

Date: Wednesday, 13 March 2019

Location: Committee Room 5, City Hall

Hearing: Justice Matters Round Table Meeting: Hate Crime

Start Time: 10:30

End Time: 12:00

Members

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair)

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair)

Natasha Plummer (MOPAC)

Stuart Webber (NPS, London)

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service)

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions)

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service)

Javed Rana (Met Association of Muslim Police)

Dorothea Jones (The Monitoring Group/CATCH Race Advocate)

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust (CST) Policy Head/CATCH)

Nick Antjoulle (Galop/CATCH Coordinator)

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH)

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Lovely, thank you very much for coming today. My name is Sophie Linden, I am the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. Can I just remind people that this is a meeting to be held in darkness, can we have the lights on? I just was going to remind people that this meeting is a public meeting and is recorded and put out on the web.

Thank you very much for coming along to this really important meeting today. It is one of a series that I hold and Chair, called Justice Matters, where we convene partners alongside the Metropolitan Police Service to look at particular issues, to delve down into the issues and to look what is working and what needs to improve and how partners can work together, and to improve whatever issue we are looking at.

Today is the important issue of hate crime. I know many of you have been to a breakfast meeting before this meeting and I hope that was helpful and useful. During the course of this meeting, which will be until 12.00 pm, we will look at the figures, the statistics and what we know about recorded hate crime. Importantly, we will have the voice of victims coming through because that is so important.

I am very pleased that Claire Waxman, London's Independent Victims Commissioner, is co-chairing this with me so that we can ensure that we take actions through from this meeting, not just to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and to the Metropolitan Police Service, but also to the Hate Crime Board that Claire has been chairing. In terms of the work that she is doing with victims, she will shortly be publishing the review of the Victims Code of Practice, which has been very useful in terms of looking at the needs of victims and what needs to happen to ensure that they are properly supported from the moment of the incident and through the Criminal Justice System (CJS) as well.

Today, we are going to look at the gaps between reported and the experiences of hate crime, and also the barriers to reporting, better understanding of lived experiences of victims, and also to understand how to increase reporting and confidence in victims of hate crime. That includes looking at solutions, such as victims' advocacy.

I am going to hand over in a minute to Natasha, who is going to take us through the trends and demographics of recorded hate crime and also the data from some of our partners. Then, importantly, we will have victims' experience and the importance of advocacy from case studies from the Community Alliance to Combat Hate (CATCH). I am very pleased that you are here today. We will then break into panel discussion and questions and hopefully, at the end, sum up with some actions and some agreed ways forward.

Thank you very much. Natasha, do you want to take us through? Oh, do you want us to quickly go round the room? We have all got name plates, but for those that cannot see the name plates, I am Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Claire Waxman, Independent Victims Commissioner for London.

Natasha Plummer (MOPAC): Natasha Plummer, Head of Engagement at MOPAC.

Stuart Webber (NPS, London): I am Stuart Webber from the National Probation Service (NPS) in London.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Dave Stringer from Metropolitan Police Service.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Sara Lewis, Head of Metropolitan Police Service Prosecutions for the Metropolitan Police Service.

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Kris Ventakasami, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)

Javed Rana (Met Association of Muslim Police): Javed Rana, Chair of the Association of Muslim Police for the Metropolitan Police Service.

Dorothea Jones (The Monitoring Group/CATCH): Dorothea Jones, Race Advocate at The Monitoring Group (TMG).

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust/CATCH): Dave Rich, Head of Policy, Community Security Trust (CST)

Nick Antjoulle (Galop/CATCH): Hi, I am Nick Antjoulle, Galop, and I coordinate CATCH

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Ruth Bashall from Stay Safe East. We are part of the CATCH partnership and the London Deaf and Disabled People's Organisations (DDPO) Hate Crime Partnership. It is a bit of a mouthful.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Thank you very much, you are all very welcome. Natasha?

Natasha Plummer (MOPAC): Thank you. Alison, could you dip that light because I do not think you can see the slide? Just the one at the front, please. Just to start off, I am going to talk a little bit about the recorded hate crime data and then Nick is going to follow me and talk a bit more about the victim experience and the data from the perspective of a commission provider.

Tackling hate crime is a priority within the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan (PCP) and that recognises the significant harm that can be caused to individuals and communities by the very nature of hate crime, which attacks people for who they are. We know that there is underreporting in terms of hate crime. The British Crime Survey estimates about 53% of hate crime is not reported to the police. Even though there is underreporting, we know within the data that hate crime has been rising steadily over the last few years with some significant peaks, which have coalesced around significant events, both national and international.

On the chart you can see, for instance, a spike where we had post EU Referendum, and then another spike following the London Bridge attacks. In terms of the type of offending, we know that seven out of ten are recorded as harassment offences in the Metropolitan Police Service,

but some of those, about 13%, are common assault, 5% assault with injury, and 2% serious wounding.

In terms of the people who are victimised, you can break that down by the different types of hate crime and you begin to see that there are differences in who is targeted within those different categories. There is a different point here about thinking about how we respond to different strands of hate crime, because the victimisation can be different. For instance, for faith hate victims, we know that 50% of the victims are female, and that is particularly true in cases of xenophobia, for example, and that compares to only 40% for all race hate crime, so you have got a different type of victimisation happening there.

In respect of faith hate victims, we also know that a third of them are under 25, which tends to be a lower age group for other types of hate crime, racists particularly. We have far more who are 25 - 35 age group, so it is a different profile in terms of the types of people who are being victimised. In terms of where hate crime happens, again there are differences. One point that particularly stood out in the data is the fact that when you talk about disability hate crime offences, they are more likely to occur in the home than other types of hate crime, which would again indicate that you need perhaps a different type of response because you will be coming to those incidents from a different perspective.

There is an interesting point here about public perceptions and victim satisfaction in respect of hate crime. We know for young victims of hate crime, 65% are satisfied overall with the police response, which compares well with 66% of all victims of crime. However, we also know that victim satisfaction overall has decreased and is at the lowest for quite some time, so there is some concern around that, for instance.

There also can be a disconnect between people's perception of hate crime and their reported experience. For example, in Barking and Dagenham, 16% of residents are concerned that hate crime is a problem in their area, yet they have very low levels of reporting. That might suggest that either that is a perception gap, or that there are significant numbers of hate crimes that are not actually being reported to the police, so we are not yet aware of them.

In terms of convictions, the sanction detections for hate crime have decreased, as they have for all crimes, but for different types of hate crime, there have been some more significant falls. Faith hate crime, for instance, has fallen by 43% in terms of sanction detections, so it is interesting to think about what is happening in that space.

One of the other things that we picked up from the data is that once people are proceeded against, 90% of those are actually charged with an offence, rather than any other kind of disposal, and we know that there is a 78% conviction rate for London, which compares to 85% nationally, so there is a gap there. However, there are concerns about what happens through that process with victims dropping out of the process at various points, so there is an attrition problem with people getting all the way through the criminal justice journey to the courts.

Some 64% of cases fall because of non attendance of victims at court, so they will have gone through a long process of reporting, something has been investigated, somebody will have been found and there is going to be a court case, but actually they do not then attend. It is interesting for us to think about what is happening there and how do we stop that from happening at that point in the process.

That was all the police recorded data, but we can pick out some interesting points from some of our partner data. Some of our organisations that we work with and who work nationally, like the CST, TMG and Tell MAMA, are collating data which tells us some additional facts that are quite helpful to us. We know, for instance, that for the CST, their report last year indicated that they were recording the highest number of incidents ever with a 21% increase on the previous year. For them, they are seeing a sustained increase with the number of incidents remaining elevated at over 100 in all but five months of that year, so they saw a significant increase and it was sustained over a period of time.

We also know from TMG, they did some work with their clients and they were able to pick out that there were some concerns amongst those communities about hate crime that actually, they were not reporting because they are self managing and taking the view that there are other things in their life like their immigration status, their housing, that are more urgent, more pressing, and that unless there is a real, clear sense of danger, they are not coming forward and telling authorities that there is a problem. This potentially enables the opportunity for things to escalate when they could be stopped earlier in the process.

In terms of Eastern European interviewees from the work that TMG did, because of their home experiences they were actually more reluctant to report to the police full stop, so they were not coming forward also, yet there are also instances happening there. We know from our experience and it was mentioned this morning at the breakfast meeting, for instance, that post Brexit there was a significant increase in terms of the victimisation of young people in schools for example. That kind of data has not really come through in schools' reports either.

Just a couple of other pieces just to point out that for disability hate crime, for instance, we know that it remains one of the most underreported areas and that there are multiple barriers to reporting. Reporting is difficult and people often do not know how to do it, whatever their background. We actually need to be doing a bit more, perhaps, to think about how we make it more accessible to people who have all different kinds of disabilities. We also need to recognise the fact that a significant proportion of those hate crimes is actually happening in the home so that actually, there is something different going on in respect of disability hate crime.

For Gallup, for instance, their 2016 survey showed that again, there is significant underreporting with only a quarter of victims reporting to the police and that was to do with their perceptions that they would not be believed or taken seriously, so they were not coming forward to authorities either. Again, this indicates a significant concern really in terms of how the police can respond to hate crime, and indeed other authorities because people are not telling authorities what the issues are.

That is my last slide, thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Thank you very much, Natasha. Real narrative coming through, even though there has been a worrying increase since 2015 incidents, and your narrative around underreporting. Has anybody got any questions about -- we will go onto discussion, but actually on that presentation, any factual clarification or questions?

OK, thank you. Nick, you were going to present now, were you not, in terms of heading up an alliance, a lead alliance for us, and delivering services around hate crime and advocacy, so it would be really helpful to have your perspective and the victims' perspective on this. I think you are going to be supported by some of your colleagues from the consortium in this, is that right?

Nick Antjoule (Galop / CATCH): Yes, that is right. Thank you very much for inviting us. First of all, I will just say CATCH is an intersectional alliance of various anti-hate crime charities. First of all, I should say, hate crime is changing, is escalating really fast. Obviously, all who work in this field and now is the time when we are looking to authorities as allies and I think MOPAC are really proving yourselves real supporters for this work over the years. The fact that you are sustaining that is really valuable for us in CATCH, all the members of CATCH, or certainly on my behalf.

To give you a bit of an idea of who CATCH is, CATCH is these various anti-hate crime organisations, TMG challenging racism, Tell MAMA challenging anti-Muslim hate crime, the CST challenging antisemitism, Stay Safe East working disability hate crime, Choice in Hackney with disability hate crime, and Galop working with anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) hate crime. Obviously, we are commissioned by MOPAC, particularly the advocacy service for victims of hate crime.

I thought it would be useful just to touch on why we exist, what is the purpose of it. Ultimately, there is very high level resolve hate crime that people in all those groups, all those marginalised groups who experience hate crime experience. We have evidence coming out of our ears about this huge level of hate crime that people experience in day to day life that they either try to put to one side or, more often than not, ends up building up this impact over time, so escalation.

Over the last three years, hate crime recorded by police nationally has doubled. That is unprecedented. We have had this recording model for over a decade of really well embedded recording practices. I suspect that the majority of that is actual escalation hate crime, but I am sure that other CATCH partners will be able to talk to that.

Personal impacts, huge practical, emotional impacts caused by hate crime, the community ripples, those single incidents that cause fear, distress, stop people living their lives in the way that they would want to, and barriers to accessing criminal justice. Those barriers to talking to police in the first place, barriers to going to court, barriers to actually attending on the day and actually getting an experience that is helpful for them.

A little bit about the advocate role. I could talk here all day about all the different things that advocates do, it is a very complex, difficult job. Here are some of them. At the top, you have got some of the things that advocates are trying to achieve, so it will be helping the people they work with to cope, helping them to recover from their experiences and helping to empower them, giving them the tools and support to get things that they need. That is through advice, through reporting, finding the right place for that to have the right impact. It is accompaniment through the process.

It is right from that very first giving a statement, all the way through the process to supporting them in court, to actually being there and supporting them on the day to be an expert ally but also a supporter and just a safeguard for them, and providing support, both practical and

emotional, planning, figuring out with them how would they like it to play out, here are some options, which of those would you like, let us have a think about what the plan is to get there. Then there are working partnerships, both intersection partnerships within CATCH, but also really our key statutory agency partners around the table, but also around housing, around emotional support, around finance, around all these various things that hate crime impacts.

A little bit about the principles behind it. CATCH is very much based on the idea that those various anti hate crime organisations that are part of CATCH have been doing this work for decades. They have grown out of needs from within the communities they work with, specifically set up to understand and address them. Rather than say, we want to create a homogenous service that is the same for everyone, that is a very kind of autocratic centre(?). It is very much saying, actually the CST is the best organisation to understand the needs and priorities and to be set up in a way that serves Jewish communities. TMG, the same thing, and all the other organisations as well, so very much saying based on community-based expertise, being victim focussed.

Ultimately, if they are not the centre of our response to hate crime then we may as well go home. There is no point if it is not actually making things better for people who are experiencing it. Empowerment, rather than taking away their power further, saying let us find ways to give you back some of that power, and intersectionality, partly because all of the people that we work with, a lot of CATCH clients have intersectional identities. Roughly 20% of CATCH incidents have more than one hate motive involved.

Just following on from principles, if I maybe give you a quick case study, I will try to be brief. There is a case, I will not tell you the hate motive involved in it, because it could be any of the CATCH partners. It involved a couple who had a neighbour who would come to their front door and would knock on their door and would give them lots of abuse, targeting them because of who they were. It involved intersectional forms of abuse, so more than one hate crime strand.

A CATCH advocate worked with that couple to get a response from police, to support them to get the things they need. It escalated from that, to that neighbour's family member coming round and breaking into their home, and assaulting them, and very seriously; causing really life changing injuries. That advocate, and intersectional kind of cooperation across partners, did really thoughtful, kind of patient, with difficult work with that couple; who had lots of very complex needs. And helped in terms of the MPS, which they had a great response from, but because like lots of hate crime cases, it was a very complex case, with lots of things going on. Having that advocate involved really helped the process to work. The advocate ended up supporting them in the courts, which there was a positive response from, and they got a conviction, which was great. That person who broken into their home, was prevented from contacting them again; and like I was saying, the advocate did a very patient work with them; they decided they didn't want to move. But the harassment carried on, through various other people connected with that case; and eventually, they decided yes, they want to move. So the advocate helped them to find an accessible property that kind of worked for them; got them moved, and at the end of last week, that person that was found guilty in court, ended up turning back up to their door, threatening to kill them, on the day -- on the night before they were due to move. And so, we did lots of very quick time -- well, the advocate did lots of very quick time work with the MPS; which was fantastic. And we actually managed to get them a hotel overnight, because there was no way of getting temporary accommodation that quickly. Not out of statutory fund; so out of funds that were voluntary sector raised. And they've ended

up being moved and have had – you know, have had a good -- as far as they can, a good outcome from that. So, this gives you a kind of quick peek into some of the complexities around this work.

So, moving on. Client profile; I won't linger on these numbers, but just to give you an idea of who CATCH clients are --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Sorry, before you do move on?

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): On that case, from a layperson's point of view, how was the sentencing appropriate, if that person was clearly so -- the perpetrator was so dangerous? I mean, is this an issue do you find, in the cases that you are taking? That actually, you can support but you're not getting the right sentencing?

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): I would agree. I think that -- I think that's a very good point. I think that in addition to that, just getting someone to court can be very, very difficult with hate crime cases.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Oh I know; I absolutely understand that, yes.

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): And so in some ways, that's a far from idea outcome.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes.

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): But it is -- it is some kind of committed outcome, which ... yes. But I would entirely agree, in the fact that that order preventing him from contacting didn't end up actually delivering on that. I think is telling in itself.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes. So maybe we'll pick that up later, in terms of an issue. Okay, sorry.

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): Yes. So, just to say with client profile, that actually, it's not one set of people experiencing hate crimes, that CATCH is dealing with; it's a whole cross-section of London's diverse communities, which I think is really encouraging. So, thinking of outcomes, I think this data speaks for itself, that actually the work is very effective; that CATCH is consistently -- the advocates within CATCH have consistently delivered really, really good -- good work, that kind of actually goes a long way to helping people to cope and recover from what's happened. And thinking about impact --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): So what's the key issues then? If you go back to that slide?

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): In terms of approval, what are your advocates -- how are they doing that, you know, and creating very impressive outcomes; what are the unique points that you're providing, in terms of the service?

Nick Antjoulé (Galop/CATCH): I think being based within the communities they work with, so understanding those kind of identity issues; being expert around safety issues, and kind of safety pairing with criminal justice issues; empathy. Just really kind of empowerment based work; I think that's the key to it. But I'm sure that other folks will chip in though.

Dorothea Jones (The Monitoring Group/CATCH): I think it's supporting the client from beginning to end, and listening to them; and sometimes there are other complex needs along with whatever strand of hate we're dealing with; so sometimes it may be mental health. So, I think it's just being there, and sometimes, you know, you have to sort of put yourself out, really; and particularly if there's a case -- I mean, I've got certain cases that have sort of touched me more than others; it happens. If there are children involved, somebody is a single parent, it's repeat victimisation; so I think it's generally listening, and you know, making them you know, being led by them. So that's what I would say, is, you know, really good.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, and on it might be a difficult question to answer, but in terms of the sort of longevity of your interaction with an individual client; do you have a sort of average? And I presume it can take quite a long time, if it's going to court; or you know, are you talking months, weeks -- months, years?

Dorothea Jones (The Monitoring Group/CATCH): Well I mean, it depends; I mean, I had a client, my first ever client, that I'm still in contact with, because she was racially abused. The man was charged, he was convicted; and then he came back again, but she wants to move, and for fear of her children -- she lives alone, and she's still not yet been moved, because she lives in an area that there's low housing stock; so I'm still trying to get her to move, but you know, she wants the community around her, so she does not want to move out. So therefore, that's been ongoing for about two and a half years.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Right.

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust/CATCH): I think, sorry, just to add to that; I mean cases can last from one phone call to several years, and you can sometimes have clients who have repeated problems, and will keep calling; and I think that speak to one of the advantages we offer, as community based groups, is that we're always available; we're very easy to contact, we're very easy to speak to, compared to perhaps the police, which is a much bigger machine; and when they do re-contact us two, three years after the previous incident, it's quite easy to find someone who knows what happened, remembers it, can dig up the records. So there's continuity; and continuity of understanding, and perhaps the sense that they're not alone in this big process, and there's someone who's on their side.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Can I just ask, because with what you're dealing with, obviously it's coming from hate crime, in that position; but it can move quite quickly, there can be domestic violence; it can move into stalking and harassment. So what support do you get as a consortium, an organisation in those different areas, that might be out of your specialist skills, to support the victims effectively?

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): So, specifically around domestic abuse, it's very strand specific; where there are specialist agencies, that for instance around domestic abuse -- say for instance, like IDVAs that have a kind of dual role. With Galop, they have a kind of dual role around DV and SV, and hate.

Dorothea Jones (The Monitoring Group/CATCH): Yes, I have a Master's in Domestic Violence.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): But yes, I think that's a really good question. But so, I think --

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): But you feel you have enough links and support into those different areas as well, to make sure the victims are properly supported, in assault?

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): I mean, I think one of the issues around that is that, you know, because CATCH is a London-wide scheme, I think that there are -- I mean, we're working differently, because we've been local, and now we've joined CATCH, so it's a different -- because the disability sector is actually very, very different. As you know, it's locally based, but there are enormous gaps in it, as well. Hence the London-wide Disabled People's Organisation Against Hate Crime partnership as well, where we're trying to plug the gaps, and capacity build everybody.

But I think in terms of the links with domestic violence, I think with disabled people in particular, also around 'cuckooing', which is a major part of hate crime; and if it's because it's targeting people for who they are. The level of work required, it can involve sexual violence, domestic violence, drugs, alcohol, gangs; and obviously taking over somebody's home, etc, etc, etc; and the kind of psychological damage to the victim, and the way that maybe a group of perpetrators have really got inside that person's head. It's -- you know, it's going to involve the whole range of skills, not just around domestic abuse and sexual abuse, or just around hate crime; it's multifaceted, and I think it's patchy in terms of the level of support that you can get from other organisations, statutory services. You know, the safeguarding process for example, doesn't work for most of the clients that we work with, and I suspect that the partners have got the same issue.

So it's long term, very slow work, sometimes very, very frustrating; and you know, for the victim in particular, but also for the advocate, in the sense that you're just constantly knocking your head against a brick wall, and you know, trying to get people moved. For us for example, one of the issues is trying to get people moved. The London Reciprocal is a fantastic scheme, but the information about access, and the number of accessible properties, is minimal; and it's almost impossible to get somebody who has any kind of physical access needs moved through the London Reciprocal. It's quite difficult to get anybody else moved, but it's much more difficult for anybody that's got any physical access needs. So there's a whole layer of things. I think for the advocates, there's a lot of pressure on them, and us to get clinical supervision. But you know, it's very much that sense of I think powerlessness with sometimes, that you're faced with somebody who day-in, day-out is living in that situation; and you are trying to change something, you are trying to help them move, you know, resolve the issues, go through the

courts, or whatever, and it's just so slow; and meanwhile they remain at risk, you know. So, it is very difficult work, in that context; and those housing related cases are the ones that are particularly difficult, I would say. But you know, people may have other experiences.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Thank you; do you want to -- ?

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): Yes, I'd support all of that. If we move onto the future, and the next slide -- just kind of skip over this one, because I know we're short on time. So, the future. Obviously Brexit is looming; all of us who work in this field are expecting another rise in the very near future. Like I say, hate crime has doubled in the last three years; we're expecting another rise, very soon. So that's why the support for MOPAC that you provide is really, really, really important. I think the visibility of that support as well. So, in terms of CATCH, there's a huge community appetite and need; obviously CATCH was a kind of pilot scheme; because it was kind of designed to work in two boroughs, and we're still on that same level of funding, delivering pan-London. So I think to some extent, your question maybe about what an average case length looks like; is in large part determined by that; and by actually, there's a huge level of need out there; massive, and we can only work with a tiny section of that. So I know that we've not really promoted CATCH, because we have enough to meet the capacity that we have right now, without.

But it would be great to be able to actually to the London Community and say, "This is a set of services that could be really useful for you". We have a campaign coming up, so hopefully, within the next three/four weeks, it will be filmed and kind of put together, and launched. Which is basically, CATCH's response, all the partners within CATCH, are responsive, saying this rise in prejudice, that all of us are experiencing is not acceptable, and kind of visibly standing together and saying actually, you know, we're more than our differences, and kind of having that really strong intersectional cooperation message, and putting it out there. So, that's coming up soon. So, any statutory agencies or others round the room, if that's something you'd like to have a part in, kind of, you know, preventing or kind of having a say in; that's coming down the road. Lastly, like I was saying, capacity is a real issue; London -- there's such a huge level of need, that CATCH kind of you know, goes some way to meet. I think in a really high quality way. But the second bit is around infrastructure. So where you look at say IDVAs, they have this really strong model, that's kind of really well recognised, has very well developed training courses around it; has recognition of statutory agencies that can -- or even if we go to, and be recognised; and kind of have of some buy-in to the process. Whether it's in court, or whether it's an investigative process. All of that is still developing for hate crime. Like we were just saying, the advocate role is very difficult, and something that we anything we can do around boosting up the infrastructure round it, to help with that, would be very helpful I think.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes. What would you prioritise in that, then? So when you talk about the need for infrastructure, where would you start? Sorry.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): I kind of want to bow to other partners for it.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Probably hate crime scrutiny panels cum case panels at local level; we know the difference in the boroughs we've been working in. We've got

one borough that's got -- it's called an ASBRAC, Anti Social Behaviour Risk Assessment Conference, but the other borough, there's nothing; and it makes a difference in terms of just being able to go to the right people, and I think we need that locally; but we need it London-wide as well, because some cases are not kind of borough based. Some kind of multi-agency panel, that allows advocates to take cases, and to get things moving, I think; and to share information; that's how MARACs work.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): So you're saying that at borough level, there's very few panels that -- or places that you can go with cases, that will bring all the partners together?

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Yes, we're very, very short.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): You're talking a handful, probably now.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): I mean, the other thing I would say, is around training. Because like I was saying, you know, kind of capacity is a real issue, but finding the time to actually put together a really good quality training course, like all of us get, that lasts literally a month. Kind of including homework, you know what I mean? Something going some way towards that for hate crime would be so useful. Far beyond the bounds of CATCH, but for the UK in general, I think would be fantastic.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes, so training for advocates, and yourselves? Yes.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay. Good.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): So, that's it; this is my last slide, is just CATCH website, which has OFELL(?) form, which anyone is very welcome to go and use, if you have any cases that you would like to connect with an advocate; and I'll leave it there.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Thank you, that's really helpful, and thanks -- thank you for the work that you do, in advocating on behalf of hate crime victims, and I know it's difficult work, and it's -- you know, the support that you give is so important. And it's difficult for a number of the reasons that you've set out, and so sort of things that need to happen, infrastructure, training, capacity, money, and the ability to do that thing. So thank you very much. So just, we're going to move onto actually asking a few questions of other members that are here, other members, and particularly around the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). Because it's been very clear that when they report, you know, hate crime is reported, there are -- they may not be consistent, they may not be enough, but there are some avenues for victims to be supported. Though it's also been very clear, around the lack of -- you know, there is a significant under-reporting; and I was just wondering,

and David if you could sort of outline how you are working, perhaps with advocacy groups, or other ways, to try to improve the confidence of victims to come forward, so that they can report? And whether you -- what you understand about why they aren't reporting?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Okay, so I think it's important to say that most reports we get come from 999 calls from homeowner own calls, from people coming to the police station. So I think it's still fair to say, although we have information sharing agreements with three of the major victim support organisations, that actually we still get most people, still report to police as the first point of reporting; and most people -- I think the evidence will suggest that whether most people will decide on reporting, depends on the seriousness of what happened. So if it's a violent incident, or it it's an incident where violence is threatened, then actually the -- what the research seems to show, is that most people report those kinds of incidents to police. And they're obviously the kind of incidents that others, who aren't the victims, who are witnesses, report to police as well. So I think there is a pretty good correlation between the very serious incidents, in terms of where there's an assault, or where there's a threat of assault, that people do report to police.

Where we collectively need to improve, is where it's -- the victim doesn't act that time, need the police to stop the incident from happening, or whether it's words, or if it's not immediately obvious to somebody else, that there's something going on, therefore we're not getting called by anyone else, so it's then the victim's total choice as to, "Do I report to the police or not?" And the research shows there's any number of reasons why they don't. For some, that might be they don't think it's important enough; some of it might be because they don't know that it's a hate crime. Some of it might be that they don't think the police are going to be taking it seriously; and some of it might be that they're not sure what the police are actually going to do about it. So, what we have in the BCU model, we have hate crime liaison officers in the bracho of our prevention hub; and their role is to form relationships. Some of them have been doing that role for quite some time; some of them are brand new. Their role, at a very low level, is to form those relationships, because our experience is -- and I think it's been borne out by the panel -- that actually, people are comfortable with reporting in either their own communities of interest, or either their own very local geographic communities.

So, working really hard through the hate crime liaison officers, to develop those relationships, and to try and bring some consistency across London in those kind of relationships. And we heard this morning, when we were talking about hate crime specifically around Brexit, that there are barriers where they have -- I think we used to call it the hate crime incident panel; but there's lots of different kinds of names for it. But they don't exist across the 32 London boroughs, so one of the things we would like to be doing, now we have the more consistent BCU structure, is to encourage our partners -- encourage other agencies to get involved in that kind of thing. Every borough that I'm aware of, has something we would probably call the community MARAC, but I don't think they're all as engaged around hate crime, or as aware of hate crime as I would probably like. Therefore, my sense is we probably need to be setting up, or you know, working with partners, encouraging those local panels to be set up. We also do a lot of good work; and Javed's here from the AMP -- a lot of good work through our staff support associations. They do a lot of outreach, and into communities, about actually what is hate crime? How can you report hate crime? And what are the police going to do about it? And critically, it's really, really serious, and we're here to show and say how serious it is, and the staff support association are doing a lot of good work around that as well.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): And what do you do about focusing your outreach, of focusing the work that you're doing, to try to improve reporting? Because we've definitely seen a decrease in disability hate crimes being reported, and I think we're also seeing a decrease in transgender hate crimes being reported; and I just wondered, you know, how do you differentiate, or how do you try to ensure that you are reaching out into the community? And I'm sure that your colleagues will have your own opinions about what does need to happen; and I'm very happy for you to interject; so sorry David, how do you do that?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, we -- so the disability hate crime matters campaign, was a centrally driven campaign. We had a dedicated resource to do that, you'll be aware that --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): I am, and that it's not longer --

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): That resource is no longer there, so what we are relying on now, is local hate crime liaison officers, working with local partnerships, to drive up reporting in those areas. We're in the process of setting up a disability Internet advisory group; and we also have started up -- which is relatively new as well, a trans forum, that covers pan-London. So that should give us a sense of what are the barriers, what are the obstacles, and what can we do collectively, to try and remove those barriers at a central level, then give that advice to BCUs? As a BC commander, I very much see it's my responsibility to make sure that those local relationships are being formed, and that we're actively seeking to increase reporting in those areas. But I think we've heard that the level of voluntary sector provision across all the strands, is very, very variable across London. And that makes our work much more challenging.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes. Did you want to say something about -- I'm encouraging reporting.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): I was just thinking, just contrasting that -- that figure around transphobia reporting, or recording kind of decreasing. So I -- you know, like lots of folks in the audience, I've been around this for a little while; I've never seen transphobia the way that it is right now. You know, there were like five, really active, well-resourced, kind of well organised transphobic hate community campaign groups, that are very active within London. It's now the norm for -- within Galop, who are currently facing transphobia, to have crowds of transphobic protesters outside court, trying to stop them getting in. You know, huge campaigns of harassment, and abuse, and death threats online, for anyone who speaks up about trans equality online. So, I think it's worth kind of contrasting that. With that said, I know -- I see Tony up there in the audience; he's done fantastic, fantastic work in the Metropolitan Police Service. I know that there are great things going on around this, in terms of that assurance. But, I think it's worth contrasting that ramping up, in society in general.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, what I'm not saying, is the reporting -- the reduction in reporting means a reduction in incidents; I'm not saying that at all. It's much more complicated than that, particularly when you have such a low level. So we think in terms of, I think from memory, it went down from about 200 to 150 last year. So even 200, you

know, we all don't we, that doesn't scratch the surface of what actually happens out there; and that's only one of -- on average, there's about one offence per borough, per month, isn't it? Less than that, so actually, when we're looking at very, very low levels of reporting, a relatively small change, of whether people report or not, has a big effect on figures. But absolutely; and that's why we set up -- one of the reasons we set up the trans forum, was to try and get underneath what is going on, what are the obstacles, and how do we work together to resolve them.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Do you want to ?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): I'll just pick up on some of the things Dave said if you don't mind, but that's why I think community engagement is so important, and reaching out. And I also think that online reporting now, for the lower level offences, if we make sure that people realise that they can report online, or by phone, that that might increase reporting as well.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, thank you. I mean, just in terms of the presentation from Natasha, around the figures, there were some quite drastic reductions in sanction detections weren't there? And in terms of you know, the knock-on effect to reporting; I'm sure there will be a link between, you know, having confidence to report, but also having some confidence that there will be an outcome. Do you know what's causing that drop in the sanction detections, and you know, how are you trying to tackle that?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, what we think is -- having looked at it from about six months ago, for Commander Smith, who's the commander in charge of hate crime; so Richard asked us to have a look at that. And, what drives the ability to get sanction protection out of a hate crime generally, is the speed at which we are told about the incident. That's generally what happens, because the difference between obviously hate crime, burglary and vehicle crime, and things like that, is people have to report crimes like that to you, because it has such an impact on their life. So, as I say, where the suspect isn't at the time -- so in 2017, you had a large increase in particularly faith hates reported to us. Now, we had a look at that, and our sense is, what happened there, we had a large increase in faith hate, because people were really concerned about what was going on. Therefore, more was happening.

But more, again, very little of that was injury; most of that, although really serious, was words in the street. Therefore, fewer witnesses there, and people more likely to report things that they wouldn't have reported at the time. Now, if people report to NATE, and that's their choice -- so we really want to have the reports; we really want to have the reports; because that gives us a really good intelligence picture, of what happens if people report later than normal, or people who weren't going to report, but do report, because of what's going on nationally. Is that we then get a report late; and then finding the suspect, when other people haven't noticed the crime taking place, because it's words rather than a physical assault -- is much more challenging. So our sense is, most of that reduction is because we were getting more crimes reported to us later; therefore much more difficult to find and locate the suspect.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, and there's no -- I thought there was a link between -- also, some link between gathering evidence via CCTV, and the ability to prosecute and get a sort of successful outcome? Is that not something -- ?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, I'm definitely not aware of the CCTV process, changing?

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Yes, it comes from partners, and we've had lots of discussion.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Okay, right.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): It's very much what victims come and report to us, saying that you know, they came forward to the police, and they reported. And then there's a lot of delay, because there wasn't an urgency in getting the CCTV. By the time they've got it, it's too late, and therefore the victim feels they've been let down.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Right, so the process of collecting CCTV hasn't changed, but I will take that back, and have a look at whether the process did change.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): The partners have quite a lot of examples don't you, to support that?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): No, okay. Right.

Natasha Plummer (MOPAC): There is a particular point about that, in terms of what happens with TfL on buses, because they don't keep the CCTV for very long.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, of course.

Natasha Plummer (MOPAC): Yes.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Is that something that MOPAC could contemplate doing that?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes, I was just about to write that down. Genuinely. So ...

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): It really would help us a lot. But I do think there's an over-reliance on CCTV by the police; sorry Dave, but -- and we've had a couple of cases where there's no other evidence, because you know, this happens in somebody's home, and they don't have a CCTV camera handy, and it's that there's only the word of the victim, even though it might be protracted abuse, and in one case, death threats and so on. And those have been no further action regularly, on those sorts of cases. So they just don't get a prosecution. I wanted to raise one other issue, which is about the fact that the restructuring of the Metropolitan Police Service, in the 12 Borough Command Units, and the way in which hate crime is being dealt with, is actually raising problems for us. And I've talked to some of the other advocates in deaf and disabled people's organisations as well, which is that aggravated and -- let me get this right; aggravated and motivated hate crimes are actually being dealt with by two different teams now. I never quite remember which way round it is, but -- and in effect, you can get a case where it is both an aggravated and a motivated hate crime; and Dave will tell us which way round it is. But basically, the response teams are struggling, and we had a case

which I've already raised, but I think might be useful for you to be aware of; and we're not the only ones. Where the person made it very clear that she didn't want to talk to the police, unless her advocate was there. The officer from the response team turned up at 5.00 pm unannounced, on a Sunday night, at her home; and a woman who has severe mental health issues, but also just wanted an advocate with her; basically sent her away. Now, we don't know if it prejudiced the investigation; the officer did her absolute best, but it wasn't appropriate.

It put an enormous amount of stress on the victim, and it wasn't what had been agreed; and that happened because the officer was part of the response team, and that was literally the only time she could do it -- and this was like several weeks after the incident. So I think, you know, there's a need to look at that in terms of -- and officers themselves don't understand the difference between an aggravated and a motivated hate crime; and it gets very complicated, and you know, you don't necessarily know that before it's been investigated. We're concerned that the expertise is being lost; we've also been told -- this came up at the disability working group, it would be the Diamond Group; that some neighbourhood officers have been told not to deal with -- and whether this is an interpretation of guidance from their superiors, I don't know; but and not to deal with verbal-only crimes, because they've got too much to deal with. So I think there's an issue about how the restructuring is actually impacting directly on hate crime. It's early days yet, but we have a lot of concerns around that.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, David, did you just want to respond to that? Obviously not -- I know you can't comment on the individual case, because --

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): No. So obviously, it is early days, and we've delivered a lot of training to our officers, in terms of investigating crime; it is absolutely correct that the aggravated offences, i.e. if the hate crime happens in the commission of another offence such as public order or theft etc, then those cases are with the response teams, and partly that's because of the volume that we have, of that kind of crime across London; and that partly is because of -- they used to sit within the community safety units, and now the community safety units are merging, and are dealing with things like child abuse and rape, which they didn't deal with before. So, to an extent, that's a way of how we are managing a significant increased workload, in both the -- in terms of sexual offences, and domestic abuse, and hate crime altogether. And partly, that's our expectation, that every officer should be able to investigate crimes such as the one we've been talking about; crimes such as assault, crimes such as verbal abuse. Every officer should be able to investigate that competently. One of the things we will need to be working really hard on, with client organisations, is about what you're saying Ruth, about understanding needs, and about making sure that actually, just because the response officer is -- without talking about a specific case, but as a general example; just because a response officer is you know, only on duty at certain times, then that doesn't unduly affect the case. That will be a challenge, but that's a challenge that we need to meet.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Can I just pick up on that? Sorry, because it has come out quite a lot, with the hate crime board, what were Ruth's comments, and from other partners as well, around the resourcing for hate crime, for the new command unit structure, and the number of hate crime liaison officers, and that lack of expertise. So, how will the Met be assessing the impact on the victims of hate crime; the new

model, how it's impacting hate crime victims? And how can we ensure that that feedback and that dialogue from partners, is fed back to you, and you can hear that?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Okay, so we -- in terms of what we will be looking for, we will be looking at -- as you know, we have a survey of victims of crime, and hate crime is included in that survey. So, the big performance measure for us, in terms of how we're doing for victims of crime, is around the practice, and the victim survey. Also, we have a fairly regular meeting with the hate crime liaison officers; some of them are very, very experienced, and have been doing it for a long, long time. Others are brand new in-post. So to an extent, they need to find their feet, they need to get to know their local partners, and they need to find out where best to go for advice and support. But actually, you know, from my perspective, the hate crime liaison officers working with CATCH, actually you've then got expert advice and support, but also linked directly into the police service for the kind of more complicated and complex cases that we've just been discussing. So, early days; but from my perspective -- and let's bear in mind, not every borough had a full time -- in fact, most didn't; I think there was only one or two full time hate crime liaison officer, under the old model; one at Westminster, one at Tower Hamlets. So actually, every BCU now, has somebody dedicated to hate crime liaison. So that's an improvement in the model, and that should help drive consistency and develop partnerships across London.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, thank you. Thank you for that.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Sara, can I just ask you; historically, officers have lacked confidence and sort of knowledge in identifying hate as a motivating factor in many cases; and therefore officers were failing to sort of identify risk, and then victims weren't getting the appropriate response and support. So, what work to date, is underway to tackle that?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, one of the really important things that came up in the HMRC review of hate crime, the national review, was at that very first point of contact, when somebody rings in to the police, it's immediately identified with, that (a) it's identified as hate crime, and (b) that credibility -- and that specific credibilities have identified that as such. So, through training in the team, we've put a training package together, for our control room staff; I think there's about 2,000 of them, and it's a large number; and they are undertaking that training over the course of the Summer. So that's at the initial stage.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Interesting.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Then, once we've identified that it's a hate crime; once -- and this is, I'd expect every victim of hate crime sees a police officer. You don't have to, clearly; but those that want to, will see a police officer. It will be investigated, then we are also -- we've got a booklet called the 124H, which we're rolling out; very similar to the 124D around domestic abuse, and 124M around missing people. What that does, it leads the officer through the initial stages of the investigation; I think really importantly, and we've consulted with colleagues around this table, about what kind of questions to ask. Because sometimes our officers perhaps don't have the confidence, are concerned about giving offence. We've really tested what kind of questions we need to ask victims, to understand what's happened, but also

to understand the risks about this offence. So we're looking to roll that out very shortly. That I'm confident -- and as with domestic abuse, the same with has been missing; will improve the mission investigation. Again, responding to the HMRC concerns, improve initial risk assessment, about what risks that the victims faces, and will assist us in managing that investigation.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Okay, and I assume the partners have been quite plugged into that work, around the risk assessment?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Okay, and through -- as you know, I've been reviewing the Victim's Code of Practice, and hearing from many, many victims in London; and specifically hearing from victims of hate crime; those around disability hate crime, and who didn't report, because there weren't the appropriate facilities to report. So, what work is going on again, within the Met, to tackle that, around digitalisation and modernising the Met, so that we have facilities that they can easily access?

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): Okay, so we have the online crime reporting portal; and so -- and we obviously have 101. So, I suppose what I'd need to understand a bit better, is exactly what kind of access issues are we facing; and then, is what we're doing going to be enough to overcome those obstacles?

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Yes, there was quite a number of issues. Ruth, did you -- I mean, you've seen issues as well, haven't you? With the online reporting, and the phone reporting; did you want to raise any of those specifically? I mean, there's a lot, I know.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): I mean, where do I start? Yes. I mean, I think you know, it's about a whole number of things, about process, about the language that officers use, about not being able to -- you know, 25% of our clients, are illiterate; completely illiterate, and probably another 30 to 35% have never used a computer. Might be able to do some, a bit of basic texting on their phone, but to do a report, just couldn't do it. So, a lot of it needs to be mediated through an advocate, and I'm not just arguing for more resources for CATCH, but it is an issue. You know, that that -- just that process of helping somebody to report; very often, officers don't have the skills in terms of communication, or in terms of just simple language. They still fall into, "I was proceeding in a northerly direction", you know, kind of as opposed to saying, "I was walking down the road".

So, that doesn't help when you're asking people questions, and I think -- but lots of issues about deaf people; one of my staff has just been seconded to a deaf organisation, to do some capacity building around hate crime work, and the barriers that their clients faced were just stratospheric. But in terms of just being able -- the basic thing, of being able to report. The online portal is very difficult to use; people who use BSL don't use standard English, their sentences are very different and so on and so on. So there's a -- you know, I could go on forever -- and the issues around people with learning disabilities, is very often -- it still gets dealt with as a safeguarding issue. So, you know, that the barriers are -- and if you have language barriers, in terms of having a speech impairment, or simply having English as a second language, you know, that's an issue across all of our strands. So, you know, there needs to be

a process for people to be able to just report to different organisations; being able to talk to somebody face to face. That's what most people that we deal with want to do; they want to see somebody, talk to them, and tell them. As opposed to dealing with somebody on the phone, being passed around, and having to press lots of buttons, you know. Just the fact that when you ring 101 now, you've got to press one button, and then say you're not in Birmingham, and then say, you know, "This isn't a --" whatever else weird questions.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): There's options now, so that it should make it easier, but for your cohort, it isn't easier.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Yes. It's impossible. Yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): We know that, so it's not quite meeting their needs.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): That's unfortunate. I mean, you know, we try and encourage people to report themselves, and they will say, "Well, I rang 101, and I got lost in the buttons, and I put the phone down". Which is, you know -- but they've tried.

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): So, obviously we have Language Line, and we have access to interpreters, etc, etc. But clearly, it's not meeting everybody's needs, and that's probably something that the Disability Independent Advisory Group would be able to assist us with; working with Met CC, and which is for most people, that's the route into the organisation.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Talking again about -- following on from Nick's case study as well, and Ruth's comments around disability, especially women, and where we see that intersectionality, or victims of domestic and sexual violence, and stalking and harassment comes up; Sara or Dave could have answered it; what are you doing to ensure that hate crime, when it's linked to other crimes, such as domestic violence or stalking and harassment, are being effectively identified and investigated, and therefore they're getting the right support as well? Because obviously, it's not always just simple hate crime, is it? It's very complex and --

David Stringer (Metropolitan Police Service): No, so one of the advantages of the new BCU structure, as I was saying before, is that in the old -- under the old system, if it was a really serious offence such as rape, that would be investigated in a different part of the Met. So, the advantage of the new safeguarding hubs, is they will be talking -- the same people will be dealing with -- they'll be dealing with domestic abuse; they'll be dealing with hate crime, and they'll be dealing with rape; and they'll be dealing with sort of stalking and harassment effectively, also. So actually, I think the new structure gives us the opportunity to better share information, and make sure that the -- it's not, you know, different officers investigating different elements of that offending pattern; and the victim having to talk to two or three different people, potentially. That's brought together. Now obviously, we've had a conversation about what happens when it's aggravated, and it sits in the response team, but anything that has any domestic connection at all, will still go back into the CSU. So that's the safeguard; and obviously we review every hate crime daily; and I have a fantastic central team, that look at every single hate crime that the Met has, on a daily basis. So that again, gives me

confidence that we're recording properly, we're flagging correctly, i.e. that we're identifying hate crime correctly; and actually that the right people -- so training the team, they have -- not regular conversations, but they occasional conversations with BCUs, when they don't think that the risk is being recognised and identified, and the right people are dealing with it. So that's the daily safeguard that we're fortunate to have.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Kris, can I bring you in?

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Yes, sure.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): It would just help us. So, we get over the hurdles, and we try and increase confidence; we have victims coming forward.

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): We obviously hear from the CPS data, that shows that in almost 30% of cases, there was an unsuccessful prosecution, down to the victim withdrawing, or failing to attend court. So, what more can be done to improve that, so we keep the victims engaged, and we actually get them to court?

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Right, so just a couple of things that I need to emphasise. First of all, as Sophie will understand, as panel members will, but also those behind me as well, is that we warn the witnesses via the Blitz(?), okay, so the terms of support that we will provide to witnesses, will be special measures at court; and whether it be screens or video links etc; that's the sort of special measures that we have; and that's the programme we have. What we don't actually have, is that we do work very, very closely with Sara's team, the witness care and support team, or the Care Unit. What we recognise in terms of the cases that we've looked at -- and I look at them, or as you know, we have hate crime forum groups, which are attended by a number of the CATCH partners that come to present there as well; is about the actual support, and extra support that people need.

I go back on my soapbox now, something that I rarely do, and I think you know what I'm going to say Claire, is that I've been advocating for some time, as others have, about perhaps a better approach, in terms of the approach that we have in IDVAs; we do a lot of work with the IDVAs; we've had workshops with them. But the issue there, is that it is well recognised, and it's an avenue that courts recognise in terms of support. We as the prosecutors, it's easy in some respects, to be able to say, "We'll come to them locally, and do some work with them". No disrespect meant to our CATCH and others, because we work very closely with them, and they've come to present and explain to prosecutors how -- what support they can provide in terms of their advocacy. What we seem to lose a bit, and along the route, is that people feel unsupported. So quite bluntly, you know, receiving a warning saying, "Please come to court" is helpful; receiving a text message -- and it may not be enough for people, and of course, you know, Ruth has already explained the disabilities that people have, the learning difficulties etc, they may not be able to understand their ways of dealing with this, and the people actually need more than that.

So, I think what really I'm asking for, is also, you know, to put it on more of a footing, properly funded; so that actually, you can help actually bring the cases when they come to court, that then they actually can prosecute them. But you need the victims and the witnesses, all throughout the support system. That's one aspect of it, but in terms of what we're doing ourselves, in terms of the CPS, to make sure that we're dealing with the victims properly, and witnesses; CPS London is undertaking a sample exercise, and looking at the national hate crime assurance scheme. You know, we have one of these schemes, we're looking at every month, to make sure that we are dealing with our cases properly, and one of those exercises is going to focus on disability hate crime.

You can see it Claire, because that's an area where the numbers are incredibly low, given that we're the capital. Quite surprising, bearing in mind; and so we're looking at the advocacy of the information provided by the police files to us; we're also going to look at identifying the victim support needs. To make sure that we as prosecutors, have actually taken the right steps to ensure that -- you know, we won't have the knowledge, but we will also know who to contact. Nick and others have come to speak to us, and Dave Rich as well.

So we have issues, we have concerns on the case, we can actually pick up the phone and say, "Well actually, what support can you have?" Alternatively, it's working quite well actually; CATCH members have actually contacted me, at times directly, or my colleagues. So this is some of the extra support we need, or, "We're involved with this case, what can you do?" If they have concerns as well, so it works both ways. There was an incredible amount of work being done with the Metropolitan Police as well, with Dave as well, and his team, and Tony, in particular. We're looking at that, to see what support we can provide police, by early intervention; so we talk about online hate crime.

That is quite a high threshold in terms of prosecutions of that process, so we need to make sure that we've got that correctly identified, and where cases have not just been stopped prematurely, on the basis that what the CPS might be; it might be useful to know what the CPS will -- let us make the decision. That's really quite important, so Dave's team and I are looking at cases for example, that have been diverted in the system. A number of cases don't even reach the process; so cases that have been NFA'd or where cautions are being imposed. We're repeating that exercise; I have been to see Commander Richard Smith last Friday, to agree this again; that we're going to be looking at cases in December, over a three month period, to see what happened, and whether those cases were correctly stopped, or NFA'd correctly, and No Further Action taken; or a caution was imposed, or alternatively, whether it should have come to us. So, that's the sort of work that we're doing with the police, but in terms of actually recognising, there's quite a lot of work we have to do in terms of victim support. We weren't going to do this on our own. We have -- we're one part of the Criminal Justice system, so that's the work we need to do.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): And do you find so we all recognise the need, and for the advocacy and the support, to get the victims to court.

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): And when they do get to court, the experience is still obviously, very traumatic for them; is there anything within that court space, or the court environment, that we could look to improve?

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): Yes, well I'm pleased you raised that Claire, is that the other thing that we're doing; we're going to refresh our training package that we have, for prosecutors; and this is going to be a trial only, focused on support on victims and witnesses, with additional support for them. So, we recognise, as we worked with you, on the V COP, the Victims Code Of Practice, and we'd recognise some of the findings, which informally have been shared, because we've been on various groups with you already. So we know what we need to do to improve.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Thank you Kris.

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust/CATCH): Can I -- sorry, can I just pick up on something Kris said? Just on the point of what can be done for victims and witnesses, when they do go to court; when cases that CATCH has been involved with have gone to court, the rate at which those victims and witnesses drop out, is considerably lower than 28%, and we do have testimony from victims, talking about how much they'd benefitted from it, so it's a model that does work, and any extra resource that can be put into that, I think would be very beneficial.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): I think -- and thanks; so I just really want to echo that, and just kind of contradict Kris a little bit as well; and just to reassure; we don't just warn victims for court, we do conduct needs assessments for them, we we'll identify whether they're vulnerable or intimidated, and then we will offer special measures, etc, etc. And we contact them through the life of the case, as long as -- you know, if that's what they want actually. So it's victim-driven around that. There are numerous reasons why victims drops out of the process; it could be the length of time; it might be that actually, when they reported, they never intended to go to court, in that particular incident anyway. We try as best as we can, you know, to get them to court. But there are some times when, you know, they are just not going to attend. We then notify the CPS of that fact, and then we have to face the decision as to whether we summons them, or actually whether we then let that case go. What's best for the victim in that case. I was really interested actually, on Nick's presentation earlier from CATCH, and I really thought I'd missed a trick, that this was Met-wide. So I was quite relieved actually, it was only in two BCUs. But I would really -- sorry, I really support actually, the advocacy around the court hearings as well, because as Kris says, we do know when IDVAs support domestic abuse victims, we've got a high success rate there.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Sorry, can I just pick up on that?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Are you saying you weren't aware of CATCH?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): No, not --

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): But your witness care unit --

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes.

Nick Antjoulle (Galop/CATCH): Sorry, I should say, CATCH is pan London, it's just that we're operating on the resource that we had initially, for the pilot. So we do cover -- different organisations within CATCH, cover --

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): I did miss a trick. So I have missed a trick, and I'm -- so I need to make sure that our witness care units are connected in with CATCH. As well though, as you'll know, on 1 April, we've also got the integrated victim and witness statements coming in, and we need to see how we can additionally support hate crime victims, and our other victims, through the court process as well.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Can I just ask a quick question?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): How many cases of hate crime have you had, where an intermediary appears to support the witness?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): So I don't know the number off the top of my head; I would say to you that it's probably pretty low. There are a shortage of intermediaries in the country, and yes, I don't have the figure off the top of my head, but I would, if I had to hazard a guess, it would be low.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): And are they being offered? Because we've had quite a lot of issues around getting intermediaries to the clients, in a number of cases, so --

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Okay, so they should be being offered; I get that the process sometimes will fail. But yes, they should be being offered.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Okay.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Yes, sorry. Just making lots of notes. Sorry. Another thing that's come up very loud and clear through the hate crime board, is around restorative justice. A number of forces have begun using RJ, as a really useful way to resolution, and address the impact of hate crime; and it really does improve the well being of victims, and their ability to cope and recover. Now, we know that the Met don't actually offer that to hate crime victims; what the policy is around that. Because obviously within VCOP, the Victims Code of Practice, it is an entitlement to victims. So it would just be really useful to clarify their position on that?

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes, okay. So I think it's really fair to say that the Met has been behind on the curve, around RJ. Actually, as opposed to our other forces in the area. We do know that it's a requirement under VCOP, to offer RJ services to victims. I don't think we've been doing that, as well as we should be, but we know we haven't been doing that as well as we should be. We do run RJ in London, but it's quite limited. So we have restorative justice providers that work alongside our witness care units. It's not as an alternative to prosecution, it complements the prosecution process; and that started -- I've got some stats actually, I won't bore you; in April 2017, and we've had 535 interventions since then. 179 of those were positive, and 36 of those cases were hate crime, where support was given. So that is low numbers, I understand that. Again, we've got IVWS coming on 1 April, so we need to see what that new provision looks like. With regards -- we've also got some other pilots running, so in the North West BCU, we've got Turning Point, which is an alternative to prosecution, where we would look at delivering RJ in certain circumstances.

That started in July last year, and we've only had around 36 appropriate cases; and that isn't looking at hate crime at the moment; and in Ealing as well, we're also looking -- we're in the very early stages of looking again at how rather than prosecution, in appropriate cases, we could look at out of court disposals, with restorative justice, as part of that.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Can I bring partners in here? Because obviously, we've talked a lot about restorative justice for victims, and it really is a right that I -- it's an entitlement that they need to be offered throughout the entire journey piece; it's not just instead of prosecution, I think it's a huge support tool, and I think we're missing a trick here, in London with that. So, does any of the partners want to bring in anything around that, with restorative justice?

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust/CATCH): In, only that we've been involved in quite a lot of RJ cases in other parts of the UK, as both alongside prosecution, but more often actually, as an alternative.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes.

Dave Rich (Community Security Trust/CATCH): And the experience is overwhelmingly positive.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes, so I think, you know, as an organisation, we weren't completely sold on the benefits of RJ, for quite a long time; and I think, you know, we want to test the principles of that, within the MPS. So, and make sure we've got our processes right, and we don't want to have adverse impacts.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): But we've got overwhelming evidence that shows the benefit of restorative justice, so we need to kind of take that evidence.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes. Yes, so there is evidence that shows the benefits of restorative justice; I wouldn't disagree with that at all.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Yes.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): But there are -- you know, there's also evidence that it works in certain crime types, with certain types of offenders, and certain victims.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Sure, but we have quite a lot of evidence, based on restorative justice, so it needs to be from our perspective, my perspective, to where appropriate, at least offered, and then the victim will support it through that process.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): And I agree; I completely agree, I think it's where appropriate, and we need to make sure that they're supported. There is a thing about service providers though, if the police are to provide that service, there's huge training implications there as well. Because we want to make sure we get it right.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes. So we do have a restorative justice programme up and running, funded through MOPAC, so we should definitely -- I mean, and one of the actions coming out of this I think, is to look at how we will increase that, given that those that are advocating on behalf on victims, and the victims commissioner, are also saying, this is a -- you know, a useful -- obviously where appropriate, so we do have some programmes who will take that up as an action. That's helpful.

Kris Ventakasami (Deputy Chief, Crown Prosecution Service): And can we say that we support that, I mean, the CPS position is that they will consider restorative justice, but as I say, it's where it's available and appropriate, in the appropriate cases.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes, of course. Yes.

Stuart Webber (NPS, London): You may be aware from the probation perspective, we've got Ray(?) card services, and we've got a programme called, "Making Amends". And if the service users are deemed suitable, then they can go onto restorative justice; and it's certainly something I'm driving now, because I've taken on the hate crime lead in London. We're going to get more referrals. Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes, that's very helpful.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): Just to say, that I personally feel very optimistic about the prospect of using RJ and hate crime; I think that -- so for instance, "Why Me?" and Galop, we're working together very closely, which is great. Literally for the last two days, two of my team have been out training them, on LGBT hate crime issues. So hopefully that's going to be really useful.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): When have you been training people, sorry?

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): Oh, Why Me?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Why Me, sorry, I didn't catch it.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): Sorry, I think something that I would say is, that it can be really, really powerful; it can be so, so useful in terms of you getting people accountability, in terms of people getting resolution. Equally, where it's not done well, it can do the opposite.

Sara Lewis (Head of MPS Prosecutions): Yes, exactly.

Nick Antjoule (Galop/CATCH): I think I'm really aware of, having seen examples of both, so I'm aware that the general model of RJ tends to be post conviction, with those cases suitable. For reasons that I'm sure are kind of really abundantly clear to everyone, that's not suitable for the vast majority of people who experience hate crime. So I think it takes some creative thinking, around actually, how do we implement around hate crime, that might be different? But, yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): That's really helpful. Just really quickly, because I just wanted to bring Stuart in around sort of re offending, and the role of the NPS as well as victim statements, actually; so Ruth, did you want to just quickly come in?

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Yes, can I -- sorry, I don't want to be a prophet of gloom, but I'll kind of just talk about disability. But can I just sound a note of caution? I'm actually trying to do a bit of research into this, and to talk to Calm Mediation, who are the people who are the partners within the London Victims and Witnesses services, because we're part of that as well. And I think there are two things; one is for people who've been victims of repeated abuse, and most of the disabled hate crime victims have been victims of multiple abuse throughout their life. Plus the fact that if you have been institutionalised in any way -- and that could be within your family, your immediate in a situation of trauma, is to pacify everybody, and there's a response to agree with the person in authority who says, "This is a good idea". We have that issue as advocates as well; because we are still people in positions of authority. And I think that there are enormous risks; we're not sure, but I think we have very big concerns about the risk that -- okay, if you're someone with a learning disability, who's been institutionalised for most of their life, where you know, you're taught to be a "good girl", okay? As one of my clients said to me, the other day. And somebody says to you, "Well, how about if we go through this process?" Which they don't necessarily understand; they won't understand the difference -- they don't know what mediation is, restorative justice has got eight syllables, and it's a lot of words to say it, you know, big words to say it; etc, etc.

You're going to say yes, because you're frightened of going to court, you're frightened of authority, and you just want to please people; and that is something that takes an enormous amount of skill from the people who are doing RJ, to actually understand that somebody might say, "Oh, I'm a bit worried"; but actually, they're terrified, yes?

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): That's the role of the advocate in supporting that as well; it's very much joined-up, because restorative justice -- and that's why it's where appropriate; there are cases where it is not appropriate, because of coercion, and the complexities of cases.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Yes.

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): So it takes a good RJ practitioner to understand that, and emphasise that. Yes, absolutely.

Ruth Bashall (Stay Safe East/CATCH): Yes, and I think there are lots of issues around the quality of that, and how that can be approached. So, we're starting a dialogue I think, and I think there was a particular issue around disabled victims, yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Okay, no I think that's a really useful sort of word of caution actually, around what does it mean to be aware -- as Claire said, that were appropriate; what does that mean, and how do you really, you know, bring that into effect, and make it a real thing about how appropriate RJ can be? We've got ten minutes left; I just wanted to ask you Stuart, around the role of the NPS in supporting -- well not supporting, in trying to change the behaviour of those that are perpetrating hate crime; and you know, what you are able to do around that? And in terms of your role from the NPS?

Stuart Webber (NPS, London): So I mean, you'll know before, the point where somebody's actually sentenced; we've got court teams, and we do the pre-sentence reports. So, we'll look at interventions, and proposals will be made to the courts. Post-sentence, we then have probation officers that manage service users on supervision plans, and we have various interventions. In my experience, what we're finding is, there's still a lot of -- it's not necessarily a hate crime, when somebody's been actually prosecuted, and then we're supervising them for hate crime; they may well be -- we may well identify them, but post-sentence, for another matter. Where they are actually bringing in hate, into the dialogue in supervision. So that's something we've had to tackle for a number of years. But moving forward, as we see more cases coming through the court system, in terms of our intervention, so we have one-to-one supervision with probation officers, and that's the same in the National Probation Service, as well as the community rehabilitation companies, across England and Wales. And --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Do you have specifics that deal with attitudes and behaviours?

Stuart Webber (NPS, London): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): So, it's that it may not be the only offence the person is in for, but there is a hate crime element to it? Even though it's just --

Stuart Webber (NPS, London): Yes, so we have -- we've got what's called an offender management toolkit. Where there's actually interventions that officers can use around hate crime, and supervision; where they sort of challenge discrepancies in conversations. But we also look at it in more broader terms, around actually, an individual's stake in society, because what we actually find some of the time again, is that there's drug and alcohol issues, there's accommodation issues, there's unemployment, etc, that we seek to tackle, as part of that overall intervention around how we actually look at hate crime. But in terms of actual -- we have got programmes; I mean, I've got them over here, we've got the Resolve programme, which deals with premeditated and instrumental violence; we've also got the thinking skills programme, which is part of the Rate card services, that the private CRCs provide, that we can procure, as

part of an intervention plan from the MPS, in terms of supervision. And there's also the restorative justice element; so there are things that tackle, and will deal with attitudes, thinking, behaviour, violence and aggression. In terms of hate crime, in my role now, I'm leading in London, in terms of really increasing the awareness around it, amongst staff. We're looking at seven minute briefings for staff; we're look at other interventions from our effective probation team, around what we can do in terms of, are there gaps in terms of our interventions, that we need to maybe close? To actually provide officers with the necessary tools to challenge sort of hate crime, and what's been seen in supervision.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): That's helpful, thank you. Claire, did you have anything more, you wanted to speak on; is there anything more?

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): No, I mean I can pick some stuff up.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Are we covered?

Claire Waxman (Independent Victims Commissioner) (co-Chair): Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing & Crime) (co-Chair): Yes, okay. Thank you, that's really helpful. Have we covered all the main issues? Is there anything that -- any burning questions that anyone has around the panel? So, I didn't want to -- okay, thank you. I thought, I think that is a really helpful look at the issues around the gap between -- large gap, I know I'm sure, between reporting and incidents, and the gap as we've heard very clearly, the gap between the capacity for advocacy, and not that there isn't the will, but the capacity and the resources that we would need for that to happen. But also in terms of, and really we do need to pick up the issue of sentencing as well. I've not really dwelt on that today, because we haven't really got the right people around the table, actually, in terms of sentencing, so we need to -- that is something we'll take.

In terms of the things that I have picked up on, in relation to sort of some actions and some work going forward, there's courts and sentencing, support for advocates, and how do we grow that in terms of -- and that that is a difficult thing, because I'm sorry, it does come down to resources; and how do we grow it. But also, your points Nick, around the need for looking at the infrastructure, and the need for capacity to meet the you know, to be in structured training, and the skill needs. You've mentioned a CATCH campaign, and I think you should circulate that, or give it to us to circulate, so that we can make sure that partners are fully embedded, you know, able to do what they can to support that. And we will take away an action around TfL and CCTV; and the -- we also do need to talk to you about the witness care units, and their -- what they do know about the advocacy services panel, and we need to make sure that that is properly communicated in terms of the messages. Then, this issue about restorative justice, and how we can really ensure that it is being -- you know, it is being offered to victims where appropriate, with the very, very important caveat, which is not just around hate crime, but around all sorts of other elements of crime, that it's got to be appropriate. Although where it is appropriate, and it is delivered well, it can be incredibly powerful and enabling for victims, and incredibly important.

So, thank you very much, and we will pick up those actions, and circulate those actions, and ensure that you do have some feedback, and ongoing conversations for this. I hope you found this useful; I certainly have, in terms of shining a light on the statistics, and the data, but also very much in terms of what is happening to people who are victims of hate crime, and how the statutory services can respond; so thank you. Thanks.