

VCR:

Date: Wednesday, 28 November 2012

Location: Chamber, City Hall

Hearing: London Assembly (Plenary)

Start time: 10.00am

Finish time: 12.05pm

Speakers:

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

Steve O'Connell, MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor

Jonathan Glanz, MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor

Faith Boardman, MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor

Jeremy Mayhew, MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor

Stephen Otter, HMIC

Simon Duckworth, Chair, joint MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel

Mark Rowley, Assistant Commissioner, MPS

Steve Rodhouse, Commander, MPS

Sally Knox, Rob Knox Foundation

Barry Mizen, The Jimmy Mizen Foundation

Christian Guy, Centre for Social Justice

Mayor Jules Pipe, London Councils

Mick McNally

Phillippa Rowe, London Councils

Keith Shipman, Association of London Directors of Children's Services

Nick Pascoe

Heather Munro, London Probation Trust

Louise Simms, Storm Empowerment

VCR:

Date: Wednesday, 28 November 2012

Location: Chamber, City Hall

Hearing: London Assembly (Plenary)

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** ... tightly managed for time, thematic event, we have quarterly performance meeting of the Metropolitan Police Service, but I think this is an issue that is one of if not the most important for London, where we look at the problems around both gang violence and serious youth violence. I have to say, before I became Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, I didn't know as much about this issue as I do now. For example, all the people in front of me today, and I've begun to read the papers with more interest -- I mean on Boxing Day, we had two young men spending their money, as with many others, but they were armed with knives and they were from rival gangs. My understanding is one of those young men died, and the other one actually wasn't convicted as he was seen as defending himself but this is a sign of what we see during the festive season. I pick up the paper yesterday and read about a young man who was mistaken for being someone else and was stabbed 14 times. Obviously he did not survive that, and it's a tragedy to read about these things. Walking over with a colleague from MOPAC, Paul Cassman, every single member of staff with a teenager has experienced some kind of threat of violence, usually with a knife. So this is a problem on our streets. I'm therefore not surprised that the Mayor, Boris Johnson, has made this one of his top priorities, if not the top priority to see sustained crime reduction and to really tackle this terrible issue.

I'm not surprised, also, that it is one of the top three issues for London Councils and the Criminal Justice Agency through the London Crime Reduction Board. I'm delighted that we have three parents and -- two parents and in this case because Marie's in the audience also Louise who is the lead youth worker for Storm to help us set the scene and tell us more about this problem and what we can do to tackle it. I don't know who would like to start, but I should probably introduce who we are. To my far left -- although I'm not sure that's politically to my far left, Steve O'Connell, assembly member for Croydon, Faith Boardman and Jeremy Mayhew, Jonathan Glanz, who's also a councillor in the West End, and Helen Bailey, who's our new Chief Operating Officer. We're here today to listen particularly to the issues and solutions that you've got for us as the Mayor's Office Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Barry, do you want to introduce yourself briefly?

**Barry Mizen (Jimmy Mizen Foundation):** Yes, I'm Barry Mizen from the Jimmy Mizen Foundation.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Sally?

**Sally Knox (Rob Knox Foundation):** Sally Knox, trustee at the Rob Knox Foundation.

**Louise Simms (Storm Empowerment):** I'm Louise Simms, and I work for a community grassroots organisation called Storm Empowerment based in Wandsworth.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Fantastic, so different parts of London. Problems, I know that are around serious youth violence and also good experience of the issues of gangs. Who would like to start and tell us a little of the problems as they see it? Barry?

**Barry Mizen (Jimmy Mizen Foundation):** Do you want me to start? That's absolutely fine. First, it's a pleasure to be here, thank you very much indeed. Hopefully I can add something of value to the debate around all of the issues that Steven, you've just raised. My son Jimmy was murdered in May 2008, the day after his 16<sup>th</sup> birthday in a bakery shop around the corner from where we live. It was a May Saturday morning. My son wasn't killed with a knife, he had a glass dish smashed in his face, which went through vital arteries in his neck and he bled to death, dying within about three minutes. My son was not associated with any gang, or anything to do with drugs, drink whatsoever. So I think that's where we're coming from.

I think, first, our experience of the police investigation was a good one. Although I've got nothing to compare it with, we felt very supported at the time. The Chief Investigating Officer, Cliff Lyons, became a colossus in our lives, this particular person. The appointment of a family liaison officer, whose name was Kerry Ash, was excellent. I understand this came through, with issues around the Steven Lawrence killing some years before, that there is now a family liaison officer. She was absolutely fantastic to us, it was only after the trial ten months later that I realised that this was just a young girl doing her job, but I think that our experience was an exceptional one and I think praise goes to the Metropolitan Police Service for what they did for us.

I think, moving on from there, myself and my wife, my family were determined that we would not be beaten by what happened and that we would bring something good and positive from that. Since then, we're doing many things now, we go into schools, we speak about the issues. We also go into prisons, we speak with young lads, we speak with murderers around the country, so I think we have absorbed a lot of experience, a lot of information, a lot of relationships, if you like, since Jimmy's death which has helped us form some of the views that we now hold. The natural reaction to this, and I understand that when a child is killed, you can go back to last Boxing Day, you can talk about the trial at the moment of young Kwame's killers but the natural reaction would tend to be, "We need to be tough, we must lock them away longer, that will solve the problem". Now I've got no issues with people going to prison, I've got no issues with the person who killed my son going to prison, he's serving a minimum 14 year, with a life term. What I do have a concern with is we do tend to talk tough and politicians go down this line, because it's expected of them and they want to get public opinion behind them, but we talk tough and, as I say, we'll increase tariffs, we'll put the tariff up.

The minimum tariff for killing somebody with a knife went up from 15 to 25 years, put up by Jack Straw about three years ago, under pressure from some families, I understand that, but I don't believe it has made a difference. These things happened as a result of someone losing their temper in anger, and most of the young people who are in prison for murder, it's because of anger. That's what has caused that, but we delude ourselves I think that if we go down this blind alleyway that by increasing tariffs, that will make people not do it. When people are

thinking logically, we don't break laws because of the consequences and it could be something as simple as parking a car or whatever, but we're talking about young people who are not thinking logically, not thinking rationally. So to think that that by increasing the tariff, they won't do it, it does not work. All it does is put someone in prison for longer. If that's your intention then fine, but if you think it's going to prevent others from doing it, then I think you're wrong. I think we need to change that narrative, I think we need to understand a little bit more about what's going on.

Early intervention, I believe -- if we want to change an attitude, there is an attitude prevalent in this society and you've just alluded to it with people with young children. An attitude among some young people that it's ok to behave in the way that they do, it's okay that if someone looks at you in a funny way, you can then attack them, and invariably with some of these things now, people are ending up dead. That is what needs to change, and it doesn't change by shouting at people. It doesn't change by threatening people with an ever bigger stick. If it did I'd be at the front of the queue. So it's through education and early intervention, and the earlier, the better. Again, we talk about rehabilitation, we've got the narrative now, 'rehabilitation', and to most people now, rehabilitation, once you've gone to prison, now we're going to rehabilitate you. We need to do that many, many years before. If someone is three, four, five years of age and displaying tendencies, we need not just to look just to punishment or exclusion, we need to say, "What is going on in that person's life?" that's when we need to start the rehabilitation.

I think for ourselves, what we have seen, the London schools and schools around the country that we've visited, one of our biggest concerns is the relationship between the public in general, but specifically young people, and the police. There is a bit of a breakdown of relationships with certain parts of society. I think that that is what we need to focus on. I would say that there is a lack of trust in some areas with the police, and bear in mind we've got excellent time for our Metropolitan Police Service. What other city could you visit in the world where you can buy a copy of a policeman's helmet? You can't do that in other countries. I think it just says a lot about our police and the observation and respect they have outside of this country. So I feel it's then about, how do we build that relationship? How do we build that trust? Again, I feel the only way is early intervention. About people's experiences of the police and what's it like from a very early age. I feel that the opportunity there is when children are at school. I think if I could have a specific ask today is that what I would like to see is a designated police officer in every secondary school in London. I don't just mean on a sentry duty, I don't just mean turn up and, "Who is it? It's PC so-and-so at this morning's meeting", I mean somebody who can build up a real relationship with all the students in that school, and it takes time. It takes two, three, four, five years or more.

Some of the police officers in these positions that we've met speak of how they've grown into it. I remember speaking to one in Peckham, he said when he first turned up on this job, nobody would talk to him, neither the staff no anyone else, there was that distance, that lack of communication. So I feel there is a specific answer, a specific police officer with the right character, perhaps enough miles under his belt, not the newly engaged PC but somebody with many years' experience to take on this almost father role. I think that the specific identified police officer in every London secondary school is an ideal. I think if we want to start

anywhere -- and I know there are already lots, but we have got at least 19 boroughs in London which I believe would be identified with the ending of gangs of youth violence. There are the other seven boroughs, or so, which the Mayor for London is specifically targeting, so at least those to start with. I appreciate it would be impossible to have a named police officer in every primary school, but primary schools feed secondary schools, so I think a relationship would be built there between the primary schools and the designated officer in a local secondary school, for him to go and visit the primary school, get to know the kids and the kids know him. Specifically for the head teachers or teachers to have a named person to go to, "I've got a concern, I go there, my concerns are this ..." to be listened to.

So for me, that is it. I think build up this relationship. I think from the police's point of view, and again speaking to some of the PCs in the specific posts, that from that relationship building, from that confidence, then information sharing comes as well. We tend to wage, Stephen, that the job of solving crime in London is yours, or the Metropolitan Police Service, or Boris', or whatever, and it is not. It's part of it, you have a responsibility, but the biggest change will come when each person in London says, "This is the kind of London I want to live in, and we showed that during the Olympics, we can have that kind of London and I'm prepared to do my part. So I would encourage, however you go about it, for you to say to the ordinary person in the street, "What kind of London do you want? Help us do this". Everyone of us has a role to play. My big concern is the amount of young people being killed and nobody being prosecuted because of a wall of silence, because people are frightened to speak. Maybe there are some avenues we could open up. Thank you.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Thank you Barry. Some very strong, powerful messages there, that the answers are not always what grabs the headlines, the stronger tariffs, the need to focus on prevention far earlier than we can even conceive of today and rehabilitation as a (inaudible) should actually start before the major offence. I think your call for a designated police officer in every secondary school, and then reaching out into the feeder primary schools, you've made a very powerful case for that. Clearly, it's the commissioner who allocates his resources, but with 32,000 police officers and more going into neighbourhoods, I would have thought that should be possible in London over time and I think you're absolutely right about the need to build a bond between the police service, the first public service, and the public and that's at the root of ensuring that we create an environment, a London where people step forward when we need them to. So thank you very much for those powerful words. Sally, would you like to also provide some context for this very important issue?

**Sally Knox (Rob Knox Foundation):** Yes, okay. My son Rob was also murdered. He was 18 years old in Sidcup, very close actually to Barry's son, but he was actually stabbed with a knife, he was stabbed four times in the stomach and once through the chest. At the same time there were four other people that were stabbed that evening. None of them were anything to do with gangs, it was just a man with a knife went to the pub and five people tried to take the knife from him. He also got 20 years' minimum sentence and a life sentence as well. At first, I was angry, as all mothers would be. I went through the anger and the upset and then I suddenly realised that I didn't want Rob to have died in vain and that's why we set up the Rob Knox Foundation.

It was all about what can we do to try and prevent any other mother or any other father or family going through what we had to. I'm 100%, I know I can't change the world but if I can, in the work that I do with the foundation, I work around the word choices and if we can make some young people make the right choices, and one person makes the right choice, just one of them, it means Rob didn't die in vain. Now, very much like Barry, I work in schools and I work in two ways with schools. I work in one way targeted, working with the children that are on the edge of exclusion and are also in trouble with the police but I also have a really strong feeling that you should target the whole school years, if possible or the whole school. It's all about, I agree with Barry here, early intervention. It's getting into schools and educating them about the awareness of knife crime. We're not talking about trying to frighten them, we're talking about educating them to make the right choice and a big thing that I do when I relate Rob's story is at the end, I talk about the choices that people can make. For example, I use when something happens, walk away from it, don't go in as they all do when there's a fight, don't all go in and try to have a look because you could end up being a witness, you could end up being hurt or you could end up being caught up in joint enterprise. My education in schools is going in and actually telling them to avoid these situations.

Now alongside that, what I also do and I think probably more children need to know about this, is I also go into kids and I talk to them, and because it's the whole year groups, we've got a mixture of what we say are the 99% good and the 1% bad kids we've got. I go into them and I talk about crimestoppers and the new fearless campaign. Now I really do -- the fearless is the crimestoppers for the young people. I really do believe that if we can get -- I talk to them, I say take responsibility for your own community. This is, and I try to get through to them because they all think crimestoppers is something to do with the police and it's getting across to them that you can text, email or make a phone call and nobody will know who's made that call. I actually get through to them by saying, "You've heard Rob's story", and this can be done by anybody, "how would you feel if you wake up and one of your friends has killed another one of your friends, your brother, your cousin? You've got to live with that for the rest of your life knowing that that person has carried a knife". I am very much behind the need to get this early intervention, we need to go into schools and we need to raise awareness of crime and street violence. It's not just knives, we look at Jimmy and it's about anger and using any weapon, but we need to tell them that they do need to take (a) the responsibility to keep themselves safe, which is walking away and (b) is walking away and making that call or telling someone this is happening.

I also get a lot -- and the reason that I do that, and I'll just add this on, I would say that every school that I go to, be it in an inner city school or whether it's in what we perceive as a good area, such as Kent, Bexley, Bromley haven't got a lot of crime, I can say, when I sit in those classrooms and I say to those children, "Can you put your hand up if you know someone who carries a knife?" boys and girls alike, there is over 50%, over half of the class every time puts their hand up. We can't say this only happens in one area, and they all use it for protection, that's the biggest thing that they come up with. So that's one thing, the other thing is I feel, as Barry said, there's not a good relationship and most of mine comes down to when I've been to schools and they're stopping and searching. I know at the moment there are things that have been going through. I've been talking to the police in Bexley and Greenwich about how they can go about stop and search, but I do think that police officers do need more training in

making the kids feel comfortable. A lot of them feel completely targeted when this happened. I'm 100% behind stop and search, as I'm 100% behind people being stopped for drinking and driving, it should happen but I do think we should look at the way that sometimes the police officers handle this. I know some of them just hate the police and however they were handled, they would moan about it, but I would say on the whole, quite a lot of them have not had a good experience when it's happened.

Finally, we're just talking about the prevention part, once somebody has committed a crime, again, I'm with Barry, I do think people should be taken off the streets for carrying a knife. I don't particularly think that the sentence should be a massively long one, and maybe we shouldn't put a time on it, but I do not think there's any point in putting those children into a youth offending institute, and I do go into youth offenders' institutes, and just leaving them. They've got to be, as Barry said, rehabilitated. They've got to do some kind of course, some kind of learning and I do think it works well. I go into Feltham youth offenders, to the Herron Unit and I do my talk to the children who are due to be released. I would say that in a room, 90% of them have committed a knife crime, and those children come up to me afterwards and they do say, "I'm so sorry for your loss". I even had a boy come up to me the other day, who's never spoken to any of the officers at all in the youth offending institute, he came up to me and he said to me, "I'm going to work really hard when I get out. I'm thinking about writing a book, would you help me?" So I do think that that is the last thing I'd say, we can't just chuck them into the youth offenders institutes and leave them. I do know there are lots of courses in there, building, and we try to get them jobs but I think anyone who's caught carrying a knife can't get off with community service because when I have been in schools and I've talked about crimes involving carrying a knife, they actually think community service is quite amusing. They do not look at that, painting a fence or doing something like that, and find it any kind of deterrent. That's the feedback I've had from a lot of schools. Okay?

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Sally, that's very powerful words and I think they also amplify the themes that Barry had introduced. I think, interestingly, you're all for awareness building and the importance of awareness building programmes, and not just targeted programmes. I think that's very important and it certainly resonates with me when you visit a youth offenders institute. These are actually extremely costly custodial environments and the reoffending rates, when people leave them, are very high. Heron is one of the better units. I looked at the Herron Unit and there are far more staff members supporting young people in the Heron Unit. If you looked at the Jay Unit, it looked positively anaemic. There were only two or three names on the board so I think there's great stuff going on in parts of Felton, but certainly, it's very difficult. Many of them don't have access to mental health services. Clearly there were psychological issues as well. Thank you for raising those issues and particularly how the police are right to have the tactics around stop and search but it's how those are carried out and the relationships with young people that's so important.

Louise, now the previous two parents are victims of serious youth violence, and that's distinct from one of the other issues that we're seeing on the streets of London around this chaotic street gang culture. I know you've had a lot of experience of working with Storm and perhaps you could give us some insights into how we might prevent that.

**Louise Simms (Storm Empowerment):** Definitely, I work for a grassroots organisation that is based in the Battersea area, and we work with gang members and we also work with ex-gang members. You have got to remember, when there's a gang, there always someone at the top and a lot of the times when you get to the people at the bottom of the gang, they do want to leave these gangs but a lot of the time they don't because of fear. A lot of them don't know how to leave. For example, I live on an estate and I can say the majority of the young boys on my estate are in a gang and I know some of them on a personal level, whether through school or having grown up with them and they want to leave but they don't know how. If they leave, they fear for their life, they fear for their family's lives. I've got someone who's an ex gang member and another gang broke into his house, killed his step-father and also stabbed his mother. He didn't know how to leave the gang.

Rehabilitation is good but you can't rehabilitate them when they're leaving prison, rehabilitation starts from the beginning because I'm finding also through working with young men who have left the gang, they often end up in prison. When they go back to be rehabilitated there's nothing out there for them. I spoke, not too long ago, to two young boys who had just left the prison system, both of them are homeless, both of them are jobless. This means that they are unable to sign on or get any type of money so the next step for them is to go back and join that gang because that's the only way forward that they see. What we try to do at Storm is show them the right way. We find in-work training, we find that the education system has failed a lot of them, a lot of them can't read or write, so there's a lot of frustration there.

I don't know if anyone knows about Jordan Price, he was stabbed in Reading. He comes from a good family. There was a **visual**(?) on my estate, rival gang members came and they burnt down where the visual was, which caused a lot of uproar. For me, it's so frustrating as a grassroots organisation that works with these ex-gang members and gang members that we're trying our best but we're not getting the funding that we need in order to give them what they need. We've got to be very honest with ourselves. You've got to understand that when people are in these gangs and their doing these illegal activities, some of them are earning £1,000 per week. How do you turn that mentality around and say to them, "I've got this, if you leave the gang, I'll give you this"? They will turn around and say, "I'm earning £1,000 per week, I'm not going to do this". As a result, you have to start from the bottom, from the root of the problem because no one wakes up in the morning and thinks, "You know what, I'm going to join a gang" or, "You know what, I'm going to commit murder". No one does this and you have to start at the bottom. There is a root to every single problem and I think that if we get to top of the gangs, and I'm not saying forget about those at the bottom, but go to the top dog because he is the one telling them what to do. The gang members do what they're told to do because of fear.

I see how they end up getting affiliated with a gang. They have to go through a thing where they get beaten up in order to join a gang. Why would anyone want to put themselves through that in order to join the gang? It's just through fear, and if you live in that area, and you have to walk through that area every day and you get beaten up, in the end you're going to think, "I might as well just join the gang". That's what's so difficult. We've worked with two ex-gang members. They were from rival gangs and we took them to South Africa and

they joined a unit, and they went back and they told their other gang members, these are rival gang members. We have a peace concert every year at Storm where we have gang members from all over London come and we've never had a problem. We have never had any fights, any stabbings or any arguments. We have to try to do this properly. You can't just go and tell a young person to do this and do that because the majority of young people don't want to listen anyway, they're going to want to do it their way, so you have to make little baby steps with them. It's so frustrating for me, as someone who works with these young people, to see how talented they are but if they have a criminal record, where do they go for these jobs?

We're talking about rehabilitation but no one wants to accept them. They go through all these courses, some of them are university graduates, but because they have a criminal record, they're unemployable. So what happens? They go back and the cycle goes round again. We have to do something about this because it will go from bad to worse. I find, a lot of the time, especially within the black community, counselling is not the thing to do, depression is not heard of so when you say to somebody, "You might be suffering from depression", they respond, "I don't suffer from depression, this is my everyday life". It's a thing that is shoved under the carpet, it's not spoken about a lot so what we also do is we try to have a family unit where we have our youth club called Off the Streets. It's run from 7pm to 11pm to target the times when young people are more vulnerable, more likely to be on the streets. We provide them with a free meal and we try to bring in a family environment. A lot of the people that we work with, we find that they have no family network or environment. Their mother might be being beaten up by their stepfather, there's a lot of domestic violence so as soon as a man talks to them or looks at them in a certain way, they go on the defensive. So what we try to do is counsel them and ask them, "Why do you behave like this? What's the problem?" That's how we get to the roots of the problem, and what makes them tick. We have to really do something about this. Jordan came from a good family, his dad is a university lecturer but because of where he lived, he had to go through that every day. When he came home from school, he walked past the gang members and they threaten you.

I live on an estate and I see it day in and day out. Sometimes they are playing their music really loud and I've got my daughter sleeping but I would never dare go outside and say, "Can you turn down your music?" So for a young person who's going through a lot of peer pressure and puberty, they're going to think that the last resort for them is to join the gang in order for them to be safe.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Louise, that's a very powerful overview of the issues that you see all around you, all the time and as a grassroots organisation, I was struck by some of the insights that you give. I know of people would potentially like to ask a couple of questions. I'm going to take chairman's prerogative. All the literature that I have read talks about what you ended with, about the lack of family networks. There was some work done by the Centre for Social Justice called Dying to Belong, but what you started with was very interesting, which was almost dying to leave the gang and the climate of fear that you see on the estate. You described the big dog and the top person and from my experiences of watching old films like *The Godfather*, where there's a top dog who controls everything, but the police never get to because there's always a buffer. In your experience, on your estate, are we getting to the architects of this chaos, the big dogs?

**Louise Simms (Storm Empowerment):** No. You're getting the younger ones. It starts from in schools where these young boys are selling drugs. My sister came home and she actually said, "There's a boy in my class and he's actually selling weed to buy trainers". How old is he? Ten. Then you have to question how it's getting younger and younger and you've got to understand these young boys have brothers and cousins who make you be affiliated with the gangs. What happens is you're getting the ones at the bottom, and they're serving their time but you're not getting the ones at the top dog. Until you get the top dog, it's not going to stop, they'll find someone else who can take that person's place.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Thank you very much. Are there any questions from colleagues? Well I think you've done a phenomenally good job of setting the scene both around the issue of serious youth violence, the use of knives and other dangerous weapons that can tragically take people close to you, and also the chaotic gang culture that we're seeing not go away as you describe, Louise, but if anything being pervasive and affecting younger and younger people, particularly in the black community and your experience on the estate. So, thank you very much indeed for setting the scene. We're now going to look on and see what we can do and with the agencies, the police and other criminal justice agencies and local government, we can see how we can tackle this problem together but thank you so much for coming along and sharing your wisdom.

Can we ask the others, there's about four for the next section. Thank you very much indeed. Sorry, we've not got the seat numbers right so can we use all six here, in some way, that would be great. Sorry about this.

Right, fantastic. I'm delighted to see Assistant Commissioner Rowley, do you just want to quickly introduce yourself and what you do, Mark?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Mark Rowley, Assistant Commissioner and I'm responsible for most of the specialist policing in the Metropolitan Police Service from public order and firearms through to serious crime, organised crime, and that includes gangs.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well perhaps if we use one of the seats over there and perhaps one of you move round. Is that okay? Sorry about the fact we've got the desks wrong and I blame Helen next to me for all of it.

**Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer):** I apologise. (laughter).

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Great stuff. Sorry, Phillippa, do you quickly want to introduce ...

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** Phillippa Rowe. I'm the leader of Westminster Council and we've got quite a strong gangs programme.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Jules?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Mayor of Hackney and the Chair of London Councils.

**Keith Shipman (Association of London Directors of Children's Services):** I'm Keith Shipman, I'm Youth inclusion manager for the London Borough of Merton.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Fantastic.

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** I'm Michael McNally, I'm the lead for the Ending Gang and Youth Violence peer reviews.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, that's great and in this section we were wanting to pick up the themes from what we've seen before around the desire, certainly from the people who have been the victims if you like, or the families of serious youth violence and also this emerging gang culture. What we can do to improve our efforts, not in enforcement here but in prioritising prevention. I'm delighted, Mick, that you've actually said you've done a lot of the peer review work and if I could, it would be really helpful for you to start with -- you've heard some of the themes that have emerged and to hear your thoughts from your exercise in learning lessons from what's going on up and down the country.

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** Thank you for the opportunity to come along and to speak to you. Louise, Barry and the first speakers resonate with what we have found from the 27 areas and the contact we've had with the 29 areas. I should perhaps give you just a bit of the background, after the summer disorder the Home Office committed to an ending gang youth violence programme, and published a report. One of the recommendations within that report was that a team of experienced and knowledgeable individuals in key stakeholder roles around gangs and youth violence visited local areas in order to support them in dealing with their ending gang and youth violence. The report was based on seven principles of leadership, of mapping and understanding the problem, of assessment and referral, working in partnership, effective interventions, mobilising the community and also breaking the cycle. So based on those seven principles, we pulled together 70 experienced and knowledgeable individuals across all of the key stakeholder groups, so that included gang members, health professionals, education, safeguarding, Local Authority, prison governors, probation workers and police officers.

We went into each of those 27, so far, and next week sees the end of the 29 and asked them questions from the strategic to the operational delivery level on how do they tackle gang and youth violence? What works? What's the evidence base behind that? What are effective interventions, with the intention of identifying areas for improvement that we could make recommendations based on the experience of that group in order to improve the impact of the interventions. We have completed all of those effectively. We have identified a lot of good practice, very little that's evidence based which is quite interesting, in terms of proper thorough evaluation, lots of promising, and developing practice. We identified some silo working. We identified some weaknesses at local level and at a national level, particularly around mapping and therefore understanding the problem and I think this resonates with what's been said already. Who is the top dog? How do they know that? Police operate on

crime data and intelligence. If they're not told who the top dog is, then they won't target the top dog. Information sharing was a key area that has come up as a weakness in all 27 areas. How does health feed into that? How does the community feed into mapping and understanding the problem? How does education -- we talked about education earlier, Barry mentioned it around schools. Every school we went into said, "It doesn't surprise me that you're talking about these individuals". That included primary schools, we're not talking about secondary education or further education, primary schools were identifying these. Again it resonates with early years intervention. This is about a safeguarding issue, it's about education and it's identifying how early years intervention, and supported by the community, how those interventions can be put in place.

So the team went round to all of those areas and found those things out and then made a number of recommendations totalling over 500 to date that they are now supporting those recommendations in place.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** 500 recommendations?

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** It's over 500 recommendations and we've still got two to do.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** That's fantastic. I'm very keen to also hear from people at the sharp end, in the sense that we have two leaders, I know Jules you represent London as the chairman of the London councils but I'm more interested in your leadership of Hackney, which has this as a serious issue. Also, Phillippa in Westminster City Council, which we all think is a beacon of extreme affluence but also has problems around both gang and serious youth violence. Jules, perhaps you could give us an outline of how you think we can work together to prioritise prevention better than we are today, and what you've done in Hackney.

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Well, in Hackney, I'd summarise it as work across three headings. One of them is obviously enforcement and you're covering that later, but that actually makes great inroads to the prevention agenda as well, targeting some of those high profile gang members. Often they aren't actually based within the country and actually getting them when you've disrupted their base enough locally, they then have to come in and take some action themselves and catching them actually, in one instance, with the firearm ready to take the action that he couldn't get his lieutenants to do because they'd been so badly disrupted. That was the London Fields gang. There's a lot on enforcement, particularly on the funding of enforcement action, covert work that the council has done. Some of it worthy of an American style TV series, well known to all, but I don't want to draw parallels between that and my own borough because -- (laughter)

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** You're talking it down, Jules!

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** -- but it has been very effective and any number of arrests now. I'm just scanning some of my figures one on **Pembury**(?) I think it was more than 30 arrests as a result of that operation. So there's a lot that could be said there and as I

said, it's particularly the funding that the local borough has put in to actually make that happen.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** The council funded covert operations by Trident, and you got to the top dog with regard to London Fields effectively, and big arrests in the Pembury estate, so that worked well. Moving on, perhaps to the other --

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** The first one I would come to if I was going to list them all is actually education, and what we're doing in the schools. I've described as attempting to turn off the tap with the supply of unemployable disaffected young men who see gang membership, and we've seen some very eloquent testimony earlier about people who are in situations where they come under peer pressure and some of them, as well as that peer pressure, they feel as though they don't have many other options. So, turning around the education system and getting schools now, who are producing 89% of their pupils coming out with five or more GCSEs including English and Maths, which is our highest performing school now and I expect a couple of the other new schools that we've built to perform as well in the coming years. The third --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** What's the percentage of five ... that's the minimum standard of employability, isn't it? Five A-Cs, including English and Maths. What was the percentage you're getting?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** 89%.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** 89%? That's brilliant. In one of your schools?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Yes, that's the highest.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** What's the lowest?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Overall, all the schools are above that national average and I think the lowest school is about 48%, which for inner London --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Is very good.

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** So a lot of work has been put into that and another strand of the three is youth work. So I've described either end, you've got the trying to turn off the supply, you've got the enforcement for where you've failed but there's also that middle strand where people are in danger of falling into this way of life and investing in that - well I hate the word 'diversionary' although it is diversion activities. I don't like it as a concept because it sounds so temporary. It's like distraction from doing something, whereas actually, we need to find permanent outcomes. I suppose that brings me to a fourth strand --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** What word do you like, Jules?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** I suppose I don't particularly have a word for it.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** What about ‘recovery’?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Yes, that’s a good word actually. I suppose it’s people going off the rails and trying to nudge them back on. Some sort of recovery before it gets too far is probably a good word, and a lot of that recovery work is the kind of thing that the youth teams are engaged in. I suppose the fourth strand, I said there were three but this fourth strand is one which --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well no more than four, Jules!

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** -- which is the problematic one, and that’s employment. We can turn children out with the qualifications. With the youth work, we could have kept them out of trouble for a period of time, but if there aren’t the jobs there, and we’ve heard some powerful testimony earlier about children who aren’t necessarily the obvious candidates to go off the rails, but they get to 18, 19, 20 and no prospect of a job, then they’re ripe for getting into a problem.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** That’s very helpful Jules. Phillipa, we’ve seen some staggering drops in knife crime and serious youth violence in Westminster, what have you learnt?

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** Yes, we have had some fantastic results and you mentioned earlier that everyone thinks Westminster is incredibly affluent, in fact we have four of the most deprived wards in the country and patches of our somewhat more affluent wards are also incredibly deprived and are estates. We started seeing what the police described as ‘crews’ actually then turned very rapidly into gangs and then we went from knife crime to gun crime. One of the things that actually struck me and shocked me was the exponential speed with which that happened. It started in the north of the borough and we got in there very quickly and we’re now seeing a rise of it in the south. It’s very different in the north of the borough, it’s much more about postcodes and rivalries between gangs from different estates. In the south, it’s about the business of drugs. Although some of the ramifications are similar, the core roots are different and I think it’s important to distinguish between the two when you’re working out solutions.

We have had some very good results. We have had a 75% reduction in serious youth violence since we started on this which I think is absolutely fantastic and all the residents have really noticed a difference and are feeling a great deal more confident. We’ve done it through a number of routes. We too have been targeting primary and secondary school children, firstly trying to work out what it is that drives particularly young children to join gangs and whilst talking about, your hated word, diversionary activities, which we have a lot of, particularly during the summer holidays to try and keep children busy so they don’t -- we’re also finding the fear factor is very big. Travelling to school on the school bus, being bullied on the estates and they feel that they have no option, particularly when they have an older sibling or cousins that are involved. So we’re targeting it at that level. We have the Your Choice programme which that programme feeds into, it’s a whole range of stick and carrot options basically for

people either at risk of going into gangs or are already in gangs. Again we've had some significant success in pulling people out of gangs. That will include relocating families away so that they can't be targeted by the existing gangs to get over that fear factor. When gang members have gone to prison, we also have a support programme for a year during their probation period to work with the probation officers to help them so that they don't go back into gangs.

We also have an education and employment programme. We've had 40 referrals to that out of 140 known gang members and 9 of which, senior gang members, we've managed to get jobs for, and it's only been going for a few months so I think that's quite significant. We've got our family recovery programme which is slightly different. We started in Westminster and it's now being rolled out country-wide. What we've done with that is we used criteria relating to gang membership and activity as part of one of the ones that bring them into the trouble families. We have about 30% of armed cohorts in troubled families are actually gang related families. However, the payment streams for linked trouble families don't take those specific criteria into account. Some of them will have other trouble families with strings attached so we will get payment for it but someone who hasn't ticked all those other boxes, we don't get payment for that which I think is an issue and something I think we have to look at more closely. We have about 20 referrals in our gang exit unit and we've got senior members of gangs in there as well. We also employ a clinical psychologist to work with the care management within the gangs, not directly with the individuals involved in gangs, where there is a resistance to dealing with a psychologist, but to guide the people who are working with them. What we've found is because quite a lot of these people have come out of very difficult backgrounds, and have actually often witnessed some rather unpleasant violence or been threatened with some terrible violence, there is some trauma and low level mental health problems associated with that.

The other aspect which hasn't been discussed today that we have which I think does have an impact with some of the things that we're doing with health and that does need to dovetail into what we're doing with gangs is female gang members and the sexual abuse of female gang members which is I think quite staggering some of the numbers that we have found. We've been working on one estate for four months and we've found 22 female youths who have been seriously abused, and that's just one estate in four months. I think there are statistics that say that there are about 20,000 girls country-wide who are being --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** 16,000.

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** Is it 16,000? I was given the figure 20,000. Nevertheless, it's a huge number.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Actually, we're supposed to have the Deputy Children's Commissioner, they've published an interim report and I think it is not quite 20,000 but a vast number of young --

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** It is a large number, and that not only goes with the trauma of going through what these girls have gone through, but also the sexual health issues

and things. We're trying to in Westminster, but I don't think yet we've dovetailed in the health services well enough into what we're actually doing. I think the final point I would like to make, which Steven knows I'm going to make is that we have funding from the Home Office to fund various bits of this. It runs out in April next year. Under normal circumstances we would be winding down in preparation for that cut, but what we're doing is so important that we're not. We are a bit here with our begging bowls. We have to have sustainable long term funding to make this work because we've only just started and we are seeing some really significant successes we want to continue that.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** I think that segues into the slide, before I ask the other people to comment on, we've followed a Westminster principle of mapping the money, which I know you occasionally do, and I'm delighted that MOPAC colleagues have done this and as we know, government, and also the Mayor, in the wake of the riots, kicked off a lot of short term projects out of funds.. So you see a few million in a number of funds that come to an end at the end of this financial year and there's a chart that's up on everyone's screens, which is the beginnings of showing the architecture of funding that could potentially go into prevention. It's an interesting chart because it shows that there are a number of different arms of government that are trying to hold the ring on this agenda and different agencies. It shows that the Home Office clearly has an agenda, and has been doing things nationwide -- sorry about that, I thought I'd knock my sign over -- and indeed they reported yesterday, one year on from the riots, a number of very successful projects and they've been doing their bit to join up central government.

I know Iain Duncan-Smith's put gang advisors into Job Centre Pluses so all of this is good work but the funding as you say comes to an end. I notice the Youth Justice Board is doing six-month pilots, looking at the impact of mentoring, all this again, very, very good work. I'm going to hear from Mark, we've got the safer London Foundation doing their bit and I'm sure it's a really, really good work, but I'm struck by what Mick said, which is if we want to get social investment into this, if we want to have payment according to outcomes, then we're going to have to start to build an evidence base. We're going to have to break down some of the silos and it seems to me that putting a few million pounds out of a plethora of different public bodies is not the solution.

We're all members of the London Crime Reduction Board, Jules, we're all representatives that meets with the other criminal justice agencies and surely this is an issue that is important enough where we can corral the remaining money that's supposed to be going against this project and co-commission -- so bring everyone who's bringing some money to the table to act as a commissioner. So that on the one hand we can start to put the money to work that we do have in a coherent way, so we're not overlapping, we don't encourage grant farming and that we collectively start to try and build the evidence base that Mick says is so terribly important, and not just the evidence of good practice. I know your choice, you said to me, some very good evidence behind it, I can't guarantee the funding for it but you're putting a very strong case. We need to elevate the debate around evidence and I think the first step is to get the money together so that we can then look to stimulate the market and attract additional investment around outcomes.

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** We worked on family recovery because that's exactly what we did. We looked at all the agencies involved in dealing with difficult families all sat round a table together and all put our money into the same pot and worked together on solutions and that's been immensely successful so it should be the same imitative on this.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Jules? Would that get your support?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Yes

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well I went to the launch of the social outcomes fund in the cabinet office and I'm sure they'll start to help us in the process of getting the social investment market to come but we have to work together on this and there has to be some way of bringing some coherence to the funding flows. Mark, not talking enforcement in this bit, because we do know that your coverage is wide, and I've been briefed before on some of the great work that you're doing, some of the programmes that you're doing. I'm more interested in this bit on prevention.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Okay. Obviously, our expertise is the intelligence and the enforcement. We see the success that we're having with our approach so far, frankly and not wanting to talk it down but what we do, we suppress the problem through enforcement, through imprisonment, through orders. There's not a lot of solving that does and the solving will come from the prevention and diversion work alongside the enforcement. We're in no doubt about that, while it's not our core work, we do fund certain schemes, part fund schemes like Kicks and various diversions schemes. We're involved in Safe and Secure and all sorts of things. I think your maths, if I was to be slightly challenging makes the picture look too tidy. I don't think it's anywhere near that tidy.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, we couldn't make it any more complicated and put it on one side bar.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Yeah, yeah, exactly. Perhaps limited by the possibilities of PowerPoint, maybe, but the multiple government funding streams and the different approaches we see across London make it very difficult for offices to engage. I mean, you've got two boroughs here who do, sort of, excellent work. The picture here is patchy across London. One statistic which I think is illustrative, more than half the gang offending we see, is a gang member living in borough A offending in borough B. So, who owns that problem? The reality is sometimes it gets picked up and there are good relationships between boroughs, sometimes it doesn't. We got a -- picking up, last couple of days, one example of a fairly sort of challenging young man with -- 17-year-old young man, partly with history in a war-torn African country and part on the streets of London, and on bail for firearms offences. Sort of, in that scenario, borough A and borough B are sort of arguing about who's going to house him and responsibilities for him, and the rest of it.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Sure.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** And, sort of, one can see how that arises when you don't have a pan-London approach. I've got a briefing document here on, for current gang tensions that we see as critical issues in London and sort of the weekly reports and the intelligence. But we do, and again all of those straddle more than one borough. So, I think if we're to really get hold of prevention and diversion, we need a way that reaches across London, because it is a London-wide issue. That doesn't mean you have one approach. There are lots of very good local schemes, some have been evaluated and some haven't been, and you want to bring that under your wing. I think the sort of the plea from the police is really, we don't pretend we're experts in that world, but as we are involved in dramatic moments in young people's lives, whether it's when they're being brought to justice, or they've been victims of assaults when they're being attacked by people from an opposition gang. Those moments, often my officers have sort of unique opportunities to push people towards diversion schemes, and the sort of diversion required needs to be sort of ready and quite transformative. Because whilst the solutions -- I think, the solutions sort of framework in probation normally work through about sort of substance abuse and housing, accommodation, about employment and mentoring and all those, all those things apply the same with gang members. There are extra issues other than in terms of the social pools for them, and the sort of comprehensive nature of the grip around the individual, where you have half a chance of diverting them, and need to be even stronger. I would sort of iron them out with support, sort of the broader pan-London approach at trying to save the best of the local, but joins up in a way that recognises that this is not a local issue, these issues straddle boundaries.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, Mark, you've set up the key thing brilliantly, because although you work in Merton, you represent the kind of professional arm of Directors of children's services, and perhaps you could pick up that point on some of the issues around dealing with an issue which doesn't just revolve around a particular postcode. Indeed, it can stretch, as Mark describes, around London boroughs, and I think Jules alluded to -- can have international ramifications. It's not just a problem that can be located, you know, to one area, in many cases.

**Male Speaker 1:** I'm thinking, I think I thoroughly agree with that, that the of the issues sort of faced by young people will be a disagreement with a group of young people in another borough, another area. I think also that the analysis that there is local area postcode and there is also drug dealing, and there are different types of gangs doing different types of things. I think that's also very important, to understand the gangs we're looking at, and there's usually violence that follows from it. I think there is good intelligence sharing between some boroughs. I think there is less good intelligence sharing within some boroughs. I think I would concur with the point made over there, which is that one of the key elements we need to get right here is sharing that intelligence across all the agencies, so that the targeted prevention we do is effective. So there are very good programmes, there are a variety of them, and I agree they're probably not that well-evaluated. There are a variety of them across London. I think that the intelligence needs to be shared well between the police, youth services, youth offending services, schools, housing providers, I haven't heard mentioned yet, and they're very key, social care, and health. All those partners are beginning to share more information through MASH programmes, which most London boroughs are now rolling out.

So I think that there is the potential with MASH programmes, that there will be better sharing of information at an earlier stage.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Can you describe more about MASH programmes?

**Male Speaker 1:** Yes, so it's the idea that there is a multi-agency safeguarding or screening out -- it's used differently, the term is used differently in different boroughs. But the idea is that each London borough will have a one single place with all that data held in one place. That's mainly looking at safeguarding child protection, but one of the spin-offs from this could be that we will be holding a lot of that information, more quickly in that area. I still think there's an area of soft intel that will sit outside that. That sort of information needs to be regularly shared in a safe environment between partners.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Yeah.

**Male Speaker 1:** So I know for example, in Merton we have a place where housing and voluntary-sector youth, and other youth services will share that intel quite readily. That allows them to decide, is this, in the words that we've used before, the top dog that needs targeting by the police? Is this a young person that needs removing and supporting? The other element which I think I've heard, but I don't know what we --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** So you're beginning to see, effectively what you're describing, which is the important bedrock of all this, a co-location of all the statutory agencies in one place?

**Male Speaker 1:** Yes, absolutely.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** They're starting off around safeguarding in child protection, but you think this could extend?

**Male Speaker 1:** Yes, it could. Yeah, it could extend.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** I mean, one of the things I'm struck about, I don't often get data from City Hall that you say that, "Wow", I was struck by something done by the crime analysts that sits within GLA, not part of MOPAC, that kind of brought together some of the data from health and the ambulance service and casualty and also data from Trident, to generate hot-spot maps. I mean, Mark, I mean, I learnt from New York that their belief in policing is it's simply also about getting police not just to respond to incidents but to be out there in numbers in places where incidents are likely to happen. This is almost like a bubble on particular streets on London where there are issues. Are we getting enough of that data sharing between agencies? Can we do more? What are your thoughts?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** We work on sort of all of that intelligence and other types which I'll go into more on the important bit. In terms of the intelligence sharing between agencies, it's good with some local authorities. It tends to be patchier with the health service, frankly, and that's an issue that, sort of, I think, most agencies find, because of health

services' nervousness about personal data, which one can understand to some degree given their duties. I think that often leads to less sharing than is possible. I know that's something that the inter-Ministerial group on gangs, chaired by the Home Secretary, has been discussing and she's keen that progress is made on that. So I think there is scope to do better. The key thing about MASH, that I think is really important for people to understand, is that it starts to share the risk and the thinking in a much more sophisticated way. Because it's all well and good for me every time a police officer comes across an incident with a child involved, just to send a form to children's services somewhere, then almost off lay the risk, but that's not really an intelligent way of working. If we put experts together in a room with access to all the data, and we share it together and share the assessments, it's a slicker process, and a more joined-up and grown-up approach to assessing risk and prioritising who best needs help. These sort of developments of MASH schemes in London and elsewhere in the country is a positive step.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** So how do you assess risk, Mark, within Trident?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** We have a matrix that looks at sort of past offending history and current intelligence. I was going to talk that through more in my presentation, and we use it to come up with a score so we could tell you --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Shall we cover that later, shall we?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** We could, but we could tell you the top 25 offenders in any given borough. So Westminster, we could put the top 25 offenders, or the top 25 offenders in London, people who are of most danger and most concern to us.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, when you say most danger and most concern, I mean I was struck by the top dog point. Are those the top, will that capture the top dog?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Absolutely. Sort of, we are determined to take out the top dogs, and I think we are pretty successful at it, and the sort of -- and I think performance stats in terms of stabbings, and shootings, and the impact we're having on that, would suggest the most violent people we're having an increased impact on. I would never claim perfection --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Are the most violent people necessarily the top dog?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** In the gang culture, they are. I mean, I think it's different when you go to a more conventional organised crime sphere, very much, the sort of the, which is probably getting closer to your sort of Godfather sort of analogy, where you get senior enough to stand back and have other people do your bidding. Most of the street gangs that you're, sort of, leadership and credibility comes as much from being parts of the violence. Of course, there isn't a clear blue water between gang culture and organised crime, and there is an overlap between them in, sort of, but I think the issue we're focused on today, the top dogs are generally high in violence and their sort of credibility in this sort of communities is based upon that.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Okay, any questions from our colleagues here?

**Male Speaker 2:** I mean, I guess that the message that seems to be coming through, what I'm hearing, is that it's less about gaps in arrangements, kind of arrangements that I'd be interested in, if I think there are particularly important gaps in arrangements, then it's about getting to use that awful phrase 'joined-up'. We've heard about data sharing, we've heard about colocation. Are there any important institutional ways in which we can try to embed the joining-up more reliably, efficaciously? Together with the siloes which, I think, Mick, you referred to earlier. You know, it's human nature that people operate within their own siloes and **boundaries**(?) but it's the light motif of almost everything we've heard today, is that we'll only address these problems effectively if the agencies work together more effectively. What is standing in the way, and what are the single most important things that you would respectively do to get to joining up?

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** The key to, I think, start with. How do we get the agencies to join up?

**Male Speaker 3:** I think, the description I heard about the MASH is a place where people are joining up, and I'm quite struck with how health are willing to join us, which was something which I was quite surprised with, to be honest. But they're very willing to join us. Police are leading this charge, so I think that's very good as well. So I think, there is that joining up. There is a different culture of information protection, if that's the right word for it, within health, and that's something we have to consider about what information is shared within health. Health isn't one organisation, either. It's many, so getting that broad range of --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** The many faces of health.

**Male Speaker 3:** Many faces of health, yeah. The many parts of the health organisation, health economy. These young people might well turn up in a hospital somewhere completely different in London, so how do we get that --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Take CAMS, to represent. Are CAMS joining MASH groups?

**Male Speaker 3:** Certainly, the version I can describe in Merton is a version which is kind of looking across Southwest London and Southwest London. St. George's trust, which is a kind of service, is part of a wider safeguarding group, which are linked to the Marsden and to our local PCT services, so yes.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, I'm son of a surgeon and I go to a lot of academic conferences, when I'm not here, before you. I met the person who runs the vascular surgical service in Tooting, and he talked about an increase, a massive increase in the number of young people arriving in his hospital in St. Georges, victims of, you know, serious youth violence, use of knives in particular, because he's the person who has to operate on them. He described a complete absence of some of the services he would expect to wrap around places,

where they would, where actually you're at the sharp end. So, I mean, is that something you would agree with? I mean, he certainly put that to me.

**Male Speaker 3:** I think one of the things that may be very true is that at certain points, there's a point of intervention, isn't there? There's a point where something goes wrong in a young person's life, is a point where we can make change with them. And whether we have the right services at the right point, I think, is a fair comment. So, do we have the right services there at St. George's or at any hospital, when the young person or the parents come in to see the young person stabbed, if they come? Have we got those services immediately there? I probably think not.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Okay.

**Male Speaker 2:** So that comes back to, I mean, what are the things that are standing in the way of the, sort of, joining-up, that all of you are saying is necessary?

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** If I could make a comment on that. I think health is the one area where we have not joined up as much as we should have done. Certainly at Westminster, we've actually had very good partnership working with it, which is why your choice, and (several inaudible words) been so successful. Bringing health in has been difficult, but we have got this change of health arrangements going forward, and the introduction of the health and wellbeing boards, and that is supposed to be the point at which health meets all the other different services that we're providing locally. So to, hopefully, if we're doing our job properly on the health, we'll have proper targeted outcomes, and I think some of this gang-related stuff needs to feed better into that.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** So you're going to make sure your local health and wellbeing board focuses on some of these issues and not just smoking cessation and obesity, but some of these issues that --

**Phillippa Rowe (London Councils):** Exactly. I think that's exactly, and I think that should be a message that goes out to more health and wellbeing boards where it's relevant.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Okay, fine. Jules?

**Mayor Jules Pipe (London Councils):** Could I just say that I agree with what Phillippa says about when we're talking about, sort of, the join up of policy or technical advice sort of the engagement and perhaps their attendance, think of advice, on say, MASH panels. But there is a glaring hole, and that touches actually on this point about join up, at say, A&E. But we don't get the stats. What I know, we could get stats, but we don't actually get intelligence. The police don't get intelligence from A&E. I know that there are data issues there, and personal information, but that bridge has already been crossed on gun crime. If someone comes in with a gunshot wound, then the hospital is required to hand over that information, but not on serious knife wounds, and I think that is a glaring hole which we've been arguing as boroughs and also, in the so in the short existence of the LCRB. But getting any movement on that, is, has proven difficult.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Nice Jules. Mick, you wanted to come in on the --

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** Just a real frustration, I think, from me, because in every area you've talked about, I can point to examples across the country of it being done really, really well. And in the same area that shares health really, really well, are really poor in school engagement, and they can learn from a neighbouring area. If we could take the 250, 300, examples of --

**Male Speaker 4:** So do you have examples in the country, not necessarily London, where health and external departments are sharing this information in a way that helps the police build up intelligence, helps to bring the partner agencies to the table at the right time? Is that happening?

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** Yes, not personalised data. Right, and you know.

**Male Speaker 5:** They're incidents, intelligence on incidents.

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** Incident areas. Incident data.

**Male Speaker 4:** Incident data. Where is that happening?

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** Merseyside, and, you know, a good example of that is Knowsley, Liverpool, driven by a professor called Mark Bellis, who is just about to launch a database that will make it a lot easier to share some of this information.

**Male Speaker 6:** There's some best practice stuff.

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** There's some best practice.

**Male Speaker 7:** There's some best practice, you don't actually need to look, but there is, this is not happening. This is an isolated example of the personal leadership of a particular clinician, but it's not happening in other places.

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** There are pockets of really good data exchange, and it's based, we can, I can talk about boroughs in London, but I can talk specifically around Salford as an example in Manchester, where they use the analogy of 'dare to share', on the basis of all of their information exchange, with welfare, childcare --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well that's a great message, isn't it? I've learnt the phrase 'dare to care', and all this other stuff, but 'dare to share', so that we can have the information needed, so we can -- Faith, you wanted to ask a question, and we need to move on.

**Faith Boardman (MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor):** Yes, I want to develop some of these things, and understand how they are being applied to issues around young girls and women

that are associated with gangs. Because I take the point that you were making very clearly, but issues can develop very rapidly. It feels like this is one of the areas where it's still developing and it's an iceberg issue, but it's there under the surface, and rapidly coming nearer to the surface. So I think, specifically, I'd like to understand -- the OCC inquiry, I think, has recommended very much that police forces should work with all manner of partners and organisations to identify young girls and women who are at risk, and to log information, and to find them diversionary objectives and to risk-assess them, in a way that we've heard is increasingly done for young men. Is that sort of process actually working in London?

**Male Speaker 8:** We're working to strengthen that. I think the debate on, sort of, sexual violence, last ten years has focused on the simpler end of the spectrum, which is the smaller part of the problem, which is, sort of, outright, sort of, stranger attacks on, sort of, women or young children, whatever. The big chunk of the iceberg under the surface is sexual violence that comes through coercion. And, frankly, whether, another thing that is troubling me at the moment is the Jimmy Savile inquiry, whether it's coercion through power and position or celebrity, or whether it's coercion through the power of a gang member. They are far harder to turn up the cases because of, sort of, reporting issues. They're far harder to investigate because of, sort of, the circumstances and credibility of different people involved, etc. The (inaudible) system is far less good at dealing with that, and I think we've really got a stone to turn over in London, to get better at sharing that data about young people at risk and the offenders, and find different ways to tackle them. One of the things I want to do, work the plans to launch some new operation approaches, is to start using the proactive tactics we used against organised crime on gang members, to deal with sexual violence, because to face up to the fact that sometimes, when a victim comes to us, and she's so damaged and troubled by a whole range of issues, perhaps not just this incident, that isn't prepared, or able, or willing to stand up in court, that shouldn't be the end of the matter. If we then know that Mr A is somebody who is exploiting the vulnerability of others, you know whatever circumstance, and gangs is one of them, then we need to think about how do we target Mr A in the same way we target Mr A, if he was a drug dealer, or a violent gang member. And I think bring some of those organised crime tactics to sexual violence, building on the intelligence supplied by victims, and accepting that sometimes a victim's accounts --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, that's very positive to hear.

**Male Speaker 8:** That's where we want to go.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** That's very positive to hear that. So you recognise that there are whole spectrum of offences that happen around this, you know, gangs that need to be looked at in a systematic way, and a way that you started to do around knife crime and gun crime. But that's good news. Sorry, Keith, you wanted to come in?

**Keith Shipman (Association of London Directors of Children's Services):** Yeah, I was going to say there's some very good work being done by Barnado's across London, which is working with girls that are running away, and particularly girls that are running away from gangs. I believe I might have the university, the University of Bedfordshire, doing some research about that as well. So the two together should give us quite an interesting story. But

it's an area which I think has been underdeveloped for a number of years. I think that the work often straddles large parts of London, where young people run away large distances, and are maybe exploited in very different areas, even outside London, which makes it very complicated. I think prosecutions are quite often, quite often difficult. The Sapphire process will kick in, a safeguarding process might kick in, but actually supporting those young girls often is the issue. We also have another, more hidden version, which is not sex exploitation version, but it's where girls are hiding the drugs in their house, they're carrying the gun, and it's about educating those girls about the risks they're taking. Some of those girls are not on our radars, they're not the ones that we know well. So I think there is more to be done.

**Faith Boardman (MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor):** That issue of focus seems to me to be very important, and as I understand it, we don't really have formal targets around girls and women issues of the types we've just talked about. I do seriously wonder whether we should make focused effort to build up the evidence base, and to put in a suitable target?

**Male Speaker 8:** This isn't the claim that we've got the right suite of measures completely, but we do have an ambition to increase the number of men prosecuted for rape offences, and this year the number of rape prosecutions here to date is a bad 30%, within a couple of percent. So we made a real step change in the way that we're dealing with child abuse and rape, in terms of prosecuting more people. That's a start, but we've got an awful long way to go.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** I think really what Faith's saying is you've got a coherence and a structure around a matrix, which we are going to next, we need to move on to that, but could be extended to look at other aspects of this. You've said you were going to do that, and other agencies need to do that as well, so it won't just be you on your own. I want to thank you, all of you, for this bit, because I think we've seen that we shouldn't be complacent, we shouldn't say everything's wonderful, everything's rosy. I mean, if this chart mark is wrong, it should be, it's worse than this. Clearly, have small short term grants come to an end? There has to be greater coherence about how we spend what limited public money there is. So that, really, I do believe should be coordinated on a pan-London basis, frankly, under the London Crime Reduction Board, which is charged with looking at this issue, as opposed to different agencies doing different things. We need to build the evidence base together, and I'm struck by Mick's point, that there are outriders out there, doing good things, who are daring to share information. More needs to be done across agencies to share intelligence and data that can help us tackle this problem. So thank you, all of you, for coming forward and making those points about how we could advance the promotion of gender. We now move on to the last bit of the meeting, looking at enforcement. Thank you very much.

**Male Speaker 8:** Mark, do you want to take us through some slides then, on Trident? That'd be really helpful.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Give me time, I've got some slides, and I'll try to canter through them. I guess my key message to start with, is what we're talking about here is a coherent pan-London enforcement and intelligence regime. There was plenty of good work across London before we launched the enhanced approach in February, but what there wasn't,

was something that joined the top to bottom, and across London, that's what we're trying to put in place. Just to give sort of some operational context, to really get into the grit. Last night, this is just normal business, we did two warrants, one in Lambeth, one in Waltham Forest. We've got several people in custody, including women possibly holding firearms, interestingly, picking up the earlier debate. In those two raids we recovered three firearms, all with ammunition, two handguns and one shotgun. We're probably recovering about 15 to 20 firearms, sort of, a month, at the moment. That's sort of normal business in terms of taking sort of violence off the streets of London. We mentioned earlier we've got four current tensions that we're concerned about between different gangs, and that intelligence picture is refreshed continually. We have 3,684 gang members currently on our matrix, of which 655 are in custody. We're sort of performing operations day in and day out. The firearms issue is interesting. We do over 1,000 pre-planned firearms operations a year in London. That's not counting the sort of armed response vehicles responding to calls of armed robberies and things.

1,000 pre-planned operations making the rest of the people with firearms, on the way to attack people, things like last night, and the professions of officers means that we do everything possible, and very rarely do we fire a shot. The slide you've got in front of you now is about success to date. So, this is building on the launch in February. This is 1 April figures to now, serious youth violence down 32%. Knife injuries, those under 25, down by 31%. That's 407 fewer young men, because it's usually young men, who are sort of injured by knife assaults, this year. Similar proportions around gun. And we've got a lot more people in custody. I'll come back to that in a moment. Next slide, please. The picture in London, you know, the 18 and in gang and youth violence, boroughs, and here is sort of the map of different gang territories and things that we're aware of and, sort of, say we have intelligence about where there are tensions and where there are issues developing. So we'll skip through a couple of slides. So we got the launch that many people took part in, the new approach in February, where we took the central triad and gang command which is historically focused simply on --

**Male Speaker 8:** Our bosses are in the front row.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Yes, yes, exactly, yes. So they're here to tell us what a great job they've done. So that's the law and it's about taking the Trident command, which is focused very much on the firearms top-end and some of the local good practice and joining it together. So we've got one regime and one assessment matrix across London, and so that the creation of dedicated teams and some targets. Can we skip through a couple of slides to the charts, please, thank you. So how are we measuring performance? We thought the first step for us was to show a stronger grid on gang offenders, the most serious gang offenders. So we make, whilst, in the last session I was really clear, we know that enforcement isn't the solution on its own. That's the thing that we bring to the table, which is taking out the most dangerous people. So the first chart there is about our ambition to increase the numbers of gang nominals in custody to 400 by the end of the year. Taking people off the streets doesn't solve problems, but it does, while they're in custody, they're not out there stabbing or shooting people.

The second chart is about our aspiration, make increased use of judicial restrictions, a sort of generic catch-all, we mean, for I suppose gang injunctions, serious crime prevention orders, and all those enforcement powers that give you some purchase over individuals and communities. That one we are increasing, we're not quite with our target yet, but we've got a lot on the system, we are sort of optimistic that we'll get to the 200 by the end of the year. And it's those that are indicative or increased group which the following slide rehearses some of the numbers at the start. So the top half are measures that I would see as good surrogate measures for gang violence. Gun crime, gun discharge, serious youth violence, and the last one which, I think, is probably the best surrogate, which is the knife injury, assault, victims under 25, not in a domestic situation.

So, whichever sort of the surrogates you look at, you get a, sort of, a quarter to a third sort of range in reductions. We're pleased with that, and I think having taken something fairly disjointed, but we've good practice and joined it together, and put a regime across, then that's success. It just shows, we need to put them as below, and it's contributing to why the patterns of reducing violence in London. And it shows it is different. Those are the more generic figures. The top ones, ones at the top are about how we how we deal with gangs. The next slide is just something I want to bring to the table. Not for sort of microscopic debate, of course, there is a list of names of young men alongside this which would be inappropriate to put into the public domain. They are top offenders, sort of, from a North London borough, top twenty gang nominals, for one. That's refreshed on a regular basis, and we match our operational activity against this.

Just to try and unpack it, so the top one there, this score is based on some historic criminality involving 2010, grievous bodily harm, firearms possessions in 2010, three weapon-enabled robberies in 2010. 2011, two other robberies over a similar period, and six offences of knife possession, and some domestic violence as well, added together with an assessment of some current intelligence around violence. So, with a fairly gruesome history like that, you probably wouldn't be surprised that he comes out top of the top of the list. I mean, the point is about a scientific approach, and we are then making sure how much activities against individuals, day in and day out. We have operational coverage on them, whether that's about stop and search activity, the sort of 'cops on the dots' thing you're talking about earlier, Deputy Mayor, or whether that's about covert operations.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** 'Cops on the dots', that's far quicker than the guy from New York was able to express.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Well, it's about 'cops on the dots', which is some of the action, or whether it's about covert activity, and the most sensitive techniques we use to get our hands around them, and catch them red-handed with drugs or firearms or whatever to put them in prison, in prison for a long period. So we've got this ruthless scientific approach on every borough and across London.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Well, as the son of an academic surgeon, who likes evidence, I appreciate that sort of approach, but I was also struck by something you said in the previous bit, when you said that the top dogs' credibility would be based upon their own involvement

with violence. Probably, I could believe that. But equally, I could also believe that the top dogs, or the big dogs' credibility, is to be engaged in the kind of violence that also doesn't get caught you know, frankly, they'd be too clever for you guys to catch them. And they would be incredibly dangerous individuals. So, you know, I'm not sure. This is me, not as a professional police officer. I'm not sure, that I would necessarily, you know. Maybe I watched too many movies, too many iterations of the Godfather to believe that, you know. Could you address whether, frankly, these measures that are picking up young people that are regularly engaged in violence, are necessarily those very dangerous people that provide the climate of fear, if you like, the architecture of fear that ensures that people find it very difficult to leave gangs? Are we convinced that the people that are getting arrested the most times are necessarily the top dogs?

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Steve can forgive us in a moment, of course the top individuals will sometimes commission violence, and we do know that sometimes to become a member of a gang you have to commit a violent act as a sort of as a badge of honour. So, it is a complex picture. Most of these gangs who (inaudible) earlier are different to conventional organised crime, where you retreat into the shadows as time goes on. That's not to say that the most senior individual's always heavily involved. That's why we use covert techniques. If we are simply based on a reactive investigation where A has stabbed B, then if A was commissioned by someone he sees as senior to him, then that's not going to capture that. If we're using intrusive surveillance, listening devices, physical surveillance, and all the other tactics we use, then we can get the evidence as to who's commissioned it, and put people in, put people in prison as well. So it's important that there's proactive policing, intelligence-led work, not simply reacting to things going wrong, which is why this ruthless approach is important. Because if you don't do this, sometimes the opportunities may arise more often, for numbers say, six to 20, and the top five may be slightly canner because they've been around longer.

**Male Speaker 8:** So we're saying that this is not the only game in town. This is something that is important if we're going to start to move a lot of the symptoms of violence that we see on our streets, but I mean, I saw the, in the report from the Home secretary in Hammersmith, he stated that they're looking at the markets for knives and crimes, and bringing in new legislation to deal with that, because there are people that are profiting from all this violence. New legislation, hopefully, will provide a framework for you to be able to target that, so you know, the same way you break a drugs market, so, I guess, you can break the markets around the supply of the weapons of violence.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** We know now, the work on firearms over the last two or three years, it's not just from this initiative. Frankly, it's a longer-term effort. Firearms we cannot take off the streets of London completely, but we have suppressed the --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** I think we're being joined by somebody on the gallery, but carry on.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** We've suppressed the supply sufficiently. That does have an impact. We do see firearms being quite hard to get hold of, and people having

to go to suppliers and that gives us new opportunities. So we can have an impact on it, we're going for top people, who's most important. We use every enforcement tactic going in, whether it's working with local authorities. In good operations in Croydon recently, where we used all sorts of powers together with the local authority. Whether it's using immigration paths, because 25% of gang members are not British citizens, or whether it's about (inaudible) enforcement.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Sure, okay. Heather, sorry, I know that you have, and within Probation, your own approach. Could you describe some of the ways that you could approach this difficult area?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** Okay, well, London Probation are supervising about 40,000 offenders at any one time, of course these are all over 18, so we're not talking here about the younger ones. It's interesting. We're looking at the ages, actually, on that previous slide, a lot of them are over 18 on, so it isn't just about young people in gangs. We are either dealing with community orders, or on a license having come out of prison having served at least 12 months. So we are dealing with, sort of, the most dangerous and difficult people as well. We have about 900 offenders that we have identified as being involved in gangs. What we're trying to do is be much, have much more of a focus and be more responsive to the gang issue in London. I'll say in a little bit why that's a challenge, but some of the new things we're doing, one we're doing is we're developing what's called an intensive alternative to custody. This is around the diversion, can't think of another word, but we are going to call it 'exit'.

These intensive alternatives to custody is a sentence that, which is it says, it's an alternative to custody. Funded and piloted by Ministry of Justice, in a number of areas not in London. Their funding did stop, but a number of areas have found a sort of successful way of working with the 18 to 24-year-old age group, and trying to keep them out of custody. What we're doing in London is trying to develop a response which just takes the best evidence from that, but actually, focus it on gang offenders. So, what we want to be able to do is, where an offender is appropriate for an alternative to custody, to offer a sentence that would, well, we can work with them to help with the exit. Now, we're working with sentences that (inaudible) are very keen on this judges, what we'd do is bring in evidence from things like New York and drug courts where sentences are having (inaudible) before them, and continually reviewing the sentence. It's intensive seeing people regularly with lots of support, mentoring, peer mentoring, etc. attached to it. So that's something new that we hope to roll out from April. We're also putting extra resources in by having a specialist unit, a serious group offending unit. We want to develop that expertise and knowledge, and make sure we're supporting the work that's going on in the boroughs. We are the screening tool, we do have gang register, we do this one-to-one programme, which now the youth offending teams are piloting, and that's evidence-based. But there's --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Heather, can I just ask something about the structure of Probation, so you've obviously got people within probation centres in London --

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** Every borough.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** -- that are focused on this gang issue. Are they, are they people that you find out within the different parts of London? Are they, sort of, you know, what do I find, there'll be someone focused on those gang boroughs, or are they centrally-located with you in Victoria?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** No, no. I mean, we see ourselves as a local delivery agency, so we have offices in every borough. So, there wouldn't be necessarily a specialist around, sometimes if there's a multi-agency team, as in Hackney and other places, in Westminster, we've got staffs --

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** So it could be in the MASH team, for instance, or not?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** Well, sometimes there is specialist gangs team, so we might have specialist resource. For another one, it's about making sure our staff, who are holding a mixed case, they can identify who these offenders are. Then by having some specialist support, we have some people who really are very knowledgeable, to work and support those members of staff, help in cases.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** And you do risk-modelling as well, don't you? Because I think I believe you do risk-modelling as well. One of my colleagues told me it's something called Oasis, I might be wrong about this, and that you try and collect data, not necessarily about their records of the number of times they've been arrested, or charged, or whatever, but you try and develop information about them, that becomes predictive.

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** Yeah. We have a huge information base, and one of the ways it does is identifies the risk of somebody's reoffending, how likely are they to go on. But it also identifies the risk of harm they will cause, will they commit a -- are they likely to cause a very serious offence or not. It's a very useful predicting tool. What we've done is we've also got this gang screening tool, because often gang members will come to us on a fairly low level sentence, they might have been convicted of motoring offences, or just be doing a community order, but actually are gang-related. And what we're very good, is sharing that information, because then we need to deal with them in a different way.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** So, do you too, as heads of this in London, share, you know, on the one hand you've got the Trident matrix, and all the intelligence, the covert ops, then on the other hand, you've got your tool around street screening, Oasis, which is a very helpful predictive tool. Is that all that information pooled and shared across the agencies?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** It is, and we have regular meetings with the Trident gang-unit and at a local borough level. It's sometimes a bit more patchy at a local borough level, but it's certainly getting better. So, you know, sometimes, we're identifying people that the police wouldn't have on the list, and vice-versa.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Okay, so it's information sharing. In this case, where you're looking at through different prisons, and I bring in NOMS as well, is there effectively a joint

risk-assessment of individuals? Is that happening in the different partner agencies, and then shared?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** Certainly in prisons we use the same tool. We use Oasis.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** For NOMS and probation it's a joint tool?

**Heather Munro (London Probation Trust):** It is. Sometimes they're getting the information, yet what they might not be able to do, is notify that they're gang offenders, and that's where it can be more challenging, because, of course, we're working with prisoners who are in prisons across the whole country. It isn't just London prisons. Mick might want to say a bit more about the information sharing in prisons.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Can I bring Mick in, sorry, from prisons, because, obviously, that's the other part of the piece. With our probation police, how do you, how are you approaching this issue? Because I have just been to Felton for the first time, and I'm going to go to the ISIS, I'm probably going to go to somewhere else. It's quite an extraordinary experience, actually, yeah and ...

**Mick McNally (Ending gang and youth violence):** The (inaudible) success is our problem, because we then end up managing large numbers of gang members in institutions, so about a quarter of the population at Felton, and of ISIS, have recognised gang connections. That's what they actually, they admit to, and that's what our statistics sort of say, but it may be higher. Managing the minute in one institution, and we have, you have a conflict between nearness to home, and concentrating Londoners in London. And so, high percentage of gang members in London prisons. We do share information, we have access to the London probation database, we've got information sharing agreements with the Metropolitan Police. But not all London gang members are in London prisons. For example, High Down, which is just outside the M25, is in the Surrey constabulary area, but has prisoners from Croydon. Other young offender institutions will take London prisoners further away. Therefore, it is quite complicated. Then there are the issues about transferring prisoners between prisons, because the gang conflict doesn't end when they come into prison. It is our most significant order and control issue in our young offender institutions, without any shadow of a doubt. We have a lot of resources devoted to trying to monitor, to keep apart, and that physically means that they don't go to the same place at the same time. As actually, if you're trying to run a safe decent institution, when you're trying to rehabilitate people, you can't do that if you've got disorder. That's a really important issue.

So there are four members of staff dedicated to gang activities in Felton alone, and we can mirror that across in ISIS. We have three prisons in one borough. So in Greenwich, there are three prisons, and that must be a headache for the Metropolitan Police Force. I can't move the prison, but actually, it does mean that Greenwich have an awful lot of work. The violence between gang members is quite significant. It's quite interesting that the new legislation, that it's a criminal offence to carry a bladed weapon in a public place. Unfortunately, a prison is not a public place, and the choice of weapon for young offenders is often a razor blade melted

into a toothbrush, and that is a very dangerous weapon. Information sharing is getting better, but I think there's probably a need for a champion across the custodial estate that can link in one voice, rather than each institution doing its own thing. Coupled with that is the lack of an evidence base of what works. I could run off the number of people, groups, bodies that work in our prisons, including some of those you've heard from today. I'm sure they do good stuff, but we actually don't know in terms of evidence base what we should invest our money in. We have one accredited programme, a thinking-skills programme, to make young people, it's aimed at young people, adults, to think first, their thought processes. Whether that has the same impact on gang activity, I don't know, and that is a particularly hard group to meet. That's just a quick overview.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** All right, all very, very strong points. Certainly my experience of Felton was almost a microcosm of the streets of London in one place, and I haven't been to ISIS yet, due to go shortly. I think what you say is very pertinent. Interestingly enough, we've heard from the new Secretary of State, the MOJ, that they're going to be looking at a kind of review of the secure youth estate, in particular. I've heard, when I went to New York, I was hearing about the young men's initiative, where essentially, young people get incarcerated in upstate New York, and their feeling is that that's not necessarily something that leads to rehabilitation, taking people away from their family support networks. Is there an opportunity to do something closer to home? Certainly the mayor in New York thinks there may well be an environment, potentially an alternative custody, potentially a custodial environment, that leads to better outcomes. Particularly, as you say, there's a lack of evidence base. I'm hesitant to ask someone who's, as you say, running an institution. Did you think we have the right custodial environment, should we say? Because it's a lot like a school to me, when I visited Felton, it was actually designed like a campus. Do we have the right environment to get these young people on a different path? I appreciate all the risk, but --

**Male Speaker 8:** The environment, the environment does impact. A decade ago I ran Felton while I was at government. I worked quite a lot with young offenders. Design is important. Felton is lucky because it's got lots of small units. They cost a lot of money, on the other hand. ISIS has got bigger units, and simply managing the population, and keeping people apart, if you send 70 young men to an education lock in a straight corridor, in classrooms that are opposite, who've failed in school, who -- you put them down one long corridor and expect peace and harmony to reign. Before you can educate them you've got to keep the peace. You put an enormous amount of effort into just policing them, and the logistics exercise of moving people from one class to another at the break time. It is a master class in logistics. That's just to keep the peace. So, design does matter. I guess overall, you'd say small is better. Certainly, smaller units, breaking it down from 180 down to 30, 40, at most. That does mean it costs more money.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Sure, sure. I know Steve wanted to ask a good question.

**Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor):** If I may, just elicit this remark? Really, for you, as you had performance, and drilling back down on the performance figures, and particularly relating to, and you mentioned the word "surrogate" and I'm interested in

your analysis of how you, perhaps, split out all the, perhaps conflate, gang fight, and non-gang fight. So you've got a good story to tell, on the figures here, although there's a mix in the boroughs. So I cite, for example, my borough, Croydon, and I think we see knife crime going the wrong direction by, perhaps, 10%. When does knife crime mean gang-related knife crime? Because I very much welcome the investment in the gang schemes, but it's a question of using that scientific evidence to see how that correlated performance of gang crime and the non-gang crime.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** To deal with maybe some of the detail, I think the reason I focused on those figures, particularly so, the one about knife violence, under 25, non-domestic, is it's a statistic I'm confident has got some good rigor in recording. We do flag crimes that we think are gang-related. It is significantly more subjective, as one can understand, because not every time a knife is used, it's gang-related. So, because that is subjective, using it to some degree is not scientific enough for me to be used as a performance metric. It's used for background analysis, as Steve can give you some of the detail. Which is why I gave the ones that I'm confident in, which I think are pretty good surrogates of gang activity. But they don't give all the details, Steve?

**Steve Rodhouse (Commander):** I think the challenge when we're measuring gang crime is that, when gangs aren't card-carrying organisations, they split, they flex, they form allegiances, and it's not possible at the time at which a crime is recorded, to categorically know whether it is motivated by gang violence or indeed committed by somebody's who is part of gang. We'll know whether they're on our radar, but, you know, we don't have complete knowledge. Pretty good, but not complete. So it's far safer to draw the statistical inferences from sort of the totality of those crimes, which we know are heavily represented by gang crime. So, use of knives on the street, by young people, in public places, not against their partners, I think is actually a pretty good proxy for the state of our performance around gang crimes.

**Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Non-Executive Advisor):** You would see it, because I'm obviously keen to hold yourselves and the local boroughs, to account for their performance, and I'm just keen to try and spit out any misunderstanding, what would be knife crime and other crimes?

**Steve Rodhouse (Commander):** Yeah, absolutely. It is a complex area, but it will take a complex investigation to understand the motivation behind a crime, and possibly we will never know who both parties in a crime are. So it is difficult to draw really strong inferences just from our flagging regime. You made a point around Croydon in terms of that, sort of, knife crime going in the wrong direction. What we are seeing is that most recently, it's strongly improving from a quite difficult picture to one that's quite successful, after the intervention of good work by the borough teams supported by people from the Trident gang crime command. We've put some things up on screen --

**Male Speaker 8:** No, no. Let's just say that it's interesting that, I think, Steve, as the assembly member's right to raise this. We have to pay credit to credit, to Metropolitan Police, to our bosses collectively, the Mayor, the Commissioner, for recognising this is a

problem that requires the Trident command to focus on this issue. And that's a relatively recent issue. So, just recognise the problem, do something about it. We have to pay tribute to excellent suppression of the problem, to use the Assistant Commissioner's phrase. Big numbers, big drops, a third, 25%, knife crime down overall 20%. I think what Steve, and I think my colleagues in MOPAC, I think Londoners would like to understand a bit more. And this is not just, as a, as something to say, "You're deficient in your performance", but what needs to be done to improve those areas that are lagging the rest of London. You know, why is it that we almost have double digit growth in knife crime in Croydon against a background of significant drops, astronomical drops in Westminster, big drops across London? What was it that changed that? Can we make that people aware of that?

So we get the agencies to work together to do, so this is all about understanding and diagnosing what needs to be done, so that we all elevate(?) and drive in the right direction, and that there aren't these isolated boroughs, particularly target boroughs, that are going the wrong direction. I mean, I could mention Kingston, plus 22.6%, and I met with (inaudible) Kingston yesterday, talked a lot about alcohol problems in Kingston town centre, I mean, nothing to do with gangs. But clearly, knife violence going into double digits in the wrong direction. Or indeed, Barnett, where it's plus 12%. So I think these are all issues where we need to get underneath the surrogate markers and understand why in isolated cases parts of London are going in the wrong direction.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** I think that's absolutely right, and as you said that, the picture isn't completely perfect. I think we've put a good regime across London and people are starting to innovate on it, so, and we're, part of the job of the central command is to spread, is to help areas which are struggling, so when Croydon was struggling, one of the central teams went in and spent, I think it was two or three months, wasn't it?

**Male Speaker 8:** Three months.

**Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner):** Three months, working alongside, and the operations are a result of that. Sometimes struggling is because there's something not great locally. Sometimes it's a bit of bad luck, and there's something gone wrong in the gang community, it takes a bit of extra weight to get a grip about it. Just to, sort of, use a story to illustrate things. If we have a gang member in a nightclub tonight, and somebody treads on his toe, and he knifes them, is that a gang incident? We can have long (inaudible) debates on whether it is, and well, does it depend if you're the person, if it's a gang member or not, of a different gang? Actually, it starts to get slightly sort of esoteric. The point is, it's young men and knives and violence, and gangs is a big chunk of it, which is why we're doing it the way we are.

**Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair):** Yeah, no, I think that's also why we've taken the view that even though we recognise there are gang incidents and there's serious youth violence. I think what we're -- this is why we have the setting of the scene. We don't want a normative -- we don't want the norms, the social norms, the antisocial norms, to predominate, where it's normal behaviour to stab someone or shoot someone because you step on their toe. That's why we've taken this in the round even though we recognise they're not always the same

issues. Now, I mean, I think I'm just actually going to draw to a close. I'm sorry that we didn't spend as long as we would have liked on this issue, or indeed, finished on the uplifting slides of all the busts and arrests committed over, probably the last couple of days, Mark, looking at that. Also I know the good work that you've been doing with the UKBA, looking at some of these international elements of this. We haven't touched on this. I mean, I'm struck that there is a lot of data showing this happening across criminal justice agencies, but I'm also struck that probably there's more that can be done. So I'd encourage more information, data sharing, more of that kind of predictive analysis, courage to be aware of more of the kind of qualitative aspects around policing. Because I'm struck by the testimony, if you like, someone who lives on an estate, that really doesn't believe the top dog has been collared. And whether the top dog is really the person that's arrested the most times? Because in all the movies I've watched, it's taken a Donny Brasco, or it's taken an unbelievable police, it's taken (inaudible) of the yard to send in his troops, you know, someone deep undercover, you know, someone who lives and breathes the lifestyle, to capture the top dogs. This is something clearly, where our young people are enveloped by a climate of fear, and it's going to take an unbelievable response from government agencies, criminal justice agencies, to rid our streets and our estates of this pernicious problem. Thank you very much indeed for coming to the fourth MOPAC Challenge and giving us an overview of what you're doing, and what you're planning to do in the future. Thank you.