

Date: Wednesday 10 June 2015
Location: The Chamber, City Hall
Hearing: MOPAC Challenge – Child Sexual Exploitation

Start time: 4pm
Finish time: 5:30pm

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime
Faith Boardman
Jonathon Glanz, MOPAC Challenge Member
Steve O’Connell, MOPAC Challenge Member
Keith Prince, MOPAC Challenge Member
Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC
Marie Snelling, Director of IOM, MOPAC

Guests

Carlene Firmin, MsUnderstood Programme
Claire Hubberstey, Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation
Mike Cooke, Chair, London Safeguarding Children’s Board (LSCB)
Lucy Botting, Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England
Gavin Swann, Head of Service for Children’s Safeguarding, LB Croydon
Steve Rodhouse, Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC), Metropolitan Police Service
Terry Sharpe, Detective Superintendent, Metropolitan Police Service

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Everybody, welcome to the – whichever – is this the 11th, 12th, 13th or 14th note change? Oh sorry, okay. Well welcome to this MOPAC challenge on child sexual exploitation. I'm Stephen Greenhouse deputy mayor for policing and crime. And I hope this is slightly more informative than the Lambeth public meeting that I chaired recently, that started with the Met Commissioner arresting someone and he's arrested someone at every rank as Commissioner so a truly tremendous first episode that showed the metropolitan police service in its finest light. Today we are dealing with the extremely important issue of child exploitation and we are going to hear from Carlene Firmin from the MsUnderstood programme and also Claire Hubberstey from the Safer London Foundation. Perhaps we could start off really to learn from you about the prevalence of child sexual exploitation.

Helen Bailey, (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): But before we do even that, I think we've got a short presentation.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Have we? Oh great stuff. Sorry. Sorry Maria.

Marie Snelling, Director of IOM, MOPAC: That's alright, no problem at all. So just a short presentation on some data around child sexual exploitation. The majority of the data I'm about to present is based on Metropolitan police service data and of course therefore, it doesn't tell the full picture around child exploitation in London but we know that the London wide data is fairly limited at this current point in time. However the slide presentation I hope will give some insights and indeed will frame the discussions for this afternoon. Can I have slide three please. Thank you very much indeed. So just to set the issue of child exploitation in context, we know that this issue is of official importance, in the context of wider child sexual abuse, the figures that you see on the slides here suggest that five percent of UK children suffer sexual abuse at some point during their childhood and indeed that being recognised in March 2015, it's worth people understanding that the strategic policing requirement was updated to include sexual abuse of which child sexual exploitation is also considered. Can I have the next slide please, thank you.

Work by the Office of the Children's Commissioner indicates that at a national level 16,500 children across England could be at risk of CSE per year. Whilst we don't know the prevalence of CSE across London it has been estimated that around 12,500 cases each year could be at risk of wider child sexual abuse. Recent data from a paediatric review of our sexual assault referral services in London indicates there are approximately 900 presentations of 11 to 17 year olds to both the Havens and indeed the designated doctor referrals in 2014. So that suggests some of the National Data and indeed sets in context from a London perspective, can I have slide five please. Thank you very much.

So then if we look at the MPS data and what that is starting to tell us the slide that you see in front of you is showing that in 2014, 2015 there were 1852 offences that were flagged as child sexual exploitation. The graph shows that those were recorded using four risk codes. The first on the left is around suspicion, we then have category one, two and three, which represent category one being at risk, category two being medium risk and category three being high risk.

We can see from the chart here that the majority of CSE cases in 2014, 2015 those 1277, the largest bar there were flagged as category one so are in that at risk of CSE category. Can I have the next slide please, thank you.

Turning briefly then to online allegations. We can see that these are low, with only 70 flagged investigations in 2014, 2015 but again similar to the overall picture of CSE, 70 percent of those were classified as being category one at risk of CSE. We can also see from the slide and the bar chart that 45 percent of online allegations were recorded within East London. Can I have the next slide please.

So when then looking at the geography of all reports of CSE, we can see that in 2014, 2015, East London and the South Inner London boroughs recorded higher volumes of reported CSE flagged cases to the MPS. Barking and Dagenham recorded the highest volume, followed by Newham and then Lambeth. It is also worth noting that two thirds of all police investigations relating to CSE were investigated by local police teams. The other one third were investigated by child abuse investigation teams, the specialist teams and indeed by Sapphire. Next slide please.

So whilst there are higher levels of reported offences in East London what we can see from the map here is that the home addresses of recorded victims is far more widespread across London. There is much more of an even split particularly across the North East and South London areas. And we can see from the map and the numbers that the highest number of CSE victims in 2014, 2015 were living in Newham. Next slide please.

Looking at then how police receive reports of CSE the pie chart shows how these break down, whilst phone calls to the police are the most frequent method that the police are notified of potential CSE cases, that's the royal blue quadrant in the top right. The second most frequent is notification from social services which is shown in the red quadrant accounting for over 25 percent of notifications of CSE to the police. The pie chart also shows that notification from health and other agencies are much lower and in fact you can see the health sliver right at the top which is the tiny pale blue. Next slide please.

So when we then look at the victims of CSE in London the analysis here shows that there are links between children being in care and those being at risk of CSE. Our data indicates that two thirds or recorded victims of CSE in London have been reported missing at some point during the preceding 12 months of when they were reported to the police. We also know that a large number of these were looked after children and generally those children were found to be missing multiple times. Next slide please.

The Metropolitan police service data indicates that 9 in 10 victims of CSE in 2014, 2015 were female and the graph at the bottom shows you that the majority were 14 and 15 years of age. Next slide please.

Looking then at suspects, we can see from the graph that in 2014, 2015 suspects were frequently recorded as being the same age or within five years older than victims of CSE. This indicates that peer on peer exploitation is a challenge within London, we also know that 86 percent of these suspects are male. Next slide please.

Whilst only 30 percent of our CSE records have a relationship that have been recorded between the suspect and the victim where a relationship is recorded the pie chart is showing us that the royal blue segment which shows that 42 percent of those relationships are acquaintances, further highlighting potential challenge of peer on peer exploitation as being an issue within London.

So that concludes the presentation and I hope that provides some insights for the session this afternoon. Thank you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Just a quick question, of the numbers what are the referrals of CSE to the Met? Do you have some idea of that figure? Just to get a quantum. You said at least – we've got the total number of referrals – these are national figures aren't they?

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): They are London figures.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yes.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): And they total just over 1800 is the current figure.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): 1800?

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): In a year, but this is a new process so it's a whole thing, we expect it to increase.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, 1800 – oh the flag defence is 1852.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yeah.

Male audience member: We can't hear it all.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, apologies, I'm dealing with the acoustic – is that better can you hear me?

Male audience member: Yeah.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Right, so, over – so that's given us an overview thank you for that Marie, so Carlene do you want to take us through how you are approaching this issue and your experiences.

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): Thank you Stephen. As I say my name is Carlene Firmin, I run the MsUnderstood Partnership at the University of Bedfordshire, the partnership has been funded by a number of foundations since 2013, to support local response to peer on peer exploitation and abuse specifically. Back in 2013 40 local authorities across England applied for this support 18 of which were in London over the course of the following 2 years we've provided direct support to 9 London boroughs and two local authorities outside of

London but have received requests from 54 local authorities across the country 30 of which are London boroughs asking for strategic advice, training, case file review, as well as in depth support to manage the challenges of peer on peer exploitation.

Much of this is not surprising to us given the statistics which we've seen that show that peer on peer abuse is of particular concern within the London area this is a challenge at a London level given that most of the national expertise around sexual exploitation focuses on an adult on child model. Some of these challenges we see in London for example the Make Safe operation that ran earlier this year which was to raise awareness amongst hoteliers about the risk of sexual exploitation in London and most of the language in the leaflets that went out and the training focused on if you see an adult with a child which would completely discount peer on peer cases in terms of raising hotelier awareness and so on and so forth.

Other challenges we have at the moment in building response to this issue is an issue of data and it's more in the fact that we don't have data and data is missing it's more that what is being recorded is highly problematic. We have a lot of data on individuals as you saw in the map, the numbers in each area. We have no idea whether those numbers are all originating from the same peer networks, schools, parks and so on and so forth. The extent to which cases are connected, the extent to which children in Enfield are actually being exploited in the south of the city and so on and so forth.

We need data that is much more contextual and tell us how many schools are affected, how many peer networks are affected, how many parks, how many transport hubs, so we can target, which is much more around location but at the moment we have not enabled to do that because most of our protocols focus on identifying children and intervening with children and their families and not necessarily context associated with peer on peer abuse. And we know most of the context associated with this particular phenomena occur outside of the home. Predominately peer group, schools and public spaces. The final thing I wanted to flag before questions are raised is we do need much more clarity in what is being done with predominately boys and young men who are perpetrating much of the national language and pan London language around that group is around pursuing prosecution and disruption. What we actually need is a safeguard response to young people who are perpetrating. We have child protection responsibilities for them. We need to understand the drivers towards that and whether some of them are being groomed by adults for example to engage in harmful sexual behaviour.

The challenge we have with data, the challenge we have with environments, the challenge we have with young men are all consequences of an ongoing challenge we have to safeguard adolescences across the capital as well as safeguard adolescents nationally. Operating within a framework that focuses on under-fives and traditional child protection practice much of which this falls right outside of. And so we are having to work with local multi agency partnerships to generate more creative ways of working such as peer group mapping, peer group interventions, risk assessing public spaces, none of which we are encouraged to do at a strategic level but which the Safeguarding Boards we are working with are hold heartedly in agreement with what is needed.

And that was most brought home to me quite starkly just on Monday when I spent the afternoon with transport for London who are now becoming increasingly concerned about their role on safeguarding on the buses. So what we do need is a pan London approach to safeguarding adolescents which would enable us to have a pan London approach to sexual

exploitation and would encourage a more contextual response the public space risk including the sexual exploitation and abuse of children.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So I got three messages from you, essentially a lack of data on the prevalence and the form that it takes, peer on peer, adult on peer, the geographic scope, also a call for a pan London approach given that the issues present not necessarily in one specific place but also finally that all the public agencies work together on this issue. Would that be a fair summary of what you said?

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): Absolutely and the boys and young men's piece, the perpetrators.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, over to Keith then for questions.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you that was a very comprehensive briefing and thank you for that. One of the points you made was about the peer on peer abuse, if we look at slide 12, is it possible to look at slide 12, yeah. It shows that it is predominantly peer on peer. I just want, I know you did touch on it in your speech there but I was just wondering if you could give us some more indication of how more effectively as partners we can work, and other partners in London can work to address this specific element.

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): I think there are three key areas where we can probably be more effective in responding to peer on peer abuse. The first I touched upon in my overview which was having a clear safeguarding response to young people who are perpetrating, most local areas do not have a harmful sexual behaviour strategy and the language around perpetrators in local CSE strategies is generally around prosecution which doesn't enable us to really work well with peer on peer. Hence some of our boroughs for example Hackney is one of the sites we are working in, they now use their multi agency planning process that they have always used for victims of CSE, they now always use that process for any young man or young woman identified as perpetrating as a means of gaining some process and systematic response to young people who are perpetrating but it is very early days and we are trying to capture that to share it across London.

The other element I think as I also mentioned was a more contextual approach to risk if we rely on what we do with adults which is disrupting individuals, moving them around, sex offender type approaches to them, disruption tactics, not allowing them to spend time with young people through harbouring and abduction notices, none of that works with under 16's, legally they don't really apply in the same way but also they don't actually capture the challenges that we have around the involvement of peer networks and the spread of risk. To give you an example I reviewed six cases of peer on peer rape, and three of murder.

All the murder cases also involved sexual violence in their escalation, just those nine cases netted in 145 young people, 76 of whom were suspects because of their involvement in sustaining abuse, threatening the victim and so on and so forth because young people network in that way, in school and in public spaces. So we need a much broader way of connecting young people and contextualising what we see as risk rather than problematizing individuals because we will only fire fight.

Connected to that we need to encourage and commission work with friendship groups and not just with individuals and think about the engagement of schools in this process and not just whether schools are doing healthy relationships education but whether schools are actually safe environments. And we know that sexual assaults are happening on school premises across the country and within London, not every school but they are occurring. And we need a robust response to that when it happens not just to the individuals involved but to the school as a community to work out how did this happen and what do we do to deal with the ramifications of that for the wider student body.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Thank you, any further questions Keith?

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): No I think that's very comprehensive, thank you very much indeed.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So that's a systematic, more systematic approach, ensuring we have it contextualised, and then obviously well you said it's the extent of the damage if you like, there may be a small number of cases but there is a wider ripple effect amongst young people, I think that was very helpful. So Claire do you want to take us through how you're working with the safer London foundation in this area?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Thank you Stephen, I'm Claire Hubberstey, chief executive at Safer London we provide services to victims in terms of the work we do around sexual exploitation, we provide services both for victims of CSE in a gang context but also in the broader sense. We work with both young women and young men. We also help to provide the pan London domestic violence service and I'll talk more about the links between that. We also work on missing, harmful sexual practises and work on a prevention programme in schools. So in terms of services we work in 12 of the London boroughs in terms of one to one, 17 of them in terms of the education programme, and last year we supported on a one to one basis 500 victims of sexual exploitation.

The key points for me in terms of the data picture if you looked at the pie chart in terms of referrals into the police around issues of CSE education was very small percentage of the overall number, and I think that's a significant issue. I think the decentralisation in terms of the education piece makes it really problematic from a service delivery perspective, it means we go where we are invited. Usually off the back of an incident. And so we aren't going in on the back of a needs assessment that that area or that school needs intervention. We are going there because the school is willing to have us in which is really problematic and means that we are responding issues rather than working in a truly preventative way.

I think Carlene is absolutely right in terms of the peer to peer stuff. We absolutely welcome the publishing of the Pan London protocol around CSE which we consulted on as one of the partners, however we, for us, really missing in there are references around peer to peer violence, it's still talking about the boyfriend model of a much older man exploiting a much younger woman, young person, sorry, and that is absolutely not what we are seeing in London at all. And I think the way that that manifests itself in practices is that what we see is professionals

absolutely not seeing that as a risk, minimising it if it does exist and therefore again not identifying the young people most at risk and vulnerable to sexual exploitation.

I would say in London we are very long way from delivering truly early intervention and preventative services. At the moment it feels very responsive and reactive. The referrals that we are getting when we go into areas are very, very high risk young people who have often been at very high risk for a long period of time and we are really not getting that identification early enough to really have an impact.

And finally my last main point is really around the standardisation and the shared understanding of risk and data across London it is a very, very mixed bag which makes it very problematic as a service provider when you've got waiting lists, you may have young people that are extremely high risk in one area without a shared assessment or fluid understanding of how that risk changes sitting on a waiting list somewhere whilst in another area that may well have been a very, very good and shared process around identifying who should be prioritised for services. So once the picture of risk is understood and a risk assessment is made there is then a further issue about prioritisation and therefore who should receive what are very limited resources in an increasingly shrinking environment around resource provision. So standardisation in terms of the risk piece but then also the data, so what data are we collecting and is that consistent across London, and at the moment that is absolutely not the case.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So questions, Steve?

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, indeed, thank you very much Claire, I know your organisation does an enormous amount across London helping victims. I think we need to pick up on your points around how we can help early prevention and early safeguarding, because you come in rather late on the scene because you are there reacting.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yeah.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes which is your point and you do that –

Male audience member: (Inaudible).

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Our systems aren't working as well as usual, I do apologise, but your point was a well-made one is because you are dealing with victims. So I think what we need to do today is try to work out how we can be earlier in the process which I think is both speakers have mentioned that. How can we do that? Is this a lack of data? And you've talked about schools as well, can you amplify the issues around data and how we can improve it. And also how, at the moment with schools it's when one is invited in, you are invited in. How we can amend that possibly potentially out of this building. Can you focus on those two points for me.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Absolutely, so what we know from the cases that we have worked on is that over 40 percent of the young people that we work with on a one to one basis have experienced domestic violence in the home, 47 percent have either been excluded from school or are not in education, employment or training, 64

percent of them have got safeguarding concerns, 54 percent of them have been excluded as missing persons, 46 percent have issues around substance misuse, 29 percent of the families have been involved in offending and 77 percent of the young people that we work with have been victims of crime. So I think that is just our data other organisations will have similar profiles.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): These are already victims aren't they?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yeah.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): You are treated because they are victims in any case.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): But what that gives us is almost a problem profile.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Indeed.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): And what we need to be doing as partners is looking at that and therefore identifying when those issues arise that young people may well be vulnerable therefore to sexual exploitation and intervening at an earlier point in time. And at the moment there is not a shared data source for all of this to be put together to unpick that and for agencies then to work in a preventative way around what we already know.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yeah, so your conclusion would be is that these young people you are looking after, are dealing with, have already come to the attention of agencies --

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Somewhere, yeah, along the line.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): The different percentages that you've quoted in their journey to that terrible point where they become victims and so therefore with the lack of, perceived lack of data sharing if that was improved, this problem could have been picked up a lot earlier by one of the other agencies, is that your view on that?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Absolutely, and this figure I quoted in terms of 47 percent either being excluded from school or not in education, employment or training that is hugely significant because what we see is that young people are excluded usually because of the behaviour that is resulting from the underlying issues around sexual exploitation and the exclusion then just exacerbates the risk. So there is a real point for us all really, when there are issues there about getting specialist agencies in to support and understand what is going on before it gets to the point where the young person needs to be excluded from school, hence my point about a real lack of engagement and ability to engage on a strategic level with education.

I think there is some interesting data come out of the Met around schools and locations that have specific issues in terms of high levels of sexual violence or numbers of perpetrators but there isn't a forum really for that to be analysed or understood or compared with partnership data and I think really for me, if we are going to be truly early interventionist, education has to play a massive role in that. At the moment that just doesn't happen.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): So it doesn't happen at all. So basically you are going there were victims are already identified within the education establishments and you are invited in there to support. There are victims that you have that have been excluded and a high percentage which is your point from areas where they may have been abused within that education. Why do you sense that there is this lack of, this break down between the educational establishment and this very worthy issue? Is it an institutional resistance to it? Or just because they don't quite get it?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): I think a lot of schools have been very nervous about potentially being labelled as having what could be a gang issue, a CSE issue, violence issue, or a specific issue around sexual exploitation and the damage that that potentially does to their reputations. The move away from local authority control means that it's not as easy for a local area to say actually everybody is just going to have this and therefore we are not targeting any specific school and that has become really problematic so for service delivery organisations you have to do the negotiations on an individual basis with each individual educational establishment, and that in itself is incredibly problematic and what we don't have any more are strategic priorities for education that include focusing on things like this. Everything is very much related to academic attainment, which of course, I understand but you can't do that without tackling this piece as well because young people simply won't achieve.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yeah, I think we get that because this is all about trying to look at early safeguarding, early prevention. I think the schools piece is really important both strategically and in individual schools and then linked into this data share piece. So I think these are two points we picked up upon. Jon.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Can you just explain, I didn't get the last bit around why the shift away to governance at a local schools level is affected, why that, what is the point you are making there? The shift of not having a strategic overview, essentially?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): I think, yeah, I think schools feel quite isolated so therefore if they invite you in to do something around safety it instantly suggests they have got an issue with safety whereas when it was done on a broader scale so all 20 schools in an area had something they felt a bit more protected by that. So I think that's part of it but also the way devolution around that means that they may well have different priorities that have been set elsewhere which aren't necessarily within the local areas control So the local area may well have strategic priorities but if they are part of the academy chain for example, there may be priorities sitting elsewhere that take precedence.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Thanks for that. Shall we move on, keep the pace going. So we've got an understanding of the data presented

by Marie, we've got the call for shared understanding. Now let's look at the London response so who is next, it's Mike I think from the Chair of the London Safeguarding Board, so Mike over to you.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Thank you, so I'm Mike Cooke, I am Chief Executive of the London Borough of Camden but I'm here today in my capacity as the Chair of the London Safeguarding Board, and a new chair I took over from the 1 April 2015. I just thought it might be helpful to start off by explaining what the London Safeguarding board does and what it doesn't do. It is a pan London multi-agency partnership grouping. It brings agencies together to try and improve the London wide system of safeguarding, addressing issues and providing sponsorship for initiatives like the rolling out of the multi-agency safeguarding hubs.

But also providing challenge and support. I think it's important to stress that unlike local safeguarding children boards it doesn't have a statutory footing. Local safeguarding children boards have a statutory duty to provide challenge and accountability to the local system, the London board doesn't do that. It focuses in on promoting best practice through education and the like, through communication, through its work to sponsor core operating procedures, by sponsoring key initiatives and by things like peer reviews.

So a few just observations on some themes and some headlines. I would concur completely with the message that you are receiving about the need for better data across London, indeed Ofsted published a thematic inspection in 2014 and it was a big theme for Ofsted too, i.e. following a peer review where all London boroughs and safeguarding boards participated it became clear that this was published in January this year, the local safeguarding boards in London all have strategies and action plans in place for dealing with the sexual exploitation of children. I think the key issue is that there is a difference between establishing those action plans and then driving them through. I think we are in a phase of driving them through and then taking them to new levels.

There is good partnership working at a local level, and I think there is good partnership working across London, but it is ever the case with partnership working that you really have to work at it even harder to promote strong messages. So I was personally very grateful to the colleagues in the police for launching operation Make Safe and I think the London board that I chair has got a role to take that forward and inculcate that across the partnership.

Awareness raising is incredibly important. It's very easy for those agencies that are either statutorily responsible or responsible through commission services to take this issue forward but we have to engage our whole communities in tackling sexual exploitation of children. Just a few observations about data, I thought you might be interested in just some sort of nuancing of the data you've received so far. We haven't got any pan London data other than the police data so I've looked at Camden's own information. The chart you saw earlier showed you that Camden had 35 cases reported to the police last year. That concurs with our understanding but in fact Camden's social care service actually saw 137 children last year who were risk assessed. Some of those were risk assessed on a number of occasions. So in total there were 182 risk assessments throughout the year and of those over 100 of those total risk assessments, there were referrals to early help and prevention support as opposed to referrals for police and criminal investigations.

Just a final observation that I absolutely concur with the view and the criticality of peer to peer sexual exploitation as being the majority of cases but I know this is an important theme for Ofsted and it's certainly backed up by the Camden data, adult to children sexual exploitation still does take place and we cannot take our eye off that. So there was a significant number of inappropriate relationships in Camden, 26 percent, there was some organised exploitation 7 percent, and some on line grooming 12 percent. So I just thought giving you the Camden data just nuances the, in the absence of good --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Unpack that data again for me in Camden? 100 cases, you said, just go through that again.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): 12 percent on line grooming.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So 12 percent on line grooming.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): This is 12 percent of 182 risk assessments.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Oh 182.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): 26 percent inappropriate relationships. 7 percent organised exploitation and 55 percent peer to peer.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): The third one?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Organised exploitation.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): How much?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): 7 percent.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Organised exploitation, and the last bit?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Peer to peer reviews 55 percent.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, so the vast majority of the presentation in Camden is peer to peer.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Yeah.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): A very small amount of it is organised 7 percent. This is the Camden data.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Yeah.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Inappropriate relationships, about a quarter is that right?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): That is correct.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): And online grooming relatively small, but 12 percent.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Correct.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, that's helpful. Do we have those sort of data across other London boroughs? Or that's really just for Camden?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): There is data available but perhaps presented in different ways, and I see the job of the safeguarding board that I chair to take forward the development of the pan-London data set.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So that's already been called for so it would be helpful to think about a data set that can be consistent across London?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Yeah.

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): Can I just point out Camden has invested in an analyst which has enabled this to happen and most boroughs do how have that resource or have not put their resource into analysts and actually the leadership they've shown in terms of not just having an analyst but an analyst that uses open source data, that uses environmental data, that can match schools, that can match geographical areas is a standard that all boroughs should be striving towards but is not one that is possible for them all at the moment in terms of where resources have been allocated or priorities of local councils. Analytical support at a pan London level is a critical gap at the moment for most boroughs.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, Jonathon.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you. Hopefully you can hear me, can everybody hear me? Thank you. Mike I just wanted to pick up on one or two things that you mentioned. You referred specifically to the Ofsted inspections and also the peer reviews. Can you perhaps tell us a bit more about those and perhaps compare and contrast the differences which occurred through those two different approaches.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Yeah, certainly the Ofsted inspection was a thematic inspection of 8 authorities across the country not just in London and it divided its findings into 6 key headings. The, it was a long report with many, many findings so if I can only really summarise its findings. It basically said that many authorities have been too slow to respond to the challenge of sexual exploitation of children, but most are starting to. Those that have been working on it for longest and have given it highest priority are doing

better and being more effective. It was that in particular that report from Ofsted last November that called for every safeguarding board locally to have a strategy and an action plan.

It bemoaned the fact there was a lack of data and it was very difficult to get a comprehensive picture and therefore performance manage the effectiveness of service delivery. It did compliment the sector on awareness raising and suggested there was some successful and innovative campaigns. It delved into detailed findings from practice and there were many of them but for example it called for better and more consistent screening and risk assessment tools which I thought was a pretty telling finding. It did express concern that there was not enough disruption and prosecution and finally it specified the criticality of working with missing children who have been missing and I quote, "Too many missed opportunities to care and support and learn from situations where children return from going missing."

So those were the headlines from the Ofsted findings. The peer to peer findings from London basically I've hinted at it in my introduction was we were particularly concerned to know that strategies and action plans were in place and they were. There was specific support given, there was emphasis on the criticality of seeing sexual exploitation of children related to other safeguarding issues, gangs, domestic violence, and the like. There was reference to good local data but not being available often but not available London wide, and it reinforced the criticality of partnership working.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Okay, so in relation to those, these are some very specific recommendations. Are they now being followed or are there other things that need to be put in place to see those recommendations actually translated into effective action? I mean clearly if people hadn't started earlier that is something, they can only start from where they are but presumably now everybody has taken that on board and the best practise which is referred to there, are you seeing that being used throughout?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): There are examples of best practice across London and I see it as the job of the London board to promote that best practice and there have been good examples of training and master classes etc. I'm coming in as a new chair to the board and frankly having a refresh of our work programme and our priorities and I'm envisaging that child sexual exploitation will be top of our agenda and is a great opportunity to pick up the feedback from those inspection reports from events such as today and specifically put into our work programme very particular actions around particular, starting off strong focus on data collection.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): I can see the data is hugely important and that whilst you said that there is no statutory basis for exactly what you are doing in terms of the arrangements there are at local level. Does that cause specific issues when children move from one borough to another, from one area to another? And is that why, is that where the data really needs to be enhanced and shared?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): I think that is a practical, that is an example of where the data has very, very practical and particular use. There are protocols for children, for situations where children are moved where we know and sometimes are moved by individual boroughs across borough boundaries there are protocols for agencies to communicate those movements with each other. I think the criticality of the data, I think we have those

protocols in place now, I think the criticality of the data is because I think we are only just beginning to understand the nature of the challenges around sexual exploitation of children in London and I think we can only do better to address the challenges when we know more and analyse the situation better.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): I'm hearing a lot about data, data is absolutely crucial to the effective cooperation between the various boards to better do their job.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): Yes, I should add that although the board is in effect a voluntary board, there is absolute commitment from all the partner agencies, the voluntary sector that sit on there, the voluntary organisations who are represented, the statutory agencies, absolute commitment to the board, and some strong recognition that this is an absolute priority and a strong commitment to that partnership working.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): And clearly it is something, as you say, a lot of people involved and the ability to work together to achieve that is absolutely crucial. So thank you for clarifying that, I appreciate it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay so it comes back to the paucity of data and really the data set across London could be improved by having a very clear way of thinking of about it that can be shared across boroughs and I think we move on now to hear the Met's response, Steve it looks like the organised exploitation is a relatively small part of the piece. Your comments on the policing challenges.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Thank you everybody. My name is Steve Rodhouse, I'm one of the deputy assistant commissioner in the Met, I lead on crime operations, which includes the sexual exploitation team. I'm here with detective super intendant Terry Sharpe, who is the direct lead of that team and an expert in the field. So we've heard that back in March the Prime Minister declared that CSE was a national policing priority putting it on the same footing as cyber and terrorism.

There was already significant work ongoing in the Met at that time but we would absolutely say there is much more to be done. So back in February 2014 Claire alluded to this the London CSE operating protocol was launched that is something that the Met drove, and it's now been signed by all boroughs, it's been recognised nationally as good practice. For me this is particularly important because it's got a number of aims but from our point of view as a pan London organisation it standardises how we identify and respond to suspicions and indeed evidence around CSE.

From a policing perspective it was absolutely crucial and you see this in a lot of the training that we've given our staff that we needed to affect a mind-set change so that officers when dealing with people who could be considered to be troublesome disruptive, chose your wording, think beneath that and understand what it is that is causing that behaviour and often it will be some sort of exploitation. That is absolutely critical to us. The Met model is based on local ownership of at risk young people that is support by borough multi agency sexual exploitation meetings with statutory and non-statutory partners where the referrals that we've spoken about

have been considered locally in line with the protocol which offers 29 different options to try and mitigate the risk and provide a positive, some positive progress.

They are supported by a specialist sexual exploitation team that Terry leads at the centre, and they undertake some criminal investigations where we believe someone has actually been targeted. I absolutely agree with Carlene's view that enforcement pursue activity is not the be all and end all. I think there is a significant role for that sort of activity in pulling some levers to provide an immediate well, resolution to the issue. Terry and I were talking earlier and made the very good point that actually a criminal prosecution might be an advantageous thing but it's also long and drawn out. I've seen good evidence, good use made of abduction orders, and sexual harm orders over 250 over the last year that provided immediate lever to prevent an abusive relationship. I do agree with Carlene that the focused most commonly at the more traditional image of child sexual exploitation rather than peer on peer but nevertheless valuable activity.

So from in the Met all front line officers have now had awareness training and I think that's been positive but needs to continue with the churn of officers that we have that's an ongoing task. Clearly prevention is better than investigation and we've had a number of mentions of Operation Make Safe I think a really innovative piece of work that draws the attention of those people who are likely to encounter people in exploitative relationships whether they be in the retail sector, café owners, hotels, mini cabs and the like. I think that's positive, also positive is work we've done with Alexis J who needs no introduction around the creation of one DVD and another on the way in relation to peer on peer violence, entitled Can You See It? Providing some very impactful and hard hitting messages both to people who might become aware of abusive and exploitative relationships with the second DVD being specifically designed for professionals in the field.

Not all is rosy in the garden, I think it's fair to say. There are areas for improvement. We talked about the number of referrals, it's a blunt mechanism but it is important to get that consistency but according to all the data we've seen we are only scratching the tip of the iceberg in terms of those numbers of referrals. I would emphasis Claire's point that actually police have a relatively small number of interactions with people who may be at risk of CSE and we would really encourage other statutory, non-statutory agencies to provide more referrals because they must be seeing the evidence that we see. I think there is absolutely work to be done in the field of peer to peer CSE particularly in the area of gangs where our focus is largely about enforcement around violent crime, stabbings and shootings, and I think there is a by-product of that that we are missing and we are not harvesting the intelligence that arises from that activity and using it to make mainly girls safer. I think I'll leave it there if I may.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Right, questions for Steve. Sorry? Well, yeah, so Steve just determining the different responses, you said the criminal justice process can take ... is quite cumbersome you were saying and effectively use of orders is often a better way of dealing with it ?

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Not necessarily an alternative. If we look at the referrals we've seen this year, just over 1800 this has boiled down to 77 charges and of course this is a challenging area were those people who are victims of these offending, will commonly not know, may not have trust in the criminal justice system. By using

some of these orders you can take that very difficult decision to support a prosecution away from someone for, in order to protect them. So those orders, I wouldn't claim to be an expert in them can be very powerful.

Terry Sharpe (Detective Superintendent, MPS): I think it also takes a considerable time to gain the confidence of some of our victims as well for them to have the confidence to come forward, to provide the evidence we require for a prosecution. We can't wait for that, we have to be more involved in the interventions and disruption strategies at a very early age and prevention, prevention work I think we are doing raising awareness is really important, particularly around, Mr Rodhouse just mentioned the DVDs. Alexis J has highlighted ironically a lot of the things that Claire and Carlene have been saying about the fear almost within some education departments of actually reporting it to us because once it's reported to us we can do something about it, there are mechanisms in place. So that's on that particular DVD for professionals, it's out there on YouTube, it's on Barnardo's website, it's on our website.

We are now – and we've done a lot of work around identifying and raising awareness of the warning signs for victims. It's equally as important, as Carlene was saying, around the perpetrators behaviours and understanding those and picking up the early signs and we are working very closely with some experts in relation to that and we will be having some seminars later this year and also launching this further videos for professionals. So that there can be no excuse once they actually understand and can identify those warning signs, then there is a mechanism within the protocol to report it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, so essentially there is a mechanism to buy time to be able to get the confidence of the young person. That is essentially how it would work in relation to policing, what would your three asks be in terms of the response, if you could summarise those from where we are today?

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Oh, well I think I've alluded to one of them which is we need a richness of referrals that goes wider than social services and policing which are the two bulk areas where we get them at the moment. I would, from my perspective locally, need to make sure that our officers are continuing to adopt the right approach when they meet and come into contact with people who are victims of CSE and as I say that is about looking beneath the behaviour to the symptoms if you like and the causes I should say. Those are probably my big concerns at the moment.

Terry Sharpe (Detective Superintendent, MPS): One more around the return interviews of children who goes missing, a really big concern for us at the moment is we don't seem to be seeing much of a product from, on the return interviews when children go missing the statutory authorities conduct those return interviews with the local authority, I'm not certain that actually we are seeing a 100 percent of those return interviews taking place. More importantly we aren't seeing the product of those interviews i.e. the simple questions, where did you go? Who were you with? We are not seeing any of that and I think that is a really big concern for me at the moment and would also save a lot of time because once that intelligence is known the next time that child goes missing, we can actually respond accordingly and probably a lot quicker as well.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Helpful, Colleagues any other questions? No questions?

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): Stephen can I just point out that the abduction notices as a mechanism to gain trust as Steve Rodhouse mentioned, they only work really in adult on child cases and given the profile of peer on peer in London we do need alternative mechanisms to gain that trust for young people who are being exploited by peers, because sometimes the investigations take just as long and one of the reasons schools are reluctant is because they are left holding, not just victims but perpetrators in the school environment while they are waiting on charging decisions and there is no other mechanism at the moment to manage that risk and that is a hugely challenging situation for the schools and does underpin a lot of their reluctance to share information not knowing how that risk is going to be handled during the investigation period.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Ironically all those issues are mentioned within the DVD I mentioned, I would recommend everybody to see that one – ‘Can you see it’.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So one of the things I’m interested in policing is obviously the interface between the local police and TP and the specialist, so how does the referral work within policing? How is that dealt within policing?

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): So all those referrals are assessed on a daily basis by an initial assessment team that is based at the centre so we understand with some consistency of approach but then they are dealt with as I said with the multi-agency sexual exploitation meetings locally. It is always a challenge around central coordination and local ownership but I think we’ve got the balance right for the moment whereby the investigations for categories two and three referrals are dealt with at the centre, whereas those category one where their child is at risk has to be done locally that is where the safeguarding provision is. Of course there is a governance structure that sits above this which ensures some commonality of standards from a policing perspective.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, so based on the level of risk it’s dealt with centrally or locally by the local teams.

Steve Rodhouse (Deputy Assistant Commissioner, MPS): That’s right.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): That’s very helpful.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Stephen can I just come in there and say that is extremely helpful. Where we’ve got the issue is that if there isn’t a good and consistent understanding of risk in the first place to make that referral then MPS aren’t necessarily seeing that right categorisation so referrals are being made or risk assessments are being made by a single agency without a good understanding of the issues, we know often with CSE that victims are very reluctant to disclose. Often the risk escalates once they’ve been engaged with the service as they start disclosing what’s happened and therefore it’s really important that we get that right so that this bit works as well where you’ve then got local borough response versus essential specialist team because otherwise the whole thing is skewed.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well just say that again, I ... didn't quite ...

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): So when the risk assessment is made.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yes.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): It's really important that there is a really good understanding and that is done in a multi-agency way.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Sure, so you need multi agency assessments.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Risk assessments, standardised.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): That has to be standardised locally, and if that works locally then effectively through that multi --

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So it's not one agency assessing it you think there should be, that then leads to the referrals pathway, whatever.

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yeah, because then the Met system is the specialist team deals with category X, and local teams deal with category X, Y. If the risk isn't understood in the first place when that referral is made then those decisions aren't necessarily right because they are based on flawed information.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Oh I see, I've got it, so the risk profile with currently in policing, if you do it surely locally then you can decide where to, how each agency responds to safeguarding is that right?

Helen Bailey, (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): I think Claire's point is also that what we've got to have is a multi-agency situation where everybody understands everybody else's risk assessment protocols and everybody else's language. So if a social worker describes something in one way police officer understands it in a consistent way across London and a teacher and so on and so forth that is what you are saying?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yeah, at the moment we've got a mix of tools, a mix of language and a real lack of a standardised approach to how we all assess and address risk.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So that is often the issue then to get different agencies to have the same common language if you like to deal with the risks associated with this?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): Yeah.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, Mike or Steve any other comments? Do you agree with that or ...?

Terry Sharpe (Detective Superintendent, MPS): I do actually in relation to there isn't a consistent risk assessment model and the police will obviously search all its databases. We had the MASH teams where we are gathering information coming in from the different agencies but Claire quite rightly says we don't always get the full picture. So we act, we assess on what we know.

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): I think it's just important to add though that the local multi agency safeguarding hubs are the, are a pivot point really in the system for a shared analysis with partners working together and therefore undertaking risk assessments using the same common language that is the whole core and focus of those safeguarding hubs. What is likely to be the case is that one MASH isn't using the same system as another MASH. So in borough the risk assessments are likely to be very, the language is likely to be the same and similar, processes used, it's when you try and compare that with the next borough along that is where the system starts to break down.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, colleagues, shall we move onto Lucy? Lucy.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England)

Thank you, Lucy Botting, I'm from NHS England, London Region. Just to give you some context about --

Male audience member: (inaudible)

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England)

Sorry, I'll try and shout a little bit louder. Just about try and give you some context about our role in safeguarding and the safeguarding for London. So we are the health care system influencer, leader across London and I think that is really important to say that. Our governance is obviously to NHS England the national team and obviously Simon Stephens. I think certainly Simon Stephens five year forward view which looks at the integrated agenda between local authorities and health so school nursing, health visiting moving into local authorities. I think is really positive for the join up of safeguarding if it's done right, I think it's really positive. Mainly we are the assurer, the assurer of health systems across London.

So we work with 32 CCGs and therefore we have safeguarding teams that sit within those 32 clinical commissioning groups. We work with them, we professionally support, professionally update, influence and lead hopefully the agenda with them in terms of that safeguarding remit. However because the landscape is so confusing we also commission health services. So we commission primary care at the moment although some of that is moving over to the clinical commissioning groups. We are accountable for GPs and practices for the name and therefore for the safeguarding assurance for that. Also health and justice which is an interesting one

which is very much about prisons but also the youth offending prisons, so the likes of Feltham. It's a really important in terms of our work around child safeguarding.

And we also then look at some specialist services so Great Ormond street being one of them. In terms of our absolute remit for safeguarding then as I said we have that strategic overview across London and we work with those professionals and again looking at awareness influence especially around CSE and that has become one of our priority agendas or focussing the last couple of months. We've got a great big remit going on about themes and trends from series case reviews because the same themes come up time and time again. A lot of it is about the difficulty of multi-agency working, how we really join those dots up and join that pathway. Because often the child falls through those dots and that includes, I think that is including CSE as we see it now.

I think the other thing for us is again raising awareness among professionals, I'm clear on slide 10 of the data pack we were shown that health professionals are the lowest referrer for CSE. So there is something about our role as an influencer how we raise awareness and I was interested about your video YouTube because actually there is something about the join up between the police and health in a much better way than it's done before and I think that's a really big ask. We have got a toolkit, so we have got a CSE toolkit as well. Which the department of Health published this year and again we fed that down to school nurses who are one of the front line professionals who will actually spot CSE going on.

Another thing that we do is looking at the child to adult journey which includes CSE because we can talk about safeguarding children but we actually must make mention that some of this falls into the safeguarding adult, the vulnerable adult if you can call the perpetrator or the victim vulnerable which I'm sure you can. So how do we join the local safeguarding children's board up with the local safeguarding adult's board. Really, really important because otherwise we'll again have more duplicated processes and oars going in different directions. In terms of my key messages then, or NHS London's key messages for me it's about that join up and for me it's about actually looking at a MOPAC CSE ambition for London, I think that would be really, with all key partners signing up. It has to be about the governance about how that transcends down to the LSABs, and the LSCBs.

MASH, absolutely and I was going to make the point about MASH's, they are variable across London, some really good health input, some not so good. Some of that may be down to our workforce and capacity on the front line in terms of health visiting and school nursing which I appreciate is an issue. What about a best practice for MASH's what about a MASH link up with children and adults. I think that could be really exciting and bringing domestic violence which we alluded to earlier. Pan London protocols, again I don't think there is enough health purist health influence in those and I would welcome the chance to input in those.

Prevention very big one. We had a couple of years ago a great big emphasis on troubled families, early help strategies from the local authority. Somehow that seems to have slightly gone off the boil but actually what about early help, bringing back early help as a priority but actually looking at CSE within that as well. So children's commissioning with the local authority. Youth Parliament, I'd love to get them engaged as well. I think the last thing for me, and I'll stop talking in a second is very much about the reoccurrence and reoffending. So if we look at the perpetrator and the perpetrator model we know in health we haven't got the mental health counselling services right.

We are doing a lot of work with the CCG's around what we call tier three, so the IAPs, so the beginning of somebody with a mental health problem. I'm not for one minute saying that everybody has a mental health problem but they need certainly post the trauma of rape or grooming they certainly need post mental health. Tier four, CAMs in-patient beds we are looking at, so how again in terms of CSE how do we maximise that and that's something that we are taking forward. Also our work with the sexual assault referral centres, so the Havens across London.

We've got some exciting work going on with Kings, we've done a review of sexual assault referral centres. There is some fantastic models in Iceland, the Bauhaus model which really looks at the whole join up and it's something that our commissioning team health and justice really want to get across about that preventative counselling mental health pathway for children going through this experience. Thank you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So questions then on the health dimension.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, thank you very much Lucy, I think it's helpful that you identified quite early on the low number of referrals by health to the Met which was I think 0.2 which is quite stark. You identified that and you say yourself you want an integrated and jointed up system so how and probably Stephen can chip in on that, how can we improve those referrals because you said yourself you had responsibility around GPs and we are clearly looking at how health can play a part in early prevention and early safeguarding, it's not achieved it up to now but now you've got the vision for it. How can we improve that working in partnership with the Met?

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) It is a difficult one.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, of I course.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) A very difficult nut to crack. I think there is something for us about really raising that awareness with professionals. Whilst we say we have done it I don't think we've fully engaged yet. So there is something around the A and E units, the urgent care centres, the GP practises. More so than school nurses and health visiting which we've maybe been focusing on but it's those areas where a child, a young person might go to and be frightened to talk, be frightened to say I'm being groomed, or I'm being exploited and we have to remember a lot of it is fear of the child as well and the youth.

Because actually going through that criminal justice system and if we look at the review that was done, we've done with Dame Elish Angiolini which looked at a non-child friendly environment, it's very fearful for a child but equally if you're in a gang it's very scary. So how do we not just raise awareness with professionals because that's one thing but how do we allow them to communicate? How do they communicate with that individual to actually glean that knowledge and make the child and young person feel safe?

And I'd welcome a join up certainly with the police and ourselves about how we do that and get the message out. I would caveat with this data some of it would also be clinical coding, as well, so we have different codes in acute hospitals and some of this information actually the child may be referred on to the Havens to the SARCs as we call them but actually it might not be coded as such. So there is a caveat with the actual accuracy of this data but I would certainly acknowledge that it's quite low because we have the same issue with child safeguarding and low data certainly in A & E and walk in centres and it is something we are looking at.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So what you're saying in Health is the health visitors the nurses there has been a lot of focus on that but actually the whole of health needs to understand who to respond to this issue.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) I think so. Absolutely, we need to understand the points where a child will access or a child or young adult will access for help and we actually need to really raise that awareness but actually look at training.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So wouldn't it be – so health visitors, nurses, most developed primary care where a child might go more often also very important and how would it work with a specialist centres then outside the Sarks obviously where you're dealing with ...?

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) It's difficult, so the question for me would be would a child access primary care? I would think in today's society a child would probably go to A&E.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): A&E.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) Or a walk in centre.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yeah.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England) So it's how we raise awareness there I think. How we look at training, we've got great focus on prevent training at the moment that also needs to be brought in house and brought into business as usual with this with CSE.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, Mike?

Mike Cooke (London Safeguarding Children's Board): On this point about access I don't know whether this helps the conversation but with another hat on I'm leading a pan London work to recommission sexual health services and that's brought me into contact with a lot of sexual health service providers and that's a very important access point for children and young people who have been sexually exploited and I've been very reassured that the providers of those services are absolutely sensitised to spotting sexual exploitation of children but I think that as an access point and an early assessment point is very important to note.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, further questions colleagues? Yeah, that's good. Well let's move on then to Gavin, who obviously from Croydon. Perhaps looking at the local authority response.

Gavin Swann (Head of Service for Children's Safeguarding, LB Croydon): Good afternoon my name is Gavin Swann, head of service for children safeguarding and quality assurance. I have lead responsibility for the council's response in relation to child sex exploitation and also missing children. I was listening to you all really I was thinking about the level of complexity that we are having to manage. I was also thinking about the voice of the child and if we had a group of young people around this room what they would be telling you because I'm sure it would be very different to what we are telling you.

And I thought a lot about normalisation of some of the exploitations that we are hearing about and we've recently commissioned Safer London to undertake a mapping and profiling, actually going and to speak to over 80 young, mainly young women but some young boys in Croydon and they were telling us we won't talk to social workers, we won't talk to police. We will talk to people but at a time and a place that is convenient to us, when we are ready to talk. So I think what we are having to do is think again about how we design our services and think again about how we engage with this group of very difficult to engage young people.

I also was thinking about the skills that we need to be able to work with these young people and the support the professionals need in terms of the quality of supervision to be able to get rid of some of the prejudices that we might all hold in relation to working with people who tell us to get out of their face, regularly. So I think really I've learnt a lot about child sexual exploitation in the last few months and I think we need that openness and to continue to think about how we can learn and promote learning in this very delicate area of work.

I think we get a lot of data, I get saturated with data about vulnerable children in Croydon, what we don't have are the skills and the systems and the ability to map and understand that data. We've recently completed an absolutely excellent joint operation with our colleagues in police both Croydon police and national crime agency C Op, and also the specialist command in Scotland Yard where we looked at our 20 most vulnerable young people and we had two police analysts from the NCA come in and we mapped and we shared our data, our systems so the police officers were able to look at children's social care data, youth offending data, compare that with their own information, and we identified particular hotels that were being used mainly in terms of peer on peer abuse.

We identified what schools, what PRU's were being used and where young people were being recruited. We identified particular behaviours, we learnt an awful lot from that mapping exercise, and I understand that mapping exercise is being rolled out to a number of other boroughs across London. So something about that continual process of learning, there isn't just one action plan. We are on I think our fifth iteration of our CSE action plan in Croydon in five months. It's that simple scale of learning and I turn to both colleagues both Carlene and Claire are very involved in the development of our practice towards young people, vulnerable at risk adolescents in general.

So it's wider for me, this is about issues of gender and power relations, and this isn't something that agencies can fix on our own it's about working with communities, it's about working with

parents, it's about changing, I think basic things like making it more difficult to access pornography, just think about that as a man, and about what the internet provides. I echo the issues around safeguarding and young men. We need more skills, we need to understand masculinity and the development of masculinity, and we need the ability to engage young men.

In terms of a pan London approach, there is something about the fluidity of young people moving around London and being exploited within that fluidity, and how we work across boroughs. So in the police operation I described we identified a lot of young women going up to Lambeth, so how could we work with Lambeth colleagues. What protocols we could put in place and so forth. There is also the issue of other local authorities placing children, so in Croydon we have over 600 young people placed by other boroughs in Croydon. A number of those young people go missing.

A number of those young people don't want to be in Croydon they want to be back in Lambeth or wherever they want to be. We are using our resources, our police resources and so forth regularly looking for these repeat missing young people, making our, the haystack of safeguarding larger and larger and larger. Making it more and more difficult to identify young people who truly are at risk. So I think they are two areas, that fluidity and the placement of children from other boroughs are key areas of work I think and gaps. We echo the issues with schools we are having a lot of problems we are only engaging with some of our schools in the borough.

I think social media in general is a challenge, understanding that, understanding how we can use social media to engage young people, but also the power of social media and what that means in young, in the world of the young person. We would echo the issue around sexual health, we've got an excellent new project starting with Safer London where we are going to have a Safer London worker based in our local sexual health clinic because there are some complexities around confidentiality and some other aspects but we would be expecting more referrals from that aspect.

I think I'll leave with that. I mean really to conclude it really is a complex area of work and we need more support to understand and to engage a large number of young people.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay, so this is an extremely complex area and you said that there is a mass of data that you need to have more structured. Just in terms of some of the points, the role of social media, can you just unpack that a little bit what you mean there?

Gavin Swann (Head of Service for Children's Safeguarding, LB Croydon): Yeah, I'll give you an example so what we identified was that we are placing quite a lot of our vulnerable young people all together in PRU's because they are excluded from school because of their behaviours you will have already heard. At lunch times, maybe one of the girls is giving oral sex to a number of the boys and this is being filmed, this is then being uploaded and is then being circulated and there is thousands of hits on this within a few hours this is the level of complexity I mean.

From a practitioners perspective in one borough I worked there was a lack of clarity about whether I could look on a Facebook page and it could actually mean a disciplinary offence if I

even looked at my Facebook page. In another borough it's positively encouraged to identify and look at a young person's Facebook page. So that kind of clarity about how we work with the internet and also how we increase our skills the internet is something that is going to be increasingly something that we need to understand and work with.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So establishing a CSE as a corporate priority is being what you've done but how you respond to it is the challenge for different social media and the internet. Could you just say how you think local partnership could be strengthened in terms across the piece in Croydon?

Gavin Swann (Head of Service for Children's Safeguarding, LB Croydon): Yeah, well I think there is something about --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): With other partners.

Gavin Swann (Head of Service for Children's Safeguarding, LB Croydon): -- meaningful joint assessments because we are all working with different thresholds, those thresholds are increasing, there is something about joint assessment work and that process of reflecting and working together not only for the process of assessment but also the intervention. Because it might be that that young person has a particular relationship with one professional person and will be able to engage with one of us, not necessarily all of us. It's how we support that one person to engage with that young person.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So the focus is on the young person and you involve all the agencies where appropriate. Okay. Right, sorry, Claire do you want to ...?

Claire Hubberstey (Chief Executive, Safer London Foundation): I would just echo what Gavin said in terms of the fluidity of London I think what we have in London is quite a unique position having worked nationally on missing and CSE if you look at Manchester young people unless they are being exploited by a group tend not to go outside of Manchester often they tend not even to go outside of their local area. The same if you are from Leeds you just wouldn't turn up in Manchester yet geographically in London that is completely different.

The nature of the city and the links between the different boroughs meaning that young people travel to school or college in a neighbouring borough and the amount of out of borough placements that we have means that we have a much more fluid movement of everybody but that includes young people. That presents particular challenges around this agenda in London and means even more so that we need a shared joint understanding around this particularly in terms of the risk and data as we've already said. I would say that in comparison to work done nationally London has a unique situation that we need to consider in that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Carlene.

Carlene Firmin (MsUnderstood Programme): Can I pick up a point there around relocation as well, the issue of relocation is a challenge across all the local authorities that we work on, all the relocating young people out and also receiving young people who they are then

having to manage the risk of in terms of their local CSE profile. A lot of the issues around relocation are linked to the fact that our systems generally respond to individuals to go back to the first point I made. Rather than what's been done to them, so we move that young person across schools, across areas, but the exploitation remains where they were so what we have is a victim vacuum that other young people fill and are then being exploited in the place of that young person.

That young person is then moved to another area and often exploited in the area they've been placed in because by moving them you strip them from all the protective factors that were around them like some of the positive relationships that they had, as well as the risk. Now sometimes relocation is essential and there is no getting around it but we have to match that with a response to the abuse that was occurring. All too often the relocation is the end point in terms of the safeguarding move and there is an assumption made that the risk has disappeared.

And what we have is just more young people falling into that gap and we need an alternative to relocation and support across boroughs when there is relocation happening and it is essential to really enter into a proper conversation about safety planning to ensure that the borough is notified, that the placement is safe, and that it is not escalating risk and at the moment boroughs continue to receive young people without appropriate notification or consideration of the risk of that placement.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So that is helpful so it's an understanding of the appropriate response to protect the child essentially. It doesn't necessarily mean relocation it's whatever is going to keep the young – but building on the positive relationships that the child has. Okay.

Lucy Botting, (Head of Quality and Regional lead for safeguarding, NHS England)

Sorry, and can I just concur with that because in terms of some of the serious case reviews that we see, some of the issues a lot of it is because the communication and therefore the data does not follow by borough, so in health it won't follow if you change practise or change health visitor, we hope it follows but I can't give you 100 percent we need to tighten up those systems because we do have great data, we just need to be clever and intelligent about a) how we use it and how it conjoins.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Any comments? Colleagues, no? Well, I guess we've had a – it's a very difficult subject and we've heard from a number of agencies obviously the voluntary sector doing some very important work defining excellent practice working with a lot of young people at risk. We've also got a corporate governance structure for London with the London Children's Safeguarding Board, the Metropolitan police service having both a local and a specialist response and importantly the roles of health and social services and recognising that data is, needs to be strengthened and understanding of this issue is critical and having the data presented in a way that is perhaps more standardised is the first point because there is a lack of awareness of this clearly.

And data is the start point. You've called for, all of you, in some ways greater pan London response and also very importantly a multi-agency approach, but I think I am left with the comment about MOPAC because MOPAC is after all the office that I've held for three years as deputy mayor but the idea of a MOPAC CSE ambition is very important indeed and that

ambition above all to protect young people is one that is most relevant for London. I want to thank everybody for coming here today.