

Date: Tuesday, 1 March 2016
Location: The Chamber, City Hall
Hearing: MOPAC Challenge – Reoffending

Start time: 10.00am
Finish time: 11.45 am

The meeting was chaired by Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing

Also in attendance were:

Keith Prince, MOPAC Challenge Member
Jonathan Glanz, MOPAC Challenge Member
Faith Boardman, MOPAC Challenge Member
Helen Bailey, MOPAC Chief Operating Officer
Graeme Gordon, MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning (Presenting)

Guests

Commander Alison Newcomb, MPS
Chief Superintendent David Stringer, MPS
Geeta Subramaniam, London Heads of Community Safety
Helga Swidenbank, London CRC
Lucy Bogue, National Offender Management Service
Hong Tan, NHS England (London Region)
Graham Robb, Youth Justice Expert
Lisa Harvey-Messina, YJB

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Good morning everybody and welcome to the last MOPAC Challenge in this mayoral term. It is great to have so many guests and we have an action packed topic looking at reoffending in the round.

First and foremost, we have to recognise that it is 12 months since we have had a look at prolific offenders and 17 months since we looked at youth reoffending and three months since I announced a commitment to invest a further -- I think it was around £500,000 into female offender services. We know that this is a very, very important topic. Not least because crime is falling, perhaps the crime reduction is certainly slowing but it has fallen significantly, but the reoffending rates have remained stubbornly at pretty much the same level for adults and youth reoffending is increasing. We also know that the numbers of defendants are reducing but timeliness through the courts, again, is pretty static. It is interesting to note though that the rest of the country it is slowing, despite a reduction. London and the rest of the Country are now tied at a similar speed through the courts system, whereas we previously had a slower system. We are not seeing that improvement despite the reduction in the number of defendants.

Importantly, for the first section, certainly prolific and repeat offenders are taking twice as long as first-time offenders through the criminal justice system, which does not strike me as the right way round. So, I think we need to focus on what we are doing, particularly to grip prolific and repeat offenders.

When it comes to female offending, obviously, there has been the announcement, I think, towards the end of last year that Holloway will close and that is not something that is going to happen sometime in 2020. Lucy will probably confirm this. The plans are to close Holloway later this year, in August, I think. Therefore, I think it is important for us to make sure that we have proper plans in place for that closure, so it is helpful when we get to the female reoffending to focus on that.

My colleagues, obviously, thank you to Johnathan Glanz, Faith Boardman, Keith Prince and Helen Bailey, our Chief Operating Officer, perhaps if each of the guests introduce themselves quickly and then Graeme will take us through the first presentation, starting with you, Dave.

David Stringer (Chief Superintendent MPS): Good morning, Dave Stringer and I have responsibility for youth justice and youth engagement in the Metropolitan Police Force.

Alison Newcomb (Commander MPS): Good morning, I am Alison Newcomb and I am the Area Commander for West London, but I also have lead responsibility for integrated offender management and female offending.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): Hello, my name is Lucy Bogue. I am from NOMS and I manage the contracted services in London and the South East, with London being my main priority.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): Good morning, my name is Helga Swidenbank. I am the Director for Probation for London CRC.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Morning, my name's Lisa Harvey-Messina and I oversee all the youth offending services in England for the YJB.

Hong Tan (NHS England (London Region)): Good morning, I am Hong Tan. I am Head of Health and Justice System, NHS England London.

Geeta Subramaniam (London Heads of Community Safety): Morning, Geeta. I am the Head of Crime Reduction and supporting people at Lewisham Council but here as Head of the London Heads of Community Safety Chair and the YOT AD Network.

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): Good morning, I am Graham, Robb. Background in education and youth justice, involved in supporting the London AD Network for Youth Justice but also setting up a new form of school, which be part of the solution to what we're talking about today.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Fantastic, there is a great wealth of expertise and very helpful and thank you all for finding time to come to this MOPAC Challenge.

Over to you, Graeme, you are going to canter through the first part of the presentation.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Thank you, Chair. Yes, the first part of the presentation is on London's reoffending landscape, gripping the offender and prolific young offenders.

Slide 1:

As we will see, from this slide, adult reoffending has remained constant over the last ten years but youth reoffending has had a significant increase over that same timeframe. Currently, the youth reoffending rate lies 5.2% higher than England and Wales, 43.2% compared to 38%. Since 2011/2012, this gap has continued to widen. Also, on the basis that London's youth population is project to increase by 11.7%, by 2034, this worsening trend becomes all the more concerning.

Slide 2: Adult Reoffending Costs

The next slide looks at adult reoffending costs. As you can see adult reoffending activity in London costs about £2.4 billion per year, which is 69% of the £3.2 billion total criminal justice spend across all agencies. 45% of this cost sits with the Metropolitan Police Service that is roughly £1 billion out of a total cost of £2.25 billion. What is also notable if you look at the court service, reoffending costs stand at £142 million out of their total organisational spend of £159 million. So although the sums are lower than for the Metropolitan Police, that proportion, and therefore that impact, is very significant. You can see similar impacts on all the different agencies in the criminal justice system.

Slide 3: Impact of Reoffending

Moving on to look at the impact of reoffending, we know that there are relatively few offenders who commit a large proportion of all crimes for both adult and youth offenders, which is based on Home Office research. We know a lot more about high harm adult offenders and their impact on the system. As this slide shows, of those adults convicted or cautioned for indictable offences in London, 77% are reoffenders. Out of all offenders in the system for the calendar year 2015, 29% had fifteen or more previous convictions or cautions.

We can target his reoffending by focusing on the demographic breakdown of prolific offenders for London. When we look at age 18 to 24 adult offenders, their reoffending rate in London is higher than the London average for adults. More concerningly, when we look at total reoffending in London, the youth reoffending rate, as I said earlier, is higher than the England and Wales rate, and almost double the adult reoffending rate for London, although the volumes are lower.

Slide 4: Gripping The Offender - High Harm Adult Offenders

Looking at these high harm offenders, what we have done during the course of last year is to identify who these high harm adult repeat offenders are in London and there are 4,091. These offenders, between them, are responsible for 233,796 arrests and 147,889 convictions over their criminal careers. That gives some indication of the scale of impact on the criminal justice system.

We know that this cohort, this gripping the offender cohort, is primarily male, 94% and mainly within the younger age range up to 34. We also know that this cohort has a more complex set of issues when compared to the overall Probation Service and CRC caseload, with finance, employment and drugs particular highlights there.

Slide 5: Gripping the Offender Pilot

Wanted to describe a bit about the Gripping the Offender Pilot. It covers two local justice areas, North and East and provides the pilot with enough volume of high harm offenders to test the innovation. On this map, dark blue denotes high volumes of offenders and red dots say where the pilot is. Within the eight Boroughs of the pilot, we are working with 1,187 of the 4,091 GTO offenders, so that is a very significant proportion of these high harm offenders.

Slide 6: Gripping the Offender - The Pilot in North and East London

Just to give a little more detail about the pilot. We are investing £1.4 million, especially targeting young adults and female offenders, which together make up 40% of the cohort.

We successfully secured £1.4 million of Home Office Police Innovation funding to design and test this model and we are now implementing the Gripping The Offender Pilot with a phased approach to the delivery of the services we are commissioning. On the next slide, we have a little more about those services.

Slide 7: Gripping the Offender Interventions

You can see across policing and courts offender management and GPS tagging, we are looking at innovations for the GTO cohort of offenders. On policing, we are putting in additional

analytical capacity to allow for offender-based tasking at the Borough level. I will come back to GPS tagging, but where that is available we will be looking for monitoring and enforcement of any breach of that GPS tagging.

In the court system, we are looking at an enhanced pre-sentence report service. Just five days to sentencing from first hearing plus tailored sentencing options. On offender management, we are looking at increased supervision and a different quality and quantity of intervention, for example, Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for 18 to 24 year olds.

On GPS tagging, whereas at the moment there is only the voluntary use of GPS tags in some boroughs, we are looking at the possibility of compulsory GPS tagging as part of a community order or licence subject to Ministry of Justice approval. We have had good conversations about that and we will hopefully be making some progress there.

Slide 8: Youth Reoffending - London Success

Looking at where we have seen some relative success, back at the original Police and Crime Plan, we set a target of reducing the reoffending rate for young people leaving custody from 70.8% to 56.6% so a reduction of 20% and we are very near to that target. The number of first time entrants, between 2010 to 2015 is significantly down. You are looking at 7,878 first time entrants in June 2010, down to 3,132 June 2015. Obviously, that is not the prolific cohort, that is first time entrants, but that is a very significant reduction.

Slide 9: Youth Reoffending by Their Disposal Groups

Looking at youth reoffending by disposal types; just to note that this data relates to calendar year 2013, whereas the previous data on the slide was the financial year 2013/2014, so there are small differences in some of the rates.

What we can see is although we have had an impact on that group leaving custody; they are a very small proportion of the total young people in the criminal justice system. The non-custody groups make up 96% of the overall youth cohort and they have an overall reoffending rate of 42.4%, which is up 2.6% on the previous year. They also account for 82% of the total number of re-offenses committed by youth reoffenders. So, the impact of custody on that overall rate is quite limited.

What we are seeing as well, is those relatively high increases in the community penalty and pre-court boxes.

Slide 10: YJB Grant and Local Authority Funding in London

Turning to the funding picture for youth offending in London, the slide you have in front of you sets out the reoffending rate, the volume of offenders and the funding by each borough. That is the core YJB Grant funding and the local authority own funding that it puts in. As you can see, funding allocations for boroughs differ for YJB and local authorities and they do not consistently correlate to either the size of the cohort or the reoffending rate.

Overall, as you can see the core YJB Grant has reduced by 18.3% over three years and the local authority spend has reduced by 9%. While the YJB has opted for a uniformed cut among

boroughs, local authorities have reduced funding quite dramatically in some priority boroughs and you see a very wide variation here. Obviously, a very different picture in Lambeth to Southwark, for example.

Slide 11: Funding Pressures and Allocation

To illustrate this slightly differently on a map, we have a map here, which shows the size of the youth offender cohort by borough. So the boroughs with the darker reds have the larger cohorts and the blue dots represent the YJB grant per offender. For example, the tri-borough shows relatively high budgets per offender but relatively low cohort sizes, while Enfield and Croydon show the reverse. So what this suggests is that the changes within offending behaviour, as we see in the spread of offending towards the outer boroughs, has not been reflected in the funding allocations.

Slide 12: YOT Partnerships - A Mixed Picture

If we look at three sample Youth Offending Team partnerships, what the next slide shows is three boroughs where the funding picture is really very different in terms of the proportion of funding received from different organisations. You see there, there is a portion of funding that goes into the Youth Offending Team from the local authority itself, from the YJB and from other sources -- the proportions are very different. The total funding is somewhat different and none of these features obviously directly correlate to either the size of the youth offender cohort or the reoffending rate in the relevant borough.

I shall pause there and hand over to the panel for questions.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you, Graeme. I know that really does pose some interesting questions. Let us kick off with Commander Newcomb. Obviously, we have this cohort of high harm offenders, what is being done to grip those and what more can be done by the Metropolitan Police Service and wider partners?

Alison Newcomb (Commander MPS): As Graeme explained, there is a methodology to identify those high harm offenders, which I was very much involved in leading that process. Having completed that, all of the agencies that work in this arena for adult reoffending, are aware of who those individuals are. From the centre, they have been sent out to the various agencies. There is also a model that determines the level of resource that each of puts against those high harm offenders.

I guess, for me, one of the difficulties with this area of business is that there are some huge opportunities for us to reduce reoffending, but actually the difficulty is making sure that all of the agencies are moving at the same pace. That we do that on each of the local boroughs so that we are all putting in the right level of resource, and we all agree, at a local level, that we will deal with that number of high harm offenders, and the activity that each of us need to carry out. That it does take place to reduce reoffending.

One of the things that I have been engaged in is looking at the Metropolitan Police Service's responsibility around that and the level of police resource that we put in. There are differences across boroughs, as you would expect, but collectively, when I look across the whole of London,

we have now got the level of resourcing that we should have given that as agencies we are only actually dealing with just under 3,000 of that cohort. What has happened is that at partnership level, locally, decisions have been made whether to accept the cohort in its entirety, whether to reduce it, presumably because of resource issues, or whether to add some other individuals to that cohort. Those decisions have been made by partners locally, and that takes us from 4,000 down to 2,700.

The second part of your question is what can we do to enhance our activity around these offenders. For me, the first thing is that we, from the centre, as agencies reiterate that we want everybody to deal with the 4,000, in excess of 4,000, and that is non-negotiable. If people want to add to that cohort, of course, they are at liberty to do that but they need to be dealing with those that have been identified as causing the greatest harm. Then each of the agencies has to put the right level of resource to it.

The Metropolitan Police Service currently has 72 officers dedicated to integrated offender management in the local teams and actually, when you look at what that means in terms of a ratio, for the actual number of offenders we are dealing with, it is 37 offenders per officer. The policy that I set two years ago was 40 offenders per officer, given that a third of that cohort are in prison at any one time. I guess that is my way of saying not that the Metropolitan Police Service has an absolute adequate level of resourcing in there, because I do not think we do. I think it is patchy across London. When I look overall, we have the right number given the number of offenders that we are dealing with but actually we should be dealing with in excess of 4,000. Once we get the agreement to do that, at a local level, then it is my responsibility to make sure that we put in the right level of resource to match that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The enhanced pilot is designed to also make sure you have adequate analytical support for the tasking. We have heard about the resourcing of a couple of additional analysts. How does that compare to the non-enhanced areas? The analytical support?

Alison Newcomb (Commander MPS): We are in discussions at the moment. MOPAC have been awarded the Police Innovation Funding, so there is funding there to recruit to the analytical hub for the Gripping The Offender boroughs, which is obviously very welcome. The majority of the work that they will carry out -- we have yet to determine exactly what their terms of reference is going to be but I imagine the majority of the work will be around research. It will be around assisting us with tasking. Again, not just for policing resources but also local authority and probation resources. We know what the offenders are doing and those that we actually need to tackle at any one time. So, as I say, that is really, really welcome.

The analytical resources will be provided from the East Hub within the Metropolitan Police Service, so as I say once we have determined exactly what we want them to do, that will exist within the Gripping The Offender Pilot. Once we are a lot clearer about the responsibilities that they need to carry out to make us much more effective, I will then be able to get the other intelligence hubs across London to also carry out those activities. I would say that is work in progress, but I am absolutely committed to making sure that in the Gripping The Offender Boroughs, we provide that capacity, that analytical capacity to support the programme. Then when we are really clear about what works, I can then roll that out across the rest of London.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Helpful. Before I hand over to Keith, really a question for you, Dave. Your responsibility is youth and you have just seen -- although we have seen a reduction in the reoffending rates of young people leaving custody, the overall reoffending rate is rising and you have that responsibility within the Metropolitan Police Service. Can you describe what we are doing to deal with the reoffending rates that seem to be increasing, particularly in the community?

David Stringer (Chief Superintendent MPS): In terms of the Metropolitan Police Service's response to that, we work very well in partnership within the Youth Offending Teams. We think much of that effect is because we have vastly reduced -- again, within that partnership -- the number of first time entrants. Essentially, what that has left us with is a large proportion of young people who have more challenges. In terms of meeting those challenges, we have maintained and are considering increasing our investment in schools and pupil referral units where many of our young people who are likely to reoffend are. Also, looking to do more work with children's homes, again, where many of our young people who are likely to reoffend in the future, are at the moment. We are working very well, from my perspective, with the troubled families agenda in partnership with agencies at a borough level.

On top of that, in terms of diversion around, particularly, the harder end around the gangs issue. Obviously, you know, we are doing an awful lot around gangs, carriage of knives, educating young people in general and also specifically those who are likely to be involved in gangs around joint enterprise, around the dangers to themselves and others of carrying knives et cetera.

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

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you. This question is for Helga. The London CRC cohort model commenced in December 2015. Could you outline how this has impacted your approach to offender management and if it is targeted on tackling prolific offenders?

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): We went live at the beginning of December, as you said, and we have a number of different cohorts, which include young adults, older men and adult men, women and people with mental health and learning difficulties. The principle behind the cohort model is it allows our practitioners to really focus in on the specific risk and needs of those people within the cohorts.

It is probably too early to tell about whether or not that is impactful. We believe it is and we believe that it will allow our practitioners to really understand the people they are working with and develop an evidence base around that. So, in terms of prolific offenders and IOM offenders, we want to work with them and share practice laterally as well, so the young males, adult males and women. You will know that we are participating in the Gripping The Offender Pilot and we are very excited about doing that and keen to pull out the learning and the evaluation from that.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): What do you do about the transition? Your younger cohort may be under 18s is it?

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): No, we work with 18 to 24 year olds.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): When they go from 24 to 25, if you are already working with them do you stay with them or does something change?

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): Well, depending on where they are at in their journey, we would hand them across to colleagues within the other cohort.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): MOPAC's invested almost half a million pounds funding into the CRC services for an enhanced offender management service, as part of the Gripping The Offender Pilot. If this intervention is successful, what will you do following that? Will you continue funding around these issues?

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): I think we are all interested to understand what has impact and what is successful. Certainly, if we were able to identify interventions that are successful we would want to work in partnership with everyone in this room to reinvest in future services.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you, Chair. My question is for Lucy. It has been a year or so since the introduction of the transforming rehabilitation and I just wondered whether you could give us your thoughts and comments on how effective you think it has been over that year?

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I think if you want to confirm effectiveness, for me, I look at three different things. I think first is your performance. Second has got to be your PBR measurement. Thirdly, is all of those additional services that when I was last here, we talked about going to be brought in. So, on performance: January performance figures were published, if you look at them, you can see across the board that actually performance is either maintained or is slowly improving.

On your PBR: the cohort started in October 2015. It takes 26 months to build it, so we will actually know those results by December 2017 and then we can really have that conversation. Has the London CRC achieved their PBR target?

The third bit, for me, is about all the new stuff that came in. So, as of, May 2015, this was the first time that virtually everybody in custody had two things. So they had a full range of mandated through the gate resettlement services, so that assessment and that resettlement plan and that signposting to services when they get out into the community. They also then had supervision upon release and then the other thing, which I think, is really different is the CRC being able to develop their own rehabilitation activity requirement. They can then put that to the Metropolitan Police Service and advice to court and be able to do some bespoke interventions. I think transformation of any kind within its first year, takes time to bed in, but those are the type of indications that I have been looking at, or indicators that I have been looking at when to determine has this been effective.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): I realise it is early days and some of those take some time.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): It is.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Do you have a general feel of their effectiveness as opposed to -- you have described what is in place but do you feel that they are positive?

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): For me then, it is what does my gut say is whether this is working. It feels really, really positive. The fact that you brought in that additional cohort of 50,000 new offenders across the country, something that we have talked about doing for such a long time. That is so positive.

I can only come back and say to you this works when actually I see the PBR results. I think performance is slowly improving across the entire piece. That has to be positive.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Indeed. I understand that you are also representing the NPS (National Probation Service).

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I am.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Can you also perhaps outline what the National Probation Service is doing.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): What the National Probation Service is doing with?

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): In terms of addressing the prolific offenders.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I am not going to repeat everything that Alison has said, but she was talking through what the National Probation Service have done with IOM. I wanted to put my hand up to say if Sara was here, what she would want to be saying is confirming their commitment to IOM. To explain that actually they are engaging at a strategic borough and practice level. They have issued new guidance. That is such a civil service type of sentence but it is really explaining to their staff that IOM is the framework in which to look after prolific offenders. To participate in Gripping The Offender Pilot, they have shown their commitment by seconding a member of staff over to MOPAC to help with the implementation and to really moving forward and make a commitment. Not only with the police, but with key partners around this table and to manage that cohort in a multi-agency way.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Again, whilst it is early days, do you feel that that is having the effect that it was planned to have?

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I think starting to. I am going to look to Alison and other partners. I think that is the way that we need to be managing that

cohort. It is the best way to be able to identify the needs. Be able to also wrap around those interventions. So, yes, I think that is the right way to be going.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Right, before I go on to Lisa. Are we the first body that has used the framework to commission additional services?

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): You are.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is fantastic, so we are leading.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): It is really fantastic. When we set up these contracts and people talked about needing to deliver the order of the court and making sure that you reduce reoffending, actually the most exciting part of the contracts is what innovation are you going to be doing. I think the work that MOPAC has been doing with the CRC, is the innovation, and it is something that I would like to be talking about nationally about the difference when you have somebody as committed as you, to wanting to bring in additional funding to reduce reoffending. That is brilliant.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, because what struck me was unless you focus, you do get supervision for the first time for many offenders, but these very high volume high harm offenders are typically getting about 30 minutes once a month and we are talking now about three hours every month, three separate sessions. It is six times the amount of supervision and that is a seismic jump.

My question to Lisa is, you can see that we are trying to pilot Gripping the Offender in eight boroughs, but it is round 25% of the cohort of high harm offenders. Meanwhile, in the youth setting we are seeing some excellent progress on reducing first time entrants from around 10,000 to around 3,000 from memory, so it is a 70% reduction, averaged out at 60% but it is a 70% reduction in first time entrants. That success in reducing youth reoffending from the 70% to the mid-fifties, but it is a small cohort in custody now and sadly an increase in reoffending rates in the community. What are the plans to grip those young people, because clearly just by that dynamic there will be repeat reoffenders. What are we doing to grip those offenders in the same way that we are planning to with the adult offenders?

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Just to start off really for context to explain that the young person's cohort, as you have said, it has actually reduced by 69% compared to 10% of the adult cohort and that is in the overall numbers of young people.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I was right with the statistic, within 1%.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): We just need to understand that the numbers of young people we are talking about is pretty small, even for London. We have to keep that within our minds.

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

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): There are also some issues, which are quite unique to London, particularly around disproportionality that we need to be mindful of as we go forward. Also, a positive being that London is actually doing better in many of the areas of intervention with young people that are offending than other areas in England or Wales. It is the out of court disposal, so it is the front-end of interventions with young people, that are not receiving interventions where we are seeing a kind of spike in reoffending which then affects, of course, the overall rate, which makes it feel a lot higher than it actually -- in terms of public perception of those young people.

In terms of what we are doing and what should we do, I am pleased to say we are doing quite a lot and we know quite a lot about this group of young people that prolifically go on to reoffend, so I am talking now about those young people that would commit five or more re-offenses within the community, not those that are in custody. We have just done a deep dive exercise that was commissioned by the Youth Reoffending Board, which is what MOPAC co-delivers with the YJB and other strategic partners. We looked at 82 cases, which is quite a large sum, across London. All the youth offending services took part in this, this is hot off the press, but some really interesting trends that arose. I am not going to go through them all right now but we can see looked after children, 41% of that cohort that are reoffending, 44% with mental health problems and so it goes on. We do see a peak in offending, of entering the system from 12 and then reoffending very quickly by the age of 13. We have some really important understanding there. In terms of the recommendations of what we need to do now is that we are very good at looking at a local level and at a borough level and drilling down to individuals. Every single youth offending service is now engaged in some way or another with the youth reoffending toolkit, so that they can then talk to their local partners about their priorities and their needs and their risks. What we are perhaps not as good at is then elevating that up to a strategic level and saying to all of our partners, are we actually focusing our efforts and our resources in the right places. Resources are extremely tight as we all know and getting extremely tighter as we speak.

In term of a notion of grip, I would not want to use the same phraseology, I would not want to be gripping any young people per se, but I think that gripping in the terms of the same cohort as we are reflecting on with adults is probably after the horse has bolted, if you like, because once a young person gets to five offences plus, or becomes prolific, then we have missed the boat in a lot of instances because these are the young people with the most entrenched risks and needs.

We also have quite a lot of provision that exists already in terms of our national standards require much more intensive contact with young people than they do with adults. We have intensive supervision and surveillance. Our court processes are already very quick in terms of five days etc. We have the emergence of digital procedures in court etc. So there is lots of work going on in order to keep that process swift and to identify those young people as quickly as possible.

Do I think that there are opportunities to improve the focus on this for young people? I do. As I said, I think that that is about our strategic understanding about the gaps I would see them as, sharing locally the effective practice out across London and indeed across the Country. About the service delivery being consistent so we get a lot of individual funding chasing, which will then offer sometimes a disproportionate level of service delivery depending on what borough

you appear in. I think that in terms of economies of scale and value for money, there are pieces of work that we could do there. Whether it be through consortia, whether it be through boroughs working together etc, to provide core services. I also think that we should have more co-ordinated links with inspectorates and monitoring and the MOPAC and the YJB and partners can play a role in that.

For me, I think that we do need to review and reflect on greater alignment of services. I know that colleagues in the Metropolitan Police Service were talking about that we work well with troubled families, but again that tends to be more on a local level rather than a strategic partnership level. I think we need to build our resources together to have more of a Pan London consideration. That needs to include the young people right at the bottom who we are seeing reoffending and not getting any intervention to right up to those that are on community interventions. I would say, in summary, we know a lot. We know what we need to do, we just need to bring it together and elevate it up to work together more cohesively.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It would be helpful for me to understand, which you clearly do, the numbers because we have a clear fix for adults about what we term the high harm offenders, 4,091. We know that the custodial cohort is very small, it is 240 according to these -- it is very small indeed and the vast majority are community based. It is over 6,400, but some of those will be repeat offenders. Obviously, a large majority will be repeat offenders but they will not be at the five plus. How many are at the five plus of the 6,400?

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): That is interesting you should ask. I do not want to bore you with the complexities of case management systems but we do not have globally that kind of figure across London or across England. What we do have is when we go down to local level, we know within their cohort of 120, for example, that there are 15 to 20 young people that are prolifically offending on five or more occasions. It may sound unbelievable but then to build that up into a national picture, we have not got an accurate picture of that at the moment because we do not have the same -- we used to have Persistent Young Offender (PYO) schemes, PPOs.

There were lots of different schemes which could collate that locally to get that picture but they are quite fragmented now, so we do have young people that are going into the matrix in terms of the gangs and we do have young people that are sitting on the edge of IOM provision, but it is not a national or indeed a capital model. Locally, there is a grip, if you like, an understanding of exactly who those young people are because you can literally count them on one hand, often. To give you a statistic now - I could not give you that, unfortunately.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is, for me, concerning that we have a very clear understanding about numbers when it comes to adults. Actually when it comes to gang nominals, we know those that are involved in violence. When it comes to the persistent offenders and high harm offenders we know that and that we do not have that same fix at a London level. Indeed, for me, before I pass on to my colleagues, it seems to me that you are right that the interventions that you are calling for just by nature of the analysis, they are going to be -- and Hong's next to you -- in part that deals with the fact that there are clearly some health issues there as well as other -- you mentioned that 44% -- which I thought was a staggering statistic, so one in two had mental health problems. Clearly,

there is going to be family and other issues as well. All of that then leads to a suite of interventions that are going to be most beneficial to the young person and not to have a focus on the numbers that we are talking about. I find certainly interesting.

I will pass now to Keith. You are going to ask a question to Graham?

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes. It is a question for you, Graham. I am trying to get your perspective on this really. The type of young people that are managed in the community and in custody, these days, they are being sentenced at a much later age. I was just wondering what you feel are now the main challenges of this slightly changing cohort.

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): It certainly has changed over the years. Partly because we have got much better at assessing and analysing the nature of the issues and partly because of possibly trends in characteristics of the young people.

I would refer you to a document that came out from the Ministry of Justice a couple of weeks ago. What works in managing young people who offend and it might be worth partners examining that. It starts from the premise that there are some young people who once they come into contact with the system will not need an intervention. They will sort themselves out. Not many, but some. Then there will be some for whom the best adoption is a diversion away from the criminal justice system, very quickly because the chances of harm as soon as they get involved are much higher. There will be a few who are then needing to be in the CJ system and then a very few going into custody.

It then goes on to talk about a lot of this is about earlier prevention. We are looking perhaps at a spike of 17 years olds, 16 year olds, but as you were picking up a moment ago, Chair, and Dave mentioned, the key role of schools and other universal services in this is hugely important. We have interventions for those above various thresholds, but what about those who become involved in trouble when they are much younger, for whom there is not an intervention. If we do not intervene, they will escalate on to higher risk. My starting point would be to say look beyond the CJ system and look into the wider services.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): You are really suggesting earlier intervention.

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): Absolutely.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The funding at the moment does not really enable you to do that, does it? You typically find a small cohort of people that are being managed by the YOTs and there is very little ability to transfer more of that money upstream as things currently stand.

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): The trick is in one of the things that Dave was mentioning. If you have police officers working effectively with schools, supporting schools, managed not to have children being excluded because they have done RJ with them or they have done other interventions, that is a good result for the overall system. Then I would say the same about health providers because many of the youngsters that we are describing in this question do not have access to the sort of health provision that you would assume. It is remarkable how many youngsters on the little bit of work that I have been involved in, do not

have active registration with a GP or a dentist or all of those other services. So some of this is about resource, absolutely, but some of it is about how partners are configured at local level.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Second part of the question, in relation to the Taylor review, I think it highlighted the needs to improve the skills of training officers in secure estates. As you know, the Government wants to replace secure estates with secure schools. What do you think are the challenges around that? The financial challenges and how can London partners support the piloting of these secure schools?

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): I would declare an interest. I am chair of trustees of a school called The Campus, which is being opened under free school legislation and its specific remit is the sort of youngsters who are an order of court or on leaving custody and not in settled education, training or employment. Our remit is to take those young people up to 7.00 pm every day and at weekends, key youth crime times, and keep them with us long enough so that with our partners we can get some of those preventative interventions in place.

Now, to specifically focus on the question that you are asking, the secure schools is slightly different because of the secure element. We will not be a secure school but the challenges are funding mechanisms. For us Department for Education Ministry of Justice have agreed there will be a different funding model for us than other schools, in partnership with our local authority partners. Staffing is a major issue, where are we going to recruit these saints and geniuses who can work with our young people and we have plans for that.

The evaluation of this and the judgment, going back to Lucy's comments, I think it will take five years before we can judge whether our campus model, when it opens is a success. Forgive me, the path of the last 10, 15 years is littered with short-term funded initiatives. This will be problematic and we must allow time for innovations to work.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Government has attention deficit disorder so five years is an awful long time.

Graham Robb (Youth Justice Expert): I could not possibly comment, but yes. Inspection, likewise.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): David, I noticed you wanted to say something. Sorry, Graham -- you were looking to come in?

David Stringer (Chief Superintendent MPS): Very briefly, please. In terms of making sure we are getting health needs catered for in the early stage, we have just started a pilot with Ealing Borough so that anyone who comes into police custody who is a young person, we offer them a health screening. So that those unmet health needs ideally we pick up at a much earlier stage because currently somebody would have to be in the formal court process for that to happen. Anyone who is arrested now, we offer that health screening which ideally will cater for lots of the points that Graham's just been talking about.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I want to bring Hong, actually, because I know the importance of health and diversion, but also in dealing with the persistent young offenders as well. Any comments on that?

Hong Tan (NHS England (London Region)): Yes, thank you, Chair. It is really good to see the huge progress in the Gripping The Offender work in the last year and really congratulate MOPAC for leadership on that.

I think a key issue in general is -- and it was interesting seeing the slides about just how patchy the funding levels are from health is a narrative around that health needs -- to understand that it is core to the justice agenda. Unfortunately, we have some great examples but also some not so good examples.

In the last year we carried out a health needs assessment, which was the largest one in the Country of a police force in terms of people coming through police custody and not surprisingly we have three times more mental ill health issues going through our police custody suites than outside of London. The numbers just recur in terms of three to five times issues particularly around alcohol, issues around learning disabilities, intellectual disabilities as well. In terms of the funding, to address a lot of this, if we think of just the levels of reoffending in London, NHS England funds about £70 million a year to just address some of that and even with that we cannot contain the reoffending with all the support that we provide in custody and other places.

I am pleased that we have been able to double our investment in mental health liaison and diversion in the last couple of years to about six million so that we are in all police custody suites and courts. It is really great to hear examples. We are trying very hard to make sure that no young person ends up in police custody and working with Youth Justice colleagues and others on the new specification for that.

Likewise, in terms of GP registration, we have started a project based in the London Borough of Sutton working with public health to ensure that all people leaving prison custody in London are registered with a GP. Still a lot of work to do but as a first access point to health and social care and other wider statutory services it is so important.

Just a quick update in terms of North East London, where our mental health liaison diversion service was piloted. The figures in some ways are quite alarming, from April 2014 to December 2015. We referred 2,541 people to mental health services. That is about 30% of the national average over that period of time in terms of the pilots, so it is a core issue that we have to address.

I do think the trauma informed approach is really important. If you look through all the evidence in terms of people in custody, the numbers of adverse childhood experiences that they experience for people in custody is always about three times more than the wider population. The re-traumatisation that happens for a whole range of reasons, is a key issue for all of us to work towards, work through to prevent reoffending. Lots of evidence showing that with the trauma informed approach -- and it is not rocket science does not need huge investment -- will reduce, in prisons, the level of self-harm, the level of admission into in-patient units by about 50%, the level of violence in prisons. You will know the future in mind which is the National Mental Health Strategy for children and young people, talks about a key recommendation being we need a trauma informed workforce who are able to assess -- be aware of the issues and address children and young people and also adults with experience of childhood trauma -- address those issues and hopefully reduce the re-traumatisation.

I think there are real opportunities and it is a window of opportunity at this moment in time. As you know, health with local authority partners and other agencies have to develop their five-year place based plans by June, which will lead the commissioning of health and other related issues. It is really important that we bring our justice agenda into those plans. In particular, around trauma informed approaches.

NHS England also announced about two weeks ago their mental health five-year forward plan. I am pleased that issues around liaison diversion and justice were in their recognition that mental ill health is a core issue in with reoffending. Again, I think that is an opportunity for London to develop its own five-year mental health in the justice plan in terms of -- and all my colleagues talking about the need for us to work better together, more effectively.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is great, Hong, thank you for that. To Faith now and some questions for Geeta.

Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, Geeta. It is very encouraging to hear what Hong has just said about the resources in health. Obviously, for a cohort, which is being managed within the community, there is a whole series of services at the local level that need to be brought together, which in a financial climate such as we have, inevitably raises some potential concerns. I would be really interested to hear a local view from you about how the funding and type of services commissioned for young people has changed and how you see the future funding picture.

Geeta Subramaniam (London Heads of Community Safety): Sure, I think what you have heard already this morning is actually quite important that the YOT is not seen in isolation. It is integral and embedded in everything we do in local authorities and across the partnership. Looking at some of the tables that have been presented this morning, the reduction in funds from either the local authority or other partners, public health, for example, reductions in budgets, changes in the way in which the Metropolitan Police Service and probation officers are integrating YOTs, it is all part of a picture. I think it is really important that we see that as a cumulative effect because there will be unintended consequences of all of the reductions of budgets in local authorities. You will see some of that coming out in terms of homelessness and supported accommodation reductions and this will be inevitable as the years go on. I think some of the future projections are going to be quite critical, that we actually plan and think about what some of these unintended consequences may well be.

We know that effective responses are multi-agency and what we have probably failed to understand is when we are reducing all of these actions that we talk about pathways out of reoffending, all the core activities that we expect young offenders and adult offenders to engage in, those pathways are being reduced. In fact, some of those pathways will not exist going forward, so we have to think about what investment are we making. Is the investment in the service with the offenders or is there an investment question about what are the pathways and actually what is going to make the difference because the outcomes we are expecting cannot just be delivered by a criminal justice agency.

The important part around the reductions for most of London local authorities now, is that yes YOTs have been -- you can see a whole variation of reductions and some YOTs have had increases in budgets. Those are local priorities that are decided by the local authority by the

democratic decision making that goes on and we have huge numbers of priorities that we are balancing in local authorities. It is not about is the YOT more important than cleaning the streets. There are some critical services that we are -- no service is protected, so we are balancing budgets against social care, children's social care, adult social care, housing needs, vulnerable people's needs and, of course, youth offending sits right within all of those things.

In terms of what London boroughs have seen change wise, specifically for commissioned services -- there have been some interesting developments so we have seen boroughs collaborate together. We have talked about the tri-borough as being one of those examples of where youth justice services have brought together and are delivering a slightly different model. We have seen outsourced models. Some boroughs have commissioned some of their elements of the youth justice bit, some of the programmes elements out to external agencies. We have seen through the North and the South London resettlement consortia, much greater geographical spread around working collaboratively, sharing practice and focusing on particular issues around resettlement, for example. That is not to say that that has necessarily been good or bad or ugly, it is a driver of reductions in budget that we obviously look to shared services and we need to be cautious that shared services are not always the answer to achieving a positive outcome.

It is also important, I think, to say some of the negative impacts we have seen locally. Some of the reductions have definitely seen reductions in staffing in YOTs. It has seen reductions in some of the commissioned services, so programmes, for example, like knife crime programmes or particular programmes in relation to resilience building or family support. These are actual services that will either have less funding going to them or will not be commissioned going forward. That also has an impact on the voluntary community sector, because, of course, inevitably these are the services that our voluntary and community sector are delivering in conjunction with our youth justice services.

We have seen reduction in reparation activity, so that choice for young people about what is the kind of reparative activity that either makes sense for them, might be a skills building exercise but also is important in terms of putting something back in the community. Those services are limited so that element of choice is not there anymore for some areas.

Clearly, we have talked quite a lot about prevention this morning and we know that there has been significant reductions in our preventative angles. Not just from the YOTs but right across the local authorities's ability to deliver either youth provision or some of the old schemes that we used to have in youth justice like the YISPs, and the YIPs and all these acronyms that we love, but that was really important and a key driver in terms of the first time entrants agenda that we now see has had some huge successes.

What has to be focused on about the models going forward and Hong is a great advocate and I do not think I could advocate any more about the trauma informed approach. To be sustainable we have to think about what is it we are all, as agencies working with anybody in our communities. What is the ethos? What is the kind of way in which we deliver stuff? We know that young people in the youth justice system have been traumatised, significantly, either as victims of crime, domestic violence, other issues around their parental support. The way in which we deliver our services have to be completely around the trauma informed approach. That is not to take away that public protection is our key and number one driver and the balance between public protection and behaviour modification has to be something that we

think about when we are looking at working with young offenders or adult offenders. You do not make change with people just by seeing them or by saying that you are attending X organisation or X programme. The change is done by people who they trust, people who they have a relationship with and about how am I going to change my behaviour, deal with my issues and be able to then move forward as part of the mainstream community.

Some of the models we have seen being created by reductions in budget, but also working together with our health colleagues, because we know that there is huge investment and support from our health colleagues, from the MOPAC Team from the Youth Justice Board and obviously from our police partners. Things like family support and intervention, so functional family therapy, multi-system therapy, all of these family support services are absolutely crucial for young people. Young people do not live on their own, they do not work on their own, they do not do things on their own, they are within a community and most of that has got to be a family-led change.

We have seen investment in things like life coaching, which is not mentoring. It is actually about doing that behavioural change. How do I see what my life might look like and how can somebody help me get there that is not about mentoring and holding hands, it is about developing their own personal ability to get to change. We have heard about the mental health liaison and diversion schemes already.

I think the other critical thing to mention about the budgets and the future plans is that, of course, youth justice and YOTs as it was created in 1998, the world has changed. The young people in terms of what we are dealing with has changed and the agendas are very cross-cutting and Dave -- we have talked very much about CSE, Child Sexual Exploitation, about the drugs, the county lines, young offenders and victimisation of young women. These are all integral agendas, and we have to think about young people in the whole rather than how do they sit in these categories of labels and boxes. Then what do we do with them in those boxes because that is not really going to be how we are going to be able to deal with services going forward with the reductions.

In real conclusion, I will say that there is a perception that budgets equals the amount of young people equals better outcomes. I do not think it is quite as straightforward as a unit costing exercise in that way. I think there are a huge range of priorities that local authorities have to deliver on and there are some statutory services we have to deliver on and therefore we have to balance all of these prevention aspects. What is going to be affordable, but also what are the huge risks about not doing some of these things going forward.

Some work that I think many colleagues in MOPAC and others have done around the projection of the population in London, going forward, is really important. Youth population is going to grow, but it is not that every young person is going to be a young offender. In fact, very few young people become embedded in the criminal justice system. What we have to think about is what does that population forecast mean? What does it mean for services? All the universal services that we have talked about -- more young people means more schools, means more universal provision, means requirements at building resilience at much earlier ages for all young people. How is that going to be done and what is the kind of implications across the partnership around the costs for that.

Just to finally say that there are lots of questions about do you devolve the budget to the local authority? Do you devolve it to sub-region, regionals? Is it a local issue? It is all of those things and I think we have to be really cautious about what does that model mean and what could be the risks of doing one model against another model. You will be aware that many years ago, the local authority was devolved the remand budgets for custody, and I can only tell you that we were in uproar and completely screaming because that added a budget pressure to local authorities. We have to think about what are those implications of doing these things because actually in a time when we are working collaboratively we cannot do one thing over here whilst other things are being impacted negatively over there.

Finally, I think that the cumulative impact of budget reductions will have a cumulative impact on social outcomes and the inequalities in terms of the social agenda. We have to think much widely about -- we are not talking just about criminal justice. We are thinking about housing, we are thinking about poverty, we must be thinking about mental illness and all of the resilience that we have to be able to support our communities around with that reduction I think is something that we all have to put our minds to collectively.

Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you very much. There is an awful lot to think about in that. If I go up more to the helicopter level and look at slide 13, one of the things that strikes me there is the difference in the budget per offender and in the different allocations as they currently stand. There really is a huge range and to a new reader it is sometimes difficult to understand the logic of why one, not the other.

We all recognise the importance of the boroughs. Is that actually going to be sustainable that those decisions are only made at that level as we go forward?

Geeta Subramaniam (London Heads of Community Safety): I think that slide shows the Youth Justice Board element, plus all other elements. The Youth Justice Board, as I understand it, have a formula in which they have allocated funding over the years and, of course, that is in relation to deprivation in numbers and all of those sorts of things. I think that is a formula. Whether we agree with it or not, that is a standard formula. In terms of local authorities, as I said, the local authorities have made decisions about where they would like to invest their funding and unfortunately, with reductions in budgets local authorities are having to make decisions about where do they then cut their cloth to balance the budget. Some boroughs will be cutting more out of the youth justice service than others.

I do not think that is a question that I can answer necessarily across London, but my own perspective on it is that we have to look at the whole issue of crime and criminality and impact of community safety and victimisation and when we look at that we might be saying, "Well, that on the YOT we have cut X, but we have got other services that we must make sure are in place to enable that other preventative angles so that the young people are not then coming in to the YOT". Therefore maybe the resource is appropriate for that number, that complexity and those issues, but they are so inter-related and intertwined that I do not think taking X borough and saying, "Why have you only put X in" and, "I've put so much more in". These are local decisions that have been at a time and the cuts are made in relation to what their requirements are going forward.

Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I ask a question. There is a grant with the YJB. Is there not about matching the grant or am I wrong in thinking that? I may be misinformed.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Yes, that is not in place anymore.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It has been unringfenced essentially. It is a local decision.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Yes, absolutely. Statutory partners under the Crime and Disorder Act will have to contribute -- police, health, local authority, but it is a contribution that we do not dictate. They just have to put something in, whether it be individuals, professionals, buildings, money etc. Our grant, a good practice, effective practice grant just forms a proportion of that whole, if you like.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In theory, the local authorities have to deliver this as a statutory service but the amount of resourcing they put in is a local decision.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Yes, absolutely.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is helpful. In terms of the total London budget, when we take into account the cost of the secure estate, are we talking less than £100 million, presumably.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Is that roughly? About £90 million.

Lisa Harvey-Messina (YJB): Yes, roughly around that. Picking up on the point about -- as we see so many changes, the point about keeping a grip and keeping a focus is so relevant at the moment because we are seeing a lot of youth justice services now going into children's services. If we think it is complicated now, to co ordinate ourselves, it is going to become more complicated because we are not necessarily going to see a recognisable YOT as such. You might get a professional within a hub. That is not to say that that is necessarily a bad thing because I think particularly this group of young people need a social work model. They need a holistic approach, but I think picking up on some of Geeta's points there about how finances and how service delivery are changing. It is going to look very different.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is a challenge really to all of you and you can say if this is wrong. In theory, based on what we are saying, given that at the moment allocations by the Youth Justice Board tend to be based on demographics, deprivation, not cohort size or reoffending rates. There should be a possibility and ability to create a system that enables a diversion and prevention dividend in the sense that if you are able to reduce reoffending and reduce those that go to custody, which is very expensive and also reduce reoffending rate in general, you can then not have the money snatched away but

reinvest into prevention and diversion given the importance of Graham said. That is in stopping people ... that must be possible, in theory.

Geeta Subramaniam (London Heads of Community Safety): I think the answer is yes it should be possible but I would probably just reflect on my many moons of work on Total Place, which went back in 2009. That was exactly the premise of how we were going to look at justice reinvestment from the critical end and if you reduced demand that you can reinvest. All I will say is that that does not happen and I think that there needs to be some real tangible questions about when we do all of this work that does reduce demand, where is the benefit for our communities, because I do not think we see those reinvestments. They are taken and let us just assume go elsewhere.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Geeta, I was around at the time of Total Place. The problem with Total Place was it was an analysis of the expenditure flows. That is not the same as introducing these basic principles. Also, it was at a time when there were not the strategic focus, if you like, at a London level combined with working with authorities. There should be a joint commissioning ability with partners to be able to enable that focus and that dividend around liaison diversion and prevention as opposed to constantly spending most of it on a diminishing cohort downstream.

Hong Tan (NHS England (London Region)): The opportunity is now really in terms of a five-year place based plans to engage with health because there is a full business case to roll out liaison diversion that is going to Treasury. We hope to get the results by end of March, which will double the investment in liaison diversion by another £30 million by 2020. You will hear additional funding around mental health, the £1 billion to implement the five-year mental health plan. The £1.4 billion that is to implement the improvement in child adolescent mental health by 2020. These are opportunities for us to put our agenda onto those plans. Onto those locally as well as sub-regionally and regionally, in a strategic way that colleagues have been saying. Much of that will be done by June, so I think the leadership to do that locally and London-wide would be really helpful.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If we can move to female offenders. The challenge to my successor, there is that opportunity to accelerate that collaborative working to ensure that we do get the budgets not tied down downstream, but equally that we find ways to be able to focus on what we know has a maximum impact in that area.

I do not think it is worth us probing anymore. We should have time now to move on to the next item. Over to you, Graeme, if you want to take us through the section on female reoffenders.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Thank you very much, Chair. We move on to female offenders with a focus on custody and alternatives to custody.

Some key facts to start with, more women are sentenced to custody in London than they are in the rest of the Country. Yet, we know that when they are given community sentences they have a higher rate of compliance than their male counterparts. That is 3.2% of female offenders

sentenced at court in 2013, were sentenced to immediate custody in London compared to 2.5% in the rest of England and Wales.

We are looking at almost 30,000 women being arrested every year and while women make up 14% of total arrests within London, 28% of all offenders sentenced at court are female. There is that point about compliance.

Looking at adult female offender sentencing in London --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That point is that females are more compliant with community orders than males.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Than male offenders, yes.

Looking at adult female offender sentencing in London, what you can see from this slide is the disproportionate level of women receiving custodial sentences in London, both compared to the national average and relative to an urban comparator, Greater Manchester. The courts in London are less likely to make use of community sentences for adult women offenders, than in Greater Manchester and the national average. More likely to use immediate custody or suspended sentences.

As we can see, there are a very significant proportion of women sentenced to custody serving very short custodial sentences. That is 78% serving short sentences of less than 12 months.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think even more staggering is over half -- less than three months.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Indeed.

It is important to understand in the context of those figures that this is almost certainly partly down to high levels of women being released on sentence as a result of time served during remand, so that is in those figures as well.

Moving on to Holloway, we heard at the beginning of the Challenge about the closure of Holloway later this year. This slide you are looking at now sets out the key profile and sentencing data for Holloway and sets the context for the Challenge of managing the impact of its closure.

Looking at the pie chart on the left, it shows the total prison population broken down by remand and sentence length given out by the courts. As you can see, 24% of women were on remand at the time of its very recent inspection. That high remand has an impact on actual sentence length. As I was saying before, it results in time served and so custodial sentences do not equate to the time in custody. If we look at the pie chart on the right, what we can see is actually this is the population of sentenced female prisoners in Holloway by their actual length of stay. You can see from this that 76% were in custody for less than a year and those other proportions in custody of less than a month, a month to three months, three months to six

months -- you can see these are very high proportions of women serving very short spell of time in Holloway.

Slide 13: The Case for Investment in Alternatives to Custody in London for Female Offenders

Moving on to the next slide, what we are looking at here is the beginnings of a case for investment in alternatives to custody in London for female offenders. In that context of the closure of HMP Holloway. When Holloway closes there will be a reduction of 140 custodial beds. Now, on the basis of what a place in Holloway costs, which is £38,676 a year, that would imply a potential saving of £5.4 million that could be reinvested elsewhere. Clearly, we are not talking about a secure business plan for a cashable saving, this is an indicative figure of the kind of saving that might be presented from having less custody provision.

At the moment, we have an annual contract cost for the CRC at £1.4 million for these offenders. At the moment, we know of no supplementary investment plans following the closure of Holloway. Looking at the challenges that result from this, fewer women in London have access to effective community solutions than in comparable places such as Manchester.

If you look at Manchester: Manchester is around 1,265 women sentenced to a community order who have access to ten women's centres, that is 126 offenders per centre. Whereas, London has around 2,528 female offenders with notional access to two centres. Virtually the coverage of those two centres, as you can imagine, is not truly pan London. That would equate to 632 offenders per centre. What Manchester also has is a minimum service model with each of the ten boroughs -- with support funding for co-ordination and implementation. It is not simply that there is more provision somewhere in Manchester, there is also provision locally and closer to the women.

Again, it has not been possible to put a figure on this, but if we could reduce the number of short-term sentences and, as we saw, there are a lot of women in Holloway serving a short time inside, and replace some of those with community orders, we should be able to deliver significant cost savings and potentially more effective outcomes. Plus, there is a kind of more physical or operational challenge, which is re provisioning the kind of rehabilitative services we have attached to Holloway in Downview and across the Bronzefield and Downview sites. Because we will no longer have remand and sentence prisoners in the same place, some of those services provision may become more complex.

Slide 14: Pan London Female Offenders Service

I now move on to one thing we are doing specifically, which is the new pan London female offenders service. Here, MOPAC and CRC are jointly funding, through the gate, and community provision. There is a total contract value of around £4.1 million over three years. £500,000 is that is from MOPAC to supplement the investment of the CRC. Specifically what we are doing over this two-year period is to test innovation in female offending services. So, an enhanced package of female offender services and interventions in a female only space. Expanding good practice from advanced Minerva in the tri-borough, which has shown a 40% reduction in reoffending, and the Beth Centre in Lambeth to cover ten London boroughs. We should see additional benefits for approximately 400 offenders in London.

I shall hand back to you at that point, Chair.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you very much, Graeme. Just before I ask questions, am I right in saying it is 2,600 female offenders that are being managed in the community? At the moment, based on the chart?

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): I am not sure I have that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I just want to make sure I understand the figures. I have here that there are 2,528 female offenders.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Correct, yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is the number of female offenders, at the moment, being managed from the community?

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): That is my understanding, yes, it is 2,528 female offenders sentenced to a community order.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Who have access to two centres and that is potentially double the number in Manchester who have access to ten centres.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Yes, so in effect many of them will not have access.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Just before I start asking questions, the population of Holloway is 525.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Correct.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There is a reduction in bed spaces of 140, but you are actually saying if we take the 50% who have very, very short sentences, then effectively up to 260 potentially might have -- there might be a case for community management as opposed to custodial management.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Correct. The challenge between the figures is that those are bed places we are talking about, 525 bed places in Holloway and obviously there is a level of churn as you see it, for offenders who are serving a three-month sentence, then that bed gets then reused during the year, which is why it is very difficult to put a specific --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If we assume the spot analysis is reflective of the proportions throughout the year, in theory there is around half of the offenders have extremely short sentences, relatively high reoffending rates. They are not benefitting from prison, so if you had effective community services you could have a positive impact on reoffending and this goes in line with your point about you get better compliance.

Graeme Gordon (MOPAC Director of Services and Commissioning): Yes, in principle, that is absolutely right.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Helga, we are sort of partners on this. We are putting in some cash, half a million, you have put in more. What do we need to be able to increase the community services to drive down reoffending? Where are we at the moment and where do we need to get to? We are the poor cousins of that economic powerhouse that is known as Greater Manchester.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): I was nodding vigorously at your analysis of the figures. I do not know whether you know but I was previously the Governor at HMP Bronzefield and certainly there are a significant number of women who are serving short-term sentences and are part of that kind of revolving door. I am nodding vigorously because if we can stop that then we will have done something pretty important with that population.

In terms of what we are doing together, we have recently agreed a model for the London Women's Consortium. London Women's Consortium brings together MOPAC funding, CRC funding and brings together CRC management, supervision and governance and with a number of third sector partners to provide women's services both in the community and in custody. The model is that we will be providing through third sector providers, community services. Some of those through the hubs, some of those into prisons and we will be directly providing services within the prisons both at Holloway currently, but when they are reconfigured into the three Surrey prisons.

The magic happens when there is a joined up, so through the gate activities where again from my previous experience and my current role, is where we can really start to break that cycle of reoffending. We will be providing services both in and out of the prisons and into the community to ensure that women have that continuity.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Do you have any feel for what it would take to be able to upscale the community-based services?

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): Clearly, mixed feelings about the closure of Holloway. I think what it does do -- it creates an opportunity for us to have this conversation about what happens in the community and how we provide alternatives to custody.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is exactly right, yes.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): The analysis around being able to do that is spot on. What we would like to do is have a conversation with NOMS, with yourselves and with other providers about how we enhance alternatives to custody and we stop women from going into prison in the first place.

Again, what I was struck by in terms of the data, was that we have 14% of women being arrested but 28% of them going to court. We need to kind of stop that increased representation of women at court and in custody.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, so diversion of the custody point.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): The diversion bit, so I think we have an opportunity. Lucy and I are talking and NOMS are talking about how we might create a model that hopefully with some investment from the closure of Holloway to provide a service London wide that is about diversion. It is about alternatives and about creating community hubs and very, very local. So in areas where women are able to travel to easily and in communities where they are known and where we can work with them.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It seems to me though, and I am just hearing everyone speak, that on the one hand we can work on better diversion and liaison with the police and other services providing the interventions, but equally is there not a call now for at least in part, ensuring that there is a Pan London advanced Minerva approach. In the sense that when we looked at an area like Rape Crisis as a policy remit, where there is only provision in South London, we are really seeing expert provision in West London. I visited that as well as the Beth Centre but advanced Minerva had seen a massive reduction in reoffending by having those kinds of services. There must be at least an opportunity to have a North London hub, a South London hub, an East London hub and the relative cost of that is far lower than the alternative, which is the expensive custody place. I think a kind of roll out of that surely must be -- part of that so on the one hand better liaison and diversion, but ensuring that there are ...

Even that does not take you up to the Manchester service provision, but at least you have then a series of provision.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): Absolutely, and we created the London Women's Consortium initially as the vehicle to deliver the services both in custody and in the community but I think the Consortium has potential to be that vehicle that is able to manage and identify need and create a sense of consistency Pan London.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It would be a crying shame given all the expertise around Holloway not to have a North London hub in the Islington area at least for community-based services. You have one in the South, you have one in the West and you need to find presumably somewhere in East London. I think that, again, is a challenge for a future Mayor but a challenge for these groups to make that happen. It is an opportunity to do that pretty swiftly.

Helga Swidenbank (London CRC): Yes, and it is very much a challenge that we are engaged with and enthusiastic about and really want to use the opportunity that the closure of Holloway has sparked debate around to be able to put some plans in place and take some action.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Lucy, I had meetings with ministers with Michael, with Caroline and others. What can I do to be able to set that challenge on the table and what opportunities are there to think about some of that community ...

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I think that there are lots of opportunities and in your role as Deputy Mayor, you actually are in that right place to influence. As Helga as already said, the closure of Holloway and actually Helga coming with her background of Bronzefield, has really focused on us working very closely with the CRC to develop a female strategy for London.

Looking at all the savings and that side is very much on let us transfer the savings from Holloway into services for London. What I would like us to do would be to focus on what the prison reform agenda is bringing. The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State have spoken a lot about what prison reform is going to bring for us, but actually there will be some bespoke services for women. They have not yet been announced. I think now is the time to be able to influence to say actually what is going to happen for London. What alternative for custody could we have and I think that is myself, you, partners around the this table to be talking to the Ministry to say what shall we do for London.

I do not know whether it is good thing or a bad thing but looking at your capacity, and I think it talks about dropping capacity, which I think is good. It means we have to do alternatives and get them into the community. In the short-term though, capacity will remain the same, so we are going to increase provision at Bronzefield so that we can have remanded women from London into Bronzefield. We are increasing provision actually in Peterborough, which will not affect the London population but it will be for Essex to go up to Peterborough.

I do not know if that is a good news story or a bad news story because in the long term we need to be reducing our capacity.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I can agree with this. On the back of a fag packet calculation, but the closure of Holloway should not just be a transfer of custody places. There are opportunities probably -- realistically, we are all nodding at this point, to halve the number of women in the Holloway setting because they probably would be better managed in the community.

Lucy Bogue (National Offender Management Service): I agree. I just want us to focus on prison reform because we all know how Government works and that is where all the new money is coming from. Where we are an unprotected department. We all know the type of budget hole that the Secretary of State needs to fill, so it is just about making sure that we influence in the right space.

The other bit that I think if Sara was here, there are lots of stats on this page 16 that I would love to know a little bit more. It talks about that we arrest 30,000 women in London per year. I actually do not know what that is in comparison to what Manchester do. Do we arrest more or do we arrest less, so it is understanding some of those policing priorities. Also, what the sentences view is. I would be asking Sara and Sara would be talking about what are those pre-sentencing reports that the Metropolitan Police Service give to the courts. Are the courts really aware of what the alternatives are and that is also the type of work that we need to be a priority over the next couple of months.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is helpful. Sorry, Keith I have nicked your question. Deputy Mayor's prerogative. Over to Jonathan.

Jonathan Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you, Chair. I just really want to ask Hong what he feels the impact of the closure of Holloway is going to be on the services that you provide.

Hong Tan (NHS England (London Region)): Again, a surprise to all of us and again there are opportunities and challenges from it. We have been developing a health strategy for women offenders with Holloway. I think there are major concerns around the impact on the family and keeping the family units, communities together and the impact that that has on reducing reoffending.

We are making a business case to NHS England and glad to be working with MOPAC colleagues on that, and with the CRC as well, in terms of supporting and increasing alternatives in the community. I talked earlier on about the fact that we know half the women in Holloway have been looked after children. We know the increased levels of traumatic events that they have lived through and are reliving. My concern is what the impact of the move further away from the important family and other units are for them in terms of re-traumatisation and revisiting of those issues.

I think we definitely need an enhanced through the gate, probably through the gate plus, plus, I think, because of those issues.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you. There is a last question from Faith in the last MOPAC Challenge. No pressure there.

Faith Boardman (MOPAC Challenge Member): To Alison if I may, because you've been listening to what colleagues on the panel have said around the preference for how we go forward. Can you tell us what the Metropolitan Police Service is doing to address what appears from the figures to be clearly a disproportionately high number of arrests of women compared with at least the experience of Greater Manchester?

Then, having heard what people have said, will you roll out? Do you feel there would be any difficulties in rolling out the use of triage for female offenders in the areas where referrals can be made to specialist community based services, especially if we can improve them in the future?

Alison Newcomb (Commander MPS): As I have been given the opportunity to answer the very last question of the last MOPAC Challenge, I will be relatively brief because I am conscious of time. In terms of our number of arrests, from this data, it does appear to be disproportionate but without the background data it is difficult for me to be able to go into detail as to why that may be. So, for example, looking at particular crime types. You know is there a particular demographic in London that means that we would and should expect a higher proportion of females to be arrested, for example, I do not know.

What I can say is generally in the Metropolitan Police Service, not just in relation to female offenders but across the board, our overall numbers of arrests have reduced quite considerably and the panel will be aware of that, I know, from other MOPAC Challenges. That is, in part, in relation to our implementation of the Code G of the Police And Criminal Evidence Act, which

requires us, quite rightly, to be really clear about the necessity to make an arrest. So, officers on the street but also the custody officer in custody will think very carefully about whether first of all to make the arrest and secondly whether to authorise the detention of somebody coming through into our custody cells. That has, quite rightly, contributed to a reduction and that work needs to continue.

Specifically, in relation to female offenders and what we can do, and you mentioned triage and that is the critical element for policing, in relation to this. We ran the tri-borough reducing female offending pilot with advanced Minerva and I chair the tri-borough reducing reoffending board. So, collectively, with partners we were able to see some really good reductions there. The thing that was really difficult about that pilot it closed prematurely partly because the funding was withdrawn and, as we have heard, the funding is now being used to provide these other services, which is really positive. Secondly, for us as an agency, it was really difficult for us to consistently triage at the point of entering custody through the process of community resolution.

We have had lots of discussions internally in terms of whether we introduce community resolution across London for male and female offenders. There are a number of national pilots that have taken place and the evaluation of those pilots is due to report in the spring, so I would expect some time in March/April we will have the information from the national pilots and I think that will help us to inform the position within the Metropolitan Police Service going forward.

What I am doing is having discussions with both MOPAC colleagues, but also Helga and Sara, together with Jenny Earl from the Prison Reform Trust to look at whether there is something bespoke that we can do, so a separate pilot specifically for females in a sense replicating what we did with Minerva, to see whether we can triage more female offenders through community resolution into those services. If that proves to be unsuccessful either because the national pilots dictate that we do not have community resolution in London or for any other reason, then one of the other things we have been talking about is when a female enters custody, across London, the custody sergeant at the point of booking her in issuing her with a fact sheet that describes the services offered either by the Beth Centre or Minerva and the hubs that we have already talked about. So, at least, even if we are not able to tie in the community resolution element, at least she has got some information in terms of services that can assist her. If we choose that method then obviously we would seek to properly evaluate that to determine what the outcomes are.

I feel pretty positive in this area. Quite frankly, it is about time that we all, as agencies, managed to resolve the disproportionality around female offending because we know that the majority of children remain with their mothers and then there is the generational cycle of reoffending that takes place. I feel really positive about this work and I think hopefully we could either pilot the community resolution, which is voluntary for the female, but actually in a sense if she agrees to it, it does tie her in to seeking the help of those services, which I think is really positive. If we can't do that then we will certainly provide information at the point of custody in order that self referrals can take place.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you, Alison. I thought that was a very helpful MOPAC Challenge, particularly on female offending. I think there is a massive opportunity to make a very real tangible difference and a great willingness

across all agencies to ensure that we do what we can to keep more of these female offenders outside the custodial estate. We think about the family unit, I think Hong's right to -- you can preserve that. That starts with where possible community resolution as opposed to police custody and then moving on to courts having the pre-sentence reports in place so that where possible and community alternatives make sense that those options are on the table.

I think we have an opportunity in London to completely reshape services to ensure that we serve that cohort far better than they are today, and certainly I think that is a massive opportunity in the next year or so as a result of the closure of Holloway.

Thank you very much indeed for coming. I think we have learned an awful lot with regards to reoffending in the round. In summary, that there is a very exciting approach to adult high harm offenders that we really are coming up with a model across the criminal justice system to grip around a quarter of those high harm offenders with this supervision, pre-sentence reports and analytics to ensure better integrated offender management.

On the youth side, opportunities I think but I sense we need to think about creative budgetary oversight that will ensure that there is a diversion, prevention dividend and more money going upstream as opposed to being caught downstream. Although that is against a background of some tremendous successes in reducing first time entrants and reducing reoffending rates coming out of custody, but that is a small cohort but we need to shift more the money upstream. As I just outlined, we stand on the threshold of really being able to transform the support for female offending if we get that right that will be a massive positive.

It is the last MOPAC Challenge of this mayoralty and with me as Deputy Mayor. I think it is a great way to end and thank you all for your contribution.