

Date: Wednesday 9 December 2015
Location: The Chamber, City Hall
Hearing: MOPAC Challenge Board - Victims

Start time: 10.00am
Finish time: 11.30pm

Members:

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (Chair)
Keith Prince, MOPAC Challenge Member
Jonathon Glanz, MOPAC Challenge Member
Steve O'Connell, MOPAC Challenge Member
Linda Duncan, Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel
Helen Bailey, MOPAC Chief Operating Officer
Rebecca Lawrence, MOPAC Director of Strategy

Guests:

Alex Khaldi, iMPower
Rosemarie Cameron, ISVA, NIA
Catherine Dunn, ISVA, Solace Women's Aid
Commander Jeremy Burton, MPS
Sally Benatar, Ch Supt. MPS
Sara Lewis, Head of Prosecutions, MPS

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I would like to welcome everybody to this, which is the second time that we have looked at the important issue of how we can seek justice for victims as part of the monthly MOPAC Challenge, and I am delighted that we have a number of people that will help inform the way that we provide support and services to victims as they continue through the Criminal Justice System journey.

I know that Dave Weston, from the Court Services, is about to join us. He has been delayed. I hope it is not due to public transport. Otherwise -- or I hope it is, in fact, but we will find out. He will be joining us later this morning.

We have got I think some excellent slides to kick off the discussion. It will take place in three parts. I do not propose to give a lengthy introduction. I will now hand over to Rebecca to take us through the first series of slides. Rebecca.

Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy): Lovely. Thank you, Stephen.

So this pack of data and analysis really is in three sections. First, we are asking ourselves what do we know about who are the victims of crime in London? How far does the information we have kind of help us answer that question?

The second section we call "The Victim's Journey". So what happens to victims once they have become a victim of crime? What are their experiences as they have contact with the police and move through the Criminal Justice System? How are they feeling and what do we know about that?

Then the third section is really what are we doing as partners to improve that and how could we redesign the services? MOPAC will introduce some of the work that we are doing with iMPower, here represented by Alex Khaldi, to redesign that service to get better outcomes for everyone.

So the first section: Who are the victims of crime in London? Well, the first caveat is we know that a lot of crime is not reported. So the data only tells us a certain amount, but it is interesting what it tells us. It tells us that London has the lion's share of crimes recorded and therefore victims. It accounts for around one in five of crimes recorded across England and Wales.

The crimes that are most recorded are in those big bubbles on the slides there. That is acquisitive crime. So robbery in London is about 44% of the England and Wales' total for robbery and theft from person 42%.

That is quite interesting in a way because theft is seen as a widely under reported crime, but it is still the highest proportion of victims in London, and violence against the person is the second most frequently recorded.

There is no great difference in recorded crime, no huge difference there across gender, but men are slightly more represented in recorded crime. Exceptions include women more frequently recorded as victims of sexual offences and men most frequently recorded as victims of robbery.

However, if you turn over to the next slide, we know that under reporting of crime is a national issue and particularly prevalent for certain crime types.

This shows the difference. The blue bars are the Crime Survey of England and Wales, so that is people reporting in a survey that they have been a victim of crime, compared to the red bars which are actual recording of crime by the police. So there is a big under reporting.

So comparing the Crime Survey in England and Wales' estimates to recorded crime shows that actually only about half the incidence of victims' experience of crime becomes a crime record, or is reported to police.

There is the whole separate issue of fraud and online crime, which is recorded in a different way in police statistics, and the Crime Survey of England and Wales shows a large number of victims of this type of crime who do not reach the reporting systems from Action Fraud.

Some of the particular differences in those bars are quite interesting. There is 33 less recorded violence offences, compared to the reports in the Crime Survey of England and Wales. The difference is 48 for robbery, 54% fewer for theft and 59 for criminal damage. So on average a fifth of all crime recorded across England and Wales, and it is assumed that there is a similar picture of under reporting for London.

We have there some of the survey questions that come out of why people do not report crime. You will see that they did not feel the crime was serious enough, "It will go away if I ignore it". "I'll get used to it". "There'll be repercussions". "Probably a few isolated incidents". "I can handle it myself", or, "Nothing is going to be done anyway".

Slide 5 shows changes in the number of victims over time. So you will see that robbery has come down over time the number of victims and burglary, as the number of crimes have come down, and criminal damage. Theft and handling are those very high volumes that we talked about, but they are coming down.

Violence against the person also high volume, and we know from our MOPAC challenges on performance that they are coming up. We know that there are issues around the changes in recording practice of violence which are contributing to that, but we have also in our Performance MOPAC Challenge looked at some of the underlying reported violence.

You can see there the trend in sexual offences going up and we know that more people are now reporting.

Even though we know that this is an imperfect picture statistically, we have asked ourselves, "Even looking at these statistics that we have, can we find out anything more about if there are any particular patterns of victimisation?"

So we have looked at ethnicity and actually the ethnicity breakdown of victims generally is in line with London's population, but with a couple of exceptions as shown on slide 6. So violence against the person there is a higher proportion of victims who are of black ethnicity, relative to the population, and for burglary and theft there is a higher proportion that are of white ethnicity.

If you turn the page to slide 7 we have looked again at the breakdown for gender, and as a whole they largely reflect population but with some differences there. So white males are more likely to be victims of crime, but in line with their slight over representation in the population. The majority of victims are within that age group that are most dominant in the population, but there are some differences by age of gender. So victims of robbery and sexual offences are more likely to be younger, and violence against the person and theft and handling are in that middle aged category between 25 and 44 years.

We have looked geographically in slide 8 finally. We have looked geographically at whether there are any particular geographic patterns to victimisation, and they mirror crime. I mean they mirror where the crime occurs. Most victims experience crime in the borough in which they live, although it is worth noting that 8% of London's victims are resident within other police forces.

Finally, slide 9. You will be aware from other challenges and evidence sessions that we have held that repeat victimisation is particularly important, and this data based on reported victim information shows that one in eight victims of crime are repeat victims. That is around 8,000 victims per month that have experienced at least one other offence in the previous 12 months, and on average 36% of repeat victims per month have experienced two or more offences in the previous 12 months.

So that is a very brief run through of the data we have, even within its limitations, of who London's victims are and what are their characteristics.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, thank you, Rebecca.

I did not do the introductions. I am obviously joined by my colleagues Keith Prince and Jonathon to my left, Steve O'Connell and Linda Duncan to my right and Helen Bailey obviously our Chief Operating Officer.

I see we have got almost brigaded elements. We have got the police represented over to my left. So obviously Jeremy, thank you very much. Jeremy Burton. You head up obviously this area of the criminal justice interface, and you have brought along colleagues: Sara Lewis, who is Head of Prosecutions from the Metropolitan Police Service, and also Sally Benatar as well.

Alex Khaldi from iMPower, thank you for coming along. I know you have done some work commissioned to look at the victim's journey and also how we redesign that.

We have also got two Independent Sexual Violence Advocates (ISVA), and so that is great to get that front line view from colleagues, from Catherine Dunn and Rosemarie Cameron. So thank you both for coming along.

We will be joined by Dave Weston when he sort of overcomes the barriers of public transport in London, or maybe it is an Uber, or even a licensed cab? I do not know. We will find out. That is perhaps something for later.

We move on I think with questions on who are the victims in London? Well, you know, to be honest with you, is that the summit of our information that we have on victims?

Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy): Yes, the information is pretty limited and driven by recording and reporting issues and victims under reporting.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Right. So I guess, Keith, do you want to kick off?

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you, Deputy Mayor.

Yes, my question is to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), and I would like to ask what you are doing to help increase reporting of victim based crimes please?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): If I can start broadly on that, clearly our first point of principle is we would encourage every person who has suffered crime to come forward. We appreciate in some circumstances that may be difficult, so we elicit the help -- and I am pleased to see colleagues from Independent Sexual Violence Advisors here. We elicit help from other referral units, other pathways, third party reporting.

We are improving -- and I will let Sally talk about it in a bit more detail, but we are improving the way people who suffer crime can access our services through better enhanced digital solutions, but clearly the first points of contact will either be officers on the street, our front counters, our public access strategy, telephone, via our online portal. So there is a number of ways, but it is all supported by that encouragement for people who have suffered crime to come forward.

Whilst the slides there are stark around what the British Crime Survey says and what we actually record, one important point to mention is we have seen some dramatic improvements in the integrity of our recording processes as well over the last 18 months.

So, for instance, when we focus on violent crime and sexual offences, I am very encouraged to see that since March last year we had respectively a 59% and a 61% compliance rate with recording those crimes. This year we are 92 and 95%.

So it is not only about for me encouraging people to come forward. It is having the integrity in the process when we record those crimes, so we have a better basis for the investigation which then leads into the needs of the people who report.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Just to expand on that, I have come recently from an operational borough and we are doing a lot of work to change the mindset of officers, that if an allegation is made then it must be recorded, and we are complying with the new Home Office guidelines that it must be recorded within 24 hours so that there is a really swift service to victims.

We recognise that we need to make it easier for victims to access our services and to report crime, and so at the moment you can only report three types of crime online hate crime, theft and criminal damage but we plan to expand that service so that you can report more types of crime online.

In addition we have done, or we are doing, a lot of work with victims of hate crime and with support services. So at the moment you can report hate crime online but, if you do not want to report it directly to the Metropolitan Police Service, you can follow the link on the website to True Vision, which is the third party reporting, so that you can report your crime and swift action will be taken.

We do recognise that channel shift and the need to change the way all our services are accessed is a real priority for the organisation going forward. So the reason I am here today is I work on the Change Team, so I am designing the One Metropolitan Police Service Model for the organisation going forward together with MOPAC, and I also support Jeremy with the implementation of total victim care. The channel shift, improving access to our services, is a really key part of that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So there are, I mean, two key questions, and you have given some reassurance that we move to enable victims to report online if necessary through third parties. That is going to be rolled out for other crime types. There is improved compliance.

If we look at some of the reasons why people do not report crime, it largely seems to focus on issues to do with the victim, as opposed to the response they have got from the police, according to the survey we have got. So, you know, they felt the crime was not serious enough. "It will go away if I ignore it". "I will get used to it". "There might be repercussions". "This is probably just a few isolated incidents". "I can handle it myself". Then the last one is, "Nothing is going to be done anyway", which is I think something that indicates they feel they are not going to get anywhere if they bother to report.

I am just wondering if you feel that there are any other reasons, other than the barriers and the ease of reporting, that we need to think about in order to increase reporting of crime, where the criminal justice agencies themselves could do more including -- well, starting with the police, because nine out of ten victims only ever deal with the police?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Having seen that list there, I think they are probably representative of most of the reasons.

One of the main barriers that we have already touched on is better IT access. Now, I appreciate not everybody will use IT and a digital solution to report crime, but it goes into how confident they are of the response they will get. As the slides go through, you look at the satisfaction. There is a couple of areas there.

However, I do think those are representative, but when you look at the whole Criminal Justice System it is about having that access at every point so that when people suffer a crime they can report wherever and it gets to the investigators.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yes. I mean, they must feel that the crime is going to be solved and there will be a response.

I mean, if you take fraud for instance, there is a huge under reporting of fraud and that might be an indication that many people do not feel that it is necessarily going to be dealt with, you know?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): I think also, Deputy Mayor, it is raising people's understandings of when they may have suffered a crime, because certainly the fraud is a complex arena. If you look at the recent publicity around dating scams, people are embarrassed, people feel awkward, people do not want to come forward and on some incidents within that context people do not actually appreciate that a crime may have been committed.

So it is around publicity and raising awareness in respect of some of those crime types as well, and then having the appropriate referral mechanisms, either directly or indirectly, so we can respond to them. Having a truer picture not only allows us better response and victim satisfaction, but also allows us to allocate our resources more effectively.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. So a combination of awareness raising, but also ensuring an effective response, as well as ease of being able to report, will enable us to see greater reporting by victims.

Okay. If we move on to the second question, which is, okay, the person has reported now. We know there has been greater compliance. The big issue is obviously attrition and crimes like domestic abuse. You know, nearly half of them may start the process, but do not effectively last the process, and I think it is about a 44% attrition rate for domestic abuse.

What are your thoughts on how we can reduce the attrition rate and support victims effectively?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Well, I am coming to Sara with responsibility going through the first start of that court process.

We have a good response at the moment where we risk assess people who have suffered domestic violence. It is the use and support of colleagues in different referral organisations that help us, but it is a constant challenge for us to keep reassuring that people who suffer particularly domestic violence that, you know, it is in their interest, it is in society's interests, that we put offenders before the court.

That on occasions is a one to one interaction and it is a sustained interaction, so it is that professional commitment using colleagues in other agencies to keep that momentum going.

That's the drive behind it but, in terms of where the attrition comes down, Sara will have the detail and the facts around the court cases.

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. So once domestic abuse victims have entered into the court process, we do have a 44% attrition rate in the Magistrates' Court at the moment, which is just absolutely too high.

We are looking at various things that we can do to address that. So in the south at the moment we are running a pilot around domestic abuse cases, where we are looking to get those for trial

within four weeks from the first hearing which is much quicker than we do at the moment. We are also looking at how those victims can give evidence via remote sites as well, rather than have to attend the actual courthouse where they could well be in the position where they actually bump into the defendant at that stage, to see if that encourages victims to give evidence in those circumstances.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. So the speed of the process is important for this and also ensuring that the vulnerability of victims is protected through the process?

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. I mean we think, you know, the longer a case goes on, the greater the chances that they will drop out. So, you know, at the moment we wait about three months on average from first hearing to trial, so we think actually if we can get them to trial quicker, with the appropriate support behind them, we have got more of a chance of those victims giving evidence.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): There is also -- I mean, on this it will be interesting to hear from the two Independent Sexual Violence Advocates. There is also quite a high attrition rate for victims of sexual violence as well.

I know we are going to come to the journey, but any comments on how we could combat and reduce the attrition rate and support victims more effectively?

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): Well, one of the things that we see for women who report sexual violence is that they are essentially going into a process where they lose a lot of control over what happens and it is a very lengthy process. So in reporting they have to make that decision that informed decision about potentially effectively putting their life on hold for a year or more, because these are the kind of time frames we are looking at the moment. So I would say that is a big factor.

However, one of the things that we are seeing as well is not so much the case of women withdrawing, but also the very high attrition rate for their cases, whether it has been dropped by the police because of a lack of evidence, or been dropped by CPS.

That links in with under reporting because, looking at these statements about why people do not report, one common one that I think we see is people feeling, "It's not worth it. What's going to come of it and what am I going to have to go through, only for it to be dropped eight months later at the CPS stage?"

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Can I also say not feeling as if they are believed.

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

I mean, this loss of control is picked up in the iMPower Victims' Survey and I think it is probably relevant. I know you are going to be commenting on how we improve the victim's journey, but I think some of those findings from your survey, would you just quickly run through them and examine the point because they speak to what we have just heard?

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): It has been submitted as an additional piece of paper, and it really confirms some of the comments that have been made already that a victim through a process a justice process is requiring and wanting significant amounts of information that is, according to the survey reports, actually provided by the various agencies involved, who all might be doing their job. It is the system as a whole which is not working necessarily, as opposed to particular failings of individual agencies within London.

I am immediately drawn, perhaps you are as well, to the statistic that, you know, 91% of the victims in London that we survey – we surveyed 100 victims in London – had to proactively contact people to find out more about their case, or what was going to happen next. That may be a lot to do with the joins in the system, as opposed to the compliance and performance of individual agencies involved.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): And 57% had difficulty finding information about support and services.

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Indeed.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. One of the key things that we do know about victims is a number of them a significant minority are repeat victims.

Linda, do you want to follow up on that?

Linda Duncan (Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel): Yes. I think just looking at the slide there on average we got 13% repeat victims, which is almost 8,000 victims a month who experienced at least one other offence in the last 12 months.

We seem to have a sort of dearth of information about repeat victims, based on what we have been able to pull together, which is basically just the 12 month rolling information about repeat victims.

What plans, or how can we gather additional information, like demographics for example and hate crime for example, where repeat victims we can get a better insight into those victims, and also when another repeat offence occurs that the police officers attending are already cognizant of the fact that there has been a previous offence against that victim?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): I will go into the sort of strategic deliberations afterwards, but in terms of the operational response, when a police officer is deployed, or a victim of crime rings, we conduct checks through an integrated platform that shows whether the caller or the premises has been subject of repeat crime beforehand. That will inform the response, the nature of the policing response, and it will also inform the nature of the investigation.

What we do, as the slide alludes to, is we do this on a rolling 12 month basis. So we look at who has suffered a crime in the previous rolling 12 months.

When we try and problem solve bigger issues, we will absolutely use demographics so that our analysis will show not only who the offender may be, or where the offences are taking place, but the victimology. So the victim demographics. So is it wider than the individual? Is it a target of, you know, males for instance, or females? We do that successfully.

What we do in terms of the repeat victimisation on a monthly basis, the 8,000 per month, we circulate that information and manage and monitor that information across all our London boroughs. So every one of those 32 boroughs, we will look, understand and action where appropriate the numbers of repeat victims so that we can bring them down and provide the best possible service for that is based on crime type. So we do it in that respect.

Linda Duncan (Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel): So the data that is available currently enables you to analyse the repeat victims by demographic and crime type?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): We pick it up by crime type and then we can drill into it to look at the demographic profile of victims.

We have done some work over the last four years in terms of victimisation, the demographics, and the very first slide there that showed the sort of 49/37% split on gender is relatively static over those four years. Then when you look underneath that, the ethnicity profile versus the crime type is again relatively static and the age profile relatively static.

So the value for us is looking at it in a more granular basis to look at the trends, so that we can respond operationally to solve the crime and prevent the crime, but equally so we can respond strategically to provide the best possible victim care.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Does the level of repeat victimisation -- I mean, from memory, we have looked at this before, it does vary significantly by crime type.

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Can you give us an idea of the range? 13% is the average.

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): It varies by crime type. What we have seen -- there has been brief discussion about it already. What we have seen most recently is the increase in repeat victimisation around sexual offending.

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

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): I think your slide says 118%, which over four years equates to an additional 3,000 offences. Now, there will be many variables as was touched on in the narrative for that.

So we have seen an increase there. We have also seen an increase in violence against the person over that time frame, in terms of repeat victimisation.

What we have seen positively is a reduction in repeat victimisation on some of those serious acquisitive crimes. So robbery, burglary, those areas have seen a reduction.

So the concern at the moment is the increase around the two crime types I have said. The challenge is the complexity in that, because absolutely we would encourage people to come forward. Absolutely there are some very high profile investigations at the moment that would have contributed to some of those increases, and again, as touched on, the change in recording practices. However, the important thing certainly for me is to understand that picture, have that information and then respond appropriately.

So broadly over four years it was up, it went down and now it is creeping up associated with those two areas.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): How does the repeat victimisation levels compare with other similar forces; so if we look at Greater Manchester Police (GMP), or West Midlands?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): I have not got that information, I am afraid. So I would not be able to say, but I can get back to you on that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): It would be interesting to know, would it not?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, it would be.

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

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): I know in terms of victim satisfaction with GMP. GMP, Greater Manchester Police, have seen a decrease. We have stayed the same over the past few years.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): It has slightly increased, yes.

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): We have had a slight increase. They have gone down.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yes, marginally. Theirs has gone down, has it? Interesting. Well, I think with those metrics it would be interesting to compare.

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Shall we move on to "The Victim's Journey"?

Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy): Yes, absolutely.

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

Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy): So just a reminder that there is a Code of Practice for victims of crime, and the slide briefly states the elements of that.

The Metropolitan Police Service collects some data around the compliance with the Code of Practice and shows the proportions there for which the code complies, and I think this should also be seen in context against the polling data that iMPower did in their deeper dive there.

The compliance varies, with updates to victims all recording below 80%. So informing a victim of a suspect's release, there is an average of 68% compliance in the year, with a low of 60% in September. Non court disposals averaging 68%, with the most recent low of 66% in December.

These compliance statistics are collected by all forces, so you can see the comparison there on page 13 slide 13 for each force in England and Wales. So the Metropolitan Police Service has the lowest satisfaction across the most similar forces and the second lowest for England and Wales in the last calendar year. Across England and Wales, average satisfaction is 84%.

If you move to slide 14, this looks at our own User Satisfaction Survey for the Metropolitan Police Service. It is useful data here in the sense that it shows that current satisfaction is actually quite high in aggregate terms on this measure and relatively stable, but I think much more richer findings come out when you drill down and you look at the different areas in the questioning of victims in that survey.

So we have asked, "What are the sort of factors that determine whether people are going to feel satisfied with their experience of police and what are the other feelings they have about whether they feel reassured of their overall situation?"

Slide 15 puts those two types of questions together. So victims are asked, "Do you feel reassured in the overall situation you face? How reassured are you after all of this?" You see 84% there happily do feel reassured and, of those 84% who feel reassured, nine out of ten of them are satisfied with the police actions.

However, if you look at those 16% who do not feel reassured, not only do they not feel reassured, but they are also far, far more likely not to be satisfied with police actions.

So there is an interesting connection there, which we have explored in more depth in slide 16. What seems to be very key for people is feeling that their vulnerability is identified and catered for right at the outset.

So those people are asked if they consider themselves vulnerable? They are asked whether they felt that was identified by the police and whether their needs were catered for?

For those people who were vulnerable, the police recognised that and the police catered for all their needs. Their satisfaction rates are high. However, those people who felt vulnerable and they did not feel their needs are catered for, this is where you move into the red box of only 40% being satisfied.

We have done previous work in sessions with partners and in panels like these of them looking at seeing how that is then affected for particular types of crime, and we have two slides there on 17 and 18 that shows the victim's journey for different crime types and the attrition rate.

The first there is for rape. Slide 17 shows the typical attrition rate in rape cases, through interaction with the police, and it shows the percentage of victims unwilling to cooperate with police, or CPS, across other crime types. So it shows there 17.4% of victims unwilling on rape, 10.4% on domestic violence, 10% on violence and only 1.1% on robbery.

So there is a key risk area there linked to decision points for both officer and victim, and in the case of rape the victim being unwilling to continue is a key reason for further action being taken whether a subject is arrested or not.

The next slide shows that for violence with injury, the dropout rate of victims for violence and injury is similar to that seen for domestic abuse, with again the victim's unwillingness being the prominent reason why cases make no further progress with the Crown Prosecution Service.

The attrition rate is actually similar to sexual offences and with a similar proportion of suspects being arrested relative to the number of cases.

So that is the available data on "The Victim's Journey".

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Great, thank you. Yes, interesting the importance of that first contact in determining the outcome.

Right. Linda, do you want to kick off the questioning, or Jonathon do you want to kick off the questioning?

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, so if I could pick up on the definitions which are being used here.

As I understand it, some of the violence and sexual offences are not applicable under the VCOP. Can you just talk us through those definitions?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Under the Victims' Code of Practice then, all victims of crime are entitled to be covered under the code. So certainly we would not differentiate between victims of sexual offences or violence, but in terms of the survey information that drives the User Satisfaction Survey then it is right that not all victims are surveyed in the same way.

In terms of the actions and the follow up that we provide, we have a duty and a responsibility to provide all victims with information set out in the code. We recognise that in areas such as follow up we do need to improve and we are doing a large amount of work with officers around making sure that they do comply with their responsibilities, and that is certainly the case for victims of violence and sexual offences as well.

Recently we are developing a tool kit which sets out extremely clearly what victims are entitled to and what officers must do, so that the statistic that we have heard about, the 91%, which is clearly not acceptable, is greatly improved.

In terms of using feedback, we recognise that it is really important to hear the voice of the victim and to improve our services. So as well as using the User Satisfaction Survey, we are also developing a quick method of feedback called "Rate Your PC", so "Rate Your Police Constable", and that is for almost instant feedback.

We are asking victims to give feedback on an online survey, that is easy to use, so that we can grip service recovery issues and quickly assist in any areas where we have not met their expectations. We want to expand that out to all victims across London, because we do recognise that actually the User Satisfaction Survey is slow. You know, it is three months. We use the data from it and so we use the comments from victim, but it is not as quick as we would like it to be.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): What kind of level of take up are you finding in response to that, because of course many people if they have just been the victim of crime it may not be their first priority to be going online to respond to that kind of survey?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Are you getting a good response?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Well, it is a slow take up so far and we are piloting out across a few boroughs. I mean, also we do recognise that that digital survey is not appropriate for all victims, but certainly we have had a great deal of instant feedback which is helping us to grip issues and respond.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): So that first impression is really important? The first contact is something which is, if you are able to capture that information, where you can perhaps really improve things?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely, and also we know how important it is to identify vulnerability at that first point of contact. So we recognise the stats here around, if we do not identify the vulnerability of the victim, the victim is much less likely to feel reassured and to be satisfied. So that instant survey work is all about, "Did we identify a vulnerability? Did we ask you whether you were a repeat victim of crime? Did we capture everything that we should do and did we actually act accordingly?"

So we know that, even if we identify vulnerability, we still have to act on it and that is what we are training officers to do at the moment.

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): Can I just come in on the Victims' Code of Practice as well?

Under the Victims' Code of Practice, victims of any sexual offence or domestic abuse offence are automatically classed as vulnerable anyway. So they are then entitled to an enhanced level

of service, and certainly as they then go through the criminal justice process they are entitled to special measures as well. So they can apply to give evidence from behind screens, etc, etc.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Presumably this applies to male victims of sexual crime as well?

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, absolutely. Yes.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you.

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

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, thank you.

I mean, drilling down pretty much on the same subject as Sally and probably Sara, again on the Code of Practice. We note that the two particular areas, which is informing of a suspect's release averaged 68% compliance with lowest 60 and non court disposals 68%, lowest 66%, kind of stands out as figures.

We have identified on other slides the link between vulnerability, reassurance, satisfaction. There is clearly a link across the three. If you are a victim of a particular crime and one of the things that will worry you potentially is about release, is about disposal outside of court, that kind of stuff is almost quite disproportionate to the worries of vulnerable people.

The figures here seem quite low. Sally, do you want to comment on that and how you may consider turning them around a bit?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. So firstly it is a duty of ours to inform victims. It is mandatory for officers, so we are reinforcing the message through training.

However, secondly we have to get better with our compliance. So we do analyse these victims' code and compliance figures, and we do share these with local leaders so that they will have one to one conversations with the officers that are persistently not updating victims. So we do drill down right into, you know, the information about individual officers' performance to make sure that we do not have any officers that are just not complying with all victims.

We have to get the balance right between the ethos that the victim is first, comes first, that all we do is designed to support the victim and the bureaucratic process of actually ticking the box on our crime reporting system to show that, yes, that victim has been updated, because we know that in some cases actually the officer has telephoned the victim to tell them that the suspect has been charged, or arrested, or the out of court disposal, but they just have not ticked the box on our system.

That still is not acceptable, but we have to get the balance right between they know that the victim's needs come first, but they also have to be very hot on their admin and our supervision as well has to pick up where there are issues.

So at the moment we have a crime reporting system that is not modern and the system for recording the compliance with the victims' code is bureaucratic, but we are moving to procure an integrated system which will simplify this and make it much more intuitive and much clearer for officers about what their actual duties are under the code.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): So you can see that there is a system fault, in essence, and you are trying to fix that, but you said "bureaucracy" three times and it does kind of strike me that, if you were a resident in a neighbourhood that was the victim of crime, one of the worries would be is the suspect back on the streets?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): It would also strike me that, if you are an officer in a neighbourhood that was close to the ground, that would kind of register with you. It would be something that you feel as your duty as an officer, and as an individual, to make sure that you could give some comfort to and also update that resident.

I mean, who would have the responsibility to make that call in your system; your bureaucratic system? Who would that have responsibility?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): It would be the investigating officer.

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

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): So the officer in the case, the officer that is investigating. So they have the responsibility to keep the victim updated through their journey.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, because we are aware obviously -- and I will not extend this too long, but we are aware that there is a change in the local policing model whereby local police officers in the neighbourhoods are taking more responsibilities about seeing the process through, yes?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Is that on your radar to make sure that those good people who are not experienced in that kind of investigation it is a core duty for them to carry out?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. I mean, it does not matter whether they are a detective, or a uniformed officer. If they are carrying an investigative caseload then absolutely, and we recognise that officers need that training.

So we have recently done a significant training package for all supervisors of front line officers, called "Leading the Investigation Programme", and a whole day of it is devoted to victim care and victims' codes, because absolutely we recognise that the victim must be prioritised. If

officers do not actually know what their responsibilities are under the code, then they will not comply with it.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes. As I suggest, particularly thinking across the whole piece is vital, but if I was to pick out one thing from my experience on the ground, to advise them that the suspect has been released, or it has been settled out of court, is that call that is so vital, or can be, and then can lead along to the vulnerability satisfaction and assurances.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you, Chair.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I know, Rosemarie, you have been looking to come in, but that is the expectation you have of the police. Do you have any comments?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): I am a front line worker.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Anybody? Rosemarie? Sorry. Sorry, did you have any thoughts around that particular --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): I am a front line worker and the majority of my role is chasing up police officers to find out what the outcomes are.

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

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): The Victims' Charter, they are supposed to get a minimum update every 28 days. That does not happen in the majority of cases.

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

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So the majority of your time day to day is chasing?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): A lot of my time is chasing up cases, and the women that I am working with are phoning in and saying, "Oh, I have not heard from the police officer. What's happening with the case?" That does make the women that I work with feel like, "What is the point? I'm not being believed. I'm not being treated as if this is serious", and then they do disengage.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Is one difficulty identifying who to contact, or is that pretty clear who the case officer is? Is that one of the things, the bureaucracy that we have heard about?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): No, they actually know who the officer is, but on occasion and not on all occasions you know, they have phoned up, tried to speak to the

officer and they are told by the officer, "Oh, I've got 20 other cases". That is not her problem. What her problem is --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So a lot of this lack of follow up --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Lack of follow up. Lack of follow up. A lot of the --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): -- is why we see these quite high levels of victims who are then unwilling to continue the process?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Yes, that happens because I work on a help line as well.

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

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): So I work on the help line one day a week, because it is good to see how things work within the system and keep your hand there.

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

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): However, like I say, a lot of people are phoning up, "Oh, I have reported to the police. I'm not hearing anything. What's going on? Can you please chase this up? I don't know who's the officer in the case. I don't know who the SOIT Officer is".

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

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): The response when they first report is very different. I do not believe that all police officers are working in a uniformed way. You get a different response at one police station and a different response at another. They are not all working in a uniformed way.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Well, going back to mine, that is a general comment across the whole kind of dissatisfaction and the debilitating effect it may have.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Yes. Yes.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): However, the particular point I was raising, and in particular the field that you work in, is the information that the suspect is back on the streets is something that you would expect your clients to be told about as a core business?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Sometimes they are not being told.

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

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Not in all occasions, but sometimes they are not being told.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, and that will be an issue as well that you are working on?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Yes, because I am chasing up and finding out, "Well, what's going on here?"

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor) (Chair): Catherine?

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): You find that sometimes that can be patchy, that they are not told in a timely fashion, and it is really important to remember that especially for survivors of sexual violence that information is huge, because survivors have been through a deeply traumatic process not only in what they have experienced in terms of sexual violence, but also in reporting.

It is important to remember that these updates are huge and they are very important for a survivor. So finding out, for example, if the suspect has been released, you know, can trigger a lot of very negative feelings, can trigger high anxiety and feelings of being unsafe, and I think it is really important to bear that in mind. I also think it is a really important point that, you know, all survivors of sexual violence should be considered as vulnerable in that sense and we need to bear that in mind.

I thought that was an interesting slide to see the difference between the satisfaction about the first response and how that tails off, and I think that is reflected in our work as ISVAs because of the lack of communication throughout the investigative process. They might have had a positive experience when they reported, and then they feel there is silence and they do not get any information.

So I think that is where early referrals into support services are vital, because that is how as well you are going to identify vulnerability at an early stage. Because the police might not necessarily even have that opportunity to identify it, whereas specialist services can offer that more holistic support and help with that liaising in the communication.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I mean, you are both raising very similar points then around the need for a proactive follow through by the police.

Jeremy, your thoughts on how you --

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): Just, you know, hearing that conversation, we absolutely agree that that level of inconsistency and quality should not happen. It is unacceptable. What does jump out is the follow up, and the follow up police action has always been a challenge for us.

Broadly speaking, when you look at when the Commissioner launched our Total Victim Care Strategy in 2012, we had a significant increase in people's satisfaction of our services through the User Satisfaction Survey. I think it was about 6%.

The work we have to do now, which we recognise, is that has stubbornly sat at 80%, more or less, since that increase.

There is a number of things in there that we are doing. One is firstly, I am really pleased to announce, that the last quarter compared with this quarter we have moved from second from bottom, when you look at the rankings, to 38th. So whilst we are still in that little bit and we have moved up one point in our most similar group, we are making progress.

There are a number of points I want to draw out. We have talked about handoffs in the Criminal Justice System. We have got handoffs within policing as well. So there is a piece of work being developed around consistency in investigation so that there is not this constant, "Who attended? Who do I speak to now? Who's dealing with my case?" We are looking at a process where that is more a continuum with an individual officer. So there are some improvements being considered there.

There are elements around much local boroughs and individuals, as Sally's articulated, scrutinise the performance data, so that it is really clear where the shortcomings are, and I get a sense that some of that might be disparate.

The point about feeding back around when suspects are arrested, absolutely for the points raised we need to improve on that. Absolutely.

The other point that I draw out from that is that there is an operational imperative for some of the offenders when they come out of prison so we put the right response in to prevent re offending, let alone the harm it causes people who have suffered crime.

Where we are now with the work we are doing through our Total Victim Care Board, with the support of MOPAC and voluntary agencies, not least Victim Support Service, we are bringing this together for January, where we are having a complete and utter refresh of who is doing what across all our boroughs and our specialist units, where borough commanders, OCU commanders, practitioners are coming to Empress State Building for a day with all stakeholders. Indeed I believe, Deputy Mayor, you are hoping to find time in your diary for it.

So at the beginning of January we will explicitly go through all these issues, all these challenges and where we want to get to not least in terms of improving the satisfaction performance, but making the bespoke service we give our victims of crime the very best it can be.

So I am optimistic that, whilst we have recognised, there is some real hard concerted effort to address not least some of the work that iMPower have done and are doing in terms of that whole victim journey across all agencies.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. So certainly a recognition that you need to galvanise and get greater consistency. I am reassured that that is taking place and I will make sure that I attend that summit.

Do you want to come in, Sally?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. Just in response to Dame Angiolini's review into rape investigation and prosecution, we have recognised that we do not get as much feedback from victims as we would like to and that is because we do not have the processes in place to do it.

So the comments that Catherine and Rosemarie have made we recognise. We need to hear more of that, because our User Satisfaction Survey does not cover victims of sexual violence.

So I am working with DCI Phil Darwin to develop how we do that. You know, we are using expertise from support agencies to work out how can we --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): I work quite closely with him.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. So, you know, really we have that as a priority, because we recognise that what you are saying we do not get it in a performance pack, but we need to hear it and we need to address it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, I would have thought you are right. You need to think about a very bespoke response for victims where we are seeing this very high unwilling to continue for whatever reason, whether it is lack of police proactivity, or for other reasons. So I think that probably needs a different response to crime types where the attrition rates are at the 1% level. So, you know, I think that makes a lot of sense, and then working with people who are working with those victims day to day would be a sensible way forward.

Linda, do you want to ask the next question? I mean, it has kind of been asked already, hasn't it, that question?

Linda Duncan (Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel): Yes, I think so.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Or do you want to --

Linda Duncan (Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel): I think the point that came out for me was, well, it is not just enough for us to identify victims, but where we see, you know, satisfaction almost doubling is when those needs are being catered for.

I guess the question is: What does that mean? I think colleagues have answered that in terms of the follow up and there being a predictable process for follow up.

I was interested in Catherine and Rosemarie's feedback, if you will, and how we can capture some of that into identifying the changes that need to take place on the follow up action.

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): If I can quickly respond in part to that?

Most of what we have talked about will be enshrined in our policy in January, which is for formal sign off. We have been working since September to provide clear guidance for officers in terms of a number of responses around how we care and cater for victims and meet their needs.

There is a particular section around vulnerability, some of the points we have already covered around special measures and access to services, but it is absolutely clear what we expect.

Now, that is a policy that goes out in January. The work we are doing behind the scenes is making sure the policy is enlivened and that people are doing it, and there are a number of different ways we will be checking that. One is the feedback that has been covered and one is the compliance that has been covered, but it has to be absolutely the operating ethos that victims' needs are at the foremost of what we do because we respond to that. We respond to those needs.

So it is a collective effort and work is in progress and there are areas clearly we need to improve upon, but equally there are areas that we have improved upon.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I think we can move on from this section, unless you want to ask something? Keith?

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Well, I did actually. Something has sprung to mind.

I mean, clearly we are dealing with vulnerable people and these are people -- and we have heard a lot about ticking boxes and following protocols and targets and so on, but I think we do need to bear in mind that we are dealing with people who are probably very, very upset and in a very difficult place.

Now, we have got a lot of quantitative data, but do we do any qualitative work? So, for instance, we know that maybe we are not keeping the victim informed sufficiently, but also what are we doing around making sure that we are doing it in the right and correct manner? So it is like not just a phone call saying, "Oh, yeah, it will be in court next week, luv". It is, you know, more the human side of it.

Do we do anything around that at all?

Commander Jeremy Burton (Metropolitan Police Service): There is a number of things that have been done. There is a number of things that we are planning. The User Satisfaction Survey gives us an indicator. I know MOPAC, you do your own surveys as well which we share through our board.

Sally touched on the "Rate My PC", which is an innovative feedback that we are rolling out on a number of boroughs and units to see how effective that is. That is literally, if I can explain it in a bit more detail, when somebody has suffered a crime, they are given a card and invited to fill out an online questionnaire that goes directly to the borough and the officer and the officer's supervisor so that we can understand qualitatively how that interaction went. Were needs met?

We have got the Victim Care Card, so called, that goes out, and "Did you follow this?" However, the qualitative bit is the piece that informs some of the challenges and the gaps that we may currently have.

So I absolutely endorse that approach. It goes back to the point I made earlier around this has to be our operating ethos. We tick the boxes, if that is the phrase, as the first exposure of have these important things been done? That is the compliance bit, but underneath that absolutely is the qualitative interaction.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Rosemarie, you looked like you were dying to say something?

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): No, we are fine.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, you can always trust Keith to be able to read the body language accurately.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): You know, can I just say this? Like I say, not everyone is working in a uniformed way.

Sometimes you have got really good SOIT Officers, who work really closely with the ISVAs, and we come to an arrangement with the victim/survivor how that information is fed back to them.

Sometimes the person is getting bail, or whatever, and they will say to us, "Do you want us to feed that back to the client, or does the client want us to feed that back to you?" The client more times will say, "We want it fed back by the ISVA, because if I'm upset she can sit and talk to me and pick things up".

However, then you have got some SOIT Officers who are making that call, "Well, there's going to be no further action". No letter, no information about victim's right to review, no nothing. It is like, "This has been out since April. You should know about this. I should not have to be telling you about your role. You are supposed to be the police officer. This is what is happening and you need to know about it".

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): If I could just add?

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Well, that is how you draw out questions with --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): What they get -- sorry, what they are getting is phone calls to say, "Oh, there is no further action", or an email, "No further action", and nothing else. I have had to phone up a number of officers and say, "What is that?"

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes. No, I agree and that is the point I was trying to get to.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): I should not have to. You know, this should not be happening.

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes. It is about caring about the individual as much as just keeping the individual informed, yes?

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): Just in regards to your point about thinking of qualitative interaction, I just want to highlight how important that is in terms of survivors feeling like they are believed, that they are respected, that they are being listened to. You know, it is absolutely vital, and I think that is a vital element of --

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, I agree.

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): -- survivors feeling like they can be satisfied with the police response, but also that they feel like we can continue to engage with the process.

So I think it is really important to always bear that in mind how vital that interaction is and how important it is to survivors feeling like they are believed. That is absolutely crucial for reporting and it is absolutely crucial for people staying engaged with the process.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): They need to know that their voices are being heard, and a lot of the times they do not feel like that voice is being heard.

Now I am going to say it, it will make me unpopular, but the hostility you get sometimes from police officers because you are questioning them and challenging them on their practice and they do not like that. "However, if you were doing what you were supposed to be doing, then I wouldn't have to question you on how you're treating the women that we work with".

Keith Prince (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): I think it is valid and we recognise it, and one of the key presentations on our day for senior leaders across the organisation in January is exactly about that. It is about the victim. You know, it is about believing the victim, the allegation when it comes in. It is exactly that.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): We do not want to be seen as the enemy.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): We both want a good outcome for the survivor. Whether that be there is a charge, or there is not a charge, she wants to know that it has been investigated and that, even if there is no further action, you know, that her voice is heard.

We all want the best outcome for the woman, but sometimes when you phone the police and say, "Actually, I'm this person's ISVA", it is this whole hostility. It is like I do not understand why that is, because we do support the work that you are doing?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, absolutely. Yeah.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): We are not against you.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Like I said, we both want the same outcome and so we need to be working more closely together for better outcomes.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): We do, yes.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): You know, that is going to kind of like help this low attrition.

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): I completely agree. It is obviously very uncomfortable for us three sitting here listening to that, but you are --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): No, I am not attacking. I am not attacking. I am just --

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): No, I know you are not and you are absolutely right. We need to work together.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): You asked us to hear our voice and I am giving the voice to you.

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): You are absolutely right. We need to work together. It is the outcome that is important.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): It is the outcome that is important.

Sara Lewis (Head of Prosecutions, Metropolitan Police Service): It is making sure that the victim is heard, that they feel like a survivor and that they feel as though they have been respected. So, you are absolutely right.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, I think that was a very good discussion and thank you for being so candid I think on two parts really. There is the importance of getting to the heart of the needs of the victim and their vulnerabilities to improve outcomes, but equally the basis upon which you communicate information and how you communicate information, through whom you communicate information, is just as critical when we look at service redesign, which is the last section.

So I think --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): It needs to be victim centred.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Of course. The whole process needs to be victim centred.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): It needs to be all about them and letting them take some power back.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Absolutely. Clearly that has to be central to what we are trying to do with this victim service redesign, which is the next bit.

So we have understood the victim's journey, the frustrations, we have got an understanding of the challenges they face, so let us try and do better on that and redesign the service to improve the response.

Rebecca Lawrence (MOPAC Director of Strategy): All right. Thank you, Stephen.

So this chapter is around redesign of that victim service and particularly the role that commissioning can play.

So, as people will know, MOPAC took on responsibility for commissioning support services from victims on 1 October last year. Previously that was Ministry of Justice and that funding has transferred to us.

So we have set ourselves a strategic ambition to take a whole system approach to support services to victims of crime to help them cope and recover, to protect vulnerable victims, to reduce the repeat victimisation, to drive that satisfaction of all the interactions they have and build confidence in the Criminal Justice System.

So we have worked across agencies involved in this space to develop that coordinated approach, and specifically we have commissioned iMPower to support this work. So I would like to invite Alex Khaldi to take us through the work carried out so far and some of the early findings.

Alex Khaldi (iMPower): Thank you, Rebecca.

Just to pick up on one or two things that Rebecca has just said, MOPAC's strategic ambition for a whole system approach is important in the context within which victim services are provided in London and indeed for almost the whole of England, which is to say that they are provided on a non integrated basis.

That is not anybody's fault. It is the reality of the Criminal Justice System, with confined service agencies with predominantly justice aims and, you know, secondary victim roles and responsibilities.

So the commissioning role and objective of MOPAC in trying to develop a whole system approach relates to the patchwork quilt of victim services and rights and indeed regulatory responsibilities upon agencies that the scene in London sets.

I should also say I think I am struck by the last debate that we have just had, and there is a tension that we have identified in the course of our work which is between the relatively recent increase in rights and responsibilities rights for victims and responsibilities on agencies with the notion of good, if you like, customer service.

It is perfectly possible and Sally and Jeremy alluded to this to be following regulatory compliance and missing the point on customer service, or indeed I suppose the other way around.

You know, the police and other agencies have got to hold those two concepts in mind at the same time; namely to comply with the law and what they have been tasked to do. At the same time they have to understand what the emotional and indeed practical journey of a victim is through the Criminal Justice System and provide the right sorts of support at the right time, and that is a very sophisticated and refined skill which does not fit well across many agencies, I would contend.

So moving on to the slides you are struck by and have already commented on the fact that nine out of ten victims in London do not reach the charge stage, making the sort of fairly blindingly obvious point that, if we want to increase in aggregate victim satisfaction, of course it is the case that more serious offences will be in the 6% and the 5% subsequent to the 89%.

However, if we want to shift in aggregate the perception Londoners have of -- whether they are victims of crime, or they are family members or friends of victims of crime, the perception they have of how well public agencies are dealing with it, then that first contact and that contact with the police forces of London is going to be absolutely signal in achieving that mood shift that perception shift in London.

At this point as well I want to draw attention to the additional page and the key findings, one or two of which we have alluded to already. Without reading them all out, they are out there in front of you, I am just noticing one or two of them.

Half of victims did not have a good understanding of the outcomes of each stage. 44% of victims felt they never knew what was going to happen next. 40% of victims never felt in control of their involvement.

That stands fairly starkly against the relatively high levels of satisfaction and we are glad that that is the case with the police's handling of the case in the first instance.

So you dig under the surface a little bit, and we spoke to 100 victims across London, and you will find that there are fairly significant concerns and issues in relation to the provision of information in terms of the victim's own sense of control over the experience that they are going through.

I think that is quite stark and interesting, and in a sense evidences or is part of the evidence base for saying, "Yes, MOPAC are right to be pursuing strongly a collaborative and whole system approach to victim support and management in London", because digging under the surface victims are not feeling as if they are having the information, advice, support that they need at all stages of the victim journey.

Moving through the slides, I think there is a sort of bit of a mistake on this slide and I will allude to it in a moment.

There are some specific points during the criminal justice process where the victim's journey comes to an end: "Screened out"; the "Detected, but no suspect arrested"; "Suspect not charged", I think it should say; and "Defendant expected to plead guilty".

What those references are designed to demonstrate is the banner type in that slide, which is "The victim's journey is predicated by the suspect's journey", and it is this tension between the roles of agencies in relation to supporting the victim and their higher goals, or arguably higher goals, in relation to serving the justice interest that their role and organisation is tasked with delivering.

However, for the victim it can very much feel like the experience that they are sort of going through is predicated on factors beyond their control and not strongly connected to their journey to find closure, coping and recovery from the experience that they have had.

Furthermore, the victim journey becomes a witness journey. We have set out on the slide there definitions very high level definitions of victims and witnesses. They are very, very different things, yet we use those phrases slightly interchangeably, do we not?

However, of course the justice system wishes to ensure that the witness gives good evidence and appears in court, and many of the pieces of evidence that we have collected as a result of this review expose that issue and that tension between the various agencies wanting the victim engagement for the purposes of their role as a witness more strongly than of course in terms of their journey as a victim.

Again, I am not necessarily setting out any blame associated with that. The investigating officer has to investigate and that is a primary responsibility, and the Court Service, you know, has to conduct the trial effectively and witnesses need to come to court, but nonetheless the victim's journey can feel to the victim very much like a witness journey and the two things are different.

So to the questions that the last slide alludes to about what can be done, I should set out that we have not concluded this work with MOPAC just yet and this discussion about victim service redesign is very much in flight.

However, given the context that I set out earlier about the services for victims bound together in part by the Victims' Code of Practice, but being a patchwork quilt across many agencies, and it being perfectly possible for particular agencies to fulfil their roles perfectly well without necessarily the victim's journey across those agencies feeling satisfactory for the reasons that I set out. So what measures might increase the ability of the victim journey to feel more seamless across the Criminal Justice System?

I think first and foremost there is not a strong performance framework for victims in London. So of course the police and other agencies have a range of regulations to comply with and targets that they and their national organisations will set themselves, but for London and for the victim's journey as a whole, whether it be related to the provision of information, the improvement of the first contact experience, the driving up of witness and victim participation in trials, maybe even the reduction of cracked trials, driving down avoidable repeat victimisation, which has been discussed before today, or indeed measuring the self confidence of victims to cope and recover, there are not Pan London measures, targets and associated incentives that

one would put in a performance framework to govern how the victim's experience across agencies should be performed.

So that may be a very difficult task to deliver, and we will go on to difficulty of implementation I think in a moment, but certainly a place to start would be in terms of a performance framework.

Equally in terms of the various police officers, court staff and other staff involved, including on the cope and recovery side in supporting victims, there is -- unless someone is going to enlighten me about this today, which I would be embarrassed about, there is not a consistent and accredited set of cross agency training and development that would, if you like, allow the various agencies to see more clearly the other parts of the system through which the victim should be travelling. That sort of workforce, police and non police, of those that support victims, we think ought to be served and supported by some form of joint training and development.

We have discussed at length the notion of a victim care coordinator role, which is something that has or is being trialled in different sorts of ways in other parts of the country.

One of the consistent issues, which has been alluded to by my colleagues to the left too, is the sort of besieging the victim with lots of information and then sort of silence for long periods where the victim does not necessarily know what is happening to their case and what services are available to them as they continue their emotional and practical journey to recover.

So there is not a joining coordinator function that would allow victims to be able to call or otherwise engage with somebody who would help them understand what the progress of their case was and navigate all of the various agencies in the system.

To a degree as well, the wide variety of victim support services across victim support, CAB and other agencies is also fragmented and could be served to be sort of more joined and consolidated in some way.

There are several needs assessments in play in London for victims, and one of the binding measures that MOPAC and its partners may wish to consider is the notion of streamlining those needs assessments and ensuring their portability from one agency to another.

Of course it is right in the context of domestic violence or rape that very specialised needs assessments are carried out, but for many of the agencies and for many of the victims providing the same information many times throughout the system --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Duplication of work.

Alex Khaldi (iMPower): Indeed. It is not only reducing the quality of the victim experience, but it is wasteful and inefficient at the same time.

As we have talked about, first contact with victims is very important, and the final issue I will refer to is the IT issue. So there are many IT systems that deal with victims across the agencies. We have mapped them and looked at their interconnectivity, or lack of interconnectivity.

In austere times it does not seem prudent to be asking for a multimillion pound investment in a new IT system, but the ability of these systems to speak to each other and to passport the victim experience and the victim information through agencies is going to be another critical joining factor in terms of improving the victim's experience.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): That is very helpful. I am just struck by it is not so easy to deliver some of those things, but I thank you for your thoughts.

Steve, do you want to kick off with the questions around the service redesign?

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): Yes, if I may?

Alex, it is a very important piece of work you are undertaking and I look forward very much to your conclusions and recommendations, but a complex piece of work, as you pointed out yourself, and there are some difficulties which we will hear about in a minute, not least the fact that it seems a goodly number of people do not even want to share their information across. However, Linda will get on to that point.

Have you looked at other pieces of work along these lines, so either other agencies that have had to cross pollenate, band together, and/or how other forces and cities do this? You know, perhaps how does New York do this, or whatever? Do they do it better than us?

So are there examples of the work that you have done investigative work where you have looked at other agencies that need to be banded together through economies of scale and efficiencies, and are there other cities and countries that you have examined that actually they seem to have cracked it, or not?

Alex Khaldi (iMPower): Good questions. There are two or three in there. Thank you, Steve.

There are analogies with other parts of the UK public service. I mean, if you think about joining up healthcare services around the needs of an individual, or indeed children's services which are kind of very famously difficult to manage from a multi agency perspective.

Also, of course, there are all sorts of different mechanisms being employed by different parts of the Public Sector in the UK to try to solve these multi agency issues from the point of view of the customer, whether it be the child, the patient, or in this case the victim, and we have used some of that thinking in what we have been thinking about.

Probably more relevant and pertinent is what other PCC areas have been doing in relation to this set of questions, and there is something of a small movement to what MOPAC has called "integrated victim commissioning".

There is a large handful of PCCs that have set out that they want to introduce integrated victim services and a smaller handful that have actually done something.

Most notable of those is the Lighthouse Project in Bristol, which has been up and running for some months now and has established three interagency hubs led by a victim and witness care coordinator whose job is to organise some of those agencies, but also to navigate for the victim information.

Now the hard evidence is not out of the Lighthouse Project yet, in terms of all of the different outcomes that have been achieved, but it does provide no pun intended some beacon for how the services may be designed and organised, and London is probably the outstanding example in England of where integrated victims' services have or are being currently provided.

Oh, in terms of international examples, I must apologise, Steve. My colleagues who have done the work on international systems are not here today. You know, I think the honest answer is that we have found it quite difficult to find analogous international examples, but my colleagues could provide further information and indeed would.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): No. I mean, I guess London and the Metropolitan Police Service and MOPAC would be not untypically leading on this, so I am not sure whether there would be too many other models in the country led by other PCCs potentially who are ahead of us who we can take models from. That was my kind of thoughts, what I was trying to flush out from you.

The project in Bristol that I have an understanding a modest understanding for is a very good project and it would be interesting to see outcomes of that, but the job of work you have got is arguably more significant in scope in that respect. That is my point.

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Oh, indeed it is more significant in scope. So implementing at some level all of the things that I outlined in the last slide would in a sense be much more ambitious than the Lighthouse Project in Bristol, but also in terms of size, of course, London being far larger.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): My last point is that it is not untypical for us to think across to the Atlantic, or to Paris, or to New York, and just do a little piece of work, because the issues that we have got will be replicated in other cities. It is patently obvious, is it not? The challenges that we have got will be replicated, and it might just be a learning point --

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Thank you.

Steve O'Connell (MOPAC Challenge Member): -- within your scope to see what happens across one pond or the other.

Thank you, Chair.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. John, do you want to pick up on IT?

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Well, I take interest in the role that IT may be able to play in looking at this coordination function, and really to ask specifically whether there are any case management systems, or other existing IT solutions, in the multi

agency area which can be adapted? If so, do you have confidence, given the experience that we have had to date with other aspects of IT, that that would actually help deliver it, or is it actually something that is still a bit more practical than that; an actual person able to share that information and able to coordinate it perhaps using IT, but actually being the coordinator themselves, rather than relying on any kind of system that actually does the coordination?

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Yes. So there are interesting digital developments, and "Track My Crime" is something that is starting to get up and running in some parts of the country.

You know, as I mentioned earlier, in a sense the idea of kind of designing a multimillion pound new system for victims in London is something that was not really practical and sort of on the table, so the question is how can existing developments be better integrated for the victim across London?

There are many existing developments, so the police services, as well as HMCTS and others, are all developing functionality in their systems which would allow the victims much better access to information and advice.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): With a willingness to share that information?

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Yes. The challenge, Jonathon, is going to be how that is integrated by those agencies to give a single and consistent view to the victim and what sort of functionality is going to allow that victim to interact with that system in London and elsewhere. That, I think, is the challenge that has yet to be sized and scaled.

It is exciting that the police and others are developing good victim centred functionality. The tragedy would be if that was not brought alongside other agencies to provide a single integrated view of victim services for the victims, which is perfectly possible to do, but it will require I think a strong role by MOPAC and other connecting organisations to ensure that that happens.

That is because, you know, often -- and one of the challenges is that these IT developments will be developed nationally for the agencies, and so the notion of bringing them together in the context of multi agency, let alone a particular geography, is going to be challenging.

Jonathon Glanz (MOPAC Challenge Member): Thank you.

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

Linda Duncan (Chair of the MPS/MOPAC Audit Panel): I take your point that, you know, IT and joint commissioning are all very complex initiatives that take some time to implement.

My question really is directed towards I think Sally, who is on the Change Programme, because clearly we are in the midst of moving to a new crime reporting system at some point here in the future. To what extent does that take account, or record and have the facility to record, victim's information and details?

My second point really is we have talked a little bit about, you know, officers will pick up the phone and make contact, but it will not necessarily be ticked in the box in the system. To what extent can we turn that on its head and use the new IT system to actually help the officers, who we all understand are very busy and have lots and lots of cases to deal with, to act as simple reminders to, you know, make the follow up calls on a regular basis? Those sort of simple steps it seems to me are not the whole solution, but at least could visibly improve the communication which appears to be one of the fundamental problems here.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): So the new integrated system is victim focused in its design to make it easier to record information and to assess risk and vulnerability, but also to have immediate access so that when a victim phones up we can see all previous information that is relevant, whereas at the moment we have to do some complex searching.

So looking at online crime tracking and then sharing information, I think for the Metropolitan Police Service first of all we have to integrate our own systems, because we have so many disparate ways of recording crime, antisocial behaviour, vulnerability. So we have to bring that together first, but then absolutely we recognise we support a platform for sharing information.

Whether that is victims' information, so victims' services in this way, or whether it is around vulnerability with local authorities and partners, we absolutely recognise that we do need to develop a shared framework once we have the integrated system in place.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): From memory, the "Track My Crime" functionality is available to small forces. I think Devon and Cornwall, was it? Am I right in that?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): They spent something like £7,000 for the functionality, but I think when the Metropolitan Police Service looked at it it was zillions, or gazillions, or something.

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): It was a lot more.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): You know, I mean have we moved any further forward at finding -- as we recommission applications, have we found a smarter way of introducing that very victim focused functionality, which is namely they can track their crime through the criminal justice process?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): So it was much more expensive for the Metropolitan Police Service to implement the online crime tracking.

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

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): So the decision was taken that it would not be part of our system until the integrated system comes in, which is frustrating.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, that is my point. So when you get the integrated system, are we absolutely sure that we will be able to have the --

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. It will be an add on, but it is part of the plan.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Okay. When is that going to be?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): So 2017/2018, and the five suppliers that will be bidding for it are all national suppliers doing the work for other forces. Online crime tracking is very much part of the agenda.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So the whole interoperability of IT is a multi year programme, where some of this is going to take some considerable time?

Ch Supt. Sally Benatar (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I mean, I think at the heart of this is a recognition that the Metropolitan Police Service now has relatively speaking protected budgets. The vast majority of the burden will fall on you.

The other criminal justice agencies are facing very difficult financial times. They are not going to get flat cash, they are going to have to make savings, but yet each one of them is commissioning services that are relevant to victims and one of the key actions from the work that we have got around an integrated approach is a single needs assessment.

I mean unfortunately we have not got the courts here and the CPS, but where are we on that single needs assessment I do not know if anyone wants to answer this and potentially pooling budgets to then commission against that?

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): Yes. Well, we are not anywhere in terms of --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): That is a bit disappointing.

Alex Khaldi (iMPOWER): -- implementing that yet. It has been raised as a recommendation, if you like, and as a proposal it has been warmly received by all of the agencies, including those not represented here today. The practical challenge of how to put that in place will now need to be scoped.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, certainly the CPS, who have made representations written representations that they are going to have an away day today, have said they are very keen to pilot this. So that is one agency.

Now, we have not got the courts here. With the police presumably, you know, we cannot go to Lighthouse model London wide, but it would make a great deal of sense, would it not, to find an opportunity to bring together one hub which essentially co locates all the agencies to provide victim and witness support services, I would have thought as a start point, and you commission against a single needs assessment?

Helen, do you want to comment on where we are, because I know you have been doing some work with colleagues?

Helen Bailey (MOPAC Chief Operating Officer): Well, just to say that I was chairing a board that Alex reported to, and at which Jeremy and other colleagues were present, and I think all of the agencies agreed that we should do this. The question was how we take it forward in the short term.

I think we have agreed that we want some sort of pathfinder. We did not want to call it a pilot, because that sounds like something that you start and then stop, but a pathfinder where you gradually sort of accrete people into a single way of delivering services to victims which runs across London and brings in all the agencies.

We all recognise that this would not be unproblematic, but there was a terrific amount of goodwill in the room and I think, Jeremy, you are working on how to take it forward in the biggest agency, which is the police, and that will bring everybody else along in their wake.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): I think that is encouraging. It is encouraging to know that we are moving towards a world where the agencies are working closely together, that we reduce the handoffs within policing, but also across the criminal justice system, that we find a way of not having three separate victim or witness care hubs depending on which agency happened to come into contact. That is positive news.

What is the time frame for the pathfinder?

Helen Bailey (MOPAC Chief Operating Officer): We do not have a definitive one as yet, so that I think as soon as possible, but it is linked to the work that Jeremy has already talked about in the New Year for the Metropolitan Police Service and we are getting the other agencies to come back and commit to the same sort of timescale.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Well, it would have made sense, would it not, to be piloting it in the new financial year and then look to roll that out, if it worked, as a pathfinder?

Helen Bailey (MOPAC Chief Operating Officer): Yes, completely, and the question we have sent everybody away to do is to say, "Well, how quickly can you move?"

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So it is a 2016/2017 pilot and a 2017/2018 roll out I would have thought is the natural -- would make sense to me anyway, but you will come back to me and say whether that is practical or not.

Helen Bailey (MOPAC Chief Operating Officer): I will.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Any final comments before we -- I mean, any thoughts?

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): If I could just add that there is actually already some work that has been done in terms of co-location. I myself am the ISVA for Westminster, and part of the week, one day a week, I am co located at the Sapphire Unit in Holborn.

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

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): There is also an individual from the CPS who is there on that same day. So that is something that is relatively recent and I think is happening as well in --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Yes, with Phil Darwin.

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): Yes.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Our worker is Newham specific, but she will be working in Cam Road two days a week.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): So I think that is really important. I think there are some crime types where the challenges are so great that we cannot lumber our way to pathfinder and then roll out and that this form of co-location needs to be accelerated as a response. So I think for both domestic abuse and sexual violence that makes sense. I am really pleased, actually. Thank you for that. I am very pleased to hear --

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): At our organisation, we have got our ISVAs -- IDVAs are in the police station most of the week.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yes, that is very good.

Rosemarie Cameron (ISVA, NIA): Different workers, but they are in the police station most of the week.

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

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): If I could just add, as part of that? I have seen there is a lot of support from the kind of higher up levels, but it is really important that that is filtering down to the officers on the ground and to the people that are working directly with victims.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): It cascades, yes.

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): Yes. So that we are seeing the referrals coming through, that ISVA support and IDVA support and other kind of victim's support

agencies that they are seen as part of the whole system, because at present there is the system and then we are seen maybe as add-ons.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): That is a very good point.

Catherine Dunn (ISVA, Solace Women's Aid): We should be integrated from the very start to the very end of the process.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair): Yes. Well, that makes a very important point, which is that MOPAC has the commissioning responsibility largely for the third sector and providing the support services, and we want to make sure those are integrated into the integration of the support and care that is provided by the criminal justice agencies. I think that is a point well made.

I think obviously this is work in progress, and it is very interesting that we think about how we can strengthen the performance framework in a meaningful way. I think that is a good challenge, and I think as part of the wider integration it is right to look at training and coordination and also the importance of getting the IT platforms to work both within an agency like the police, but also across the wider Criminal Justice System and including also the third sector.

I mean, all this is hard yards. It is really interesting to hear about the -- I have heard about it before, but once again about the work in other parts of the country such as the Lighthouse Project in Bristol that interagency working can be made to work. There is no reason it should not work in London, and it is beginning to work on the ground as we have heard today.

So I think that has given us a clear boost, if you like, to move as fast as we can in practical terms towards the pathfinder, continue the collaboration and continue to look at how we can deliver a better service and support for the victims of crime in our capital city.

So thank you very much indeed all of you for coming and I look forward to a proactive programme of work in the next few months.

Thank you very much.