/control is implicit.¹⁸

At our meeting in December 2014, Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick told us the Met is “putting a lot of resource and effort into [CSE], but we recognise we are probably at the tip of the iceberg.”¹⁹ She went on to explain the Met has “some feeling for the extent of the problem, but I would be lying if I said we have a really, really good picture ... [reports] are continuing to increase as awareness goes up and people realise what this is.”²⁰ **It is because the picture is so uncertain that we, as a Committee, will continue to focus our efforts on ensuring that all those with professional responsibilities in this field remain focused on keeping London’s children safe.**

Rotherham – the issues

High profile cases of CSE have raised concerns about how the police and other services work together to respond to indications of wrong doing or simple cries for help. The Jay Report documented a number of ways the police and partner agencies failed to prevent abuse or prioritise dealing with CSE.²¹ In November 2014, Ofsted’s thematic inspection of CSE in eight local authorities across England also found that some areas have only just begun to address CSE at the strategic level, despite statutory guidance being issued in 2009.²²

Rotherham had many policies and plans to tackle CSE. However, inspection reports describe how children's social care was typically understaffed, overstretched and struggling to cope with demand. Thresholds for action were identified as very high and there were significant weaknesses in scrutiny and challenge within Rotherham's governance system. A report from the Home Affairs Select Committee concludes: "Both Rochdale and Rotherham Councils were inexcusably slow to realise that the widespread, organised sexual abuse of children, many of them in the care of the local authority, was taking place on their doorstep. This is due in large part to a woeful lack of professional curiosity or indifference."²³ The government has now announced that five Commissioners will take over the running of Rotherham Council after an independent inspection, by Louise Casey CB, of its handling of CSE concluded it was not fit for purpose.²⁴

Failures in Rotherham were identified within and between organisations. The Jay Report found care professionals and those in the criminal justice service failed to recognise young people at risk of CSE for more than a decade.²⁵ Children that had been sexually exploited were wrongly labelled as "promiscuous" or considered to have made a "lifestyle choice". There is evidence to suggest the council and police "ignored numerous credible warnings about the scale of CSE in Rotherham."²⁶ Jay reports that "the collective failures of political and officer leadership were blatant ... the police gave no priority to CSE, regarding many child victims with contempt and failing to act on their abuse as a crime ... [and] some at a senior level in the police and children's social care continued to think the extent of the problem, as described by youth workers, was exaggerated, and seemed intent on reducing the official numbers of children categorised as CSE."²⁷

The police response was a concern in Rotherham. Young girls were often not believed when they contacted the police about their experiences. The police were also, at times, reluctant to engage in joint investigations with the council. As reported by the Home Affairs Select Committee: "We have heard evidence that South Yorkshire Police Force have previously let down victims of localised grooming and child sexual exploitation – as a result, we would expect the force to be striving to redeem their reputation."²⁸

Recommendations from the Jay Report focus on 15 priority areas. Our report picks up on key recommendations to assess whether London has the strategic plans and policies in place to respond to CSE; to determine whether the framework for inter-agency co-operation is effective; and whether there is robust monitoring and oversight work to prevent and tackle CSE. We also review the work taking place across agencies to identify children and young people at risk, in particular how local authorities in London prioritise looked after children, and the availability and quality of training to support professionals in the field.

Responding to CSE in London

Many London boroughs have made significant developments in their response to CSE over the past few years. London Councils report that “progress is clearly observable at a strategic level.”²⁹ Policies and procedures have been developed, multi-agency groups have been established and investment in training increased. In its report, *Tackling child sexual exploitation – a study of current practice in London*, published in February 2014, London Councils found that most London boroughs have: a system in place to monitor the number of children at risk of CSE; a CSE strategy or guidance; an information sharing protocol for CSE cases; and some have an outcomes framework for monitoring progress against CSE strategies or action plans.³⁰ The CSE co-ordinator role was also identified as becoming more common in London, with 29 boroughs having, or in the process of establishing, a CSE coordinator role – either exclusively for CSE or dealing with CSE as part of a wider safeguarding remit.³¹

The Met has shown positive progress in developing its approach to CSE. In February 2014, the Met launched *The London Child Sexual Exploitation Protocol*.³² The Protocol received agreement from all London local authority Chief Executives and the Chair of each of London’s LSCBs. It sets out the procedures for the Met and partner agencies for safeguarding and protecting children from sexual exploitation. It is recognised by the ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) CSE Working Group as best practice for tackling CSE in large cities. Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick told us that the Met “have a very pan-London approach and we are very confident of our systems across London.”³³

Our report, *Keeping London’s children safe*, recommended: “The Met should, within 12 months, review the evidence and impact of the CSE Protocol on reporting and identification of CSE in London and the level of resource dedicated to tackling CSE. The Committee would welcome regular updates on progress.”³⁴ In response to this recommendation, the Met told us that it has scheduled a review of the Pan-London CSE Protocol to start in January 2015 and plans to publish a good practice guide.³⁵ **We would expect to comment on this review once it is published.**

The progress made by the Met in the way it responds to CSE, supports victims and brings offenders to justice is welcomed. We were told in March 2014 that SOECA (Sexual Offences Exploitation and Child Abuse command) was brought into being to bring resources together and create dedicated capacity to respond to CSE. The Met’s central CSE team now has 54 detectives and provides a link into each of the 32 boroughs.³⁶ They attend monthly Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation (MASE) meetings, provide advice and guidance to local officers and continue to establish links with key agencies. The Met has reassigned complex historic cases of child abuse to dedicated teams outside

of its Child Abuse Investigation Teams (CAITs), to allow CAIT staff to concentrate on the most current and most high risk investigations.³⁷ It is also looking at how it can best integrate staff from both its CAIT and CSE team within the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH).³⁸

There has been some criticism of the Met's understanding of CSE. While partner agencies welcome the Met's leadership and commitment in addressing CSE, during our investigation in 2014 we heard that generally, Met officers lack understanding of what constitutes CSE, and borough-based officers do not always have the skills, training and awareness to enable them to recognise the signs of CSE and other forms of child sexual abuse.³⁹ Similarly, in her report, Ann Coffey suggested that frontline police are not recognising CSE.⁴⁰ This is a clear failing.

Child abuse and CSE is not a MOPAC 7 priority.⁴¹ The Met has identified this as a concern – as borough police are not measured on CSE it becomes less of a “priority” in some areas.⁴² MOPAC told us that it wants to avoid setting targets for CSE as it wants to encourage more people to come forward and report.⁴³ It told us that it is establishing a performance monitoring framework for crimes that fall outside of the MOPAC 7 priority crimes. While the Met has made progress in recording CSE data, MOPAC is yet to establish its performance monitoring framework: “We are taking this at a steady pace. At the moment we do not have a specific performance framework around safeguarding.”⁴⁴ **As we previously recommended, MOPAC must set out a clear performance monitoring framework for holding the Met to account on its safeguarding children duties, including CSE, as a matter of urgency.**⁴⁵

Are comprehensive strategies and action plans in place?

National guidance requires local areas to have appropriate policies and procedures in place to tackle CSE. These must allow all agencies to understand their role and contribution to tackling CSE. The evidence we received suggested that CSE is a strategic priority for London boroughs and that LSCBs are mainly responsible for the development and monitoring of CSE strategies. Camden reported that it has a CSE Strategy Group and Quality Assurance sub-group responsible for ensuring its CSE Strategy is implemented and its effectiveness measured.⁴⁶ Waltham Forest reported that CSE is a strategic priority for its Community Safety Partnership (SafetyNet) and included in its strategic plan.⁴⁷ Its LSCB regularly monitors and updates its CSE Strategy and ensures robust links with children missing from home, care and education. CSE is one of four key priorities for Barnet's Safeguarding Children Board, with a detailed CSE strategy and action plan.⁴⁸

A number of boroughs have reviewed their CSE strategies and procedures in response to the findings of the Jay Report. Lewisham told us that its multi-agency CSE task group considered the report and incorporated the findings

into a revised CSE strategy, procedure and action plan.⁴⁹ Similarly, Sutton reported that local arrangements for identifying and responding to allegations and indicators of CSE are being reviewed by its LSCB and the Jay Report is considered at its SEARCH (Sexual Exploitation and Runaway Children) strategic group.⁵⁰ Hounslow has reviewed strategic corporate plans, such as its Children's Strategy and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, to ensure CSE is integrated into top line priorities.⁵¹

Recommendation 1:

We recommend that all London LSCBs review their CSE strategies and procedures in response to the findings of the Jay Report.

CSE does not recognise borough boundaries. The challenge is to ensure that boroughs work together to deliver a system that can effectively implement strategies, plans and protocols to safeguard children and tackle CSE across the whole of London, with no gaps. The pan-London Safeguarding Children Board has a role to play in leading the development of procedures for safeguarding London's children.⁵² Furthermore, London boroughs are conducting peer reviews as part of the pan-London review and improvement programme.⁵³ The peer reviews will identify best practice and areas of improvement around CSE, ensuring CSE processes are robust and inform future planning. We believe the peer reviews will offer valuable additional insight into the extent to which CSE features in strategies across London. The public need to be reassured by having sight of the steps London's local authorities are taking and it is essential that these are published imminently.

There needs to be effective monitoring and oversight

Strategies, policies and procedures need to be robustly monitored and regularly reviewed to ensure effectiveness. Strong leadership and full commitment from partner agencies is essential. As identified by the Office of the Children's Commissioner, monitoring is an essential component in responding to CSE.⁵⁴ The Jay Report found, that while Rotherham had "good inter-agency policies and procedures applicable to CSE, the weakness in their approach was that members of the Safeguarding Board rarely checked whether these were being implemented or whether they were working."⁵⁵ Similarly, Ofsted found that leadership to tackle CSE was not sufficiently developed and concluded that LSCBs "must step up to be the driving force in prevention, making full use of the range of policing and other powers available to them to disrupt child sexual exploitation."⁵⁶ Furthermore, in its report, *If it's not better, it's not the end*, The Office of the Children's Commissioner revealed that strong strategies "do not always lead to effective frontline practice" and "there is a gap between strategy and what happens on the ground."⁵⁷

MOPAC is responsible for holding the Met to account on its safeguarding children duties. We asked MOPAC whether it was assured in how it holds the Met to account. Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC, told us: “This is work in progress. For us I have become increasingly confident since we have started to take up our position on the London Safeguarding Children Board that not only are we in direct contact with colleagues in the MPS and able to understand what they are doing and cross-question them ... but we also have independent sources of information and assurance from colleagues in the boroughs.”⁵⁸ However, the Met told us an effective quality assurance framework is “urgently required to ensure consistency across the command and prevent failings” yet, it does not have the capacity to provide this.⁵⁹ This is a real concern.

In November 2014, Ofsted reported that many LSCBs have shown poor leadership and that they “have failed to adequately challenge slow progress in developing both child sexual exploitation strategies and meaningful action plans.”⁶⁰ We asked London boroughs how they could be confident in the effectiveness of local arrangements to safeguard and protect children at risk of CSE. The LSCB was highlighted as the main driver and body endorsing the local response to CSE – with members of the LSCB responsible for scrutinising, challenging and holding each other to account, and the independent Chair liable for delivery. LSCBs need to ensure strong leadership to deliver a robust partnership response to CSE.

The LSCB should scrutinise the effectiveness of its members, not protect them from criticism.⁶¹ As recommended in the Jay Report: “All agencies should continue to resource, and strengthen, the quality assurance work currently underway under the auspices of the safeguarding board.”⁶² At our meeting in December 2014, Suzanne Elwick, Business Manager, Waltham Forest LSCB, highlighted the need to ensure a culture of professional challenge is embedded within the LSCB – “in Waltham Forest there is very strong commitment to addressing the issues of CSE and holding partners to account and we do that through the board, through the independent chair and through a range of reports and visits that are done throughout the year. Obviously we expect partners to be honest, but it is not just taking what they tell us. We do other pieces of work to triangulate that it is actually the right story.”⁶³

Recommendation 2:

All London LSCBs must have a robust mechanism in place to ensure effective monitoring, oversight and regular review of CSE strategies and procedures.

It is important to establish links with other safeguarding strategies. Lewisham told us that it demonstrates a coordinated approach to managing CSE by linking with other strategies, including violence against women and girls,

gangs and serious youth violence, community safety, looked after children and children missing from home, care and education – to prevent silo working.⁶⁴ We were told Lewisham’s LSCB monitors the implementation of these through well-established governance mechanisms.⁶⁵ We recommend well-defined links with other strategies and robust reporting structures between the LSCB and the Community Safety Partnership and Children’s Board to provide a holistic response to CSE at the local level.

Recommendation 3:

London’s LSCBs and Directors of Children’s Services must ensure well-defined links with other safeguarding strategies and robust reporting structures between the LSCB and the Community Safety Partnership and Children’s Board.

Working together

Agencies must work together to tackle CSE. While we are encouraged by local arrangements, such as MASE and MASH, and the progress made by the police, local authorities and other partners that have come together to tackle CSE, partnership working is one area where further work is required.

MASH was introduced to improve the way local safeguarding partners work together on the ground. It plays a key role in establishing those at risk of CSE by identifying warning signs within referral notifications. Evidence received from boroughs suggested that MASH is allowing for timely intelligence-sharing and is becoming a “well-established referral pathway” assisting “the process of early identification, information gathering and response to protect children from CSE.” Commander Keith Niven, SOECA, told us that he is “reassured around the level of information sharing for the MASH.”⁶⁶ We were also informed that MASH is helping to strengthen cross-borough information sharing.⁶⁷

While MASH has made promising progress, it faces a number of challenges. During our investigation in 2014, we heard how certain elements of the Met’s services could be better integrated with the MASH and recommended the Met determine how it can bring CAITs and MASH closer together.⁶⁸ The Met told us it recognises the need for MASH and CAITs to develop a closer working relationship and “the vision of CAIT staff within the MASH is something the Met are committed to working towards.”⁶⁹ Within the Met a project team has been established to look at how the Met can integrate staff from its CAIT and CSE teams with MASH.⁷⁰ **We welcome this commitment and ask the Met to progress this as a priority.**

The Met has introduced monthly MASE meetings, in every borough, to determine local profiles of CSE. Relevant information and intelligence is passed from MASH to MASE to enable a detailed strategic response to CSE. All

statutory agencies with a responsibility for child protection are required to attend MASE meetings, and attendance from local care home managers and charities working with young people who are, or may be at risk, of CSE is recommended. MASE meetings review progress of individual cases and ensure action is being taken at the strategic level.

MASE provides an opportunity for professional challenge and learning. Most London boroughs have adopted MASE as a sub-group of the LSCB, with “significant multi-agency attendance.”⁷¹ Information is shared across agencies and analysed to identify trends, issues and agree coordinated actions, while responding to individual needs. Hounslow reported that MASE enables profiling of vulnerable children at risk of sexual exploitation, and aligns with other multi-agency groups already in existence within the borough.⁷² MASE also looks at cross border issues to provide a coordinated approach with other boroughs – Barnet reported that its MASE panel often shares information with other boroughs and other MASE panels.⁷³ The valuable contribution from the voluntary sector – that work directly with those affected by CSE – was also recognised in the responses we received.⁷⁴ While MASE has been identified as a “good platform” and “a really effective forum to share information” we also heard that it “could be used more in relation to cross borough issues.”⁷⁵

How are children and young people of concern being identified?

The Met has reported an increase in CSE referrals. The vast majority of these are current as opposed to historic. All referrals, every piece of information and every crime report that may have a link to CSE is monitored.⁷⁶ All suspicions of CSE, even when a crime has not been identified, are recorded on the Met’s CRIS (Crime Reporting Information System).

The Jay Report stressed that risk assessments for all children affected by CSE should be up-to-date, of high quality, clearly recorded and regularly reviewed.⁷⁷ We are assured that safeguarding work to identify, track and protect children and young people at risk of CSE is taking place across London. However, Simon Bailey, ACPO lead on child protection and abuse investigations, warns that “failures to share information and work together are hindering attempts by police and children’s social services to tackle CSE ... and can leave young people vulnerable.”⁷⁸ All local partners should be conscious of this.

Boroughs reported the use of MASE and MASH to facilitate sharing of intelligence and information to understand the nature and prevalence of CSE. Local scoping exercises and “problem profiles” to identify victims or children and young people at risk have been undertaken. For example, the Tri-borough⁷⁹ developed a local “problem profile”, in accordance with the recommendation in the Office of the Children’s Commissioner report *If only*

*someone had listened.*⁸⁰ The profile drew together known intelligence and data to inform strategic decision making and local practice. The Tri-borough stressed the importance of the MASH data analyst in preparing information and recognised the need for “more involvement from other agencies and make use of intelligence held by the police” going forward.⁸¹

Redbridge has established MAP (multi-agency panel) meetings to supplement MASE and consider all cases where CSE is a concern.⁸² MAP is jointly chaired by a Detective Inspector from the Met and service manager from the local authority child protection and assessment service. It tracks the demographics of children and young people at risk of CSE to identify “hotspots” of activity. MAP also considers repeat missing episodes, children living away from home, and referrals of young people placed in Redbridge but looked after by another local authority. Similarly, the chair of the Kingston and Richmond LSCB CSE and Children Missing from Home and Care sub-group informed us that the LSCB work plan covers a number of prevention strategies. It uses its MASE meetings to consider plans for each child, and potential trends and hotspots are monitored through the MASE and LSCB subgroup. It reports that “numbers of young people referred continue to be low and no hotspots have been identified.”⁸³

Information shared locally is crucial to understanding risk. Ofsted has raised concern that not all areas are collecting and sharing information to enable an accurate local picture of CSE.⁸⁴ Similarly, the Office of the Children’s Commissioner found that “over half of police forces say that they have experienced barriers to sharing information across agencies.”⁸⁵ We recommend that all London’s LSCBs have a structure in place for mapping CSE. This should include a detailed profile of victims and offenders, children and young people identified at risk and an overview of any “hotspots.” LSCBs need to have robust protocols to ensure that information and intelligence is shared at the local level and across borough boundaries to inform both the strategic and operational response. The London Safeguarding Children Board aims to “promote the development of London protocols for the sharing of information to safeguard children and promote their welfare”, as stated in its terms of reference.⁸⁶ **We would therefore expect the London Safeguarding Children Board to work with LSCBs in London to ensure every borough has a structure in place for sharing information in relation to CSE. We will monitor progress on this.**

There is a need for increasing knowledge and understanding of CSE and raising awareness across agencies

A range of innovative work is taking place to increase understanding of CSE among key agencies. Tackling CSE requires all partners to understand how to identify children at risk and respond appropriately.⁸⁷ In its recent inspection, Ofsted found that “specific training, where it exists, is of good quality and

gives staff confidence in their ability to identify and respond to child sexual exploitation.”⁸⁸ However, it is suggested that training does not always reach those that need it most and should be targeted on those working with children and young people at risk of or suffering from CSE.⁸⁹

The Met has introduced mandatory CSE awareness training for all front-line staff. 20 out of the 32 boroughs have received this training – including follow-up training on officer’s respective roles and responsibilities.⁹⁰ CSE awareness training has been delivered to the Met’s senior leadership teams and a mobile app developed to assist officers on scene in identifying CSE. Officers also receive quarterly bespoke training days to ensure knowledge of CSE is current.⁹¹

The importance of training was identified in all 14 responses we received. We were told that the Tri-borough LSCBs training framework addresses the learning and development needs of all professionals working with children and their families,⁹² and Sutton is working with the voluntary sector to strengthen local knowledge.⁹³ Lewisham’s CSE action plan includes different levels of training for the partnership in relation to awareness raising, response, identifying and building resilience,⁹⁴ and Hounslow’s LSCB has sponsored a multi-agency CSE e-learning module for professionals and parents.⁹⁵ Barnet reported that its LSCB has a comprehensive awareness and training plan that includes professionals, children and their parents/carers, the voluntary sector and the community.⁹⁶

It is important to evaluate the impact of training and how it makes a positive difference to keeping children and young people safe from CSE.⁹⁷ Camden told us it undertook a training needs analysis in January 2014 and its CSE Strategy Group reviews the level of attendance and impact of training (reporting directly to Camden’s LSCB).⁹⁸ Redbridge has commissioned a multi-agency audit programme to support improvements in partnership working,⁹⁹ and while Waltham Forest has delivered a range of training, further training at four different levels is being developed as part of its CSE Strategy action plan.¹⁰⁰

Recommendation 4:

We recommend London’s LSCBs evaluate the impact of training and identify further training needs on a regular basis.

We recognise the importance of increasing understanding of CSE within the wider community. One example, launched in Waltham Forest in October 2014, was “Operation Makesafe” which is raising awareness of CSE with residents and local businesses.¹⁰¹ “Operation Makesafe” aims to ensure that those most likely to come into contact with children and young people vulnerable to CSE know what to do if they suspect CSE is taking place.¹⁰² Taxi

drivers, hoteliers and those working in licensed premises are provided with bespoke CSE awareness training. They are encouraged to take a pro-active role and implement preventive measures to safeguard premises from CSE. The Met is now rolling out “Operation Makesafe” to businesses groups across London and all CCC (Central Communications Command) operators have been trained in how to respond to “Operation Makesafe” calls.¹⁰³ We would encourage London’s boroughs to emulate this good practice to ensure that all professionals (including schools, health workers, community groups), parents, and children and young people themselves, are fully aware of the risk factors associated with CSE and how to respond.

Children in care and missing children remain a key priority

Missing and looked after children are proportionately more at risk of CSE. While the majority of CSE victims are living at home, children who go missing, particularly from residential care, are more vulnerable to sexual exploitation. In addition, as highlighted in the Jay Report, some children are also exposed to CSE when they become looked after.¹⁰⁴ While going missing increases vulnerability to CSE, it can also be an indication that CSE is already taking place. Evidence also suggests that repeat incidents of going missing are strongly linked to sexual exploitation and that children in care that are placed out of their home area are a particular concern.

The Jay Report concluded that “management oversight of looked after children had not ensured they had been safeguarded.”¹⁰⁵ Similarly, “nearly two years after Ofsted published a report on looked after children who go missing; many local authorities are still failing in their duty of care to this group of vulnerable children. Not all children who go missing from home or care get good support on their return. Not enough local authorities are systematically making the connection between child sexual exploitation and children who are missing from care.”¹⁰⁶ As recommended in the Jay Report, managers need to develop a more strategic approach to protecting looked after children who are sexually exploited, including out-of-area placements.¹⁰⁷

We were interested in what local authorities in London are doing to protect looked after children and children who go missing from CSE. Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick told us that missing people is an issue that the Met “prioritises very highly and the way in which we do a risk assessment immediately when the report comes in and that sort of thing is getting better and better as a system that has greater effort put in.”¹⁰⁸

London boroughs reported that recording practices for children missing from placements have been tightened in line with ACPO and Ofsted requirements. We were told that MASE help to ensure that looked after children placed out of borough are protected by the agencies where they are located and independent reviewing officers (IROs) are vital to engaging with these young

people.¹⁰⁹ Barnet also told us that it is introducing significant additional monitoring for children placed more than 20 miles away.¹¹⁰ Waltham Forest reported that while meetings are held with care providers from in and out of boroughs, and a CSE risk assessment is completed for all looked after children that go missing, “work in relation to other boroughs is in the early stages and more needs to be done on this.”¹¹¹

Private and voluntary agencies provide an important role in protecting looked after children and those that go missing from CSE. Redbridge has commissioned Barnados to undertake independent return home interviews for young people missing from care,¹¹² and Lewisham reported that the Children’s Society provide individual and group work for girls in care or being released from custody.¹¹³ Redbridge is visiting all care homes and semi-independent housing providers to discuss CSE preventative measures,¹¹⁴ and Hounslow have contacted both private and voluntary services to ensure they are aware of the vulnerability of looked after children in relation to CSE.¹¹⁵ We commend the active involvement of the “virtual head teacher for looked after children” and Children Missing Education Service in Lewisham’s CSE task force, and the lead taken by CAMHS in promoting the health and wellbeing of children, including those looked after, affected by CSE.¹¹⁶

There needs to be greater understanding of the victim’s experience. It is important to engage with children and young people that have experienced CSE and ensure they contribute to the local response. Young people must also be fully aware of the support available to them. Lewisham has established a steering group of young people to support resilience and ascertain views and feelings of its young people affected by CSE.¹¹⁷ It is also in the process of developing an online counselling service.¹¹⁸ London’s LSCBs need to offer reassurance that children in care and those that go missing have a number of avenues to make representations to increase confidence in reporting CSE. We recommend that every LSCB in London establish a forum to engage with children and young people affected by CSE, including looked after children and those that have in the past gone missing, to increase understanding, provide appropriate care and support to young victims and those at risk of CSE, and encourage confidence in reporting.

Recommendation 5:

Every LSCB in London should have a forum in place to engage with children and young people affected by CSE, including looked after children and those that have in the past gone missing, to increase understanding, provide appropriate care and support to young victims and those at risk of CSE, and encourage confidence in reporting.

2. The role of the Met and MOPAC and future challenges

Boroughs reported a strong and effective partnership with the Met.¹¹⁹ However, our evidence suggested the Met and MOPAC could do more to improve the response to CSE on a local and regional basis. While they must take a strategic lead in raising public awareness,¹²⁰ the Met and MOPAC also have an essential role to play in the sharing of emerging best practice.¹²¹

Collaboration between the police and local partners is essential. Boroughs highlighted the importance of the Met working alongside LSCBs to gather and analyse local intelligence, to disrupt CSE activity and increase the number of cases that result in prosecution.¹²² This should include victim and offender profiles to help inform and improve the local response, cross-borough operations, and pan-London commissioning of services.¹²³ The Tri-borough suggested the Met ensure that intelligence gathered by individual boroughs is analysed as a whole, and sub-regional and London-wide patterns detected and shared, including information from “Operation Makesafe”.¹²⁴ Waltham Forest also identified a role for the Met in providing “examples of good practice in relation to MASE and opportunities to meet other MASE chairs.”¹²⁵

Support for victims was identified as an issue in the responses we received. Lewisham stressed that the Met and MOPAC should work with LSCBs to develop joint protocols and establish minimum standards to support victims of CSE, from the point of disclosure through to police enquiries and court processes.¹²⁶ Hounslow identified the challenge of increasing the number of prosecutions, while still supporting victims through the court process,¹²⁷ and Waltham Forest highlighted the need for vigilance around how victims are targeted and the changing profile of perpetrators.¹²⁸

Boroughs identified a role for the Met and MOPAC in ensuring the right capacity and resources to respond to CSE in London. Redbridge suggested that SOECA’s resources should be increased to improve digital media investigation and mobile phone analysis.¹²⁹ At our meeting in December 2014, Suzanne Elwick, Business Manager, Waltham Forest LSCB, told us that “the whole issue around digital and social media is an issue that we really have not grasped at all yet.”¹³⁰ The Tri-borough proposed that a “focus on predictive modelling would enable safeguarding professionals to consider what issues may be faced in the future.”¹³¹

Funding was also identified as an issue. Hounslow suggested that MOPAC and the Met could fund sub-regional community based initiatives to work with

young people and their families over a sustained period and produce communications materials that could be used by local authorities across London.¹³² Camden highlighted the important contribution of its MASE analyst, funded by MOPAC, in progressing its response to CSE.¹³³ It recommended that “each London local authority should have a designated child sexual exploitation analyst to undertake mapping in their area as well as linking in with other analysts on cross borough issues.”¹³⁴ We support that view.

It is clear that more needs to be done to prevent and tackle CSE. We heard how important it is to engage with young people who have experienced CSE and ensure they are able to contribute and inform the local response – as recommended by Ann Coffey: “a radical new approach to tackling CSE to be led by young people, which recognises that the police, justice system and children’s services alone cannot succeed in protecting children, especially at a time of deep spending cuts.”¹³⁵ Redbridge highlighted the need for victims of CSE to work with “peers and to enable other young people to understand what a healthy relationship looks like and the effects of CSE on their self-esteem.”¹³⁶ Lewisham stressed the challenge of involving young people in the development and implementation of its CSE strategy¹³⁷ and Camden identified the need to engage and determine how best to work with children and young people on the periphery of gangs.¹³⁸

The lack of consistent data was identified as a challenge by the boroughs that provided evidence to us. Hounslow reported that “there is no agreed dataset either nationally or across the capital” and that information shared across boroughs through MASE is inconsistent “and needs to be more rigorous and systematic.”¹³⁹ Similarly, Redbridge highlighted the need to develop “a common dataset across partner agencies to enable a detailed analysis of themes, types of abuse and hot spots in the local area.”¹⁴⁰ A need to capture perpetrator information, and those at risk of becoming perpetrators, was also identified.¹⁴¹

Recommendation 6:

The Met and MOPAC must work with the London Safeguarding Children Board to establish an agreed and consistent dataset across London.

There is a question whether joint CSE teams, as advocated by the Jay Report, should be introduced in London. The evidence we received suggested there is not currently the resource to do so.¹⁴² Furthermore, it may not be necessary in London as the Met already has good links with all statutory agencies through MASE and MASH.¹⁴³ However, while the Met have recommended that all local authorities employ a dedicated CSE coordinator it informed us that currently not all boroughs have one in place.¹⁴⁴

Schools must be part of the local response to CSE, and take a strong preventive approach. The Office of the Children’s Commissioner recommended that relationships and sex education must be provided by trained practitioners in every educational setting for all children and young people.¹⁴⁵ The reports into CSE in Rotherham¹⁴⁶ and Greater Manchester both state that schools are crucial, and while the police should consider more innovative ways of engaging with children and young people, it is important for police officers to go into schools and provide information on CSE.¹⁴⁷ However, as Personal, Social and Health Education (PHSE) is not compulsory in schools, the information schools provide to children and young people about CSE varies greatly.¹⁴⁸ As Coffey recommends, “we need to campaign for the government to make PHSE compulsory so that all children in schools are better safeguarded from CSE.”¹⁴⁹

Some schools do not tackle CSE at all for “fear of reputational damage.”¹⁵⁰ But we were also told that others are “fantastic” and take a whole school approach.¹⁵¹ There are “pockets of very good practice and what we need to do is start making that consistent.”¹⁵² Camden is delivering presentations to schools, sexual health clinics, social work teams and GPs.¹⁵³ In addition, approximately 1,200 13-15 year old young people in Camden have seen “Chelsea’s Choice”¹⁵⁴, a play about sexual exploitation (presented in five secondary schools, two PRUs and a community centre in Camden) to raise awareness of issues relating to CSE and offer young people a safe environment to discuss CSE.

London’s LSCBs have a key role in leading the engagement with schools, to get them to work together with all partners on a strategic level. As identified by Waltham Forest, all London’s local authorities need to consider how effective local schools are in raising awareness and protecting children at risk of, or who have suffered from, sexual exploitation: “We need to do this as a borough and we need to have not only a whole-school approach but a whole-borough approach, which fits in with going back to the age-old safeguarding is everyone’s responsibility. We are looking at schools and working with parents and businesses to say, ‘It is all our responsibility to try and address these issues’.”¹⁵⁵ This is a particular challenge in many boroughs as local authorities have little sway over the increasing number of academy chains, trusts and free schools in the capital.

Recommendation 7:

London’s LSCBs should take a lead in rolling out programmes across London schools that inform and tackle the issue of CSE.

We are encouraged by the progress made in responding to CSE in London. However, there is more that can be done. As summarised by Louise Casey, a number of challenges make tackling CSE difficult, “but they cannot be used as

excuses ... Victims cannot be abandoned to their abusers. Authorities cannot claim they are powerless to act.”¹⁵⁶ **We call upon the London Safeguarding Children Board to ensure the issues identified within this report are responded to, on a local and regional level, across the capital to protect all London’s children and young people from CSE.**

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

Recommendation 1

We recommend that all London LSCBs review their CSE strategies and procedures in response to the findings of the Jay Report.

Recommendation 2

All London LSCBs must have a robust mechanism in place to ensure effective monitoring, oversight and regular review of CSE strategies and procedures.

Recommendation 3

London's LSCBs and Directors of Children's Services must ensure well-defined links with other safeguarding strategies and robust reporting structures between the LSCB and the Community Safety Partnership and Children's Board.

Recommendation 4

We recommend London's LSCBs evaluate the impact of training and identify further training needs on a regular basis.

Recommendation 5

Every LSCB in London should have a forum in place to engage with children and young people affected by CSE, including those that have in the past gone missing and looked after children, to increase understanding, provide appropriate care and support to young victims and those at risk of CSE, and encourage confidence in reporting.

Recommendation 6

The Met and MOPAC must work with the London Safeguarding Children Board to establish an agreed and consistent dataset across London.

Recommendation 7

London's LSCBs should take a lead in rolling out programmes across London schools that inform and tackle the issue of CSE.

Appendix 2 – Endnotes

- ¹ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ² Department for Education, Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan, November 2011
- ³ HM Government, Working Together to Safeguard Children, March 2013
- ⁴ Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board, Serious Case Review into Child Sexual Exploitation in Oxfordshire, February 2015
- ⁵ Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board, Serious Case Review into Child Sexual Exploitation in Oxfordshire, February 2015
- ⁶ MOPAC is committed to delivering a 20 per cent reduction in 7 key neighbourhood crimes by 2016: burglary, violence with injury, robbery, theft from the person, criminal damage and theft of motor vehicle crime and theft from motor vehicle.
- ⁷ Eileen Munro (2011) The Munro Review of Child Protection
- ⁸ For further information see: London Safeguarding Children Board terms of reference
- ⁹ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁰ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹¹ College of Policing, Responding to child sexual exploitation, October 2014
- ¹² Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹³ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁴ Office of the Children’s Commissioner, If only someone had listened, February 2014
- ¹⁵ Office of the Children’s Commissioner, If only someone had listened, February 2014
- ¹⁶ Ann Coffey, Press release – Child sexual exploitation the new “social norm” in some areas, October 2014
- ¹⁷ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ¹⁸ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ¹⁹ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ²⁰ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ²¹ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ²² Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ²³ Home Affairs Select Committee, Child Sexual Exploitation and the Response to Localised Grooming, June 2013
- ²⁴ DCLG, Rotherham Commissioners Confirmed, 26 February 2015
- ²⁵ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ²⁶ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ²⁷ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ²⁸ Home Affairs Committee, Child Sexual Exploitation and the Response to Localised Grooming, June 2013
- ²⁹ London Councils, Tackling child sexual exploitation – a study of current practice in London, February 2014

- ³⁰ London Councils, Tackling child sexual exploitation – a study of current practice in London, February 2014
- ³¹ London Councils, Tackling child sexual exploitation – a study of current practice in London, February 2014
- ³² MPS, Launch of the London Child Sexual Exploitation Operating Protocol, February 2014
- ³³ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ³⁴ Police and Crime Committee, Keeping London’s children safe, July 2014
- ³⁵ MPS, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, November 2014
- ³⁶ MPS, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, November 2014
- ³⁷ MPS, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, November 2014
- ³⁸ MPS, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, November 2014
- ³⁹ See: Submissions to the investigation, July 2014
- ⁴⁰ Ann Coffey MP, Real Voices – child sexual exploitation in Greater Manchester, October 2014
- ⁴¹ MOPAC’s focus on reducing neighbourhood crime in seven key areas: burglary, vandalism (criminal damage), theft from and theft of motor vehicles, violence with injury, robbery and theft from the person – see MOPAC, Police and Crime Plan 2013-2016, March 2013.
- ⁴² MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ⁴³ MOPAC, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, October 2014
- ⁴⁴ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁴⁵ Police and Crime Committee, Keeping London’s children safe, July 2014 (rec 8)
- ⁴⁶ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁴⁷ London Borough of Waltham Forest, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁴⁸ London Borough of Barnet, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁴⁹ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁵⁰ London Borough of Sutton, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁵¹ London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁵² London Safeguarding Children Board – terms of reference
- ⁵³ Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁵⁴ Office of the Children’s Commissioner, If only someone had listened, February 2014
- ⁵⁵ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ⁵⁶ Ofsted calls for prevention of child sexual exploitation to be given higher priority, November 2014
- ⁵⁷ Office of the Children’s Commissioner, If it’s not better, it’s not the end, February 2015
- ⁵⁸ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁵⁹ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ⁶⁰ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ⁶¹ Home Affairs Committee, Child Sexual Exploitation and the Response to Localised Grooming, June 2013
- ⁶² Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014 (recommendation 11)
- ⁶³ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁶⁴ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁶⁵ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁶⁶ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁶⁷ Suzanne Elwick, Business Manager, Waltham Forest Safeguarding Children Board, Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁶⁸ Police and Crime Committee, Keeping London’s children safe, July 2014 (rec 5)
- ⁶⁹ MPS, Response to Keeping London’s children safe, November 2014

- ⁷⁰ MPS, Response to Keeping London's children safe, November 2014
- ⁷¹ Royal Borough of Kingston and London Borough of Richmond, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁷² London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁷³ London Borough of Barnet, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁷⁴ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁷⁵ London Borough of Newham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁷⁶ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ⁷⁷ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014 (recommendations 1 and 2)
- ⁷⁸ Children and Young People Now, Police call for joint working improvements to tackle CSE, January 2015
- ⁷⁹ Hammersmith and Fulham; Kensington and Chelsea; and Westminster councils, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁸⁰ Office of the Children's Commissioner, If only someone had listened, February 2014
- ⁸¹ Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁸² London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁸³ Royal Borough of Kingston and London Borough of Richmond, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁸⁴ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ⁸⁵ Office of the Children's Commissioner, Too many sexually exploited children are still not identified, February 2015
- ⁸⁶ London Safeguarding Children Board – terms of reference
- ⁸⁷ Local Government Association, Tackling child sexual exploitation – a resource pack for councils, February 2015
- ⁸⁸ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ⁸⁹ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ⁹⁰ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ⁹¹ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ⁹² Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹³ London Borough of Sutton, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹⁴ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹⁵ London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹⁶ London Borough of Barnet, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹⁷ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014
- ⁹⁸ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ⁹⁹ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁰⁰ London Borough of Waltham Forest, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁰¹ MPS, Operation Makesafe – raising awareness of child sexual exploitation, November 2014
- ¹⁰² National research indicates that they are particular types of businesses that are more likely to unknowingly aid CSE perpetrators – e.g. Office of the Children's Commissioner Inquiry into CSE in Gangs and Groups. These include: hotels, B&Bs, Licensed premises serving alcohol, cafes and taxi companies.
- ¹⁰³ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ¹⁰⁴ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁰⁵ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁰⁶ Ofsted, Sexual exploitation of children, November 2014

- ¹⁰⁷ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁰⁸ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ¹⁰⁹ Hounslow, Newham and Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁰ London Borough of Barnet, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹¹ London Borough of Waltham Forest, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹² London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹³ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁴ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁵ London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁶ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁷ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁸ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹¹⁹ London Borough of Newham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁰ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²¹ London Borough of Sutton, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²² London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²³ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁴ Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁵ London Borough of Waltham Forest, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁶ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁷ London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁸ London Borough of Waltham Forest, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹²⁹ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³⁰ Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ¹³¹ Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³² London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³³ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³⁴ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³⁵ Ann Coffey, Press release – Child sexual exploitation the new “social norm” in some areas, October 2014
- ¹³⁶ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014

- ¹³⁷ London Borough of Lewisham, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³⁸ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹³⁹ London Borough of Hounslow, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁴⁰ London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁴¹ Sutton, Hounslow and Tri-borough, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁴² London Borough of Redbridge, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁴³ MPS, Child sexual exploitation – briefing for PCC, 10 November 2014
- ¹⁴⁴ MPS, The London Child Sexual Exploitation Protocol, February 2014
- ¹⁴⁵ Office of the Children’s Commissioner, If only someone had listened, February 2014
- ¹⁴⁶ Alexis Jay OBE, Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2013, August 2014
- ¹⁴⁷ Ann Coffey MP, Real Voices – child sexual exploitation in Greater Manchester, October 2014
- ¹⁴⁸ NSPCC, Ann Coffey MP’s independent report: summary of findings and recommendations, November 2014
- ¹⁴⁹ Ann Coffey MP, Real Voices – child sexual exploitation in Greater Manchester, October 2014
- ¹⁵⁰ NSPCC, Ann Coffey MP’s independent report: summary of findings and recommendations, November 2014
- ¹⁵¹ Suzanne Elwick, Business Manager, Waltham Forest LSCB, Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ¹⁵² George Curtis, MsUnderstood, Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ¹⁵³ London Borough of Camden, Submission to Police and Crime Committee, November 2014
- ¹⁵⁴ <http://www.alteregocreativesolutions.co.uk/chelseas-choice/>
- ¹⁵⁵ Suzanne Elwick, Business Manager, Waltham Forest LSCB, Police and Crime Committee, 4 December 2014 – transcript
- ¹⁵⁶ Louise Casey CB, Report of Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, February 2015

Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Janette Roker on 020 7983 6562 or email: Janette.roker@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/publications>

Large print, braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email:

assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系我们或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或
Email 与我们联系。

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটা সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফোন করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Arabic

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغتك،
فارجاء الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي العادي أو عنوان البريد
الإلكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં જોઈતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઇ-મેઇલ સરનામા પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.

Greater London Authority

City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Enquiries 020 7983 4100
Minicom 020 7983 4458

www.london.gov.uk

This publication is printed on recycled paper