

Date: Monday 27 February 2017

Location: Committee Room 5, City Hall

Hearing: JUSTICE MATTERS - Offender Management in London

Start time: 9.00am

Finish time: 10.30pm

Members:

Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, (Co-Chair)

Rebecca Lawrence, MOPAC Chief Executive Officer

Michael Lockwood, CEO Harrow Council, (Co-Chair)

Helga Swidenbank, Director of Probation, CRC

Kilvinder Vigurs, Deputy Director, NPS

Lucy Bogue, Deputy Director, Head of CRC Contract Management Group, NOMS

Martin Hewitt, Assistant Commissioner at the Metropolitan Police Service

David Reed, Chief Superintendent, Metropolitan Police Service

Chris Wright, Chief Executive, Catch 22

Patricia Cadden, NHS England

Catherine Briody, Victim and Offender Services Manager, Islington Council

Kuljit Sandhu, Managing Director, RISE Mutual CIC

Paula Harriott, Revolving Doors

Maureen Frazer, Service User (accompanied by Revolving Doors)

Gill Arukpe, Chief Executive, Penrose

Debra Levison, Senior Manager, GLA Housing

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Shall we start? Thank you very much for coming here today for one of the Justice Matters Sessions where we have called a meeting in public to publicly ... for the transparency and the important role of accountability and oversight that the mayor's office has around police and crime within London. Shall we just quickly introduce ourselves so everybody knows who is here? I am Sophie Linden. I am the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. Shall we go along because I ...

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive Officer) (MOPAC): I am Rebecca Lawrence. I am the Chief Executive of MOPAC.

Patricia Cadden (NHS England): Hi, I am Patricia Cadden. I am the head of the Health and Justice System Team in London and NHS England.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): So I am Mike Lockwood, Chief Executive of the London Borough of Harrow and I also have the lead on policing.

Catherine Briody (Victim and Offender Services Manager - Islington Council): I am Catherine Briody. I am Victim and Offender Services Manager, London Borough of Islington.

Chris Wright (Chief Executive Officer - Catch 22): I am Chris Wright, Catch 22 Chief Executive.

Maureen Frazer (Service User - Revolving Doors): I am Maureen Frazer. I have been invited by Revolving Doors as their service user representative.

Martin Hewitt (Assistant Commissioner - Metropolitan Police Service): I am Martin Hewitt. I am Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police and responsible for territorial policing.

David Reed (Chief Superintendent - Metropolitan Police Service): I am David Reed. I am part of the local policing programme in the Metropolitan Police's Change Programme.

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): I am Lucy Bogue and I am from the National Offender Management Service, soon to be HMPPS.

Debra Levison (Senior Manager - GLA Housing): I am Debra Levison from the Greater London Authority and I work on rough sleeping amongst other things.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): I am Kilvinder Vigurs. I am Deputy Director for the National Probation Service and I am responsible for London National Probation Service.

Kuljit Sandhu (Managing Director - RISE Mutual CIC): I am Kuljit Sandhu from RISE Mutual.

Gill Arukpe (Chief Executive Officer - Penrose): I am Gill Arukpe and I am the Chief Executive of Penrose, part of the Social Interest Group.

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): I am Helga Swidenbank from the London CRC.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much and thank you all for coming today. Mike is co-chairing today as well because I find with these sessions it is always good to have a voice other than MOPAC's asking some of the questions so thank you very much, Mike, for agreeing to do that.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Pleasure.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you also for attending and for your flexibility in attending this meeting at relatively short notice, so today we are going to look at offender management in London and this is alongside, as everybody round the table will know, a report from HMIP into the effectiveness of Probation in north London.

It was an important report and also one that requires an effective response by the CRC and the NPS and that is important. It is their response and the report for them but actually in order really to have real impact on offending under the new Police and Crime Plan, everybody is going to - partners included - is going to have to play their part in enabling that to happen so I really do want to sort of stress that I think today and future work, we need to make some recommendations to ensure the support the CRC and the NPS need whilst they also have their own role to play, is improved.

So the Police and Crime Plan ... we are out to consultation at the moment on the Police and Crime Plan. Actually it is the final week this week and we set out our vision of the Criminal Justice Service and we call it a service because we really want the Criminal Justice System to actually become a service which is there really to have the needs of victims at its heart but also ensure that in doing so we actually look at what the offenders need because really if you really are going to look at victims we have to think about reducing the numbers of victims and reducing repeat victimisation and that means reducing the number of offenders and repeat offending as well.

MOPAC have been working with the Female Offender Service and we have quite a lot of work around working together in partnership and the offender pilot as well on re-offending so we will go through some of that work this morning and look and one of the things I'd like to do this morning is to really understand what more needs to be done to try to bring down offending particularly around female offending and youth offending but actually also around prolific and persistent offenders which is an incredibly difficult one, especially when we look - and I know we will come on to this - look into some of the needs of the offenders and people coming out of prison or finishing their sentences.

So thank you for coming. I hope we will have a productive morning. It is only an hour and a half so I know we have got some slots for everybody but we do need to try to keep to time as well so I am just going to hand it over to Rebecca who is going to give us a presentation on offender management and the current picture in London.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive Officer) (MOPAC): Thank you, Sophie. I am just going to run through a few statistics and a few context-setting slides to tell you, to describe the issue that we are dealing with. As I say, the statistics do not provide a conclusive picture but do give us some context, so the first issue we will look at in the first part of this meeting is why re-offending matters to London so here are some of the headline statistics so the current joint National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company caseload is around 45,000 offenders. London has got the highest percentage of offenders compared to any other area in England and Wales. We have got 17% nationally and it is very costly, re-offending, both to society and to organisations.

This next slide comes from a piece of joint work that a number of our organisations were involved with about 18 months ago which was a real look at the cost to different organisations across the Criminal Justice System in London of re-offending and of course, that is the financial cost, it is not the social cost so we found that 69% of the total spend of our organisations went on tackling re-offending and we also found that there are a large number of organisations involved, some of which have small spend but very significant as a proportion of their activity. So, although this is a busy slide, it shows that tackling this issue is really core to managing the financial cost but also the social cost and harm that re-offending gives and it also shows that we really need a partnership approach across all the organisations there at the bottom in order to improve the picture.

This slide shows the adult re-offending rate of London and nationally. Both have fallen in recent years. That is pleasing - if you see from about 2012-13 down but they are consistently between 23% and 25%. The peaks and troughs nationally are reflected in the London rate.

Here, if we move on, this compares the average number of re-offences per offender in London and nationally so although re-offending is falling slightly, the number of offences that those people commit is increasing so you have fewer people but individually, they are committing more crimes. This shows if we have a really targeted approach to get under the skin of what is going on for those individuals we might have a chance of better success so let us look at the current approach and some of the challenges within the current approach and forgive me, because I will be presenting data about your organisations which I know is a picture that you are very, very familiar with and I know that you will each be speaking to what we are doing about that so here is a slide. It is a busy slide and you will not need to look fully at the detail here. These slides are available on the website, though, but this shows down the list, down there are all the different areas of England and Wales and the performance of Community Rehabilitation Company on each of those areas.

It shows of the 20 measures there, the London CRC is below the national average on 17 of them. On the left-hand side, that shows the areas where London is falling behind, so initial offender contact, prioritisation of unpaid work, completion of sentence in the court, contracted delivery of unpaid work ... you can read down there and the colours in the slide, obviously that is describing the fact that London, which is the horizontal line there across in the middle, has more reds than other parts of the country.

Here we see the same with the National Probation Service, so again, London has some pleasingly good performance in some areas - you will see the green, but it has lower performance in some areas, particularly pre-sentence report, allocation timeliness, initial contact, referral quality, quality assurance and parole process but London is the best performer

of all the NPS divisions on some key areas, particularly completion of Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders and completion of licences and post-sentence supervision.

As Sophie said in the introduction, we have had an HMIP report which is a while ago now and I know a huge programme of work has been put in place addressing its recommendations but just for the spirit of completeness, here is a summary here of the key inspection judgements around performance of the London CRC and the National Probation Service and the integration of the two so we are looking forward later in this meeting to hear about the progress on the needed improvements in London which the inspectors said must commence straight away and I know, as I have said, there has been a vigorous programme of work.

So here is further detail on the overall recommendations again which summarises, and I know we will have a response to those. HMIC, the police inspectorate, also in its Peel Report, brought out conclusions for the Metropolitan Police and this is a summary again - I will not be reading it out verbatim, but it summarises the sections on offender management and repeat offenders, those sections that are most relevant today. Again, it points to the need for a consistent approach to integrated offender management.

This is a busy area of work in terms of policy reform and I am sure colleagues around the table will highlight that so we have the Ministry of Justice, its prison reform agenda, the draft legislation of last week. There is an ongoing review of the Probation Service, the Community Rehabilitation Company is working on their 20/20 vision and the Metropolitan Police has a considerable programme of transformation and our aim here collectively will be to make sure that all of those reform programmes can make progress in a way that is going to achieve a real improvement in outcomes.

Now we thought we would look very briefly at the type of people we are talking about who become offenders, who become repeat offenders and what the data shows us, imperfect though it is, about their needs. So needs are different and re-offending patterns are different for different types of cohorts. If you look at the chart there on the left, it shows the re-offending rates from different groups of cohorts: we have got the transition cohort, we call them, the sort of 18 to 20 year olds, young adults, a slightly broader group, 18 to 24, female offenders and youths.

It shows that with the exception of female offenders, all those other priority groups of offenders have higher re-offending rates in London compared to England and Wales and youth, in particular, at that 43% has a higher rate than the 38% of England and Wales. If you look at the right, that also shows what happens with the disposals, compliance with the disposals granted to each group and this is a conclusion that will not be a surprise to those round the table - people who receive custody sentences of less than 12 months have a higher re-offending rate than those with longer sentences and in fact, those with less than a year's sentence have re-offending rates of almost 60% and it shows if we really got some targeted action into those type of groups, we can make significant progress.

This is data, again it is just illustrative, I know people will have a real granular view on what the needs are of offenders, but pulling off from the NPS and the CRC caseload data of reported needs of those re-offenders, it shows a significant number (91%, more than significant) are classified from those systems as having a thinking need around cognitive skills and 69% around

attitude. Men and boys have more needs across the board, particularly in their lifestyle, drugs and attitude and young women, girls and older women have more emotional needs than men.

For younger offenders, employment, finance and lifestyle are really key and there is a difference there with ethnicity that is pulled out, with BAME offenders have fewer alcohol and emotional needs but more financial needs than white offenders and for those prolific offenders it is clear they have got more multiple needs, you know, many of these needs occurring for individuals.

That is the context setting and really the platform for discussions for particular organisations. Thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much, Rebecca. So we will just move on to get some responses to that presentation from the three statutory organisations round the table. First of all from Helga on the Community Rehabilitation Company and we have had discussions already and we have seen today, you know, a very critical report but also in the meetings that myself and the Metropolitan Police have been doing going around every London Borough I have to say this raised with us nearly consistently around the offender management and what an impact that is having in the community so I would be really grateful if you could set up how you are responding to that report but also how you are responding to some of the specific needs that are highlighted.

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): Thank you very much. So as we have already mentioned, the HMIP report for London CRC was very critical and certainly London CRC has not shied away from the challenges that we knew we faced prior to the inspection report but that were also highlighted in detail by the report. So what I intend to do is go through some themes but also then talk about the recommendations and some of we are doing in response to those recommendations.

So London CRC is implementing a comprehensive change plan which you spoke to on the slides which we are calling Ambition 20/20. The Plan includes our response to the HMIP recommendations but also it acknowledges that we inherited a legacy of poor performance within London CRC and some of the positions we took when we deployed the matrix cohort model, whilst well intentioned, exposed and compounded some of those pre-existing performance concerns.

The change plan that we have devised actively puts service users' needs at the heart of our work and ensures compliance with sentences of court, public protection and reducing re-offending. We have a robust, business-approved project plan that oversees the change plan, we have strict internal governance arrangement and we are also working very closely with our commissioners, NOMS, to ensure that we are meeting those objectives.

The change plan not only oversees business as usual but also ensures that the new work we are doing is properly coordinated and is focused on delivering our approved services. Themes of the change plan include a new leadership structure, an operational reorganisation, redefining some of our teams and our service delivery, introducing a new quality assurance framework and also initiating a significant recruitment campaign.

So there were nine primary recommendations that came out of the inspection report. The first two touched on the relationship between London CRC and the NPS. We absolutely acknowledge that there was an adverse impact that the cohort model had on our relationship with the NPS and the mismatch of our operator model and that of the NPS caused a number of things to fall through the net.

We have a new operating model which is much more aligned to an area-based structure and which we absolutely believe will allow the communication between the NPS and London CRC staff to be improved. To support that, both the MPS and CRC staff have access to an online staff directory which gives people numbers and details and names and responsibilities so it will be much easier for people to contact colleagues within both organisations and for stakeholders and service users our external website will have locations of offices, telephone numbers of key staff, that kind of thing.

The second recommendation was that the CRC and the NPS should require all staff to work together to solve individual problems and focus on desired outcomes. The London CRC is reviewing the existing interface between us and the NPS and we are both working together to make sure that the work we are doing collectively is working in the right direction, so we are also working with the MOJ to review our Service Integration Group and a number of recommendations have come out of the recent report for that. We have also identified a senior management to liaise with the NPS to discuss and resolve joint concerns around things like court allocations, inadequate information for court enforcement and risk escalation and we are working with staff lower down the organisation to produce a joint quality assurance tool.

The third recommendation was that London CRC should make sure that all functional departments prioritise operation delivery to service users. London CRC has adopted a new model which is easily understood and transparent and is based in communities and it is very much a community delivery model which I will talk about in a moment so from January, service users have been moved to and managed by a location-based community team in the areas where they live. The 32 London Boroughs will be organised into 5 London CRC geographical areas, each with similar caseloads, headed up by an area manager. Each area manager will have around eight SPOs leading these local teams and they will ensure clear lines of accountability and direct lines of management, from service users to offender managers to area managers and to myself.

One of the criticisms of the inspection report were high caseloads and that the caseloads in the ... and what we are doing by reorganising our structure from the cohort model to the geographical model will allow us to realign caseloads. The caseloads will be organised into women's and male services. Each geographical office will also have a dedicated women's team and each geographical area will have a support team, not just of operational staff but also of a quality assurance member of staff, the intervention of the pathway member of staff and a contracts and partnerships member of staff and we believe that the locally-based staff teams will be able to facilitate better connectivity with local Boroughs and services and community partners and stakeholders, thereby picking up the concerns that Sophie raised earlier.

The fourth recommendation was that London CRC should obtain and regularly scrutinise relevant management information to support operational delivery. London CRC had already identified gaps in management reporting across the organisation, resulting in part from some of the difficulties of the matrix model. We have a newly focused business improvement team

which are collating and disseminating weekly MI reports and we are sharing these with our commissioner. We also have a quality dashboard which enables us to measure caseloads and the quality of the information coming through to us.

The fifth recommendation was that London CRC should make every effort to reduce caseloads to management levels, steering clear priorities of casework, casework activities so as I said, we were very conscious of the disproportionate caseloads. We had some very high caseloads at the time of inspection and some very low caseloads; again, an unintended consequence of the cohort model. Is it our intention that by May 2017 the average caseload will be 55 across London and to help support this we have introduced a workload management tool which will allow us to track and monitor this. Also to support this, we are actively recruiting for Probation officers, PSOs and other support staff.

The sixth recommendation was that London CRC should manage the impact of sick absence effectively. Like many organisations, sick absences is a significant challenge for us. To support the management of that challenge, we have instigated a Managing Attendance Committee and we are reviewing our managing attendance policy. We also have MI status support of what we are doing and what I am able to report is that there has been a significant reduction in sick absence from the time of the inspection to now in London CRC.

The seventh recommendation was that London CRC should provide all staff with supervision and support in accordance with experience and workload. Through our performance and assurance framework we have monthly supervision templates for our senior probation officers and our offender managers. We hold monthly accountability meetings with all of our staff, feeding into an accountability with deputy directors and myself and we have instigated a twice-yearly case dip sample assessment where each offender manager's cases will be dip sampled by a senior practitioner not in their line.

The eighth recommendation was that London CRC should procure sufficient resources within the supply chain to deliver consistent services to all service users. It is our view that the operational restructure, with its dedicated, area-based contract managers in each of the five areas, will help support this.

Then the final recommendation was that London CRC should provide a rate card to the NPS without delay. That was a joint recommendation for ourselves, NPS and NOMS. The contract year 3 rate card has been signed off and I am presenting the contents of that to Kilvinder and her team in March and we are beginning to have conversations about the contract year 4 rate card and what that will look like.

So your question regarding what we need from partners, I think probably - and I know we've tested the patience of partners considerably over the last 12 months - really kind of an understanding that we are going through a significant amount of change. I had a very productive meeting last week with partners, both from London councils and from the MET where we through our new model, talked about our ambitions and were able to introduce partners to some of our key staff in those area positions and really the message to them was we know we had made some mistakes when we implemented the new model - sorry, the cohort model. We have learnt from those and we are re-establishing ourselves back in areas, however, the other message was it can not be the way it was so we are not replicating the old London Probation Trust model and so my kind of request for partners is that we engage in a

conversation about what the future looks like and how we can work productively with you to ensure that we all meet our common objectives.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. Thank you very much. There is a lot in that and a lot of really useful detail around how you responded to the recommendations. The really key issue which I am sure we will come onto is how we as partners and ourselves as MOPAC understand what the outcomes are of the considerable work you are putting in and also how quickly we should be able to expect the outcomes and how that has affected partnership work and I am sure Mike will have some questions about that later.

If could just go on to Kilvinder in terms of the National Probation Service. Again, another report which had a couple of, you know, good news stories within it. It also had some critical bits around lower performance and in particular on pre-sentence reports which can be incredibly important in terms of offender management and ensuring the right support is there so I would be grateful if you could just touch on how you are responding on that.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Okay. Before I do that, I do need to comment on the data that was produced for the National Probation performance - partly that it was dated at September. If the January data would have been taken off the website, it would have shown a much improved organisation and it is data that is about trajectory so it was taken at a moment in time but actually looking at where we are getting to by April, so in terms of the data, I will not go down but it is much improved and the vast majority have gone beyond the targets or about to meet them in the next two months so I think that is really important that I set that out, given that it is a public meeting.

In terms of the actual HMIP report, I do not know if it is worth just taking a moment to explain how actually the National Probation Service and the CRC, whilst often grouped together as Probation providers we are very, very different organisations and have different delivery models and work closely where there are some interface points.

So the National Probation Service is responsible for writing the pre-sentence reports to judges and magistrates to aid the independent sentences of offenders and we interface with those sentences. We also provide offender management for all high risk or serious harm cases on community or prison licences and all those cases that fall under the map of statutory and so the interface there with the CRC ... it obviously appears ours is the allocation, a timely allocation, CRC risk escalation process and actually (inaudible) interventions which you've already talked about so I will not go into that so in terms of our HMIP report, to focus on that, so I do not want to repeat Helga's parts where she has already supported around the work we are doing to improve our interface and actually that is supported by NOMS in terms of an Assurance Board that we present to and talk about how we are improving that.

The issues around, if you want to focus on the courts, so we have done a huge recruitment drive, probably looking at ... we are just January, February, it takes about three to six months to train the staff to work in courts so if you think we are only in February, we have got probably 50% of the staff we need. As you all know, it is very hard to recruit and retain staff in London but we are at that point so we have got a separate court delivery plan, which it is not just about what HMIP say, it is actually what we see across the board, that we need some places for improvement so there is a number of mandatory training that we have put in place for all staff.

I will just take a breath so that I ... speed through this. One of the key areas for a performance that is not mentioned here is actually the feedback from the sentences because they are our key customers in this and actually we have constantly got high levels of positive indicators from them. What we do need to do is be able to provide timely reports and where partners could support that is providing safeguarded information to allow us to do quicker assessments, to get quicker allocation, get the right cases to the CRCs, keep the cases in MPS that are about high risk and actually propose the right intervention so there is no to-ing and fro-ing back to courts and organisations.

In terms of the recommendations for NPS, so you have picked up the issue around the quality of information regarding court, the courts. The other things was about making sure that our staff were sufficiently focused on public protection so one of the important news items for the National Probation Service is we are developing an Effective Practice Division which will focus primarily on things like the oasis quality. I think that is one of the areas of work that London Probation do need to work on. Again, it is about once we have recruited people and trained people, keeping them in London so that we are not having to keep training new people in so there is a lot of work we are doing, really, around training people to do quality risk assessments which feed into your needs assessments.

The better our assessments are, the better the commissioning abilities are. So in terms of what partners can do -- and one of the other areas that I should mention, that the National Probation Service provides interventions for sex offenders as well - often something that is missed off, so partners, yes, providing information on risk and safeguarding at the earliest opportunity, supporting interventions around mental health, mental health treatment requirements is something that London does not actually provide a lot of, learning disabilities, things that are in the Police and Crime Draft Plan, housing, employment and training and drugs and alcohol so I am doing a quick run to try and catch up some of the time but happy to be open to more questions.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. Thank you very much. I think I would like to come back to this issue about making sure all work is focused on public protection, because I think, you know, in terms of impact on the community who I would say are the absolute key customers in the work that you are doing, you know, if there is an issue around public protection that is incredibly worrying and you have talked about training but I would like to understand how that is managed and what the outcomes are around that.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Sorry, you said there is a particular issue - what is that?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): You have talked about public ... the National Probation Service, one of the inspection recommendations was make sure that all work is sufficiently focused on public protection. You talked about training to make sure that happens. Again, it is back to what impact has that training had and what the outcomes are and therefore what the risk is that you are actually managing and mitigating.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): I think it is worth saying --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Can we ... we will come back to that.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Oh, sorry, I thought you were asking me the question.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): No, we will come back to that.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): That is fine.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. So the next one is the Metropolitan Police Service and Martin Hewitt in terms of your response to the Peel inspections and in particular, need for consistency and a consistent approach across the Metropolitan Police on offender management.

Martin Hewitt (Assistant Commissioner - Metropolitan Police Service): I mean ... the sort of comments from the inspection are relatively limited. I think I would accept that one of our challenges is getting consistency across the 32 Boroughs and as you aware, we have a programme or a plan to reduce the number of Boroughs that I think will help us there.

I think it is worth just emphasising the sort of range of activity that we undertake in relation to offender management and I do think one of the things that would be really helpful coming out of today would be for us to be really clear how we are defining the parameters of what we mean when we talk about offender management because certainly for ourselves on each of the Boroughs there will be activity that is directly around the Integrated Offender Management work. We obviously do the work around MAPPAs and our Jigsaw Teams specifically and then we have the work that is done with the Youth Offending Teams and in addition and over and above that within the Trident world and the gang cohort, Operation Boa is a particular piece of work looking at gang members who are coming out of prison.

We have the domestic abuse work that we do under Operation Dauntless which is focusing particularly at the most dangerous domestic abuse offenders and obviously there is the prevent activity as well. I mean, our role primarily is around providing intelligence to support the system and obviously then an enforcement role when people are breaching any orders with obviously the exception of RSOs who are out of their licence period and we take a bigger role with those.

I think one of the challenges for me is there are mixed criteria that gets someone onto each of these different cohorts which I think creates some challenge into the system. We have put together a Governance Board around Integrated Offender Management and we are working quite close to getting to a performance management framework which I think is important but as the presentation at the outset demonstrated, I think it's probably unhelpful that we all individually have performance management frameworks that are not necessarily kind of coherent or integrated and again, that may be a bit of work that we maybe want to work through.

I mean, I have got ... I think the data around our workloads is fairly well known. For me the big challenges that we face and we are trying to deal with are those issues of inconsistency which I

would absolutely accept. There is a challenge about resourcing, the model and the various elements of the model and we need to just be honest about that. We have done it in many places. In other places we haven't achieved that and I think that point about a performance management framework that is effective is really important.

As we go forward to the BCUs, there will be a very specific offender management function in the modelling within the concept of Basic Command Units which will be lead and owned by one of the detective superintendents. There is some debate that we still have going on internally as to whether that sits in the safeguarding or re-investigation and I think there are pros and cons to both of those which we could perhaps explore if we wanted to and each of the BCUs would have a dedicated detective inspector looking at that.

One of the other issues, of course, is one of the ... there are two issues about getting it outside just those officers that are specifically doing these roles. One is making sure that everyone understands their responsibilities around offender management but also it is managing some of the workload and so we are looking at, particularly with the rollout of dedicated ward officers and the officers that will work directly with young people, where there are opportunities for them to be utilised in some of the roles that at the moment we keep quite tight and you will probably recall from the child protection inspection that HMIC did, one of their points there was about registered sex offenders and the level of knowledge outside so I think there is a debate to be had around that.

So I think generally I think it is how we line up with other ... and we are working with Helga around the changes around CRC. It came out last week, did it not, at the events, about you not having a specific Integrated Offender Management element and I understand the rationale for that but I think we need to work through that. I think the biggest issue for me is collectively us agreeing when we say offender management what we think is in the scope of that activity so that we are all focused around that and then getting ourselves to a kind of unified performance framework management or performance management framework, even, that is really focusing our activities on those things that are going to give us the biggest response and I think, you know, the slide that was there that showed the sort of disproportionality and re-offending, particularly around young people, is something that I would be very keen for us to be focusing on. Is that okay?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. Thank you, that is very helpful. We talked a little bit already about outcomes and performance and you are talking about, you know, longer term performance management of some integration and the importance of that.

Helga, you have set out a lot of work in terms of putting things right where things had gone badly wrong. How long do you think it will take for us to see improvements and also there is an issue for me about transparency and accountability around that because it is very difficult at the moment to really understand what they outcomes are and really drill down where there is effective practice?

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): Okay, so I think probably it is worth just remembering that Transforming Rehabilitation was deliberately disruptive and I think that was the purpose of the entire initiative and that the aim was to revolutionise the delivery of

reducing offending services to offenders and we have certainly been in the middle of that revolution and I just wanted to reflect on the National Audit Office report about transformative change in 2015 which talks about it being the greatest risk of failure but we also need to be realistic about the pace of change and certainly for London, I think this year, 2017, is around just establishing good practice and making sure that we are really rooting ourselves back into doing ... getting the basics right, so I would be really cautious about being overly optimistic about our ability to deliver excellent performance, which is absolutely my ambition for London, that we deliver excellent performance and then beyond that, going into 2018, 2019 and 2020 we would like to see a gradual progression into improved performance.

The other contextual comment worth making is that we are in the middle of the Probation System Review which is looking at service-level measures, it is looking at revenue and it is looking at how we are measured, so what we are being measured on now may not necessarily be what we are being measured on in 6, 12 months time and I think Lucy is going to be speaking to that later, so that probably speaks to your question around transparency but we are very transparent with our commissioners and we meet with them frequently, we share all of our performance data with them and I know that we have had conversations about how we might extend that to MOPAC.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): That is a key issue for us, is it not, around that transparency because the commissioners are national commissioners, in the Ministry of Justice, not London commissioners or even transparency down to local authority level where the real impact being felt and we do need to ... we have had those discussions but it is actually really crucial we have that transparency and accountability, London-wide, that actually, not just for ... you know, MOPAC can have sight of but I think local authorities need sight of as well because they are feeling that impact locally. Can I ask the same question of you, Kilvinder, in terms of when you expect to see changes to the outcomes and how we get some transparency around that?

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): I suppose what I was thinking is that the work of when Martin talked about MAPPa and actually the HMIP report was very limited, it was very ... but I want to be able to see all the Boroughs in terms of performance so the transparency is around the outcomes of our multi-agency public protection work and there needs to be more work around the audit and quality around that process, rather than the procedural, target-driven audits that we do so in terms of our organisation and the Strategic Management Board, I think there needs to be a lot more accountability to that board which is multi-agency, represented across the board in relation to local authorities, other organisations.

I think I would like to see more accountability for our public protection outcomes within that because that is about managing the high risk and sexual offenders so I think we could do a lot more work in terms of the performance data around that, Martin, I think, and I also think it would help us to define, again just picking up on Martin saying defining the offender management model, so I suppose I am really thinking about this because yes, we are taking people through recruitment, training, getting them better at filling in forms so that we can pass audits but actually, what we want to see is that we already have really good compliance with our service users but the outcomes around reducing victimisation, reducing harm, I don't have the answer in terms of how we ... you know, I think I went to a meeting that Samantha was chairing

in relation to how do we manage success for that cohort and I think it is about tracking those people.

Reconviction rates for high risk of serious harm people is different from reconviction rates for general offending so they look at the two year, so we are in a position in the NPS in terms of looking at our public protection data, I think it has to be cohort driven. I think we have to watch these people, particularly around domestic abuse, MARAC, victimisation, so I think we and that is the collective, to look at the outcomes following cohorts and I would like to do some work around that with the re-offending board with MOPAC to see how we can do that.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): So when do you expect, you know, in terms of --

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Well, that is how long is a piece of string, so ...

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): So we have the getting the basics right from the CRC which ... would be good but you know, in terms of the inspection report and improvement on the inspection report, when would you expect to see those improvements? I can see there is longer term work that needs to happen.

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Yes, so in terms of seeing the performance improve, all things being equal, having the staff staying, I would say within six months we should see improvement, but that is, you know, all the stars coming into alignment.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Mike, do you want to ...

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Maybe just an observation first of all from what Rebecca said is to me is the cost of re-offending to the Criminal Justice System which was quite a surprise to me in terms of 2.25 billion and the amount of time, 69% of our time is spent on that area. That was point one.

The second point was also, I think you alluded to that the idea of a targeted approach, I think, really comes out in terms of focusing on the youth re-offending and looking at individuals in custody for less than 12 months. I think you must not lose that when we come back to our conclusion but the question I was going to ask, and I am very grateful to Helga, because we met a week or so ago and I may have misunderstood this, but the contract you have to abide by, I understand is nationally commissioned by NOMS?

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): Yes.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): I got the sense that it was not specific to London, that it was more a national ... and I would argue that the needs of London may be different for other parts of the country and just also alluding to what Martin said about you had not got any requirement provision in terms of IOM so I am trying to understand, who decides that contract and the provisions in it and the priorities with it would be a really ... because I am not sure they necessarily reflect what is important to London as opposed to the rest of the country?

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Do you want me to answer that, as I am the one that decides the contract?

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Yes.

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): I mean, not being specific to London, I mean, the contract sets out what we want from all our suppliers to deliver the order of the court or to deliver services, the sentence of the court within the community and there are generic service levels and I will talk a little bit more about that when we come to the PSR but if we wanted to put some specific services in for London which we actually have done with MOPAC about Gripping the Offender or other stuff, we are able to do that so it is about really understanding what London needs that we do not think the rest of the country needs.

If it is specifically about housing or accommodation or employment for London, then come and talk to us, as you already have done over some of the work that you are doing with us but we do have a offer that we expect everybody to deliver and we would not want London to do anything less than that. We would love them to do more.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): So in terms of putting the contract again, you would welcome comments from MOPAC, councils etc about what would be important in that contract?

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Yes. I mean, we have made a commitment through the minister and through the Deputy Mayor to be working closely with MOPAC and if you can come to us to say, "Actually, I think we ought to be doing something slightly different to London" but I have got to be really clear that the ... London need to be delivering the order of the court, what is being ... they need to make sure that offenders in their care deliver the sentence of the court and I cannot get away from that. I could not suddenly say, "You can not deliver that". Whether you are in London or in Northumberland, you still need to be doing that. You need to be engaging properly. You need to be enforcing the sentence. You need to be breaching appropriately. These are all of the things that you need to do.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Can I just ... Helga, I mean, first of all, I think historically we have become more disengaged as partners and I am pleased you are now moving back to more local type models and as Sophie mentioned earlier, there have been some issues and criticisms from councils - you have probably heard them - about that engagement so I am really pleased we are moving to an area manager-type approach but what will that mean further down the system in terms of sort of MASHs and some of the infrastructure? What would that relationship look like in your new model?

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): Yes, so what I would anticipate is that our area managers get closer to local council colleagues, get closer to colleagues in the police force and really understand what the really local requirement is and what we can do to ensure that we are redacting our services to meet those so rather than having a generic "This is what

we will do across London” we have that local conversation so as Lucy has spoken about, we have contractual obligations to deliver certain contractual inputs and outputs.

At the moment we also have a payment by results mechanism so when we are looking at how we might want to reinvest or invest our resource into activity, we would be wanting to look to investing resource into activity that works and these are some of the messages we talked about, some of the things we talked about last week so where we know, for example, IOM is working in a particular Borough of course we would want to invest in that and so on so those would be some of the decisions that we will be making.

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Sorry, I would like to actually just come back because it is a public meeting and just to confirm, London has a London contract so it is not a national contract, it is a London-particular contract that has got a number of generic national obligations in it and also the contract does not stop local delivery in any of our regions so it does not prevent delivery-specific services being delivered within London.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): All I am reacting to is the fact ... I think Martin ... there was no IOM provision within this contract which was quite a surprise to me in the context of what we are trying to achieve and I just, really, to understand how that came about and what involvement there were from partners into that contract.

Kuljit Sandhu (Managing Director - RISE Mutual CIC): It is approach, is it not? It depends on the approach and London and CRC have decided to have an approach to dealing with offender management within a framework, a contract framework, so that is your decision, is it not, on how you deliver a CRC model?

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): I think without wanting to kind of go into the nuts and bolts of the contract, the contract is pretty generic around delivery of IOM so it does not specifically say, “You must do X, Y and Z” and that was the point we were making at the meeting last week and what I was saying earlier about asking our area managers to meet with local authorities and to meet with the police and identify how we can help support that is certainly our intention.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): I think ... did you want to come in? Just on the London contract issue and I appreciate, Lucy, that you are from the Ministry of Justice and it is a London contract but it is a London contract that is managed nationally and of course, our position from MOPAC and the Mayor’s Office is actually it is a contract that should be managed - at the very least co-commissioned but actually managed by London and as London as a region which is about devolution away from national management and I think that is where we do need to get to get that transparency and accountability but accountability, it is not ... it is absolutely crucial because it is from a London region with the London specifics that we can do from the mayoralty and also with local authorities that you will really make, you know, actually provide the services that London needs and that is a real issue for us with the way the contracts are managed and I appreciate that that is not your position to comment on that but I do feel I need to say that. Martin, do you want to ...

Martin Hewitt (Assistant Commissioner - Metropolitan Police Service): It was just really to make the point, I mean, I think that everyone accepts that IOM as a concept and certainly the discussions that we've had with CRC, you know, where that is a method that is applicable but of course these things work on that direct relationship and that dedicated staff and the challenge that Helga has got is that that ... the plan does not give you the staff to service that in the way ... and of course, one of the challenges around London and I think one of the reasons that we look as we look on a whole range of things is because we are doing that 32 times with the Boroughs and the police at the moment and it is exactly the same in child protection. They are not volumes that you are having to deal with in other places so to really integrate offender management with us is times 32 which is not provisioned for currently in the kind of resource level and I think that is the issue.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. Can I just ask about the interface between the NPS and the CRC and how that works and where there is room for improvement in that because there is obviously very clear parameters but there are movements of, I think particularly from the CRC into the NPS, of offenders. Can I ask you both in terms of improvements in how you work together?

Helga Swidenbank (Director of Probation - CRC): Okay, so there are obviously informal relationships at various levels of the organisation which Kilvinder and I are working on strengthening and then there are the more formal relationships so we have formal meeting structures which we are currently revising and working out whether or not they are fit for purpose and they are doing the job that they need to do and then there is the activity which is a kind of transactional activity, so for example how we allocate offenders from ... service users from CRC to NPS and vice versa and that is all being scrutinised on the back of the HMIP report.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Kilvinder, do you want to add that?

Kilvinder Vigurs (Deputy Director - NPS): Yes, just to say that I think there has been significant changes and we are looking at restructuring so we are looking at local problem solving, you know, less formal meetings but just ... and then an escalation process that brings it up directly to us so we do not wait months to find out there is a problem so I think we are already working on that and developing a thematic task and finish groups for senior leaders, whether it be about enforcement or unpaid work etc so we are putting some structures in place but also some dotted lines in place but very much an escalation process as well.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Lucy, did you want to say anything else about the Probation review ...

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Do you want me to do that now?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Yes, that would be helpful.

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): I was going to talk a little bit about the Probation review and also about the bill that went through. Yes, so I mean, one of the bits about actually, what will it feel for London, I think the bits that we are going to see and notice in London is the

bill sets out a really clear system of accountabilities for prisons and actually it sets out, or enshrines in law, the purpose of prison is to reform and rehabilitate and that is the first time, actually, that that has happened and it is a real change of focus from punishment to reform.

It is actually going to be supported by a new framework which will include some standards but also league tables so that London are going to know exactly what is happening within London. I mean, it is driving towards more about that transparency and accountability. Governors taking control and taking control of some of their budget, so I mean, you know, use education as an example, actually which gives them the freedom and the flexibility to work with local partners and to make decisions about actually what is happening within their jails. A strengthened role from HMIP and the PPO, so that is some of the sort of stuff that the bill does.

I mean, it goes on a lot more and talks about flexibility of the courts and victims but I think for the prisons ... the other bit that the Secretary of State has spoken a lot about and it has been well published over the last 3 to 4 months about the instability within the prison system actually as a whole, I am bringing in 2,500 new staff, the training has started specifically around health and really mental health and the need to create some more senior positions, to be paying prison officers more in those senior positions, so really to be trying to do stuff that brings a bit more stability to the system and to have an increased level of staffing.

So actually for me to go on a little bit about Probation System Review – and Helga has talked about that already – there is not a huge amount that I can say because we are in the middle of our commercial discussions with suppliers and we do need to let that land before we come out and say: “actually, what is it that we want to change”, but be clear that the review is looking at all aspects of Probation delivery. I think the bit about what does it mean for London, so what is the interesting bit for London, I mean, Helga talked a little bit about the payment mechanism and resource flowing in but actually we are looking at that through-the-gate service, the resettlement service and whether the resettlement service that we originally commissioned was fit for purpose and did it do the stuff that we thought we wanted suppliers to do?

So we are looking much more at enhancing that service and also holding suppliers to account for less of the sort of process-driven service levels which were the bits that you looked up on the screen, much more into the outcome targets that I think that you will be more interested in so we are still having to go through about what that means but I mean, the obvious ones that you would expect around employment and housing and sort of progress ... travelled so how has the offender done not only from coming out of prison but for months onwards, so we are still having to land all of that which is why I can not give clarity about what it is actually going to be.

In the same way as prisons, the Secretary of State is really keen that we have a clearer, simpler system, with some very specific outcome measures so the review is due to complete in April and then when it has done we will be able to come out and give a little bit more detail.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. I am sorry, I am just slightly asking Rebecca this, there is a review in terms of following on the Probation report of the CRC, the London CRC and then there is a national Probation Service review?

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Yes, it is called Probation System Review.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): What input does MOPAC have in to that National Probation Service review because I understand there is commercial sensitivities with the contract, however going back to my previous comments about who knows London and who, you know, who has a real grip on understanding London needs, how are you taking the views of MOPAC, the Mayor's Office, local authorities, London councils into that before you do come out in April?

Lucy Bogue (Deputy Director - NOMS): Yes, so you have had a couple of conversations, I know, with the minister where you have spoken about some of your concerns about London and your thoughts and views so all of that contributes. Really happy to have further conversations either with you or with your officials about the types of things that we are discussing.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): That would be very helpful, because obviously discussions with the ministers are very high-level ones and it is getting down to the detail which would be important in terms of if we can get MOPAC input into that review in good time before it comes out in April that would be very helpful. Thank you. Did you have anything else?

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): No, that's fine.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Are you sure?

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. All right. We are going to move on to the second part of the discussion because there is obviously very helpful and useful discussion around your statutory responsibilities and improvements that are going to be made there but there is obviously, and as we have said already, yes, there is ... very important that the statutory sector is improving and making progress as quickly as possible and that can be done only to some extent but it does need some partnership supporting and partnership help in doing that.

Chris, at the other end, from Catch 22, I was wondering if you might be able to give us your organisation's perspective on the challenges in offender management and how we improve the management of offenders? Thank you.

Chris Wright (Chief Executive Officer - Catch 22): Catch 22 is a supply chain partner to the CRC delivering through the gate services in London but we also run employability, skills, children in social care, mental health-type services. I think we welcome the focus around accountabilities and I think the Probation Systems Review is interesting in its focus on outcomes. It is not rocket science. The things that you need to do to stop people offending are pretty well evidenced. People need somewhere decent to live, they need something useful to do and they tend to need a network of people around them who can support them. I think as we have built more complicated systems over the years we have thrown out of the window some of the basics which were around casework and we are very strong advocates of the need for a model based on relational continuity where you can get alongside people and help people

navigate their way through the complexity of their lives and those are the kind of arguments that we put forward to our partners.

I think it is also fair to say that of course there are challenges around access to resources but I do not believe that the resources are not necessarily there. I think we need to be much better at developing a more coherent approach to unlocking the capacity that exists out there than we currently do, so Michael's point around community and I think ... and Helga's reorganisation around community is absolutely fundamental to this. And when we talk about capacity we are not just talking about capacity provided by the public purse. I think we need to think about capacity that exists in people themselves. The city has something like 17,000 special constables which is, I think, an illustration of the contribution that people, community members, volunteers can make to the system.

I think there is foundations, there are social investors and what we are not very good at is bringing a collective approach to accessing the capacity that lies out there and there are models in the States, in particular. There is a framework called Collective Impact which has been used to effect significant reductions in re-offending in New York around young offenders by simply unlocking capability, so ... employers. I think employability is not necessarily ... access to employment is not a fundamental problem, sustaining employment is a problem and that can be supported by good quality casework to help people sustain their employment opportunities.

I think there is more the Mayor can do around bringing employers to the fore. I think we could have a more coherent approach to how the 106 monies are spent so I think the argument is that there is a huge amount of energy, activity, capability, resource, but we are not very good at unlocking it in a coherent way and you will get pockets of brilliance and excellence and people doing lots of good things together. I think we need to lift ourselves above it a bit and try and pull together a more collective approach, and as I said, there are frameworks available which have been proven to be successful in doing that but all of that has to be underpinned by high-quality casework, based on the idea of an effective relationship which can enable somebody to navigate through their difficulties. Thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much and thanks for reminding us that actually, this is not, in your phrase "rocket science" and it is getting the basics right and I think it is a challenge back to possibly MOPAC in terms of looking at how we do bring together employers and have that influencing to do that. We have certainly started the conversations on the foundations in terms of trying to unlock capacity and trying to sort of align whilst obviously recognising independence there. Thank you.

I was wondering, Maureen, if you would be kind enough - and thank you very much for coming - kind enough to give us your experience of accessing what we have been talking about in terms of what everybody is trying to deliver from your perspective and your own experience?

Maureen Frazer (Service User - Revolving Doors): Actually, have to endorse everything that Chris has said and throughout the whole of the discussion thus far, I have noticed that there has been very little comment or reflection from service users per se and you spoke, Helga, on the revolution of the Probation service - I think that is the word you used. The chaos and the outfall of that on service users I do not think has been taken up at all.

My personal experience, which although I accept is not ... it is probably a bit different to others, has been one of, if I had to use one word, chaos. In seven years of licence, following a seven-year custodial sentence, I have seen in excess of nine different Probation officers, offender managers and in fairness, I learnt probably more about the transition of the Probation Service through them and they are offloading at my expense because I was there for half an hour on my reporting conditions and I was listening to them telling me how they were so stressed about having to move and how I was now going to be put into a different cohort and get a different probation.

I was employed when I left custody and I also had a home so I did not fall into the need for pathway referral per se in those avenues, however, health for me was something that was totally ... it was relevant for me but it was missed and I think looking at the figures that were displayed earlier, it talks about women's mental health and their emotional needs and I think it is very key that the emotional needs and the mental health of females, particularly those who do not present as having any issues - custody is very, very traumatic, even if you present as being coping very well. There are underlying issues that will present at all different levels of your rehabilitation or reintegration and as Chris said, it's not rocket science. It simply is not. And sometimes we add complexity which just clouds the real issues. I don't know if you need me to say anything else.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. That is really helpful and in terms of ... you have come with Revolving Doors so, you know, you ...

Maureen Frazer (Service User - Revolving Doors): I was asked to come on from Revolving Doors. I do not actually use services of Revolving Doors but I fit the criteria as in my licence ended last year so I actually wanted to come and ... no, I am not on the revolving door cycle but I do know many people who are and I have worked in criminal justice since I have been released and I also think it is key that Probation staff, CRC staff are aware of the changes and are enabled to empower more ownership from the service users because the various legislations that have taken place over the past years have enabled service users, people with criminal history to actually access quite relevant jobs and until we have inclusion and have service users in the mainstream, I think we are always going to be a little bit of a "them and us" situation. It does not need to be. There is a lot of value to be had from inclusion, total inclusion.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): You talked about health needs being overlooked, that you had employment and a home. Looking back, what would you have wanted to have been offered if you can answer that ...

Maureen Frazer (Service User - Revolving Doors): Well, actually, for myself, I had a GP, for example, but after a few years of release and during the last 2 years of my prison sentence, I worked in the community and I was lucky to work on a project that worked with women who were in the revolving door cycle, had served less than 12 months in custody and were coming out. Specifically my role was to enrol them, engage them with a GP and a dentist, that was it. The project went through the roof. The numbers were ... they started our target at 70. We had to close the doors at 140. We doubled it because it simply was not happening and it was key.

I mean, the avenues that sparked from that specific ... you consider, you know, the registration with a GP to be very simple but for somebody with complex needs and with the stigma, shall we say, of just leaving prison, it is not. It simply is not.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you. That is really helpful and it is really helpful, the very specific issues around just registering for GP or dentists and what we might be able to do to actually support really practical issues.

Maureen Frazer (Service User - Revolving Doors): I mean, in fairness, the project was actually funded by the London Probation Service, so I will have to give them their due - they did really well. Unfortunately it was not able to continue but it was key at that time. It was amazing.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. That is really helpful.

Paula Harriott (Revolving Doors): I was just going to add in that the whole notion from Revolving Doors agency's perspective, the whole notion of relationships is absolutely central to supporting people through trauma and recovery and getting them to look at their offending history and backgrounds and constant change in staffing in the ... I manage the National Service User Forum for Revolving Doors and the constant change in relationships has definitely been brought up and if we could try and look at some integrating into the quality assurance of the services, some service user feedback around that about staff retention rates or the constancy or relationships, I think that might well help us to understand that picture more clearly.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Kuljit and Gill, I was just wondering if you had any reflections on what you have just heard and particularly around health but also those two pathways that were not of relevance to Maureen, around health and unemployment and your own perspectives from the voluntary and community sector?

Gill Arukpe (Chief Executive Officer - Penrose): I think, I mean for Penrose, obviously we are partnered within the CRC in London and we are providing licence on adult males in prison and outside of that we have forensic mental health supported housing in south London so I can sympathise with Martin. I think the biggest pull for us really, inside of the prisons, obviously the processes of the prisons are not always conducive at the moment because they have a recruitment problem so obviously getting access to offenders to work with them on preparing them and coordinating the rehabilitation is really difficult and we look forward to the growth in prison staff who will be able to help that.

I think the biggest loss for us, really, in terms of our excitement about being involved in the revolution that we were all hoping would happen was that there has not been an enormous lot of change within the court system and therefore sentencing as we had all looked forward to alternatives to prison for a lot of people especially those who are not causing any public risk in terms of their offence, but perhaps have got a mental health problem, might be better served doing alternatives. We have tried to seek funding for them, we have tried to establish them and the difficulties are that when you then try to set the services up outside of the Borough, outside of the prison, a lot of the Boroughs get resistance from local people in us actually establishing services, especially forensic mental health.

1.5 million ... property in Lambeth we acquired recently for people leaving prison who have got serious mental health problems and we were blocked by the local MP and 450 local residents from the setting up so I think there is an awful lot that we need to do locally, coordinating. I would really advocate that and I welcome everything Chris said and agree.

I think that unfortunately for us within the CRC it has become very process driven and if we could take a lot, we are doing a time/motion study this week just to see where really we have got a lot of replication going on. We know that some offenders in some of the prisons are being assessed, asked the same questions up to seven times by different agencies so I welcome the changes within the prison system so hopefully we can get some of that out.

We have got differences in terms of retention of staff which is a difficulty because we are all paying different rates because of the different funding and unfortunately, Maureen, I am not sure how we are going to overcome that because if the funding rates are different, people are going to move on and you will get a turn over. People within the prison system coming through, an awful lot have got mental health problems that have also probably got an undiagnosed personality disorder and vice versa. An awful lot more could be done in helping and supporting in the long term because you do not just change when you come out of prison because you have had a few hours rehabilitation in the prison. It helps, but it takes a lot longer.

Our forensic mental health services in the community, we work for up to two years, intensive work around behaviour and attitudes, understanding and also accepting that there are roads to recovery and mental health when you are coming out very confused.

Much more intense casework, that is what we would like to do. I absolutely agree with Chris. I have been in this business now for nearly 40 years and never have I had such light touch, and light touch for a lot of people is not enough. We have lost an awful lot of funding from the sector over the last few years for many different reasons and it has been very difficult to attract more funding into being able to come up with innovation so I welcome, again, opportunities to approach you to say, you know, we have come up with a programme recently on working with adult males who are causing great harm and violence to women and yet we have been unable to get that funded and it is a very intense programme which would have made a lot of difference. I could go on much longer than the time we have got.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. Kuljit ... just briefly?

Kuljit Sandhu (Managing Director - RISE Mutual CIC): So RISE Mutual spun out from the London CRC two years ago and we are an employee-led mutual delivering a range of interventions for the London CRC as well as other local authorities around domestic abuse.

I think for us what Chris has said, of course, and Gill was saying, a very kind of focused case-management model, we all believe in having consistent engagement but we do have to have a targeted approach because our resourcing is so tight so there are kind of early onset of persistent offenders, persistent, we know and those that are early desistors so have moved in ... so if our approach is deliberate and targeted to those persistents which they are on average about 12% to 18% where you have an integrated model. The difficulty we have is that we then

bring in those desistors that are ready to move on in their lives to make our cohort, make it more viable. I think we need to ensure that we target the right resources and the right interventions.

We are working really closely with the CRC and part of the Gripping the Offender model to look at trauma-based interventions so moving beyond the thinking skills, cognitive behavioural programmes, but also to have more trauma-based interventions that help people. It is short interventions that help people to them be ready to take on other interventions and what Maureen is talking about, the service user, having a more service-user-driven model, which is not new, as Chris and others, you know ... going back to so some of our service users, we have recruited service users delivering interventions that are side by side and they are having better outcomes for our service users so we are reaching out to people earlier and getting more engagement because we have got a co-production model where we have got service users and facilitators delivering interventions so for me it is a more targeted, deliberate interventions rather than trying to bring a cohort together which meets a commissioner's needs. We need to be more focused.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much and it is interesting what you are talking about, targeted interventions and early intervention and then particularly you are talking about mental health. We have talked a little bit about employment and obviously the health bit but Mike, I just wondered if ...

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Yes, I mean, just this one other ingredient we have not picked up which is the health element and it is great, Patricia, that you are here. Thank you for coming along from NHS England, so I suppose from your perspective, what is the sort of support you give currently to offenders and how could we see health integrating more effectively and better on this subject, in terms of partnership?

Patricia Cadden (NHS England): So currently the Health and the Justice System Team in NHS England commissions healthcare services within custody so police custody for liaison and diversion services which predominantly identify individuals with mental health and learning disability needs and then we also support and commission services for those individuals in the prison service.

The services that we deliver within prisons are all primary and secondary care services. We have been working closely with the CRC recently to try and look at reducing the amount of assessments that prisoners have to face, so looking at actually, could Health pick up your initial assessment that you do? We are asking the same questions from Health as from the CRC so can we join that together in order to get a wider picture of the greater needs of the individual, then they will receive their health interventions whilst they are in prison and then on release or certainly in preparation for release, coming together again with the CRC to do the final resettlement plan for the individual.

I am very interested in some of the things that you have brought up, Helga, with regards to the through-the-gates model and the enhancement of through-the-gate model. I think what we found from an NHS England point of view is there is potential lack of clarity around what is delivered, what is expected of the CRC in the prisons for the through-the-gate model so any help that we can provide and support you with that would ... I am more than happy to do that.

We have through-the-gate services within our drug and alcohol services and our mental health services within the prison so again, if we can align what is going on there, we would be more than happy to support.

The enhanced service that we provide in liaison diversion services in custody is again trying to divert people from a custodial sentence and keep them in community-based service. Obviously when someone gets to court the judge makes a decision as to whether they will have a custodial sentence or be sent down on remand rather than being released back into the community and that is really for us, I think, about the work that we do in informing the court about what is available and what support is available for them in the community or what is not at that time, depending on their level of need and I think certainly with regards to improving services within the community to manage individuals without them having to have a custodial sentence would mean that there is less risk within the prison for those individuals and less risk for them and also for the healthcare system that provides support to them.

I think the remodelling of liaison diversion that is going to be happening throughout next year will look at how better we can support the individuals coming through custody and support the court system as well and then also with regards to the re-procurement of HMYOI Feltham which is going to be happening next year is going to target a lot of work on the emotional wellbeing of young people within the Criminal Justice System because we feel that that is our biggest issue and for young men coming through HMYOI Feltham, primary care needs, their health needs are not the biggest issue for us. It is certainly around their trauma and emotional wellbeing from their experience of gangs and experience of their particular family lives so that is definitely what our service model is going to focus on and we will come out to consult with all of the stakeholders on what our service model will bring in supporting the re-offending agenda.

I guess where we have some of our problems, our challenges going forward is London is going to change as part of the prison reform agenda to hold three very large reception prisons so HMP Wandsworth, as everyone knows, HMP Thameside will come online as well which is a private prison in south-east London and also there is going to be HMP Belmarsh coming online potentially next year. That is still to be fully confirmed but that is certainly within our thinking. Those reception prisons hold offenders for under 56 days.

The interventions that we will need to provide to those individuals will be short, will be brief and picking up on some of your points, will not fully address all their needs so we have to work collaboratively whilst those individuals are there for those 56 days - not to fight over who gets the individual for the service, but to actually work together on the planned care plans whilst in prison and certainly for any planning that we can do for their release so I would be more than happy to think about how we might do that a bit better.

What we do have around GP registration is we have a GP registration programme and the GP registration programme is trying to support the registration of individuals more seamlessly into GPs on release. We have now just recently got an agreement through the GP contract through NHS England that we can get people to be registered prior to them being released now and that is going to be coming online in July and we can report back on how successful that has been as well as supporting some of those particular programmes that are coming out for individuals in the wider sense of their health needs.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you very much. That is a response to the GP registration issues. Mike, did you have any other questions but I also wanted to pick up with you, even though you are co-chairing, around housing because that is obviously such a huge, important issue for people leaving custody and from a local authority perspective what is currently in place to address housing and then if you had any other questions as well.

Michael Lockwood (Chief Executive Officer - Harrow Council) (Co-Chair): Okay. I am happy to kick off straight to the housing bit. I am conscious of time, so, well, I do not think it is surprising to say it is tough. Demand is far exceeding our supply. I know the Mayor and the many agencies are trying to commit to building more housing. I think many people recognise it is one of the biggest challenges London faces and you know, not building enough houses, prices go up, rents go up and without being political, some of the welfare changes have also contributed to that and so many councils, my own included, we are suffering major homelessness issues. My homelessness budget is £4 million overspent and I am not unique, so it is that context that maybe where do offenders or re-offenders fit into that and that is a tough question because we have, in terms of that list of vulnerable people, single parents, individuals suffering domestic violence, vulnerable children and the challenge is, as I said, where does offenders fit into that list of priorities?

They are classified as vulnerable however in many councils, even though they are classified as vulnerable and priority, we still can not house them so there is a big issue on that and I put my hands up to say we need to get better at that and I think the things we need -- I suppose the four or five things just very quickly I would suggest we need to do is first of all understand what the approach and provision is across London because I think it is, as you will remind me, sort of different in every Borough and there are plusses to that and minuses to that but what is the approach? What do we offer? What do we need? Not just on a Borough-by-Borough basis but a lot more to think sub-regionally. I think that is issue one.

The second issue, I think we have got opportunity(?) to target sectors we have not better -- landlords and private rental sector but some are unwilling to let to ex-offenders but I think some education, some support by providing deposits or guaranteeing rents, we can encourage more in the private sector to let accommodation to ex-offenders.

The third issue is awareness. When I started this discussion, I was surprised how much this is costing London and the social worth of getting it right and I think we need to improve awareness and understanding of what the opportunity is here and all the evidence talks of people that do not have a house are two or three times more likely to re-offend and the evidence also suggests you put a million pounds into housing, you get ten million pounds back in terms of benefits and particularly in terms of housing, I include housing support as well because housing is one element that supports like helping with budgets, helping with, you know their way of working is an important one, so I think, you know, there is a cost benefit for doing this as well so there is a benefit issue.

My final issue is more elusive. It's not just putting somebody into a house, it is making sure they get a job as well. We need to make sure to make that housing sustainable, and one they can live in, it is making sure we offer the opportunity to get people into work so they can live in that house going forward so I suppose for us it is a big chance of that profile, it is about

understanding opportunity in the private rental sector and it is about realising, putting more money into this actually has a big benefit in terms of return, both monetary and social value.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you. That is really helpful. I was wondering, Debra, if you might just - sorry, very briefly - give us an overview of the rough sleeping programme which is clearly not just about offenders but there are many offenders leaving with no fixed abode and may end up on the streets.

Debra Levison (Senior Manager, GLA Housing): Well, obviously our rough sleeping programme is mainly targeted at dealing with people when they do hit the streets and around a third of people seen rough sleeping last year had been in prison but only 3% of new rough sleepers had come straight from prison so something is happening on that journey which means that people are making temporary arrangements that are then falling through so I think there is something about that gap which is not to do with our rough sleeping services at all but it is about housing option services. It is about addressing the needs of people with no local connection with any particular London Borough which is a real problem because then they fall through the net completely.

On our rough sleeping services we commission outreach teams to find people once they hit the streets. We commission a service called No Second Night Out to pick up people as soon as they sleep rough and try and find a housing solution for them. We also have about 3,500 flats earmarked for former rough sleepers that come with tenancy sustainment and somebody mentioned the importance of ongoing support for people but our services basically complement what the Boroughs do and for most people leaving prison, an option could be to come to your housing option services or to get into your hostel pathway, which, if they have a local connection and you have enough notice of when they are going to be released works but people inevitably are going to fall through the net.

Just to mention London councils have recently given funding to St Mungo's for a new project, a through-the-gate project for people leaving prison in London but also people from London leaving prison outside London which I think sounds like a very valuable project to complement what is already there but I know we are very short of time so I will not go on.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you. That is really helpful. That is very interesting. I had not picked up the statistics around actually those leaving prison and then actually it is later on at some point that they then drop out of the combination and onto the streets which is exactly your point about sustainability and support within housing. That is really helpful. Thank you.

We have just ... we have run out of time. If there is any really, really, quick issues, otherwise I will ask Rebecca to sum up. I am conscious that it is a very, very ... sorry.

Catherine Briody (Victim and Offender Services Manager - Islington Council): Yes, I just wanted to say very briefly we have heard a lot about the issues around performance information and making the case and I think for local authorities, if we do not make the case it is unlikely to be prioritised and we know where these systems work.

It can make a huge amount of difference financially but also the huge costs to local communities, individuals and families and any help we can have around evidencing the impact of what we are doing, around offender management but also where there is an opportunity from organisations that are London-wide to have consistency in what the offer is locally so for example, in the police now in Islington, we have increased our IOM-specific police. That has made such a difference and then with the CRC having offender managers with a specific caseload on IOM, that makes such a difference otherwise they are spread out across and it becomes very difficult, where there is additionality which we could be provide, be it health, employability, to make the links with the relevant offender manager so that they can access that resource so that is my plea. Any help ... we really need to be able ... we really struggle to evidence impact on ...

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Thank you. That is really helpful. Thank you. I will just ask Rebecca just quickly to sum up some key issues. I am really conscious that we did not pick up on - and I think it was very interesting what you were saying around alternatives to custody and how you develop that and ensure that there is public buy-in. Rebecca?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive Officer) (MOPAC): Well, thank you everyone for your contributions. I think Maureen, you set a very important context of the impact that organisational change, which we have all been a part of, has on improving those outcomes and really affecting people and giving them the constant and consistent support they need on leaving prison. We have had a lot of organisational change. We heard there from Martin and I think Helga were amongst many who agreed that a consistent performance framework where we have, as the Deputy Mayor says in transparency of outcomes is going to be key to improving our prioritisation and our accountability.

Sharing information as partners, as Kilvinder, you said on safeguarding is key and I think all of us, Helga, welcome the work you are doing in the CRC on getting those basics right; what we know works in terms of employment.

[At this point in the Justice Matters meeting the sound recording was lost for several minutes]

We will look to see, in MOPAC, how we can bring employers together and we will, on housing, I think continue to make the case and support local authorities making the case but really work to identify not just how to start people off in housing but ensure they stay in housing.

These are the themes that we will be taking forward in our Police and Crime Plan but those may be some of the key points.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Co-Chair): Okay. Thank you very much and thank you very much for attending today. I think it was very helpful to pull out the issues and have some challenging stuff come up as well so thank you.