

Date: Tuesday 18 September 2018  
Location: Committee Room 5, City Hall  
Hearing: JUSTICE MATTERS – Tackling Reoffending

Start time: 10:30am  
Finish time: 12:01pm

Sophie Linden – Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (Chair)  
Marie Snelling, MOPAC  
Dr Paul Dawson, MOPAC  
DAC Laurence Taylor, Metropolitan Police Service  
Phil Douglas, Ministry of Justice  
Jim Barton, Ministry of Justice  
Ian Porée, HMPPS  
Stuart Webber, NPS, London Division  
Gabriel Amahwe, London Community Rehabilitation Company  
Peter Jones, Catch 22  
Dee Anand, Together for Mental Wellbeing  
Andy Keen-Downs, Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT)  
Gill Arukpe, Penrose  
Dave Huie – Service user representative  
Louise Spencer, HMPPS  
Sinead Dervin, NHS England  
Melanie Smith, Brent Council  
Kate Aldous, Clinks  
Zina Etheridge, CEO, Haringey Council

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you very much for coming here this morning for one of the series that we hold of Justice Matters. It is an opportunity for myself as Deputy Mayor to fulfil part of my statutory function which is the convening, oversight and scrutiny of not just the Metropolitan Police Service but of partners as well. So I am really grateful for everyone being here. Just to remind people that although we are in a committee room this is all filmed and on the record and webcast, so this is an all public record of what happens in the meeting.

Shall we just quickly whizz round to introduce ourselves? I am Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor.

**Zina Etheridge (Chief Executive Officer, Haringey Council):** I am Zina Etheridge, I am Chief Executive of the London Borough of Haringey and here broadly talking on behalf of other London Chief Executives.

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** Louise Spencer, Group Director for London Prisons.

**Kate Aldous (Clinks):** Kate Aldous from Clinks which is the infrastructure organisation for the voluntary sector working in Criminal Justice.

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** Paul Dawson, I am the Head of Research at MOPAC.

**Andy Keen-Down (PACT):** Andy Keen-Down Chief Executive of PACT which is the Prison Advice and Care Trust.

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** Sinead Dervin, Head of Health and Justice, NHS England, London Region. We have responsibility for commissioning health care across justice settings in London.

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** Stuart Webber, I am the Head of City of London, Hackney Tower Hamlets in the National Probation Service covering community violence.

**Gill Arukpe (Penrose):** Gill Arukpe, Chief Executive of Penrose. We are part of London CRC and we also have Forensic Mental Health supported Housing pan London.

**Ian Porée (HMPPS):** Ian Porée from HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) and I am responsible for the contract of our bit of probation in England.

**Jim Barton (Ministry of Justice):** Jim Barton from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). I am responsible for the programme that we are designing to implement the next generation of probation structures.

**Phil Douglas (Ministry of Justice):** I am Phil Douglas. I am Director of Youth Justice and Offender Policy at the Ministry of Justice (MoJ).

**Peter Jones (Catch 22):** Peter Jones, Director of Justice Reform at Catch 22, also a part of the London Community Rehabilitation Company network as well as providing prison services nationally to a number of large brands.

**Marie Snelling (MOPAC):** I am Marie Snelling. I am a Director for Insight Strategic Partnerships here at the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC).

**David Huie (Service User Representative):** I am David Huie, currently Service User, Probation Services.

**Dee Anand (Together for Mental Wellbeing):** I am Dee Anand, Interim Director of Criminal Justice at Together for Mental Wellbeing and we run a GTO or POP project in London.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Can you just spell out what that means?

**Dee Anand (Together for Mental Wellbeing):** GTO is Gripping The Offender and it has turned into the POP Service which is the Persistent Offender Programme in London.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you.

**Gabriel Amahwe (London Community Rehabilitation Company):** Gabriel Amahwe, Director of Probation, London Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC).

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** Morning. Laurence Taylor, Deputy Assistant Commissioner with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). One of my portfolio responsibilities is Criminal Justice.

**Melanie Smith (Brent Council):** Melanie Smith, Director of Public Health from Brent and I am here on behalf of the Association of Directors Public Health London.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you very much. I just think the number of organisations and the seniority here is really welcome. It also gives for me an absolute, it shows you the complexity of dealing with persistent offending in London because it does take such a lot of different organisations with different statutory duties and different remits to really get to the bottom of persistent offending and tackling it.

I really do thank you, David [Huie], for coming and it is really important that you are here because this is all about what happens to service users and what happens in the community and how we improve the services around persistent offending so thank you. We will come to you I think half way through but thank you very much for being here, it really does matter.

**David Huie (Service User Representative):** You are welcome.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** So as I think most people around the table know persistent offending was one of the commitments within our Police and Crime Plan that we published last year in March. The two main focuses of our commitments

around tackling persistent offending is one; to try new and innovative approaches to persistent offending. Two; to show that there is consistency across London.

I hope that through today that we look at those two commitments and how we can drive those forward but also to refresh a focus on persistent offending. I think over the last couple years for whatever reasons persistent offending has slightly fallen down the agenda and fallen off the radar. I know there is still a lot of very good work happening but I do think this is an opportunity for all partners in London to refresh and to refocus what they are doing on persistent offending. Looking at what that means in relation to ensuring that we get that balance right which is a really tricky balance, that balance right around how do you tackle persistent offending, looking at the volume of offending but also high harm offending.

I know there is some really interesting evidence and analysis around because persistent offending, trigger offences and violence which Dr Paul Dawson is going to take us through in a minute. So the two commitments and the trying to get that balance right around high harm and high volume are really where I am trying to look during the course of this meeting.

We have until 12.00pm. We will get to everyone but I really, really would welcome short and succinct interventions, unlike the one I have just given.

Dr Dawson, would you care to take us through the evidence? Thank you.

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** Yes, thank you. Good morning. So if I direct your attention to the first slide, slide one, Adult Reoffending Rates Remain Stable, this presents adult reoffending rates in England and in London.

As you can see they have pretty much remained stable across both of these for the last ten years, around 27 or 28% which is the graph on the top right. But what is interesting is that you can look a little bit deeper on this and there are certain groups that are really driving that reoffending. So for example the less than 12 months' offender cohort, the London 18 to 20 year-old cohorts are far higher with any rate compared to their national peers and those with an offence with theft. In London those with a drug index offence have higher reoffending rates than their London peers. So all the offenders have a higher level of reoffending are really kind of volume demand offenders which I think most people would recognise that.

I have also got on the slide the difference between the National Probation Service (NPS) and the CRC in terms of reoffending rates. So those managed by London NPS are only, if any, are to 36%. Those managed by London CRC however have an offending rate of around 44%.

What I would say is both of those are below the England and Wales average. It also shows that generally the higher reoffending rate usually comes with the low level of harm.

Just once again, I do not think anyone will be surprised by anything on the first slide but really just to set the scene and the context.

Now the next slide, slide two, just shows the trends and offenders and reoffenders over the time. The top two lines show the number of offenders; the bottom two lines show the number of reoffenders.

Essentially the takeaway for me is that the overall cohort is reducing both in England, England and Wales and in London but the proportion that we see that is owned by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is increasing. So MPS currently hold 17% of reoffenders and offenders and that has increased over the last ten years.

I just want to direct your attention to the next slide, slide two, There is a Rising Trend in Violent Reoffending, that I would highlight which is a rising trend specifically in violent reoffending. So essentially over the last two available years of data we see increases in reoffending and across all the violent reoffending indicators, which is a more recent worrying trend.

The next slide, slide three, The Current IOM Cohort – A Growth in Numbers, takes us to Integrated Offender Management (IOM). So we know that a minority of offenders are responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime and Integrated Offender Management is a far easier way to tackle these persistent offenders.

Now previously London had a way to identify offenders involving the Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGR), the OGR Scale and one or two key crime types. So what we have done recently is just refresh that cohort and if we do that we see around just under 7,000 eligible offenders within London that would meet that criteria.

We can split that data by borough so we can see the potential demands on borough, on it is spread unequally across London. Now that is a little bit interesting but I think it gets much more interesting when we compare that most recent IOM cohort to the previous cohorts that we have generated which is the slide you can see now, slide four, IOM Cohort Increasing Numbers and a Shift Towards Violence.

So if we compare the most recent group to those in 2013 and 2015 we see some very interesting differences. Remember this is the same criteria that has been used to identify this cohort of offenders over these different time periods.

We see an increase in sheer size of those eligible to receive, so from 4,271 in 2013 up to nearly 7,000 in the most recent year. We see an increase in the proportion that are BAME from 39% in 2013 to 49% in 2017 and 2018.

For me the most interesting one is the increase in violence of the index offence that brought them to the attention. So if we look back in the previous years, historically it is very much theft and handling and burglary have been the two offences that brought them into contact. The most recent cohort violence has come up as number one.

For myself who has been involved in offender management research for many years, the old diamond scheme, the old PPL scheme years and years back, acquisitive offenders were predominantly the ones that drove those offending. The fact that now violence has come up as the top that has brought them to notice is a really interesting factor. It is also indicating potential change in the cohort as well.

Then I just wanted to look at that violence in a little bit more detail, so this is just of the violent group on the most recent cohort, slide five, Breakdown the Violence Aspects of the IOM Cohort. As you can see the biggest chunk of the violence is around malicious wounding and other like offences. So that details a whole range of other offences that includes GBH, ABH, possession

of offensive weapons, having a blade pointing in public. Those are the most dominant offences within that violent chunk. So we see a wide array of violence and some even at the very highest levels of harm around manslaughter, attempted murder.

Then my final slide is just to wrap some of the discussions we have been having around how can we have a system of IOM that blends together the high demand, high reoffending rates that we have seen as well as the increase in harm and the increase in violence that we have been seeing in the most recent cohort. What else should be taken on board such as, as we have on the slide, local priorities, other criteria. So local borough priorities, offender needs' data. What else can we feed into the model to improve how we identify work with such offenders?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you very much. Has anybody got any questions about the evidence of the figures or anything like that? No?

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** I just had a query just around substance misuse. Could you just say has there been a decrease? Has the picture changed within that cohort around substance misuse as well?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** In terms of the most recent IOM cohort 9% came to attention re: drugs offence. In previous years 8% and 5%. So this is not their complete offending background, this is the offence that brought them to notice.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Can you remind me, to be in the IOM cohort how do you get into the IOM cohort?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** The criteria that was developed a few years ago was having an OGR score.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What is the OGR score?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** That is the Offending Group Reconviction Scale (OGR). That is a very accurate predictor of someone's offending over the next one or two years. A high OGR score of 75 plus, so that is the highest risk of reoffending, there was also if you had an OGR score of 50 plus, plus a burglary and a robbery in the previous year.

So it was built on an evidence base of the highest risk of reoffending and certain crime types. That brought them to into attention to be eligible for IOM.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** So the IOM cohort does not necessarily pick up high harm. If your trigger offences are a high harm offence but it is actually weighted in, as you say, burglary and robbery, actually there may be an issue about persistent offending for high harm as well but you are not necessarily in the IOM cohort.

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** That is right. So historically this cohort has very much been acquisitive offences and now we are seeing a slight change towards violence.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Right, I just wondered if there is an issue that whether we do need to pick up actually the how you get into the IOM

cohort. Does it have enough of a focus on high harm as well as the acquisitive. Sorry, Gill [Arukpe]?

**Gill Arukpe (Penrose):** On the violence statistic I wonder how much of that is domestic violence again related, is that broken down? It is just very wide, because clearly that would be interesting. The offence of handling, is that attached to substance misuse, gang related? Substance misuse is just again a title. If you break it down it will give us more insight.

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** So in terms of the violence chunk of the most recent cohort, as I said it is predominantly -- it is this, it is malicious wounding and other like offences that contribute the biggest chunks. So 40% of that 29%, if that makes sense, is these offences.

So it is predominantly malicious wounding and other like offences which, as I mentioned, is ABH, GBH but we do see quite a wide spectrum. So looking across all of those all it is a range of assaults and you get to the highest levels of harms near the bottom; blackmail, attempted murder, murder, these are relatively small numbers in the overall population.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Would domestic violence go in?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** I do not believe we would have it in here, no.

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** A two-part question, if I can. So this is just looking at those currently within the IOM cohort. So it is demonstrating a change in behaviour criminality of those who are already selected within the cohort. It is not identifying people outside that cohort who are committing like offences, is that right?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** Yes, this is all those that are eligible. This is all those that are currently eligible that meet the IOM definition at the moment.

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** OK, and then the second bit is using the OGR score, is it easier to do predictive analysis around acquisitive crime than violent crime? I wonder if that is why we have seen a higher volume of people there because of the predictive nature of the scoring tool that we are using.

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** It is an interesting point but OGRs is a very accurate tool regardless of offence. So it looks at a variety of historical factors and is a very good predictor. It is not just for one or the other.

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** So we are comfortable it fits with a broad spectrum of crime types. If there as a change in cohort selection that tool is still as accurate for violent crime, for domestic violence as it would be for serious acquisitive crime?

**Dr Paul Dawson (Head of Research, MOPAC):** Yes, the challenge with OGRs is it just it is a will this person be reconvicted in the next one or two years? It is a yes/no. It does not discuss

how many times or how harmful that offence might be, just will they reoffend in the next one or two years.

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** Thank you.

**Marie Snelling (MOPAC):** Could you just go back to the Venn diagram? Which why this is really, really important and picks up multiple bits of the conversation here today. We have been lots of conversations with partners more broadly that going forward everyone seems to be saying we need to be looking at this blended approach.

So the high demand is typically your OGRS at the top so your acquisitives with obviously that low level violence that Paul [Dawson] has talked about that we need to also be looking at where are high harm offenders coming into that mix. Also how do we allow for local factors given that London is 32 boroughs that have very different offending populations in different boroughs. I think going forward we would like to explore how we do that so we do not end up with just an overview because we think that that has been useful to date but actually going forward there is probably a more sophisticated way of thinking about our persistent offending cohort.

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** I mean taking the stats on one step I wonder if there has been any further work done to really try to understand what is driving that increase. Particularly the top value with the malicious wounding which was the most significant increase. Equally, then understanding why there has been a decrease in the acquisitive offending and what might be driving those changes because we need to get under them so that (Overspeaking) absolutely that work is being done. I acknowledge it involves a wide range of people to really understand this. It is not a straightforward --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** It is definitely something we do need to get into the detail on and very important.

OK, thank you very much. I think we do need to, one, look at the detail at what is driving this and what the (Overspeaking) are. Then the two is just to have a look at whether there is an issue around the selections that are in the cohort and whether it is looking at that balance between violence by harm and volume to the extent that we would wish it to for what we are tackling in London.

Thank you. I was going to move on to the national picture in terms of now we have had the picture evidence and the analysis for London. I was wondering, Phil Douglas, if you could just outline for us what the Government position is on persistent reoffending and how you are trying to balance high volume and high harm violence, if that is what the direction of thinking is on that.

**Phil Douglas (Ministry of Justice):** Yes. It is a really welcome focus that we have got here. It is interesting that you have drawn out the balance between high harm and high volume.

I think what would be really interesting from what we saw before would be a further breakdown around domestic abuse, around substance abuse and around issues like cognitive skills and stuff like that. It would really be good to have that broken down.

I think on a national basis there is a growing recognition not just in the Ministry of Justice but across other Whitehall departments; Department for Health, CLG. When we talk about the high volume crime we are talking about a cohort of people who have complex needs, who generally are low harm, they are not violent, they live chaotic lives. We know quite a lot about these people because they are being in touch with the Authorities from the very beginning of their lives and they are still in touch now.

So there is a general discussion going on when we talk about trying to create an emphasis on community sentences rather than custodial sentences, that we need to treat that sector of people as a cohort nationally. I recently went up to the North East and I talked to a CRC there and they talked to me about 276 people that they had in their area who were responsible for a large amount of the low harm crime that is taking place in that area.

I think London, in some respects, is different because we have this spike in violent crime which is really, really difficult and really will take that balanced approach. The difficulty that we have got is how do we get stuff started to really make a difference on these different cohorts.

One of the things that we have put forward recently is the Female Offender Strategy with a much great focus on a kind of residential approach to female offenders. I think that is going to be also necessary when we look at this low harm cohort of persistent offenders.

I think the violent crime will require quite a different approach that is quite London specific.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** We have welcomed, and I do welcome the Female Offender Strategy and the Mayor is putting £5 million into female offenders in London compared to 2.5 nationally that the Government is putting in. For me, and I do not know whether this is something you want to elaborate on, or whether Jim [Barton] wants to, it is picking up that in London we do have an issue around persistent offending and violence. How that is going to be picked up and what learning we can have from other areas that are also seeing an increase in violence which is happening across the country. Whether that is also around persistent offending or there is something else going on, a part of it, and how that actually in concrete terms from the Government is shown through leadership but also from policy and how you are going to redesign the CRC contracts as well as work with the Metropolitan Police Service.

How is that actually going to manifest itself?

**Jim Barton (Ministry of Justice):** A couple of comments to amplify points Phil [Douglas] made. So persistent offending is an issue across the country, so we have seen a reduction in the binary rate of reoffending achieved across England and Wales with about two percentage points. So fewer people are reoffending than were two years ago but a substantial increase in the frequency rate of reoffending.

So for those who reoffend, on average how many further offences do they commit? That has gone up from more than three offences on average to more than four offences on average. So a 25 percentage point increase in frequency. So it is a recognised issue across England and Wales and something that we are very focused on trying to address in thinking through how we

design the next generation of probation delivery structures, both CRC contracts and arrangements for the Metropolitan Police Service.

In terms of how we do that in London; so I think just a week ago we had a session here co-hosted with MOPAC to start a discussion with all local partners in London about how we build into our thinking about the design of future probation structures in London. Those factors that are particular to London and the communities that you serve and the offenders, service users that you support here.

So for us we are incredibly open to a discussion about differential need in London and how we reflect that in the design of contracted probation provision and the services that the National Probation Service produce and deliver in the future. So we are open to that discussion, today is a helpful means, I think, of carrying that discussion on.

Sorry, Sophie [Linden], just one more point perhaps; which is we are interested in teasing out in London and across the country as well whether we need to take a more tailored approach to prolific offenders more generally within the contracts. Learning lessons from integrated offender management, both the highlights and lowlights, I think. Generalising; not a specific contract, a comment on London, but I think we have perhaps seen some kind of diminution of focus on integrated offender management in parts of the country in the last few years. We are interested using the lens of starting to design next generation probation structures on whether there are specific areas of focus that we might want to use to re-energise IOM across the country including in London.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** We absolutely would welcome that and with the conversations we are having through the Memorandum of Understanding. That is great but the contracts are not going to be re-let until 2020 and we have 18 or 24 months, if it all goes to plan, where we have still got a significant problem with persistent offending either high volume or high harm, violence. For me it is also how is the Ministry of Justice and the Business Service as well, how are you actually prioritising that and focusing on that in the meantime and getting the CRC and working with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to really look and focus on this? It is going to have an impact right up to 2020.

**Jim Barton (Ministry of Justice):** Sure, I mean Gabriel [Amahwe] may want to comment from a London CRC perspective but from our perspective if there is a coalition, if they are willing around the need to focus specifically on cohorts of offenders today, that can both help inform the design of next generation contracts and help focus activity in the interim.

So it is not, from our perspective, a discussion around nothing can happen until 2020 but of course that is in our mind's eye because a clearer opportunity to really reset contracts from that point forward.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I just wondered, Ian, in terms of the prisons and what is happening in the prisons and you are focusing in the work that you are doing with prisoners to enable them to, when they do go through the gate, not to be reoffending.

**Ian Porée (HMPPS):** Yes, I completely support Jim's [Barton] point which is we do not need to wait until 2020. There are enough people around this table who have responsibility for the various parts of the system that we can together focus our resource and effort and priorities.

We need to always remember when looking at the reoffending data that it is only proven reoffending data. It is not the actual reoffending happening across the country. What we have seen is there is a strong correlation between how limited police resource gets focused and that correlates to what proven reoffending comes through the system. Quite rightly police continue to focus on serious crime and high harm crime.

So there is a correlation there that we just need to remember this is not the actual offending across the country. This is proven reoffending in our data and that is what we are looking at.

We have made a commitment to increase an investment in the Through the Gate Service exactly as you said, which is the model that has been running for the last few years has not met our expectations in terms of the level of support individuals get in preparing for and on release from custody.

So that Through the Gate model, we have put an additional £22 million a year, and that is a national number, into the system. Now that will take some time to get implemented and all CRCs are in the process of working through those implementation plans.

Effectively what that is going to do is just enhance the level of service delivered at each of the resettlement prisons. Of course that will include the resettlement prisons that release people into London. There is an opportunity to work on how do we prioritise that additional resource in line with the needs of London and the requirements for London. We have some scope to prioritise that on particular things. I hope we are having those discussions and talking how best to do that.

So I do not want to say that amount of investment kind of fixes something. It is a limited amount of investment and it will be spread nationally. Of course London still represents a big proportion of our total system in terms of the volume of people. Therefore, those services can be tuned to the particular requirements of London.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** In terms of those two, the volume that London represents in terms of service users compared to the actual slice of that £22 million, I do not know much is coming to London and what that might be spent on. What does that look like? When I look at crime statistics and victim services and London victims, there is a mismatch. London does not get its fair share. What are the figures like for London in terms of offenders and then the money from the £22 million?

**Ian Porée (HMPPS):** Yes, the money largely was apportioned proportionally to the volume of work so it would match. That is not to say that it is in proportion to the mix of cases in London. So I am not saying it was corrected as sophisticatedly as more money for higher harm offences but as a basic allocation that it was allocated on, the kind of volume of work that CRCs have got which effectively is measured on the number of people being released from custody back into the community. So that is how the money was divided up.

So in that sense it will be proportionate to the volume of work in London. How that is spent; we obviously have requirements that we put on that money that we expect to see an enhancement of the service that is available. It is for practical things that you would expect it to be in supporting individuals in terms of their release into accommodation, getting people into some kind of other skills or employment. Then of course making the connections effectively to health provision, whether that is substance misuse support or mental health provision.

So it is prioritised against those requirements but because it is additional investment going in on top of the existing delivery there is the opportunity to adjust the particular priorities for each resettlement prison. That should be discussions we should be having with yourselves in London. I am not going to for a minute pretend that that is enough resource to completely fix the entire problem. It gives us a chance to improve the quality of release planning.

Gabriel [Amahwe] will have a more accurate feel for this but there is unquestionably still the underlying problem and London is no exception that the availability of suitable accommodation is still challenging. That means that in a very practical sense even with people really committed, working very hard, that does not mean everyone getting released actually goes into suitable accommodation because they do not.

Of course, when they do not there is this kind of cycle that shows up in our data which is they are back in the system very quickly as prolific reoffenders.

So the national picture compared to London is we have significantly few individuals but significantly higher re-offences per individual as Jim [Barton] said. So there is something going on about this cohort which is they appear from the data to be even more prolific than they were a few years ago. We have not seemed to have found a way to slow them down markedly. So whatever multi-agency group we need to apply that may just be the evidence of complicated, chaotic lives and we have not provided the support those individuals need to help them get out of those cycles.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you very much. I will come on to you, Gabriel [Amahwe], in terms of the CRC but I think it would be really helpful if we could just agree for that, whatever slice it is of £22 million that is coming to London, that we can have a small working group. The working group would look at what the best use of that is, to work with you, Gabriel [Amahwe], and the CRC to actually ensure that people understanding there is some transparency around that investment and it is going on the types of services that will really make the difference.

I think ourselves, and I am sure London boroughs, would have quite a large and useful input into that. Would that be OK?

**Ian Porée (HMPPS):** That is actually no problem. We should sit down and talk that through. We should include Kilvinder Vigurs in the National Probation Service as well because their high harm individuals are generally coming through that kind of route. We should be looking at how that is working as well to make sure we have got a holistic picture.

You may miss some of those really high harm individuals if you are just looking at the CLC delivery because the NPS are managing those cases.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Yes, fair point, yes. OK, thank you very much.

So that is the national picture. If we could just move on to the delivery in London. I think it would be really helpful if David [Huie], you might be able to give us an understanding of your own experience and your understanding of what worked well and what did not work well. What, if you were designing a system, you might put in. Would that be OK? Thank you.

**David Huie (Service User Representative):** OK, first I just want to add what the gentleman was saying about what he thinks is contributing to reoffending.

From my experience inside prison there is not a lot of skilled work that we can do. I have been in prison since 2010 and I remember upon my first year in prison I tried to get into every education there was. About two years down the line, I am not conversant with the funding and all that, but everything was cut. There was only entry level and level one, prior to that you could get level three qualifications in the skills that included plastering, welding; various skills that could help us upon release.

However, that was cut. Some of the skills, they were abundant, and what was remaining, the few that were remaining you only get like entry level and level one. For an inmate getting released into the community it is bad enough being branded a convict, still there is not any job that will hire us.

So, it is good, it would be good to get skilled upon release. While attending probation we could be studying, getting skilled, so as to set up even our own business. I personally think that the majority of crimes other than the ones that I consider ignominious crimes like rape and murder and all that, most crimes are for financial gains.

So, if inmates could get like, as I said, skilled to set up their own business and such and such then I think that could reduce reoffending a lot.

Also, for me I also think that mentoring, there are young men who are entrenched into gangs. They do not want to hear or have someone that is not quite equipped or skilled or even inexperienced into gangs to giving them advice. So I also think that would help for past gang members having groups at Probation Offices mentoring these young boys. I think that would also help into reducing reoffending.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Brilliant, thank you very much. In terms of your own experience were you offered a mentor? In terms of your experience with CRC?

**David Huie (Service User Representative):** No. I was not offered one. I personally would love to do mentoring. I have enquired about it all through my sentence but due to immigration status I was not able to pursue it. I was prohibited from doing it and even while I am released I am prohibited from working, studying, whether it is voluntary or involuntary.

I think mentoring would do a lot for a lot of young men because certainly for myself young people seem to listen to me a lot. I can persuade and coax them into get out of certain crime because there is only place it is going to lead.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What about this issue about accommodation that Ian [Porée] raised around Housing? The issue about where do people go once they leave prison and where do they live? My understanding is that critical moment is actually as soon as you leave prison is having somewhere that you are going to be able to stay in.

Is that an issue for you or for any of the people that you --?

**David Huie, (Service User Representative):** No, it is not an issue for me but I have got friends also who have been inside that it is a big issue for them. We do quarterly forums at my Probation Office and the majority of the inmates that attend the forums, that is one of the main problems about Housing.

Even gang members are stating that they would like to get out of their gangs but it is only because they are upon release they are put back into that same community. It is like they do not want to seem soft as they say, "I am not going to be involved in this gang anymore".

It is like they are coerced into staying in the gang because they are in that same community that were away from when they were in prison.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you. Thanks ever so much, that is really helpful.

Zina [Etheridge], I just wondered if you wanted to pick up on any of that in terms of your own borough or London councils in general, around not just Housing, but skills. Local councils do play such a vital part in that relationship with CRC or the Metropolitan Police Service, and know what the key issues are for you.

**Zina Etheridge (Chief Executive Officer, Haringey Council):** Yes, so I wanted to make a couple of general points. Firstly, right back to what you said at the beginning, Sophie [Linden], about us really needing to refocus on tackling persistent offenders. I slightly worry that in all of the very welcome focus on youth violence we might lose sight of this cohort which actually local for us is one of the cohorts that is actually really driving violence because our knife crime rates of under 25s have been dropping. So it is actually the older offenders who are more problematic locally.

On your point about balance of high harm and high volume, I think we have to find a way, absolutely, to do both. High harm for really obvious reasons, high volume; because it actually has quite high harms for our community, for their sense of wellbeing, for their sense of place, for their sense of being safe in the place they live. That has all sorts of wider ramifications, it has wider economic ramifications for our local businesses, so kind of absolutely has to be both.

It was really, really helpful to hear David's [Huie] experiences particularly on the skill side. Locally we know that our most persistent reoffenders, in common with everybody else's, are

those are sentenced to short sentences. So actually even those interventions that might happen in prisons on the education and skill side are unlikely to be very effective just because there simply is not time to do it. Then for whatever reason there does not seem to be a way of getting people into skills and training when they leave and sticking with that.

Our local college has just started offering free adult learning and training up to level two for anybody. So the Government funding changes made it possible for them to offer that free for anybody who was on a salary of less than about £15,000. They have opened it up to everybody and found that actually they can do that at no net extra cost. I just wonder if there are some things that we might explore in some of that cross-over with the Government funding changes.

On Housing, we are locally starting to explore a Making Every Adult Matter approach which quite a lot of local Authorities are looking into. It has a set of principles to just try to get underneath this real complexity that people find if they are being bunked around lots of different systems.

One of the key principles is that there is no wrong front door. So anywhere anybody turns up in the system that individual should know where to send people on, where to refer them, how to work with them. That does need for reoffenders a really strong and active intervention involvements from CRC and Probation, rather than just as a passive watching it.

Then finally I think, on Housing certainly for quite a lot of that cohort, we need to be looking at supported Housing routes rather than just kind of general needs Housing. Actually helping people sustain tenancies is really important in that wider bundle.

Then finally I think, there is a specific issue about some cohorts. I am just talking about particular cohorts, so we are again it is a multi-borough programme, part of the Wiser programme. It is focused on women who have a really complex history of reoffending, sex work, substance misuse, quite often domestic violence in that mix. So some of those very specific programmes to tackle some of those quite high harm, high self-harm often cohorts are also important.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** When you talk about refocus, in terms of that you have just outlined Housing, skills and some of the work that you want; what do you mean in terms of the MPS and the CRC when you are talking about refocus? What is it in terms of next 18 months and then the contracts, what would you as a local Authority, want to be seeing come out of that?

**Zina Etheridge (Chief Executive Officer, Haringey Council):** Locally I would like to see the CRC in particular, because of the contract issue inevitably when you have only got 18 months, two years left on a contract, it becomes quite difficult to absolutely focus as hard as you did when you were starting off on the outcomes that you were delivering. So an absolute restatement of a commitment to focus on tackling reoffending.

So CRC as we all know has had some difficulties and we have seen some welcome re-engagement over the last few months and that is really great. I absolutely want to see that continuing and absolutely agreeing what are the things that we are going to do in the next 18 months to get underneath this problem.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What is that going to be then? Zina [Etheridge] has asked an absolute commitment in the next 18 months and then for the next 18 months what that might look like. I know it is different, you are not under the contract conditions, we will come on to the CRC, but what would that look like in terms of balancing high harm and high volume?

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** I think there is already a commitment from the NPS about managing high risk harm offenders. We are working very closely with partners around the table both at Committee Safety Partnership level, through MAPA, through Housing provision etc. and I know that, although I cannot go into major detail, we have just negotiated a Housing contract for NPS, London about how we are going to support the boroughs where we have had maybe issues around re-housing and trying to procure services.

So that is a positive move for us over the next 12 to 18 months moving forward. I guess really on behalf of (inaudible) just reinstating our commitment to obviously managing high risk harm offenders on this cohort.

It is very much the feedback I have had from Carina Heckroodt who is the lead now, is that we are looking at the gangs, the knife, the violence. We are very much welcoming the review and refresh of the cohort in terms of them being able to provide provision for the high risk of harm offenders.

There is an acknowledgement that the CRC have a number at the moment of higher volumes than us, we have got less. There is not always necessarily the provision there for us. We are very eager to review that.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What does that mean about police sentence reports? You need a baseline and an understanding of the needs and so do the sentences. In terms of --

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** In terms of Highbury Corner and Thames Magistrates' Court.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you. In terms of Highbury Corner there were Police sentencing reports that is likely to come to an end really soon or is coming to. Are you going to maintain that investment?

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** Well what we can say from Gripping The Offender (GTO) etc is that there has been a better identification of persistent offenders at both of those of courts. The timeliness has improved at those courts in terms of how we turn around from the point of when there is the first appearance to when individuals are sentenced.

We obviously need to move towards a position where we do not have specific staff from the project, so to speak, at the courts but we actually move that into the court teams in terms of how we liaise with the MPS moving forward to maintain the consistent and improved response with PSRs.

My understanding is that between February 2016 and January 2018 we saw 2,944 offenders at Highbury Corner and Thames Magistrates' Court predominantly male, 35 years on average. I believe that around 19% of that cohort ended up having pre-sentence reports as a result of the identification process.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I think it has been the pre-sentence reports and I have no argument with whatsoever. My question is how is that going to be continued because it has been successful, it has been useful. In terms of the offender it is that element that has been seen to be make a difference. You may not be a position now but that is absolutely what we are asking of the NPS, is to maintain those pre-sentencing reports.

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** Entirely, and it is obviously something that my colleague, Kate Gilbert, she is the stakeholder engagement. She is the Head who covers the courts, this is something she is aware of and it is a discussion she has had with Carina Heckroodt and Kilvinder Vigurs about actually how do we move forward and maintain that. It will certainly be something that I take back out of the meeting today that I feed back.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, we are looking for commitment to maintain.

**Stuart Webber (NPS, London Division):** Yes, and it is completely because we have seen the benefits of it.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, thank you. Gabriel [Amahwe], what about your own CRC and what it is going to be doing in the next 18 months and then onwards, if you do win the contracts at competitive tendering? What investment are you going to be putting in the next two years?

**Gabriel Amahwe (London Community Rehabilitation Company):** Sophie [Linden], I am going to act as a politician, not answer the question directly.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I am not having that, I answer questions!

**Gabriel Amahwe (London Community Rehabilitation Company):** I think I just wanted to point out I became the interim London Director of Probation at CRC in the middle of July. I just wanted to reiterate, yes, we have got kind of the 18 months and the point that was made around things probably start to tail off rather than intensify.

I think for me and for London CRC it is a point about actually we are not taking our foot off of the gas pedal in terms of the work we are doing around London CRC. I am not going to pretend, there have been challenges and difficulties in terms of some of the standard and the work we want to deliver across London and also in terms of our engagement with our key partners in the community.

So, for me with my experience in probation, I know what makes probation work. I have always said there is no one walks into a Probation Office and gets killed like you probably walk into an A&E(?)

A lot of the work you need to do to make people stop reoffending are mostly in the community. So, for me engaging the community but engaging it very proactively in terms of bringing to the table our own expertise. Around 33,000 people who work within London, roughly about 12,000 of them commit violent offences and about 4,000 of them are actually DV (inaudible).

So, from a CRC we cannot afford to take our foot off the pedal because of the impact this large proportion of offenders in London can have if we do that. I wanted to make that point.

Secondly, critically for me I have been very clear about some of the things we need to do. So engaging partners proactively, looking at areas where we can work collective together and look at what sort of investment we can do to make that happen. It is absolutely important for me in terms of how we work with the profile or cohorts of offenders we are describing here.

Secondly, I think for me it is that research, research around what the London CRC is about. I am making that very clear in my organisation which is we are about three things. One is making people less likely to reoffend. That has to be the day-to-day objective of my staff across London.

How we do that, we have talked about interventions, we have talked working with our partners. It is absolutely critical that we do that.

The second one for me is around how we minimise the harm. So the first bit is about that volume we are talking about, Sophie [Linden]. The second one is around the harm bit. About 30-odd% of our case load, they are DV or other violence, or safeguarding children that are linked to them with some of the gang lifestyle that we have talked about here.

So, how we do that in terms of managing those harms. For me, one of the things we have not done is we do not have a better visibility of what this group looks like in the CRC. So I want to start to think about how as a whole system solution and not just as a single agency, how do we as a whole system solution begin to address and work with these cases, understand them very well, identify them, where we have a common identification and criteria of this group, just as we do with MAPA.

So, bringing in that MAPA experience in how we start to really identify collectively this group so we do not have them. I think as a single agency we can start to do that work across those 33,000 cases.

The second thing is I am aware that in probation sometimes a lot of the work we do can be quite routine in terms of the various interventions. I want us to get to a place in the next 18 months where we have better visibility of what this cohort or profile of the high volume and indeed the high harm, what they look like in our books but also be very clear about what the solution package looks like.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you, I think it is really good to hear the words 'reset' and 'commitment' and 'better visibility'. I think what we

are really looking for, and we have had this discussion already when we met, is some really concrete specific commitments around what that looks like. I certainly have from MOPAC in previous discussions with the CRC, we have had discussions around London Gang Exit. I am sure there are partners around the table who have specifics.

I will not press you now but it is, from here, to really get some specific commitments about what that looks like because we are in the territory of the next 18 months are going to make a critical difference in London. The violence on the streets and the reoffending is increasing and it really is impacting our communities. We have been asking for a number of years for this research so I really, really welcome that but it is about what are the specifics around that?

**Gabriel Amahwe (London Community Rehabilitation Company):** So some of the specifics and some of that, so some of the women provision; we will carry on our investment in supporting that. Secondly, I think some of the local programmes such as the Safer(?) Street branch, so our contribution in terms of part of that development of that activity.

Also, not necessarily just in part, where we need to make investment, even it is in terms of resources, what I see in terms of personnel. Otherwise I am absolutely open to have this conversation with key partners.

So, just the last thing for me, I said three things and again doing the politician thing I have got to make my point. The third one for me --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** You are not endearing yourself to me!

**Gabriel Amahwe (London Community Rehabilitation Company):** The third one is implementing the sentence of the courts and for us that is absolutely important and I think Stuart was talking about that. We know centres of confidence is not where want it to be. We also know that in terms of reducing reoffending, turning people's lives around, community sentences have got to be effective. They will only be effective if we are implementing those sentences absolutely spot on and making sure that data information is available to the courts and yourself to see that that is happening. That is how we can increase centres of confidence and make sure we use more community sentences.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, and we are taking up those issues around community sentences via the work that we are doing around violence and knife crime. I think that is really helpful and really important.

Just moving on in terms of for Louise [Spencer] for prisons and how you are coping and what you are looking for from CRC. It would be really interesting to find out from Andy Downs as well from PACT and yourself, Dee [Anand], from Together. We hear 'increased investment, reset'.

What would help you in terms of what you are dealing with in the prisons and your inmates going out through the gate?

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** I just want to talk a little bit about violence. Coming back to the earlier slides because what we were seeing around violence in our cohort communities as most people will know is being replicated in what we have seen in prisons in the last few years. Particularly driven by drugs NPS specifically and the links that that has had with illicit economy.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Illicit what? Sorry?

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** So, an increase in illicit economy, so debt and how that links with increasing levels of NPS (Spice, a drug as it is currently known) which has been a new threat and risk for us in prisons. That has happened at the same time that we saw a downturn in the number of Prison Officer numbers.

So some of the problems for us, particularly around being able to give prisoners access to a decent regime actually that might help them reduce reoffending. That has impacted on the CRC actually because not in all of our London prisons have we been able to get prisoners to engage and act with the CRC just because physically we have not always had enough staff to do that.

We are coming through that now. I mean all the London prisons are now at a point where they are fully staffed with Prison Officers although not all of those staff are yet in prisons because they are still training. Of course it is going to take them time to become fully effective and confident Prison Officers because it is not a straightforward role.

So we are particularly looking at rolling out key workers. People might have heard of Offender Management Custody, which is the additional commitment of Prison Officers. So every Prison Officer in a London prison and in fact across the whole of State, will be a key worker.

Brixton, one of my six prisons, has fully implemented key work already. So every prisoner there has a Prison Officer who supports him on a day-to-day basis with his individual needs.

The next stage of that, which will be 2019 and beyond, is the Phase Two, which is the link to probation on the case management. So managing men and building that link to the community service.

Just picking up on David's [Huie] point about his experience with education. There was a shift a few years ago around a focus on core curriculum issues. I think particularly because four of my six prisons are local, they do tend to focus on that entry level literacy and numeracy issues. Although Governors will now have flexibility to be able to look at more advanced or more flexible learning skills opportunity.

In terms of the CRC, so I am really focused on what we can do to build those links between the CRC so that we make sure we do our bit as a Prison Service, as my local prisons, to get men to access the CRCs. It is a shared understanding. I am due to meet with senior CRC colleagues in the next couple of weeks at Wormwood Scrubs where we have had particular issues with CRC provision to really work together to see how we can tackle problems on both sides.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, in terms of the looking at the going back to that balance between high harm and violence. I keep calling it

high harm but violence – and high volume, how is that playing out in terms of what you have just described?

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** Yes, so I think it is really interesting, and I have made a few notes for myself to follow up on that. I have been reflecting on whether the men who cause the most harm to others in our establishments are also the men who then continue to cause the highest harm. So would they be those men who are showing up in that cohort that we have looked at.

We are not good enough yet and we are improving but we are not good enough at understanding who is in our establishments. We have just rolled out a diagnostic tool which for every man in custody will give them what is called a VIPER score about the likelihood they are causing harms to others.

We are looking at that across London so we understand where are those men and how can we make sure and target our attention and our resources on those men in our London prisons. Then we need to do more actually about developing that and make sure that they are linked into the right resources. I do not know, sat here, and I am going to follow that up about whether the match is because you are causing violence in custody, are you also continuing to cause violence in the future.

I suspect or would think that would be the same but I am not sure we have yet got the evidence and the data to be able to prove it or not.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** We have a commitment to work, and we are, working with the Ministry of Justice around the Prison Pathfinder and --

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** Yes.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** -- ISIS. It would be really good to see what we can do, specific commitment there. We are beginning to build on that and how that might fit in with looking at that violence and that balance around persistent offending.

**Louise Spencer (HMPPS):** I am really excited about the Pathfinder ISIS, partly because ISIS is one of our prisons that has shown a sharp increase in violence and it tends to hold a cohort of younger men as well.

I know Emily Thomas who is the Governor there has been working closely with MOPAC too. They designed the model to roll out in 2019. You also might be aware it is one of the Minister's ten priority prisons as well. So they are getting some additional funding around particularly around decency issues so we need just make sure they tie up together.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Fit together, OK, that would be really helpful if we can take that.

What about yourselves from PACT and from Catch 22 and Together in terms of your experiences of delivering services to offenders, how this is playing out in terms of short term sentences, persistent offending?

**Andy Keen-Down (PACT):** I suppose nationally under transforming rehabilitation has been a lot unnecessary complexity around the split between NPS and the CRCs and the rate card system. So the kind of internal market has been created for agencies like ourselves to do front line work, it does not work.

So in most parts of the country we struggle to engage with people who under NPS supervision because of the way the contracts are built. So I suppose that would be a plea, not only for London but nationally, that that is looked at because it prevents many agencies such as PACT from delivering the kind of services to NPS clients that we know could make a difference.

I think looking at issues around Housing and mentoring and all the things we know have an effect on desistance; I suppose the other key point that you would expect us to make is that family relationships, social networks, matter profoundly. We know that people who have regular family contact during custody are about 39% less likely to be reconvicted. I am taking Ian's [Porée] point about the difference between reoffending rates and proving reoffending rates.

We know there is about a 39% difference and yet that evidence base has not really been fully exploited in terms of commissioning or thinking around how we do rehabilitation, how we do resettlement.

We know from the joint thematic inspection reports from HMI Prison, HMI Probation and Ofsted that in terms of education training outcomes, in terms of accommodation outcomes the single most important agency for somebody in custody in terms of their resettlement is their own family.

Yet we have very limited support for family members whether they be the single parent or kind of nuclear family or extended family. There is very little support in the system for those family members to cope themselves with the impact of being dragged through the justice system and the trauma that is often caused to them and the support that they can then offer to people coming out of custody and people in and out of custody.

I mean as Louise [Spencer] was saying I was reflecting on whether in terms of the Venn diagrams whether they are different people. Whether the high harm people and the high volume people are different people or actually, you know, the level of that overlap I am not clear about.

Longer term, I would be really interested in research around family structures, in parenting competence with regard to those different groups to understand that better.

We did do a lot of Through the Gate mentoring prior to TR. We were named in the original contract but then we did not have the opportunity to become a provider which was disappointing for us. We do think Through the Gate mentoring is crucial particularly for those who do not have good family contacts.

I think the other point I would like to make is around the Government's Employment and Training Strategy. There has been lots of really good positive rhetoric about the use of release on temporary licence as a kind of gateway for people towards employment.

We have a high support ROTL programme we run so that people who are nearly employable but not quite can have a period of time with a placement with us where they get ready for the world

of work. It is very successful but I think there is a piece of work to be done around how we can support and equip prisons around doing Wattle because actually with the churn of staff many prisons have lost the habit and have lost some of their skills around that. Also, how do we incentivise employers around that, I think that is really critical.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That is something that we certainly should be looking at from City Hall. I know the Deputy Mayor, Jules Pipe, is looking at those skills and opportunities and reoffending is in there in terms of that Strategy.

Peter [Jones] and Dee [Anand], did you want to add to that in terms of some of the similar experiences in terms of the work that you are doing?

**Peter Jones (Catch 22):** We operate in a very similar landscape. It is very challenging within the current schedule to deliver services as either we would like to or indeed we used to.

An example of that is obviously the current Through the Gate services. We did deliver Pathfinder services in HMP Doncaster as part of the Through the Gate Pathfinder pilot. Much of our success was actually working Through the Gate, delivering that mentorship, actually working within the first three months when we know that 70% of reoffending ordinarily takes place.

It is delivering that enhanced suite of services particularly amongst the more chaotic groups that do not have accommodation, that have been in very short sentence, have not had the full opportunity to engage with full resettlement package. Your point earlier those within that group that have learning needs and mental health issues and are very complex and chaotic.

The current solution that is around that group of offenders, the Offender Rehabilitation Act which mandates a period licensing supervision and has increased a large number of recalls back to custody. Who knew?

Obviously that was going to happen but our ability to be able to engage them with groups in the way that we would like to is very much constrained by the current schedule of delivery.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What do you mean by the current schedule of delivery? In terms of picking the specifics out around what would make apart from extra money. I always say that is part of the case is funding; apart from that, what would make both your jobs in terms of delivery of services to persistent offenders to enable them to stop offending? What would make the difference?

**Peter Jones (Catch 22):** Having the flexibility to deliver services in the ways that the needs present. For example, one of our pilots in HMP Brinsford, we have an MoJ pilot working specifically working with gang nominals. Part of that is that we are working with them on a one-to-one basis, conflict resolution, mediation for example. We have also got a Gang Exit programme.

We have linked that with our Wolverhampton Youth Gang Violence service which is PCC funded in the community, because that prison releases the youngest men to that area. So we have

created those links not through any national commissioning of any CRC money, but actually through other pockets.

I guess it is having the flexibility and a lot of this comes back to commissioning and then sensible commissioning. Looking at the new regulations, probably contract regulations like Touch Pecune(?). Let us commission this flexibly in a way that --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** We are going to come on to commissioning because I think that is really important.

Sorry, we are going to run out of time.

**Peter Jones (Catch 22):** Can I just make one last point?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Just one last one.

**Peter Jones (Catch 22):** We talk about the next two years, I think you are absolutely right on your point, we need to make the best use of the next two years. What I would like to see is many young men and women and short sentence offenders and people with mental health not actually coming to prison.

I would like to see alternatives to prosecution, alternatives to custody and I would like to see more flexible use of community sentence. A total overhaul of the rehabilitation activity requirements that are actually tailored.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you, that is really helpful. In terms of the specifics around what would make your life easier, not your life, but your work more successful?

**Dee Anand (Together for Mental Wellbeing):** Yes, I guess in the first instance, if I may, I think it is very gratifying to hear the commitment and the restatement of commitment from various parties around the table today.

What is more welcome is your guidance that we are looking for specifics today because certainly our experience is not that services have restated their commitment and back to that with available resources and funding. Certainly our experience is that genuine policy declaration and availability of funding do not always match.

For those around the table who are not familiar with us, we are a mental health charity and we provide a forensic mental health service to the Persistent Offender Programme which was formerly known as the Gripping the Offender Programme.

The issues that we found in the cohort that we work with are that they are obviously notoriously difficult to engage. We have operated across a risk and need dynamic that has sought to understand the influence and variables that are both internal and external that contribute to poor engagement and repeated offending behaviour.

This means that we have had to include a psychological and psycho-social element to the service that we provide as well as understanding the more external aspects such as Housing and substance misuse, peer engagement and so on.

The problems that we have found are that, and the specifics around that, are that while our service has been able to support some of these very difficult to engage individuals and we have been able to have a degree in the funding model that we have had, that allows us to for example offer multiple appoints to those who might not attend to reach out more proactively in areas such as drop in centres where we can try to engage those difficult to engage offenders.

What we found is that other resources and other referral sources are not as flexible as that. So they will have a criterion for example that says, 'we will not take someone if they do not attend for two sessions in a row' or we cannot access particular services because of the complex needs. We have all talked about the complex needs of this cohort. We will not provide support to this complex needs individual because they are a drug user and they have a mental health problem and one supersedes the other.

Our service has sought to try to bridge that gap and provide a very important and I think very key element of mental health input that helps to bridge that gap for this very difficult to engage cohort.

The sad thing is of course that the funding for our project ends in September this year and so the needs of this cohort do not disappear over the next 18 months as we have discussed here but the source of support that they could have availed themselves of has disappeared, or will disappear.

This is true and I echo Andy's [Keen-Downs] point there about the problems with the rate card and the NPS system. Together, as an organisation has supplied a partnership mental health input to Probation Services in London in excess of 25 years. We have developed very close partnerships with NHS Trusts, NHS England and Probation Services in London.

The NPS service and the mental health inputs the NPS service has also had its funding cut and so that service will end as well.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** We know funding is an issue and we are always going to be lobbying for more funding. Sorry, I am going to have to ask you to wrap up.

**Dee Anand (Together for Mental Wellbeing):** Sorry yes, just to wrap up. So those around those specifics it is about gaining access flexibility to services and trying to ring fence some funding for a high need cohort.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thank you, that is really helpful. Laurence, in terms of the MPS and your focus on offender management, many people around the room will know that there is a new business model now for the Metropolitan Police Service.

How are you factoring in and working with that balance between high volume and high harm for persistent offending?

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** Yes, so without wishing to repeat a lot of what has been said I think we would definitely like a great focus on harm and how we measure that.

I think as well I would like to have a wider view of how we demonstrate effective outcomes. So we talk a lot about reoffending which is quite a binary measure. I would like to understand what the harm reduction is around some of our cohorts as well. So not just whether they reoffend but also the level of harm that is being committed because there can be some positive outcomes there as well.

We have done a review of all 32 of our borough units. It will surprise you not that we do not have complete consistency across London. There are pockets of good practice, there are pockets where it is not so strong. Within our new model we are moving to 12 command units which will help build some of that consistency. We have appointed 12 Detective Chief Inspectors to lead on Integrated Offender Management across each of those BCUs. So we have got a relatively senior officer who will be driving some of the activity around that.

We have also got a central team reviewing our strategic framework, looking at those cohorts of individuals. As I say historically we have looked at serious acquisitive crime. I think there is a clear need to review those cohorts.

We talk a lot about violence and I think I would plea that violence is not just about gangs as well and domestic violence, I think, is really important. Particularly pertinent within domestic violence is if an offender comes to us because they are prolific they are probably way more prolific than the point they come to us and they will have been offending for a much longer time. So, we would like that focus.

I suppose my final plea is around that strategic clarity in that what is it we are trying to achieve? The Venn diagram is great. There is a risk of having your cake and eating it and trying to do everything. So how do we manage that balance between the volume that may be important in some areas, the high harm in others. How do we then look at that outcome using some different measures like the Cambridge Harm Index, ONS Severity Scores, so that we can really understand the impact that we are having on the outcomes that we want to achieve.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I think that is really helpful in terms of actually that harm reduction as well, not just around specific scores on reoffending but what that means around harm reduction.

I take your point around not wanting to have your cake and eat it, but hey, I am a politician. I do want to have my cake and eat it.

I think there is going to be a balance but we cannot get into what I think happened in the previous administration which was to only focus on certain things and not focus on the high harm as well. We have to be able to balance it. It is a real trick to pull off, I know.

**DAC Laurence Taylor (Metropolitan Police Service):** It is about having that flexible model so the teams who are delivering this on the ground know what is required of them. Then the different interventions and diversionary tactics and all the stuff that has been discussed so we have got a much more flexible approach.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Yes OK, thank you. I am sorry, we are slightly running over. If we might just move onto co-commissioning and actually picking up on your point around commissioning. It would be really good to have some input from the health colleagues as well as yourself, Melanie [Smith] from Brent in terms of public health.

I know there are lots of other priorities, it is very similar probably with different topics but lots of other priorities, but how in health and also in public health in particular from a local level do you focus on persistent offending? That those needs of the persistent offender, whether it is high harm or volume, are being picked up?

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** I think it is important to clarify like our Probation colleagues, health can often be deemed under one umbrella. Within the NPS and CRCs have very distinct roles I guess in NHS world as well. We are, as you all know, it is a very complex organisation.

What I have responsibility for is commissioning of Health Care Services within secure and detained settings. So that is within our London prisons, within our Immigration Removal Centres, our Sexual Assault Referral Centres and all our police stations and courts and police stations across the three Police Forces in London which is known as Liaison Diversion Services.

The point around understanding sensible commissioning, we do not therefore then have responsibility for commissioning the Community Services and what happens to people when they leave our establishments, which is a real challenge in the way services are organised.

I think that was just the first point I wanted to raise, but also I think when we talk about Health and we are asking Health of something it is articulating, 'who are we asking in Health'? So are we talking about access, are we talking experiences at A&E, are we talking about our GPs? Are we talking about acute care? Are we talking about Clinical Substance Misuse Services? Are we talking about Mental Health Services?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I am sorry if it is not your area, it might be something that Melanie [Smith] might be able to pick up, but in relation to offenders getting access to Health Services, how is that picked up? I know it is an issue around people leaving prison, not being registered with a GP, not being able to get Mental Health Services. How is that picked up in terms of ...? I am not sure if it is your service as you have just described?

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** So we will offer obviously a comprehensive Health Service in prison for people whether they have got a persistent offending background or not. Obviously there are people who might have a persistent offending and high harm profile who would not necessarily fall under the remit of a Mental Health Service for various reasons. It might be deemed that that is not the service that is right for them.

So we do provide comprehensive offer within the prison system and then within the community. Of course we are more focused on identifying vulnerability and mental health problems regardless of the offence in our police stations and courts whether together are being provided --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Sorry, I am still struggling, so you are describing the services within the prison. When they leave the prison they just go into the general population and there is no specific support?

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** Yes, and that is the challenge around what we were saying around the commissioning arrangements is that it then falls to Local Authorities and CCG commissioning responsibility for commissioning services for offenders in the community.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, thank you. Would you be able to --?

**Melanie Smith (Brent Council):** Yes, I mean I think as Sinead just said the health system has become fragmented and that has been a challenge for all of us.

We have heard many of the issues that I would recognise identified and the fact that we tend to approach this cohort through a service perspective rather than through a Service User perspective is a challenge.

I think that the increasing focus on integration through the Strategic and Transformation Plans STPs is potentially a way of addressing this because it gives us some structural --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Sorry, you will have to explain what that is to me.

**Melanie Smith (Brent Council):** Strategic and Transformation Plans which represent a coming together of both Health Commissioners and Health Providers, Social Care and Health Commissioners.

I think that if we can engage the STPs in attention to this cohort we may have a way forward which is more joined up than we currently have.

I would reference the work that has been done through the Healthy London Partnership where they have made a step change in response to particularly universal services to people experiencing homelessness. I think we could learn some lessons there particularly in terms of the difficulty in engaging general practice. With that access to that universal service this cohort will miss out on the services which are available.

I think there are pockets of very good services. The problem is we do not talk to each other and do not join up around the Service User.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Is that more difficult to do from ... I assume it is in terms of you are Director of Public Health in Brent, is there

something that needs to be taken up with NHS England? Or is an issue for the Department for Health? How do you influence that as a Director of Public Health?

**Melanie Smith (Brent Council):** I think increasingly we are seeing the role of Local Authorities in the STP as a way of being able to influence Health Service commissioning and provision. I would suggest that that is a useful dialogue to have with the five STP leads across the capital.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Right OK, all right.

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** Could I just also raise a point around the Prevention Agenda? I think that if we look at our population in prisons and in the community that we are working with, we will know that a high percentage of our offender population, you know, it is no surprise at first charge that the experience is poverty, racism, social exclusion, school exclusion, childhood sexual abuse, domestic violence.

These are all big indicators of what is happening, has happened, in the lives of the people we are working with now. I think there is a real place around the Prevention Agenda that unfortunately, I think, has been suffered over the years due to austerity as many services have. There is something, I think, there is a real issue and your point about parenting, families, parenting skills, the evidence base we know for example around conduct disorder. We will never turn the tap off if we cannot actually go back and be looking at prevention.

I know that does not solve the problems for today but I think it is a really key point that we have to still -- we cannot stop campaigning around prevention.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** I absolutely agree with you. Those issues around those child experiences just we are focusing on.

**Sinead Dervin (NHS England):** That comes into Health, you know, in terms of actually how people present and then the Health arena of how people, their health and their equalities and their inequalities in life are leading to poor health outcomes.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Absolutely. Zina [Etheridge], did you want to?

**Zina Etheridge (Chief Executive Officer, Haringey Council):** Just very briefly and it is partly about the governance point, STPs etc but also about the CRC. So we have got a whole set of local partnership bodies who I think have a role to play in this. It does feel like it would be helpful for locally the CRC to work with Community Safety Partnerships but also with the local Health and Wellbeing Board on this nexus of issues to talk about what about the local (inaudible) priorities are that you could helpfully refocus on over the next 18 months. That will bring together Housing, Health commissioning and the wider set of issues that we are talking about including prevention.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** OK, I think that is a really solid issue that we need to take forward in terms of then seeing what the role of MOPAC is in trying to help, and London Councils, in trying to support that in a manageable way. So not

necessarily those conversations 32 times but actually maybe within the five strategic priority areas, transformation areas. OK, thank you, that is really helpful.

Gill [Arukpe], I am really conscious and Kate [Aldous], I am conscious that I have not brought you in, in terms of some of the issues that you will be coming up across. Did you want to add anything to the discussion?

**Gill Arukpe (Penrose):** I think just to reinforce Peter's [Jones] points really because obviously we are providing supervision in the community and Gateway and coordination within for the London prisons and pan London or adult male.

For me there is still the big missing bits, it is before we get into prison. I think the light touch is not working well at all. I think that has been agreed. I think if we actually had more intense work with those that are really prolific, who we know are the most chaotic and have lots of social issues and we could put our attention there, that would be good.

I probably would do something around the rest --

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** What would that look like? So when you said, 'light touch'.

**Gill Arukpe (Penrose):** Different emphasis because at the moment we have to see every adult through supervision after leaving prison if they have received a short sentence. I think even if the data that you took now you can analyse those where in actual fact they are unlikely to reoffend or they are not causing the greater harm. We could be putting our energy on those that are causing the greatest harm or are repeating to the point where it is having a knock-on effect to other services.

I would do something a bit before and I would do it at arrest and I would look at particularly those around domestic violence. I think it is in Derby, Adam(?) will correct me if it is somewhere else in the country, but they have introduced a really good scheme where there is domestic violence and it is prolific and it is reoccurring that as an option before you get a sentence, before you go to prison or before you even go to court that you attend voluntarily courses around your behaviours, your socialisation, your alcohol often driven substance misuse.

There is something to be done a lot earlier than entering prison. If we are just going to push people through we are not going to solve it. We have to stop them getting there in the first place.

Substance misuse; we run within Equinox, because I am the Chief Exec of Equinox as well, we have Substance Misuse Services. Across London there are lots of agencies, good agencies doing a Mixtures and Models of Care around substance misuse and people are repeating going through. We can tell that by the detox.

So I think again going into prison, if you are a substance misuser and that has been your primary crime linked to your substance misuse, putting you in prison right now is the worst place you could possibly go.

Therefore, those that have not committed harm to others necessarily, direct physical harm, it might be better to do a diversion. So I would like to see a lot more emphasis around stopping the majority of those that are going in going in the first place.

Mental Health or Forensic Mental Health Services; we have not cracked this one and we are having a seminar again this year, we had one last year. Trying to find a way where we can support the police better if someone is having a mental health crisis that has an effect on somebody to the point that they are arrested. We call upon the police, wrongly often, I think, when I look at the incident reports from my Supported Housing where somebody in a mental health crisis has not been supported well by clinical teams because of a variety of different reasons, have not come in. We have not been able to do much than actually getting somebody engaged back to depot. They have really got to a crisis point and the police are called to assist, they are not bouncers.

So I just think that there is a huge amount to be done outside of getting into prison in the first place. Then a greater emphasis on those that are creating the greatest harm that we all work with them when they do get released on community and not literally everybody that is coming through because that is quite a waste of resource.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** Thanks a lot. Kate [Aldous], did you want to add anything to the discussion?

**Kate Aldous (Clinks):** Yes. I think the voluntary sector organisations around the room have made a lot of the points that I would make, very well. I think, I do not know if people have seen that tracked TR report that looked at the voluntary sector involvement in TR which has been very disappointing. It has tended to be the larger organisations which has had a big impact on the community organisations which also provide really valuable services.

The latest report was called at 100 represented under pressure and under resourced and I think that is a real reflection of what has happened to the sector. You see organisations subsidising services that they are providing through TR which should not happen and a real problem with communication and join up.

So, I think there is a plea to everyone in the room to recognise what the voluntary sector does and also look at how we can work in a more coordinated way across sectors.

There is an example in prisons where we ran a pilot in the South West with a Voluntary Sector Coordinator who basically recorded who was delivering what in the prisons which in most prisons is not known. There is no comprehensive record of who delivering what in a prison which I think is astonishing but it is the fact.

So, actually just having that recorded means that Governors can then see whether what is being delivered in their prisons is what they need and if it is not they can review that.

So I think we all know that there is not enough money to do what we would like to do and therefore it is really important we use what we have well. I think there are areas where we can improve that significantly.

The final thing I would like to say is when people are thinking about commissioning, think about how you can do that best for the voluntary sector. It is not always through a contract. Actually grants are much more effective in some cases.

So do not make the assumption that everything has to go through a commissioning process.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime) (Chair):** That is a really helpful point and it something that we are looking in MOPAC. Obviously if there is commissioning, actually in some cases, it should be grant and I think that is quite important and we do recognise that. As long as you have got the right framework behind it that is actually quite important. It is something we certainly picked up.

It is 12.00pm so thank you very much for coming. I think there have been a number of things coming out of today. One is for me that as I started, that balance between high harm and what we are seeing coming through on persistent offending around violence and how we really tackle that with the MPS and the CRC and the partners around the table. If that continues it is going to continue to have that impact on the communities and on the violence on the streets of London and in the homes of London.

It really takes the point about people raising domestic abuse and domestic violence because that is absolutely on the radar in terms of violence. It is not just street violence that we are really concerned with. We are really worried about domestic abuse and domestic violence. We have seen a leap recently in domestic homicides this year, having seen a decrease last year. It is very, very concerning.

It would be really good to have those more detailed discussions with yourself, for the NPS, around pre-sentencing reports and the CRC around specifics around what a reset and investment looks like in the next 18 months around that and from yourselves and the MoJ around how we can work with you as the Government. You and Government to raise the leadership of our persistent offending and also across Government. We heard about the NHS and what needs to happen in London and that really is bringing the NHS to the table in some of the discussions that we are having on Devolution would be extremely helpful.

So thank you very much.