

RESTRICTED

Title & Version
Author
Creating BOCU / Branch
Summary/Purpose
Suitable for Publication
Date Created

LCJB Meeting
 DI Elsa Mak - Staff Officer AC Ephgrave
 Met Operations (MO1)
 Minutes of Meeting
 No
 03/12/2019



Date of meeting: Tuesday 26th November 2019 1300-1500 hours

<u>Present</u> Nick Ephgrave Siobhan Peters Ed Beltrami Sara Lewis Iain Raphael Damian McCleave Andrew Blight Chantal Foster Ruth Bloomfield Mathew Pickering Damon Williams Suzanne Burke Elsa Mak	NE SP EB SL IR DM AB CF RB MP DW SB EM	MPS (CHAIR) MOPAC CPS MPS MPS HMCTS NPS CRC MOPAC MOPAC MPS MPS MPS (Minutes)
<u>Apologies offered</u> Laurence Taylor Julian Bennett Greg Powell Sam Cunningham Claire Lindley Katheryn Hunt Caroline Sparks Amy Hudspith David Service	LT JB DS GP SC CL CS AH DS	MPS MPS Defence Law MOPAC CPS NPS NPS BTP CoLP

1	<u>Welcome - Introductions, Minutes and actions</u> NE made introductions and noted apologies. The board agreed the previous minutes without amendment. The board reviewed and discussed LCJB the outstanding actions. Actions were agreed for closure as per recommendations and written updates provided by secretariat.
---	---

2	<p><u>Case Progression at Snaresbrook Crown Court – HHJ Zeidman</u></p> <p>HHJ Ziedman outlined to the group case progression and the pre-trial review process at Snaresbrook Crown Court. The purpose of the pre-trial review was to increase efficiency and there is one for every case that was being heard at Snaresbrook Crown Court. Pre-trial review requires the attendance of officer in case (OIC), the defendant and his defense team. It normally takes place shortly before the trial. Often, Plea and Trial Preparing Hearing (PTPH) is not sufficient to cover all issues that may arise in a trial.</p> <p>HHJ Ziedman outlined several benefits of pre-trial review including i) certificate of readiness are review more vigorously; ii) identified potential legal argument; iii) enforcing actions set at PTPH. HHJ Ziedman reiterated the positive impact of face to face contact between Prosecution and Defense has. Furthermore, the time gap between PTPH and trial can often be a year or over and the pre-trial hearing would helped to improve preparedness for trial for defendants, victim and witness, identify any potential issue and reduce delay of the trial.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, there are concerns post-trial review which included additional work and costs incurred to both court and other parties involved. Pre-trial review may dilute the effectiveness of PTPH.</p> <p>HHJ Zeilaman informed the group there is currently no foul-proof performance metric on trial effectiveness as figures for effective trial rate performance can be easily manipulated. Example such as the trial merely started or a 2 weeks trial which has taken 4 weeks doesn't necessary means it is an effective trial but may get measured as effective trial. The current performance metric does not incorporate any additional factor He encouraged views from LCJB members.</p> <p>EB stated he recognised the benefits of pre-trial preview and would be appropriate for complex cases and not for simple cases. EB agreed that the trial effectiveness figures does not reflect the benefit of pre-trial review. SL raised concerns from police perspective that pre-trial review would bring additional abstractions for police officers and questioned what values would OIC's attendance add to pre-trial review.</p> <p>Judge Ziedman stated he noted the difference on when a police officer or lawyer complete the certificate of readiness. SL stated she would like to improve the standard on certificate of completed readiness.</p> <p>NE wished to find new ways to improving the trial effectiveness. NE asked Judge Zeldman's views from his colleagues. Most members believed pre-trial review is positive but deeply concerned on the potential costs it may incur. EB stated in addition to the cost, pre-trial review also clogged up the list. DM raised to the group whether there are alternative solution to improve the trial effectiveness. Judge Zeldman raised to the group whether reducing the gap between PTPH and trial may assist. A gap of ten months to one year is too long.</p> <p>Action – What extra resource does it require from Police and CPS if pre-trial review was to be introduced – SL/EB</p> <p>Action – To consider types of metrics to use to measure the effectiveness and benefit of pre-trial review – DM</p>
3	<p><u>Crown Court Performance – DM</u></p> <p>NE recapped the history to the group on the necessity to discuss the Crown Court Performance. DM stated he was not closed enough to the details to provide the</p>

	<p>group an accurate picture of the Crown Court Performance and would require someone with more in-depth knowledge to assist.</p> <p>Judge Zeldeman enquired how LCJB's remit and its escalation process. NE explained LCJB escalate issues to London crime reduction board which is chaired by the Mayor.</p> <p>Action – Performance Group to review what has changed on Crown Court Performance and update to be brought back for January 2020. E.g. What facts and figures are available on past, present and future position around - guilty / non guilty plea; witness / victim attendance rate.</p>
4	<p><u>Ethnic Disproportionality in youth justice – RB</u></p> <p>RB outlined Item 4 to the group and the action plans. LCJB members enquired RB whether this can be replicate for people over 18. NE mentioned there was little information explaining the causes of disproportionality and it was unclear how the actions were derived. NE suggested wider education would have more impact and an annex is required to outline clearly between the cause and action. RB informed the group the paper had been review by MOPAC's governance board but had some consultation with external stakeholders.</p> <p>Action – RB to send out enhanced version to the next board with the view to seek comments from involved agencies.</p>
5	<p><u>User satisfaction pilot – MP</u></p> <p>No change in the User satisfaction survey and remains at 66%. MH outlined the background of the survey pilot and methodology, as per Item 5.</p> <p>NE questioned how this survey would add value and its ability to provide tangible recommendations on how to improve the survey. MP explained the purpose of the survey was to identify trends and patterns and provide a richer insight focusing on users in London. This would improve overall services to all users. NE suggested that it should widen on users sample and not just focus on users who gives evidence.</p>
6	<p><u>Integrated offender management – RB</u></p> <p>RB outlined Item 6 to the group and this was multi-agencies paper. NE stated it was important to understand what the paper was trying to achieve. NE suggested the paper should highlight the costs and benefits of the strategy. Paper to need clarify the cohort and direction the strategy should focus on, harm or violence or volume.</p> <p>Action – To take the paper to respective agencies and provide written feedback on the paper for January LCJB – All</p> <p>Action – To take the paper to Central Intergrated Offender Management Team for Met Police's views and cc'd to AC Mark Simmons – SL</p>
7	<p><u>Performance data</u></p> <p>To update in January 2020 LCJB.</p>
8	<p><u>Extinction rebellion – BC</u></p> <p>NE provided the group a brief update of the judicial review on section 14 used at</p>

	Extinction Rebellion.
9	<p><u>Sec 28 update –SL</u></p> <p>SL updated the group that Kingston Crown Court remains the only court is that delivers section 28. Uptake on Sec 28 has doubled with 44 case this calendar year compare with 21 cases in 2018.</p> <p>NE would like to provide a complete picture and asked SL to identify whether figures of people declined ABE can be obtained.</p> <p>National roll out has been delayed until the end of 2020 and early 2021 and this came out on the board which ACC Barnett chaired on 29th October 2019. DM would like to secure another site prior to the national roll out.</p> <p>Action – DM to identify new site for the national roll out.</p>
10	<p><u>GPS tagging – update</u></p> <p>Briefly discussed – no conviction to date and implemented across 22 boroughs.</p>
11	<p><u>Agency updates</u></p> <p>None</p>
12	<p><u>Agenda setting for January LCJB</u></p> <p>Not discussed.</p>
13	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>NE raised to the group whether December LCJB meeting should take place as it was schedule two weeks after this meeting. All agreed to cancel the December LCJB meeting. NE wanted to extend the meeting for 1 hour.</p> <p>Decision - All future LCJB meetings will be 3 hours.</p>

Next meeting on Wednesday 29th January 2020, 1300-1500 hours Room G.4 at NSY

London Criminal Justice Board - 26 May 2021 minutes

[Home](#) > [Programmes and Strategies](#) >
[Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime \(MOPAC\)](#) >
[MOPAC governance and decision making](#) >
[The London Criminal Justice Board](#) >
London Criminal Justice Board - 26 May 2021 minutes

Present:

Louisa Rolfe MPS (Chair) – AC Met Operations

Barbara Gray MPS - DAC

Barry Hughes CPS CCP- London North

Damian McCleave HMCTS – Head of Crime

Sara Lewis MPS – Head of Met Prosecutions

Sue Williams MPS – Commander CJ

Louise Capel Cure MOPAC

Mat Pickering MOPAC

Chloe Iliesa MOPAC

Stephen McAllister HMCTS – Magistrates Court

Damon Williams MPS – LCJB Business Manager

Suzanne Burke MPS – LCJB Support (minutes)

Ali Hinchliff MPS – LCJB Support

Lionel Idan CPS CCP- London South

Adeela Khan London Criminal Court Solicitors Assoc

David Cain MoJ

Tom Dodsworth MoJ

Katie Nash Probation Service

Stephen Beckett-Carroll Probation Service

Dominic Daley Youth Justice

Helen Isaac CoLP

Apologies:

Darius Hemmatpour Chief Superintendent NPCC CJ Lead - MPS

Welcome - Introductions, Minutes and actions

The Board agreed the previous minutes without amendment.

The Board reviewed and discussed LCJB outstanding actions.
Actions agreed for closure as per recommendations.

Disproportionality Dashboard: This is still being progressed and still proving to be technically challenging. The MPS are trying to discover what disproportionality we *can* be provided, bearing in mind some of the more basic IT being used to discover the data.

Agenda Item 2: Case Progression, Court Backlog & Timeliness

During the presentation of the data, The Board discussed the following areas:

Released Under Investigation (RUI) rates:

A small increase in the number of current RUI cases has been occurring for a number of months. This is generally believed to be due to reasons of housekeeping on IT systems rather than an actual increase in the number of suspects currently RUI.

Use of witness live link:

The Board discussed that the use of live link for witnesses including the police to give evidence is a useful tool. It was suggested that a more detailed look at the data of how and when it is used would be beneficial to all as there may be knock on implications of it being used more prominently (such as courts not being able to cope with the number of witnesses using live link).

Live Link usage may be useful whilst we are still experiencing some aspects of COVID restrictions, however it may not be long until these restrictions are lifted and this may also have an effect on Live Link's use.

Also mentioned was that a proposed new MG2 is helpful for explaining the use of Live Link to officers.

Action 2021/12 SM - Convene meeting with CPS, Courts, Police and the LVWS to discuss witness live links and look at the numbers and establish further scope for the increased use of Live Links.

Trial Effectiveness:

The Board considered that data surrounding trial effectiveness seemed to suggest that many Crown Court trials are vacated (86 went ahead during the last week and 87 were vacated). HMCTS confirmed that this data is likely to be accurate. Reasons for this high rate may include:

Judges not being available

The use of backup trials (both in response to COVID).

Trials are vacated the day before they are listed which causes many problems for all stakeholders

A desire was expressed for a deep dive in to why so many trials are being vacated, particularly in the Crown Court.

It is possible that the reasons for vacated trials may become clearer after 21st June if COVID restrictions ease.

Sentiment was also made that the data surrounding cracked/ineffective/effective and vacated trials can be looked in to at the Data and Analysis Board Sub-Group Board. The Data and Analysis Sub-Group Board are currently considering all available data, in addition to working with all partner agencies to locate appropriate data to help understand the reasons behind the vacated trials.

Agenda Item 3: Court Recovery

Magistrates' Court Magistrates' Courts will be operating normally again very soon. There is a possibility that extra courts will be opened to help with social distancing if this is necessary. Best use of all options to improve recovery including use of VRH is still being

made, along with some IT tools which are being considered to help with scheduling of these VRHs. Identifying appropriate IT to help with trials listing remains a challenge, although HMCTS are keen to make use of staggered trials listings even after the pandemic. The

Board also discussed the plans for possible near future rise in custody receipts that could occur once COVID restrictions are lifted.

Crown Court Crown courts are still accumulating a backlog but this is reducing and beginning to stabilise. In particular Snaresbrook CC is making an improvement. Disproportionality is still occurring of backlogs across the CC estate, HMCTS continue to try to improve this. The Agency continue to discuss how to move cases out of London in to less burdened CCs, this is a complicated and challenging process. An effort is being made at each CC to understand receipts and disposal of cases. The continued use of Nightingale Courts is also being explored. Social distancing measures and possible upcoming changes to them are still being considered. There are likely to be upcoming problems with staffing the increased future sitting days which are planned, particularly with the judiciary and recorders. More crown court clerks are also being recruited. MoJ are planning to legislate to be able to send cases from CC back to Mags for trial and sentencing where appropriate. The processes of sentencing and appeals are also being considered as avenues for improved efficiency. A pilot is also underway to help with the use of S.28 for intimidated witnesses. 3 more sites can possibly be opened for this and 2 of them have already been procured, being Isleworth and Wood Green. There is no definitive timeline for how long this pilot will take.

MOPAC GPS Tagging

MOPAC are currently running a pilot for the use of GPS tags for violent and domestic abuse offenders. Since 2019 a pilot has been running for knife crime offenders (on determinate licence). Pilot now extended until March 2022. So far nearly 496 offenders GPS tagged compulsorily on leaving prison. 255 of these were completed successfully, 123 were recalled. 14% of those recalled were done so directly because of a breach of the GPS exclusion zone and 24% of those recalled were done so with the use of the GPS tag being a secondary factor (such as not charging their tag).

The MOPAC pilot for domestic abusers is designed to help improve risk management of the offender until March 2022. GPS tags are used for adult offenders being released from a London Prison, to an address in London and serving a determinate sentence only The

GPS tag also seems to work as a deterrent to the wearer from re-victimising people. GPS tags have only been used in 20 cases so far. 11 of these have already been recalled, with a minimal number of these due to breaching an exclusion zone as shown by the tag.

MoJ are running a pilot for acquisitive crime offenders which will come to London in September. This will be for adults only, serving sentences of at least 12 months. There are 6 pathfinder areas already live with this in Counties forces. 13 more will go live in late September including the MPS. There are early predictions that around 600 tags may become readily used at any one time in the MPS. One small issue with using the tags is that they can't be used if an offender does not have suitable accommodation for it. This issue is currently being worked through. External Agency Requests (EARs) are in place so that tagging data can be applied for if necessary. Another useful tool of the tags is Crime Mapping where police forces can export large acquisitive crime maps to the MoJ where these maps are compared with the tag data to see if there are any hits for a tag as being in the same location and time. Any matches are sent back to the police force along with a statement. So far 60 tags have been issued, 8 of which have been matched to crimes

The Board expressed enthusiasm for these pilots and it was reiterated that any breaches would firstly be sent to Probation to deal with and then any recalls would be dealt with in the normal way between Probation and the Police.

Agenda Item 4: Victims and Witnesses

The idea was discussed that an update for Victims and Witnesses as an agenda item each month is no longer necessary and can be dealt with as a separate update from the LVWS as part of Agenda item 8. This was agreed amongst board members.

Agenda Item 5: Common Platform

Common platform (CP) has been implemented at pilot sites and so far it is working relatively smoothly. The next sites due to use the CP are Harrow and Isleworth in early July. HMCTS are also trialing some new tools which may improve administration of the system. The HMCTS role-out plan for CP is available on their intranet, although some changes are still being made to this.

Further issues discussed:

Further issues discussed:

The CPS are not shown as the prosecuting authority on CP, which causes problems with the CPS receiving documents from

CP. A change to COPA needs to be implemented to correct this and it may be some time until this is implemented.

There is an issue with CP not being able to display drink and drug levels. Police are currently having to enter this data manually which is time consuming, again a fix for this may not be implemented for some time.

A sign off process is in place at each court which begins to use CP where all stakeholders have a say in sign off before it is given a go ahead by the senior presiding judge.

A number of other issues may well appear during CPs role out and all stakeholders ought to be mindful of communicating these issues so that they may be troubleshot.

Action 2021/13 - All - All parties to consider issues associated with CP and communicate these with other stakeholders as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 6: New LCJB Governance Structure Update

Representatives from MOPAC explained that a new LCJB Governance Structure is being implemented and that this is being represented in some charts and diagrams which can be shared with other Board members. Furthermore, some consultancy partners have been hired by MOPAC to help with moving forward and they would like to invite them to future LCJB meetings.

Action 2021/14 – LCC – New Governance structure charts to be shared with all board members.

Agenda Item 8: Agency Updates

1. **CPS** – Focus is still on clearing backlogs in the both courts. With Magistrates' courts this is going well, with Crown Courts there are still concerns, although Snaresbrook CC is starting to make improvements. Preparations are also being made for a sharp increase in trials (especially with appropriately deployed advocates) once restrictions ease and hopefully other agencies are also preparing for this. We are also being mindful of ensuring that both Mag's and Crown Courts can be serviced

ensuring that both Mag's and Crown Courts can be serviced correctly by lawyers as trials ramp up.

2. **HMCTS** – Court recovery plans had already been given as part of Agenda Item 3, however discussion was drawn to how well a ramp up in trials listings in both Crown and Mag's Courts could be co-ordinated with the CPS and other partners, to ensure that resourcing does not become too high for some at any particular time. A desire that the MPS and other partners will also be able to meet resourcing levels as trials ramp up was also expressed.

Action 2021/15 DM/SM – HMCTS plans for COVID recovery to be shared. All members to be privy to the plans for making use of court time so that other members can co-ordinate with the same timescales

3. **Prisons** - No representative present
4. **Probation and CRC** – Unification will occur on the 25th June. Due to the reunification of the National Probation Service, CRC will soon no longer exist. From this date London will be split in to three districts, with a Head of Service responsible for each. Currently more staff are being mobilised to come in to offices and carry out appointments. On the day reporting is also improving with more staff becoming available to carry this out. Efforts are being made to make best use of video slots with courts. Preparations are also being made to increase throughput when Mags' courts begin an uplift. Some discussion was made that statistical data relating to Probation's activities might be beneficial to other board members, especially the CPS
5. **LVWS** - Referrals to the LVWS are now approximately back to pre-COVID levels, with pre-trial visits taking place face to face. Efforts are still being made to improve a back log by making resourcing changes and improve partnership working with HMCTS. Funding has also been received for an additional 21 Independent Sexual Violence Advisers (ISVAS) and 23 Independent Domestic Abuse Advisers (IDVAS) for the next two years, which will hopefully become recruited by the summer.
6. **Defence Community (LCCSA)** - Mention was made that the Magistrates' Court backlog was now manageable although it would be pertinent to know plans for increased trials so that

during interviews). This is an issue acknowledged by the MPS that not much more can be done to help although lateral flow tests can be used and some efforts are to be made with the MPS estates team to see if anything more could be done.

Action 2021/17 SW – Speak with the MPS estates team and see if anything more can be done to improve distancing in custodies.

7. **Youth Justice** - Yots are now using a blended approach of face to face and virtual meetings. There are still some concerns again around distancing in the custody environment. There is also apprehension of a possible spike in youth violence which may occur this coming summer
8. **Police:**
9. **Metropolitan Police** - As a result of Video Recorded Interviews, conversations are ongoing to decide whether the extra redaction required of these before they are sent to the CPS (for reasons of confidentiality) should be done by the interviewing officers or other resources. A request from the NPCC was made to raise the issue of drug driving, however this is not an area of issue for the MPS. A new community resolution option for young persons is being brought in to place (bringing the MPS in line with most other Police Forces). This ought to help with levels of disproportionality. HMIC have conducted an inspection with Met Detention (MO9) regarding persons with Mental Health ailments and good feedback was received from them. Identity kiosks are also being rolled out across the MPS (in custody suites) to capture suspect IDs. A pilot will also soon begin with Bail Kiosks which will allow persons to sign on for bail using automated facial recognition kiosks.
10. **City of London Police** - A backlog of traffic offences still exists and work is being done to reduce this including the use of additional courts. This may well go on past December

British Transport Police - No representative present

Agenda item 9: Risk Register - The risk register was reviewed by the board and accepted as being up to date. One issue of amendment was that in the two risks recorded as 'Rising Magistrates and Crown Courts Backlogs', mitigating actions have been reflected to record that all stakeholders are to be mindful of when an increase in the activity of both the Crown and Mags' Courts occurs that HMCTS will require support from other stakeholders making use of the extra court time

Agenda item 10: Agenda Setting

Disproportionality - A discussion was held regarding the plans for a disproportionality board. This is still being planned and it has not yet been decided in which board the discussions around disproportionality may actually be placed, although one possibility may be that a Disproportionality Board may soon be set up.

Community Resolutions for under 18s – The use of community resolutions for under 18-year-olds as described earlier may have a small impact in reducing the number of youths who attend Youth Courts.

Agenda item 11: AOB

Common Platform - There are instances where if previous convictions are not sent by the Police with a case file, then an offender's file on Common Platform will need to be rejected and the legacy system used instead. A task and finish sub-group can be set up to look in to this, in combination with a long standing and difficult to resolve issue of Police supplying PNC prints in case files.

Action 2021/18 SL, BH, LI – A task and finish sub-group is to be created to look in to the issue of PNC prints in Officers' case files.

Upcoming large scale events UEFA European Championships and G7 - HMCTS had a desire to be included in any upcoming intelligence/planning relating to large scale events which may increase trials at Courts. Including HMCTS in key stakeholders of such planning would be beneficial

Action 2021/11 LR – LR to speak with Commander Jane Connors and ensure that HMCTS are included where necessary in Stakeholder conversations regarding possible large-scale events.

Share this page

Need a document on this page in an accessible format?

accessible format.

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of a PDF or other document on this page in a more

accessible format, please get in touch via our [online form](#) and tell us which format you need.

It will also help us if you tell us which assistive technology you use.

Useful links

[Who we are](#)

[Jobs](#)

[Venue hire](#)

[Privacy policy](#)

[Terms and conditions](#)

[City Hall blog](#)

[Keep up to date](#)

[Contact us](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Cafe](#)

[Freedom of Information](#)

[Media centre](#)

We use cookies to ensure that we give you the best experience on our website. [View cookie settings.](#)

© Copyright Greater London Authority 2022

London Criminal Justice Board - 25 August 2021 Minutes

[Home](#) > [Programmes and Strategies](#) >

[Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime \(MOPAC\)](#) >

[MOPAC governance and decision making](#) >

[The London Criminal Justice Board](#) >

London Criminal Justice Board - 25 August 2021 Minutes

Louisa Rolfe - MPS (Chair) – AC Met Operations

Suzanne Burke - MPS – LCJB Support (minutes)

Ali Hinchcliffe - MPS – LCJB Support

Alex Murray - MPS - Commander

Alan Catlin - Head of London CJ Partnership

Andy Carter - MPS – Superintendent, CJ

Wayne Matthews - MPS – Superintendent, Youth Crime

Simone Oram - MPS – Police Sergeant, Youth Crime

Louise Capel Cure - MOPAC

Mat Pickering - MOPAC

Hannah Jones - MOPAC

Damian McCleave - HMCTS – Head of Crime

Stephen McAllister - MMCTS – Magistrates Courts

Barry Hughes CPS CCP – London North

Lionel Idan CPS CCP – London South

Adeela Khan - London Criminal Court Solicitors Assoc

Helen Isaac - CoLP

Stephen Beckett-Carroll - Probation

Gary Poole - Prisons

Bianca Bamieh - BTP

Apologies:

Damon Williams MPS – LCJB Business Manager

Barbara Gray MPS – DAC

Sara Lewis MPS – Head of Met Prosecutions

Sue Williams MPS – CJ Commander

Darius Hemmatpour MPS – Chief Superintendent

David Clarke - MOPAC

Ashlie May - MOPAC

Charlie Doyle - BTP

Susan Yeomans-Jones - BTP

Welcome - Introductions, minutes and actions

The Board agreed the previous minutes without amendment.

The Board reviewed and discussed LCJB outstanding actions.
Actions agreed for closure as per recommendations.

Agenda Item 2: Case Progression, Court Backlog and Timeliness

During the previously circulated performance pack presentation, the below item was discussed:

Cracked Trials – The Defence Community raised that previously, when a trial was cracked, the solicitor was provided with a pink form on which the reasons for the trial cracking were recorded. Solicitors report that these forms are no longer available for them to complete, causing the loss of vital data. Due to COVID there was a time where paper forms were not able to be used due to PHE rules, but data was collected throughout this time in a digital format.

ACTION REQUIRED: CHAIRMAN TO FOLLOW UP WITH DEFENCE COMMUNITY

ACTION 2021/32 SM/AK: Data collection around reasons for cracked trials – Stephen McAllister will look into this and ensure the data collection method is shared with Adeela Khan to enable defence solicitors to contribute

Agenda Item 3: Custody Time Limits (CTLs)

Extended CTLs and ordinary CTLs are due to come together for expiry at the end of the 2021. A Criminal Justice group is currently in the process of being arranged to consider the necessary data, review the existing processes and introduce effective management of the existing CTLs, well in advance of the end of 2021.

The CPS are confident that the Judicial process in place manages CTLs, and the protocols effectively, it does mean that the Courts have to accommodate these kinds of cases, by moving cases outside of London etc. CPS continue to apply to extend CTLs where the necessity arises. The level of cases involving CTLs has remained stable.

The Board felt assured that there is a plan in place that for ensuring these cases go to trial especially for serious, violent and at risk offenders – the partners involved are aware that this may be a difficult period and that the preparations are in progress to effectively manage any heightened risk. A more detailed update will be provided to The Board.

Agenda Item 4: CJ Options to Reduce Youth Homicides and Violence

The Board discussed how CJ Agencies working in partnership could look at work to help reduce youth homicides and violence.

Offenders and victims of these types of crimes are often already known to CJ Agencies for various reasons. Some youth homicides are committed while the victim and/or the suspect are on RUI/Bail. The below points were discussed:

Crime types – most of the crime types involving suspects on RUI/Bail are possession of offensive weapons and Possession of drugs with intent to supply (PWITs), where a suspect has been arrested for both offences. A disparity in the charging arrangements between the two seems to exist. Offensive weapon crimes can often be charged immediately as they tend to be straightforward when an offender is found in possession of a knife/other weapon.

The PWITs offences often require RUI/Bail because drugs are required to be sent away for analysis to prove that they are a controlled substance.

Splitting charges – The Board discussed the possibility of splitting the charges. This would involve charging immediately for the offensive weapon and leaving the suspect on RUI/Bail for the PWITs. This is a current live topic (for high harm offences) at National Level. CC Nick Dean is leading the National discussions on this.

Gangs Matrix – the gangs matrix is an effective tool for establishing risk to individuals. The Board discussed how a similar method could be used to assess risk.

Bail – There were arguments in favour of bail over RUI in these circumstances due to the governance that is in place for suspects that are on bail. This governance is a reminder to very busy police officers that their suspect is outstanding and so may be dealt with more expeditiously than those where no reminders exist (RUI)

Charging earlier – The Board discussed how suspects that are charged earlier may still be back out on the street earlier and the risk may remain.

Youth Remand – The Board agree that further work in relation to remanding youths is vital, especially in terms of secure accommodation. The lack of appropriate secure accommodation across London often prevents youths being remanded even where the threshold to remand may be met.

YOTs – The Board discussed the involvement of YOTs in these cases – YOTs are always involved.

Policing Minister – The Policing Minister meets with all police forces to discuss different types of homicide. The Board agree that it would be beneficial to provide The Commissioner with appropriate information to be able to raise with The Policing Minister.

PYOs – The Board discussed the opportunity to reintroduce a similar model to PYOs (Persistent Young Offenders) as they may have worked well in these types of crimes/offenders.

Pilot – The Board discussed the possibility of a pilot. A pilot where an identified cohort in an identified area (for example Lambeth) assesses a different way of charging (express charging in identified cases for example)

ACTION 2021/33 LI/BH/AM : Youth Violence Pilot - Partners to discuss further to explore the feasibility of a Youth Violence Pilot

Agenda Item 5: Community Resolution for U18s

Community Resolution for under 18s went live on 1st August, 2021 which has proved to be a very useful tool, especially for possession of cannabis. Currently work is still in progress to ensure all front line staff are fully trained in its use.

Disproportionality – The Board discussed the work between MPS and MOPAC which ensures that disproportionality is being considered in this work.

Scrutiny Panels – MPS hold two Scrutiny Panels per BCU per year where these will be looked at.

Agenda Item 6: Victim Care Hub Update

There has been a delay in awarding the contract, the tenders are in and are at the evaluation stage. The aim is to begin the project in September, 2021. This will be presented in further detail at the LCJB - September, 2021.

Agenda Item 7: Agency Updates

CPS

CPS are still working through issues relating to Crown Court recovery. The current Crown Court capacity is limited by Judiciary not space. The CPS are still facing resourcing issues and are still looking for more Counsel to be recruited, vetted, trained etc.

HMCTS

Crown Court - resourcing continues to be an issue although staff numbers are recovering well. Judiciary numbers remain an issue but measures are in place to address for example moving Judiciary from outside London to inside London

Magistrates Court – Magistrates Courts are still carrying a small 8 week backlog from COVID although the clearance rate of trials is almost back to pre-pandemic rates.

Around 200 additional Magistrates Court trials due to trial blitz are planned for.

Common Platform - HMCTS London has adopted some changes to its proposed Common Platform roll out. The revised dates, which see our next tranche moved from September back to December to allow further time for recovery and planning to be completed more generally are:

25th October – Westminster and Highbury Magistrates Courts, Central Criminal Court and Southwark Crown Court. – BTP and City of London Police will also go live on this date.

15th November – Thames, Stratford, Barkingside, Romford Magistrates Courts, Snaresbrook and Wood Green Crown Courts

7th December – Croydon, Bromley, Bexley Magistrates Courts, Inner London, Woolwich and Croydon Crown Courts

LITs – Local Implementation Teams will be put in place in due course

Prisons

Outbreak status - two London prisons are currently in outbreak status but there is no interruption to business of sending and receiving prisoners to and from Court. Prisons communicate with Court to make arrangements if there are any likely issues due to infections etc.

Resourcing – staff absences remain an issue in prisons and continues to be addressed.

COVID Vaccinations – COVID vaccination take up has been low. There are many factors that could be driving this including a younger population who often display anti-establishment ideals or a feeling that the pandemic will be over by the time the prisoner is released. Prisons continue to work on education to address this.

Probation

Probation are currently working through their risk assessments to enable efficiency (PPE etc.)

Face To Face – 70% of meetings are currently being conducted face to face

Community Payback – this continues to be a challenge for the Probation Service. It is currently running at 53% work continues to

improve this.

Accredited Programmes – Accredited programmes are currently running at 20% due to reduced group sizes.

London Victims and Witness Service (LVWS)

Referrals into the service are almost back to pre-pandemic levels, with a high level of S28 referrals which are mostly children and young people.

Intermediaries – The Board discussed that there are a shortage of intermediaries which are vital for S28 cases in courts. This was raised by the Judiciary and was taken away by MoJ colleagues to look at further.

Defence Community (LCCSA)

Defence solicitors are finding scheduling issues booking face to face client prison visits and virtual visits at the below prisons:

Snaresbrook – many reported issues arranging visits

Thamesford – appear to have only 1 person that deals with requests. When they are off, no one covers which delays visits.

Pentonville – large delay in getting an email response to a visit request (weeks). In addition, if a prisoner is isolating (due to COVID) a prison visit is not allowed to be booked. Once the prisoners isolation ends, the delay in getting a visit is applied.

The Defence Community would like these issues to be addressed to enable face to face and virtual visits be conducted with their clients. Previously, face to face visits were arranged by telephone which was a more effective process for solicitors.

ACTION 2021/35 GP : Scheduling face to face and virtual prison visits for defence solicitors – Prisons will take the issues raised by LCCSA to the prison managers and provide LCCSA with contacts so that issues can be addressed

Youth Justice

No representative present at the meeting.

Police:

Metropolitan Police

Witness Care Units (WCU) - continue to have high workloads and

are progressing with recruiting additional staff to provide support

City of London Police

Witness Care Units (WCU) - recruiting an additional Witness Care staff member with the funding provided for this

Magistrates Court - we are making good progress with our backlog at the Mags court

Resources - staffing in custody and in Criminal Justice is good at present

PPE - enhanced PPE continues to be used in custody suite to protect all

British Transport Police

Witness Care Units (WCU) – working with higher volumes and continuing to support the additional work with overtime until more staff are recruited.

Agenda Item 8: Risk Register

Common Platform – The Board discussed whether this continues to be a risk. As only a small number of sites have received Common Platform and there has been some functionality issues, it was agreed that the risk will remain until further roll out has completed.

LCJB Governance Structure – this risk is to remain the same, as the work progresses and is agreed, the risk can be reassessed.

CTLs – The Board agreed that this is to remain at this time.

Readiness for elevated Crown Court caseload – The Board agreed that as more cases are listed in the Crown Courts, there is a risk that all supporting agencies may not be fully able to support the additional caseload due to resourcing issues.

ACTION 2021 38 AC : All agency readiness for elevated Crown Court caseload (resources etc.) – draft appropriately to reflect the risk across all agencies in London

Agenda item 9: Agenda Setting

CJ Options to Reduce Youth Homicides and Violence – The Board agreed the importance of looking at this from a CJ perspective

Domestic Abuse (DA) – The Board discussed that more focus on how to improve Criminal Justice for victims of DA eg. DA Specialist Courts etc.

ACTION 2021/37 DW : Domestic Abuse (DA) – to be added to the LCJB Agenda

Hate Crime – The Board agree that there are many aspects of Hate Crime that can be looked at from a CJ perspective

Extension of S28 – Extension to S28 to include intimidated witnesses

Agenda item 10: AOB

LCJB Meeting Re-Structure – The Chair updated The Board that the draft of the new structure is currently with The Mayor's Office where a few issues remain.

Share this page

Need a document on this page in an accessible format?

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of a PDF or other document on this page in a more accessible format, please get in touch via our [online form](#) and tell us which format you need.

It will also help us if you tell us which assistive technology you use. We'll consider your request and get back to you in 5 working days.

Useful links

Who we are

Jobs

Venue hire

Keep up to date

Contact us

Accessibility

London Criminal Justice Board - 28 September 2021 minutes

[Home](#) > [Programmes and Strategies](#) >
[Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime \(MOPAC\)](#) >
[MOPAC governance and decision making](#) >
[The London Criminal Justice Board](#) >
London Criminal Justice Board - 28 September 2021 minutes

Present

Louisa Rolfe, MPS (Chair) – AC Met Operations

Barbara Gray, MPS – DAC

Damon Williams, MPS – LCJB Business Manager

Sara Lewis, MPS – Head of Met Prosecutions

Sue Williams, MPS – CJ Commander

[Home](#)

[Search](#)

[Menu](#)

Mat Pickering, MOPAC

Damian McCleave, HMCTS – Head of Crime

Darius Hemmatpour, MPS – Chief Superintendent

Barry Hughes, CPS CCP – London North

Stephen Beckett-Carroll, Probation

Helen Isaac, CoLP

Simone Oram, MPS – Police Sergeant

Gary Mancini, MPS – Police Constable

Lisa Mylett, BTP

Domonic Daley, Youth Justice

Mo Foster, Prisons

Kris Venkatasami, CPS Deputy CCP – London South

Apologies

Lionel Idan, CPS CCP – London South

Alex Murray, MPS - Commander

Stephen McAllister, MMCTS – Magistrates Courts

Adeela Khan, London Criminal Court Solicitors Assoc

Charlie Doyle, BTP - ACC

Welcome - introductions, minutes and actions

The Board agreed the previous minutes without amendment.

The Board reviewed and discussed LCJB outstanding actions.

Actions agreed for closure as per recommendations.

Agenda item two: case progression, court backlog and timeliness

During the previously circulated performance pack presentation, the below item was discussed:

Cracked and ineffective trials – The Board discussed what can be done in relation to this issue. On the 19th October, the CPS are looking at case progression, overall, there tends to be more cases adjourned within London than in the rest of the country. The Police have met with MoJ in relation to thinking about how defendants can be encouraged to plead guilty at the earliest opportunity. The Board are aware that due to the length of time that is currently waiting for a trial to come to court may provide little incentive to plead guilty

early on in the process.

Crown Court throughput – the throughput of cases through the Crown Courts is currently high. HMCTS are in the process of

completing a deep dive into the available data. The results will be brought back to The Board.

BTP Pilot – BTP will be commencing a pilot soon in which they will observe what happens in court. The intention is to observe from the Police perspective rather than the CPS, and exploring the possibility of trying in the absence of the defendants to negate the need for an adjournment.

Backlog in London – The Board discussed how the case file backlog remains an issue in London and that there are defendants still in custody since before COVID. This is causing a number of issues, there have been cases where the Judges have released the defendant when CPS request an extension to custody. HMCTS continue to petition the Judiciary around providing further resources to be able to utilise all available court spaces. Police are keen to ensure that all cases are consulted with prior to any release from custody at court so that all circumstances (not just time served) are considered.

Agenda item three: CJ options to reduce youth homicides and violence

The Board agreed that the discussion in the previous meeting was very useful where an action was raised to trial a new way of working, work continues in relation to this and all updates will be logged on the actions sheet.

This discussion began due to the high number of young people that are involved in knife crime, violence and homicide offences as victims and/or suspects that are on bail for other offences, and therefore, is there more that can be done through intervention as they are already within the CJS.

The Board have been considering the options where a young person is arrested for, for example, possession of offensive weapon and possession with intent to supply drugs (PWITS). MPS are keen to consider early charging decisions which is not possible in these cases, prevented by the further work in relation to the drugs offences (forensic ident through analysis of drug for evidential

offences (forensic ident through analysis of drug for evidential purposes) which leads to the defendant being bailed.

Splitting charges

The Board discussed situations when there is a charge of possession with intent to supply drugs (PWITs) and offensive weapon, and whether the charges should be split. This is due to the delay in charging for the offensive weapon while the drugs are sent away for analysis. MPS with CPS colleagues are currently looking further into the data to see how best to move forward with this.

CPS (London South) and Police Pilot in Lambeth

MPS are putting a paper together with data etc. with the aim of exploring various options, including splitting charges. This is looking at how police can expedite some of the GREEN charging decisions. The MPS is looking at running a pilot in Lambeth and initially, in consultation with CPS colleagues looking at what offence types would be included in that pilot. MPS will pull together a proposal, considering the number of cases, once complete this will be put to CPS colleagues. The Board highlighted these are initial discussions and have not, at this time involved Youth Justice colleagues.

What charges to consider

Some of the charges are police charged – possession of offensive weapon, possession of knife.

PWITs cases have been mentioned and are currently being explored and volumes looked at. Some CPS colleagues in London feel these crimes are not able to be included within the pilot.

National charging – there is discussion at NPCC around national charging. RED exception cases. Policing was disappointed with the position reached in these meetings with CPS around RED exception cases.

It will now be part of a 6 months discovery phase, national piece of work with the aim of establishing what could be a RED exception case.

Chief Constable Nick Dean leads on this work with Greg McGill (CPS) and meet as part of the criminal justice update at the NPCC where discussions around the RED and GREEN cases will take place.

If a national position is reached around these types of cases, the local negotiation with CPS will no longer be needed. The police are

renewal negotiations that are no longer as needed. The police are keen to establish a position that suits operationally.

Charging transformation

What is a RED exception case:

in custody, seeking a charge, anticipating a remand application

Or

on bail, remand application may be considered.

Community Resolutions (CR) for U18s for possession of cannabis

The MPS recently introduced CR for Under 18s for possession of cannabis. The main advantage is that it enables the police to have the intervention (for them and their family) that can steer the youngster into a different more positive pathway.

Since 01/08/2021 nearly 200 CR have been issued to young people across London for possession of cannabis and each one are referred to the Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) where interventions are offered.

Community Resolutions for under 18s for other offences

MPS are looking into CRs for U18s for all offences where current possible interventions are looked at as well as considering how this can be improved across each BCU.

Problem Orientated Policing (POP)

The MPS are using POP, also known as problem solving policing which is an approach that involves the identification of a specific problem and uses data analysis to understand the problem and develop a tailored response. The MPS currently have 211 identified individuals where interventions will be made for focused deterrents and are working with the partners on those individuals.

Civil orders

The MPS have been focusing on civil orders, looking at how officers can consider utilising civil orders more effectively as an alternative to remand or when remand has been refused for example, in addition to post court hearings (CBOs).

Knife Crime Protection Orders (KCPOs) – The Board discussed the KCPO pilot currently running and that very few orders have progressed. MPS are in discussions with HMCTS around how information can be provided to the Magistrates so that they are

information can be provided to the magistrates so that they are more aware of the KCPOs.

Probation met with MPS DI Dean Purvis to ensure that the communication between the two agencies is effective in relation to

KCPOs. Probation have a plan in place that will look at:

- how KCPOs will be promoted to probation staff
- devise and implement a clear process within probation
- ensure identification, liaison and effective proposals are in place
- engaging with sentences.

The Board established that further communications with MOPAC is needed on KCPOs.

Action 2021/39 LCC : KCPO communications - MOPAC may be able to make some useful communications to explain the recent importance of the use of that Knife Crime Prevention Orders. Louise Capel-Cure to look into what might be possible from MOPAC.

Agenda item four: Victim Care Hub

LVWS introduce colleagues from PA Consulting. It relates to a Mayoral manifesto to explore the creation of a Victim Care Hub. LVWS and Met Prosecutions have been working closely on putting together a tender specification that will go out to suppliers.

PA introduce themselves, Andrew Dowie and Neil Amos to The Board. They will meet with most of the members, some meetings have already taken place. PA Consulting bring policing and justice insight and combine it with their business case experience to enable evidence-based decisions to be made.

PA Consulting are looking at the strategies of what's already been completed, aiming to complete the priorities by December. For this project to be successful engaging with the right stakeholders is very important, reaching agreement on the objectives and consider the full range of options ensuring that the objectives are delivered.

The business case will be built around delivering key groups of benefits:

- developing a victim centred approach

Improved CJ outcomes

value for money and the efficiency and effectiveness of the victims' journey

continual improvement.

The Board discussed the below points:

Probation – PA Consulting have a meeting arranged with Probation to discuss how victims tend to be linked into Probation post sentence, which is a different part of the CJS, to ensure this is considered and covered in the objectives.

Scope – part of the consultation at this stage involves the scope. Some victims never report to the police, for example so would the work involve these victims or only the ones that reach court. The work aims to establish the operational scope of the Victim Care Hub.

MoJ – PA Consultancy are liaising with MoJ and are keen to liaise with anyone further (national strategy leads) that is felt to be worth speaking to so welcome any suggestions from anyone in The Board.

All comments and thoughts are welcome in relation to this.

Agenda item five: domestic abuse and hate crime

The Board received the previously circulated DA update paper in which an update was provided in relation to the monthly multi agency Domestic Abuse Delivery Board (DADB), chaired by the CPS.

Over the last 12 months and looking forwards, the key priorities of the are to increase the referral rate coming from police to the CPS for consideration for a charging decision. Analysis has shown that in the cases that are referred to the CPS, there is a relatively high charge rate compared to the national figures.

CPS have completed some historic working looking at no further action (NFA) and cautions taken what we can and fed it back in terms of lessons learned etc.

Evidence led prosecutions – CPS have been working closely with MPS on evidence led prosecutions, which relies on evidence other than from the complainant (BWV, 999 call, house to house etc.)

This work is very important as we know that witness attrition accounts for half of unsuccessful outcomes. This involves by investigators and prosecutors so training has been delivered across the MPS and the CPS in regards to these cases.

Conviction rates – performance is embedded in the previously circulated paper, which shows that London is behind the national conviction rate.

Guilty plea rate – the delivery board is focusing on ways to improve the guilty plea rates. It is preferable for the defendant to plead guilty at the earliest opportunity as this prevents the victim needing to attend court to give evidence and prevents attrition. The key to the guilty plea at the earliest opportunity is to ensure the strongest case is built and from the outset and once at court, there is effective case management.

Remote witness sites – the Board discussed additional support that can be provided in terms of the work of the Domestic Abuse Delivery Board. Further work around providing remote witness sites, that would enable victims and witnesses to give evidence from remote locations meaning they don't have to travel to court and face the perpetrator. This would work with the roll out of the expansion of S28 and with recording of cross examination.

Best practice framework – one of the pieces of work that the DA Delivery Board is working on is to implement and embed the best practice framework across London. The Board discuss how far away implementation of this is. At the end of 2020, work was done to ensure all the components of the framework were adopted across the LJAs into the agreed position. Due to a move away from reporting, the picture across the LJAs is quite varied. We need to focus now on regular updates to ensure that that framework is embedded as BAU across the LJAs.

The Board discussed how there is currently no representative from FLP that attends the Domestic Abuse Delivery Board.

If any actions are raised in relation to the work of the DA Delivery Board, they can be taken through MPS CJ Gold Group to prevent duplication.

Action 2021/41 LR/DW: the MPS at the DADB - The MPS are not currently being represented at the Domestic Abuse Delivery Board. It may be possible that they can. Louisa Rolfe to look into the possibility of some MPS attendance at the DADB. Damon Williams will liaise with Lisa Ramsarran and Matt Pilch to map out DA meeting structure and ensure appropriate MPS attendance.

Effectiveness and attendance of LJAs – The Board discussed how the attendance at LJAs can be bad. When the LJAs run, they are very effective as they incorporate all the CJ agencies within the Court areas. The Board agree that this is an area that needs to be looked at. These should report into the LCJB or the CJ Efficiency Board. The LJAs were providing quarterly updates that appears to have fallen away since COVID.

Action 2021/40 SL/DW: LJA re-invigoration - LJAs used to give updates back to the LCJB. These have stopped and should be brought back plus ensuring that the relevant framework is being used. Sara Lewis/Damon Williams will contact the LJA Chairs and them to provide updates for the next LCJB meeting.

Work overseen and monitored by the Domestic Abuse Delivery Board was discussed:

MPS pilot – 2 MPS BCUs are running a pilot in which a risk-based approach is used, where there is a STANDARD risk and the officers have the opportunity to arrest the defendant at an early stage and support the victim effectively. The work is in its early stages, the Delivery Board have provided the MPS with outcome data to set a benchmark for outcomes. The DADB are expecting an update from the MPS at their November board.

Op Cara – is where conditional cautions are being considered for DA offences. Members of the DADB have been involved with meetings with MPS which established that this is not for consideration at this time but will be considered at a later stage.

Domestic Abuse Deep Dives, key findings from Hampshire Police.

The work looked at DA cases as they progressed through the CJ system.

Methodology – selecting eight to 10 DA cases that had entered the CJS and ended in a conviction. Using an investigator and prosecutor that was not involved in the case, HMCTS reviewed their agency's input into that case. 75 cases were looked at across 8 police forces.

Looking at things such as DA Best Practice Framework and considerations around DA.

The key findings:

- agencies operating in isolation

- timeliness issues across the system – especially if the suspect

unnecessary releases across the system – especially if the suspect was bailed

victims get lost within the process – the longer the process, the higher likelihood of the victim withdrawing

delays in court system and listing trials a contributing factor

police prioritising front end demand, not secondary investigation

inconsistent prioritization by CPS at point of charge

variable use of BWV by police.

Some positives from the report:

Many forces adopting a DA gatekeeper role to expedite secondary enquiries that is very successful.

The main recommendation is that LCJBs commission a more joined up process. For example, prosecutors, investigators and court service staff in a room together, take them through cases and get them to perform a more system-based review by looking at the case together.

The Domestic Abuse Delivery Board does look at similar work, but on a smaller scale. This work will be remitted to the delivery board where the partners can be organized to look at cases together.

Hate crime

This will be discussed at the next LCJB. There is work in progress and an action plan is in place. Marin Kerby, the MPS LRO will be invited to the next LCJB.

Agenda Item six: agency updates

CPS

CPS are preparing for the trial blitz that is due to start. In the Crown Court the backlog remains the main issue. The CPS are continuing to recruit additional prosecutors as well as non legal staff.

HMCTS

HMCTS are working in a number of areas to address the Crown Court backlog, including scrutinizing Crown Court disposals data to ensure HMCTS is always working at optimum operating levels.

Prisons

Prisons are looking into available options for increasing capacity

across the country, which may lead to additional pressures on police custody. The Police will struggle to find additional capacity in custodys in London and would need considerable warning to ensure planning is possible. In the meantime Prisons are

considering other options within the estate. Higher amounts of prisoners together may increase crimes inside prisons.

Probation

Service delivery – from 10/09/2021 every probation region has moved from the exceptional delivery model to the new operational model, which is in line with the national standard.

Some of the key changes that we will move to include:

Minimum monthly face to face appointments to all people on probation, with the exception of unpaid work which is stand alone.

Home visits – reintroduction of home visits in every case. If not complied with, this is recorded.

Initial appointments – all carried out face to face. This includes people on probation with standalone unpaid work.

Different regions are at different stages of recovery and each region is able to apply to have some national standards suspended if they can't be delivered (for example, for recovery reasons) but also, for BAU reasons (such as low staffing).

London is recovering well 14 out of 18 of our delivery units are currently delivering national standards fully.

The four delivery units that are not delivering at the moment have suspended between one and four national standards – work continues to assist them achieving BAU.

Community Payback

Currently operating at around 55 per cent of delivery. This is due to reduced groups (due to continued social distancing) as well as difficulties sourcing some of our unpaid work placement options in addition to a backlog that is being dealt with through a national piece of work. This involves bulk listing. Those cases that were affected by the lockdowns will be extended by the court passed the original time so that those unpaid work hours can be completed.

Accredited programs – is currently operating at around 25 per cent of delivery.

Restricted group numbers.

Not being able to get the numbers through the program as before.

All the groups are up and running and we are exploring alternative ways to deliver those groups.

Pre-release services are currently working at 80 per cent of service delivery:

Polygraph testing.

Victims unit.

Sex Offender program.

Senior attendance centres.

Court report recovery

Making progress with some courts that are very close to 50 per cent, Ealing Magistrates Court, Highbury Corner.

Croydon and City of London Courts are not improving at the ideal rate, but both have non COVID related performance issues that continue to be addressed, with improvement plans in place.

Training bootcamp for legacy CRC staff – this increases the amount of probation officers that are available and enables them to complete pre-sentence reports (PSRs).

Probation are confident that they will be able to provide the additional capacity to support the trial blitzes in the courts.

The chair discusses with probation the work that MPS has discussed with Probation where work for TSG teams doing some work around stop and search, particularly in areas of London where there is a high proportion of black communities – sharing information in a constructive way, ie why we carry out stop and search and what it is all about. MPS are awaiting an update on this from probation.

London Victims and Witness Service (LVWS)

The Agency are seeing volumes go back to pre covid and staying steady. Changes to the staffing structure are in progress and much more face to face working is taking place.

Defence Community (LCCSA)

No one present

no one present.

Youth Justice

Youth Justice are now working mostly face to face, with some hybrid working still in place. The number of cases being referred into YOTs are low which adds to the concern around the current level and nature of violence across London.

Police:

Metropolitan Police

Met Detention - are operating back to normal levels.

Witness Care Units (WCU) – due to the court backlogs, the higher demand led to a higher workload for staff. More staff have been recruited.

VRH – a small number of VRH are used to support the courts where required. The MPS have a pilot for Breach of Bail VRHs working with HMCTS Magistrates Court. More information will be available to bring to The Board for the next meeting.

PECS and SERCO - HMCTS chairs a group, where it has been raised that PECS and SERCO have recruitment issues and will keep The Board informed. There is a plan in place to improve performance and the option for VRH remains if required.

Out of Court Disposals (OCD) – 2 tier structure will be adopted in London in 2023. The necessary work needed to ensure planning, training and delivery is in progress.

City of London Police

No update.

British Transport Police

BTP have found that they are holding onto cases for longer and that last minute adjournments causes issues. More finalisations have been recorded which is positive. BTP trials appear to be excluded from the trial blitzes which may prevent our backlogs reducing at the rate that other police forces are reducing. BTP are engaging in the right conversations to address this and working with our CPS colleagues but as we are a national force, this can make this slightly more complicated.

Agenda Item 7: Risk Register

Risk of increase in officer numbers and increase in crime due to the ending of the COVID restrictions are to be combined as the risks are linked.

CJS Recovery Plan – when considering all the risks that are currently on the Risk Register, The Board discussed the need to consider commissioning a high-level end-to-end CJS recovery plan which would involve joining together each part of the system's individual plans, identifying inter-dependencies, effective monitoring and support with investigation and initiatives where required.

Action 2021/42 DM/DW/ALL : High Level CJS Recovery plan - A useful project will be to begin a high level risk management strategy for COVID recovery, mainly in the crown court as various small actions are currently working independently. This could involve monitor and reporting systems. All Agencies can have someone involved in the project. DM may begin as the chair of this project. All Agencies need to put someone forward to play a part. Damon Williams to find out from other LCJBs what strategies may be useful for COVID recovery planning. DW will check with business managers at regional LCJBs for best practice.

Agenda item 8: agenda setting

Hate Crime – Martin Kerby, LRO to be invited to next LCJB

LJAs – SL to give update to The Board on the work to reinvigorate the LJAs.

CJS Recovery plan – The Board would like to speak further at another LCJB meeting around this item to discuss progress

S28 and S17 – a suggestion was made that a member of the Judiciary could come and update The Board. HMCTS will discuss with colleagues to establish the best person to come to The Board and provide an update on S28 and S17

Frequency of meetings – these meetings will become quarterly. The Chair will meet with the CCPs for London north and south to discuss further

Agenda item 9: AOB

Share this page

Need a document on this page in an accessible format?

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of a PDF or other document on this page in a more accessible format, please get in touch via our [online form](#) and tell us which format you need.

It will also help us if you tell us which assistive technology you use. We'll consider your request and get back to you in 5 working days.

Useful links

[Who we are](#)

[Jobs](#)

[Venue hire](#)

[Privacy policy](#)

[Terms and conditions](#)

[City Hall blog](#)

[Keep up to date](#)

[Contact us](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Cafe](#)

[Freedom of Information](#)

[Media centre](#)

We use cookies to ensure that we give you the best experience on our website. [View cookie settings](#).

© Copyright Greater London Authority 2022

London Criminal Justice Board - 16th December 2021 Minutes

[Home](#) > [London Criminal Justice Board - 16th December 2021 Minutes](#)

Attending:

Louisa Rolfe - MPS (Chair) – AC Met Operations

Damon Williams- MPS – LCJB Business Manager

Sue Williams - MPS – CJ Commander

Suzanne Burke - MPS – LCJB Support (minutes)

Ali Hinchcliff - MPS – LCJB Support

Damian McCleave - HMCTS – Head of Crime

Helen Isaac - BTP

Dominic Daley - Youth Justice

Puri Hesham - LCCSA

Lionel Idan - CPS CCP – London South

Stephen Mcallister - HMCTS – Magistrates Court

Andrew Blight - Probation

Chloe Iliesa - MOPAC

Lisa Ramsarran - CPS D/CCP

Apologies:

Barry Hughes - CPS CCP – London North

Mo Foster - Prisons

Gary Poole - Prisons

Susan Yeoman-Jones - BTP

Lisa Mylett - BTP

Welcome - Introductions, Minutes and actions

The Board agreed the previous minutes without amendment.

The Board reviewed and discussed LCJB outstanding actions.
Actions agreed for closure as per recommendations.

Agenda Item 2: Performance Overview (incl. discussion of future performance reporting at LCJB)

CJS Score Cards

The Board are introduced to the new CJS score cards which have been published.

MoJ and LCJB Business Managers meeting – the CJS scorecards were discussed at this meeting. The MoJ see the score cards as being split into 3 phases which aligns with which agency owns the data.

The City of London data may be challenging to separate out from the MPS data

The data is owned depending on which stage of case progression the case is at:

Recorded offence to CPS referral stage – Police are the data owner. The understanding is that the majority of that performance is owned by Policing. This is from the point of the first CPS referral from the police and the belief is that this includes early investigative advice. This data will be broken down by BCU in London and may be able to be drilled down further into if required.

CPS referral to charge authorised – CPS are the data owner

CPS referral to charge authorizes – CPS are the data owner.
This data will be broken down into CPS area level.

Point of charge to point of completion in the court – HMCTS
are the data owner. This data will be broken down into HMCTS
areas as well as individual courts.

The next iteration of the cards (end of January 2022) will include
localized score cards, (the current cards are national) and will
include Q3 data (July, August, September). This means the data
will not be as current as the data that has been used previously.
This will be discussed further at the LCJB Data and Analysis
Working Group.

Data layout – the data is likely to be presented via a dashboard in
a more familiar manner that The Board have seen previously.

The data available will be published, so the public will have access
to it.

The Board are shown the CJS Scorecards and a performance pack
is delivered using the data.

Agenda Item 3: Cross CJ Recovery Plan

The Cross CJ Recovery Plan involves aligning plans to support
recovery of Crown Court with all CJ partner agencies.

HMCTS took a presentation to their HMCTS Board which included
a deep dive into Crown Court performance to promote discussions
around how to reduce the backlogs. A paper will be disseminated to
all Agencies, providing a framework of areas to focus on to reduce
the backlog in the crown court.

HMCTS Workshop – in the New Year, HMCTS will hold a
workshop, lead by the new head of crime for London, with all
partner agencies to discuss the Cross CJ Recovery Plans and to
identify what the priorities are and where the focus should be
through the support of the LCJB.

The Board are aware of the need to establish what to focus on to
assist in steering the direction of the plan:

Driving up early guilty plea rate – the key to this is disclosure at
the earliest opportunity by OIC's. Supporting officers with
investigations – the police consider what additional support can be
offered to OIC's earlier to get things done expeditiously as soon as

the offender is in custody.

Funding - Bellamy report states the CJS requires additional funding. The Board fully support the Bellamy report and the well thought through solutions contained within it. The Board needs to look at how to obtain further funding to support defence looking at material earlier and overall work into early guilty pleas.

Defence lawyers review evidence early – more experienced lawyers are proved to give the right advice earlier. There are issues around funding and retaining lawyers, experienced defence lawyers are moving to the CPS due to lack of funding for defence lawyers. MPS will consider how younger newer defence lawyers can be better supported when in custody suites.

Victim attrition – the longer the case goes on the more likely the victim will withdraw their support for the prosecution.

Pleading Guilty on the first day of Crown Court trial – offenders often elect for a CC trial and then plead guilty on the first day. It is identified that this is often the first opportunity that all the evidence (BWV etc.) is seen by the defence, and further demonstrates that early disclosure of evidence will speed up this guilty plea rate.

It is important that all evidence and disclosure is available at the point of charging. The court then can case manage in a way that will narrow down these issues; due to DG6 and defence having better engagement and this in turn will mean that the first hearing is more efficient and may lead to more early guilty pleas.

Video Evidence played in interviews – many consultations have found that playing video evidence (BWV etc.) in the interview results in more early admissions of guilt by the offender. The MPS have communicated this message in their CJ Comms and will continue to push this key message to ensure that more officers use BWV in interview. Defence Lawyers confirm that it is often the case that when offenders view compelling video evidence they tend to plead guilty. This video evidence is often disclosed at a very late point within the CJS, often just before the first hearing. However, if the BWV was disclosed at the earliest opportunity this could lead to more increased earlier guilty pleas.

Triable Either Way Offences – there are many offences that are triable either way but would be more appropriate to be heard in the Magistrates Court. Due to the triable either way status often the option to elect for a Crown Court trial is taken. The Board can consider whether there is any influence over legislative changes that keeps appropriate summary crimes in the Magistrates Courts

where they are currently triable either way.

Disclosure – MPS is holding a number of regular strategic disclosure boards where the above issues will be discussed.

Agenda Item 4: Agency Updates on Recovery (including impact of HMG 'Plan B')

Board members were invited to raise issues, by exception in relation to recovery:

CPS

Nothing raised

HMCTS

Nothing raised

Crown Court – there has been ongoing work to obtain Judges from outside of London to sit in London courts to assist with the backlog. Advertisements have gone out and the first wave of visiting judges took place last month.

Nightingale Courts – there is a commitment for London to retain its Nightingale Courts. At least one site will have to be relocated due to commercial reasons. The funding has been agreed.

Magistrates Court – on the use of live links there is a lot of work within HMCTS on this. There is likely to be an increase in applications for video hearings. Magistrates Court are prepared and ready for this increase in the applications for

Prisons

Written update provided by Prisons –

52 prisons with outbreaks mainly with the Delta variant, but they are expecting Omicron to enter into the prison system soon. Hospitalisations have taken place and there have been a number of staff cases in London with one prisoner fatality. Outbreaks confirmed in all London prisons

74 prisons in Stage 1 social distancing with considerations to take these back to stage 2. London prisons are offering a stage 1 regime of reverting to stage 2 social distancing. Have infections control measures in place.

Staff absences increased but hasn't impacted significantly on business as usual; such as accompanying prisoners to court and social visits from external visitors.

Face to face social visits are managed with well established infection control.

There has also been an increase capacity for visitors and extended operating hours. Demand for video consultations are high within the prisons.

CTL cases – raised with prisons, any interruption to that will impact the CJS.

PECS – subcontractors are having increasing COVID absences that impacts on the whole CJS as it impacts on their ability to produce prisoners.

Probation

Nothing raised

London Victims and Witness Service (LVWS)

Nothing raised

Defence Community (LCCSA)

It is likely that by the end of the day, protocol 3 may be adopted – this is a return to remote interviews/meetings other than youths and vulnerable adults.

Youth Justice

Nothing raised

Metropolitan Police

Nothing raised

City of London Police

Nothing raised

British Transport Police

Nothing raised

Agenda Item 5: Hate Crime Update

This agenda item will be moved to the March LJCB

Agenda Item 6 : Charging Arrangements

Charging transformation

Red and Green arrangements are still being discussed.

What is a RED exception case:

In custody, seeking a charge, anticipating a remand application

Or

On bail, remand application may be considered

Discussions around local arrangements continue between CPS and the NPCC, that are looking at solutions in relation to focusing on gangs, high harm offenders, DA etc. Work needs to be done to identify why there are problems with charging when Police are ready to charge.

The Board agreed that this issue of charging decisions remains a work in progress between the CPS and Police.

Agenda Item 7: Out of Court Disposals Two Tier Framework Implementation

Information was provided to the Board around what the implementation of the Two Tier framework will look like in April 2023. Diversionary cautions; will be on criminal record and community cautions; will not. Consideration will need to be given around a referral process (drug/alcohol worker) for each individual and it would be useful for there to be an App to use for the office to decide which was the best option. The schemes may differ dependent on area of London where subject lives.

Some data shows that the MPS currently issues 12,000 cautions; including FPN. These will all fall under the new Two Tier framework. Work is being undertaken to work out how and what impact this will have on FLP. All outcomes that are cautionable (simple / conditional) will fall under this framework; however it is yet to be decided how it will be categorized – Diversionary and Community. It is also unknown how CPS work will sit within this framework.

Main risk at this time is how the breaches will be dealt with (no central team) Risks are that we don't have a central team and how breaches will be dealt with – Diversionary could be deferred for prosecution and Community could result in a fine. This could be

seen to reduce disproportionality. There could be a loss in sanction detections as a performance measure. A number of other impacts may occur which are yet to be identified.

Firstly, a Central team needs to be established. There will be a lot of training required to roll this out. It is not believed that anything will be provided by COP so this will need to be done locally. There is a question around a National referrals process and which team will look at the breaches.

It is unknown if the new framework will apply to DA. Currently Cautions for DA are the exception and whilst they are trying to drive up cases for DA; the introduction of the framework may have the opposite effect to this. However, a victim may be more helpful if there was a community caution involved rather than the victim not supporting due to length of time through Court.

Diversionary cautions sound similar to conditional cautions and CPS will need to identify how they will be involved in this framework if they are referred to Court for non-compliance. CPS do sit on MoJ nationally for this framework. PNDs should become Community as with most of PNDs. Legislation requires admission and therefore this can pose a problem with D&D/D&I. Breaches will be challenging. It is unknown how many there will be but maybe another Force's data may give us some insight into this.

The Board asked the question around whether the cautions will be disclosable on a DBS. The Community Caution would be shown on an enhanced DBS and a Diversionary Caution will be on a normal DBS. The new framework does not include youths.

Agenda Item 8 : Directors Guidance (Charging) Arrangements

The DGA information will be placed in the new scorecard. This will be relevant to the Police and other agencies as well. There has been two sets of data and lots of work has been done. The MPS review the failures, take some back to CPS and then another challenge meeting takes place before finalisation. 846 failures in Oct (145 dups). The agreement around what the failures are is still be discussed and considered.

CPS are not sure the figures are correct – CPS believe it to be

CPS are not sure the figures are correct - CPS believe it to be 56%; whilst it is currently recorded in the MPS as 44%. The issues surrounding cases being referred back and forth between the Police and CPS continue and there is still a lot of work to be done to reduce this.

The Board has raised the importance of looking at quality good files rather than concentrating merely on the available data.

Agenda Item 9: Common Platform

HMCT is keen to work with partner agencies and will not be going ahead until Police are happy with the way forward.

Agenda Item 10: Risk Register Review and Remissions to CJ Effectiveness Board

The Board reviewed the below risks on the Risk Register.

RISKS

Common Platform – the challenge has moved on from the risk as it is currently shown. The update from HMCTS will be considered and the risk will be re-articulated. The risk has changed from originally reflected on the risk register and is now focused around the software and how it performs within the Court setting. The Board agree to keep the risk rating as AMBER.

ISSUES

S28 – this issue has moved on since it was added and there is a further risk around the roll out of S17 and what this would encompass. The Board discussed whether the expansion and the demand this would generate could be added as a new risk/issue. In addition the availability of CPS Counsel could present further risks. The full understanding around what is needed to ensure the expansion of S28 is effective is where the risk would sit. This remains Amber but will have a high impact when the change happens.

Governance structure – agreed it should be taken off the risk register.

Community Payback – to remain on the register as although it is improving, there is still work to be done and this was delayed by Covid.

Agenda item 11: Agenda Setting

Hate Crime – Supt Matt Kirby and Tracey Mesme / Toks Adeysan.

S28 Expansion

Cracked Trials

Cross CJS Plans

Agenda item 12: AOB

Thank you to Damian McCleave who is moving on from his current role.

Share this page

Need a document on this page in an accessible format?

If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and need a version of a PDF or other document on this page in a more accessible format, please get in touch via our [online form](#) and tell us which format you need.

It will also help us if you tell us which assistive technology you use. We'll consider your request and get back to you in 5 working days.

Useful links

Who we are

Jobs

Venue hire

Privacy policy

Terms and conditions

City Hall blog

Keep up to date

Contact us

Accessibility

Cafe

Freedom of Information

Media centre

London Criminal Justice Board

Friday 15 July 2022

11.30 – 13:30

Rm U164 Union Street

MINUTES

Present

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Sophie Linden (SL) | Deputy Mayor, MOPAC |
| • Debbie Weekes-Bernard (DBW) | Deputy Mayor |
| • Diana Luchford (DL) | Chief Executive, MOPAC |
| • Will Balakrishnan ((WB) | Director, C&P, MOPAC |
| • Kenny Bowie (KB) | Director, S&MPS Oversight MOPAC |
| • Barbara Gray (BG) | MPS |
| • Nick John (NJ) | MPS |
| • Barry Hughes | Chief Crown Prosecutor London North, CPS |
| • Althea Loderick | London Councils |
| • Gary Poole (GP) | London Prisons |
| • Martin Machray (MM) | NHS England |
| • David Malone | Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor London South, CPS |
| • Andrew Nicholson (AM) | HMCTS |
| • Andrea Simone | EVAW |
| • Claudia Strut (CS) | CEO, YJB |
| • Karen Tipping (KT) | NPS |

Apologies

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Ian Bickers | Prisons Director, HMPPS |
| • Sinead Derwin | NHS |
| • Lionel Idan (LI) | Chief Crown Prosecutor, CPS |
| • Stephen McAllister | HMCTS |
| • Jo Towens | Head of Crime, HMCTS |
| • Kilvinder Vigurs | Director, NPS |

In Attendance

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| • Tamara Barnett | Officer, MOPAC |
| • Tina Price (TP) | Officer, MOPAC |
| • Naomi Sterling (NS) | Senior Advisor, MOPAC |
| • Sean Cregten | Consultant, Leapwise |

Welcome, Apologies and Introductions

1. Introduction and case for new LCJB approach
 2. Priority outcomes for LCJB to drive in partnership in this period
 3. Accelerating progress: LCJB workplan
 4. Spotlight: LCJB's role in delivering the VAWG strategy
 5. Any Other Business
-

Actions

Action – Consult and consider extending LCJB invitation to all London prison directors and partners within defence (SL, WB, TB).

Response – decision made to invite additional guests as and when the agenda requires it. Defence are invited to this meeting. Note that MOPAC has also reached out to the National Criminal Justice Board and invited them to attend the next meeting.

Action – MM agreed to share available data held on NHS database which helped to identify ethnicity and/or protected characteristics to facilitate partners gaps in knowledge due to lack of available data.

Response – MOPAC and NHS have been in touch about sharing this data. Follow up is required to share this data with partners.

Action: Review disproportionality data and inclusion in outcomes.

Response – Have added disproportionality to all sub-board outcomes and at next LCJB will create a sub-group on data to include all partners' data leads

Welcome

The Deputy Mayor, Sophie Linden opened the meeting. Members were welcomed to the first meeting of the new London Criminal Justice Board (LCJB). There was an expression of thanks to AC Louisa Rolfe for her role as Chair on the former LCJB and for her contribution to the Board.

1. Introduction and case for new LCJB approach

LCJB partners were advised regarding the rationale for the new LCJB noting that the purpose was to set in place a new structure for the Board that included an outcome-focused, strategic approach whilst building on the previous good work of LCJB. Partners were advised of the important need to work in partnership to deliver for London in coming months and years.

The previously circulated Terms of Reference (ToR) for the LCJB and its sub boards was summarised with the key points and terms within, highlighted for approval.

Partners expressed appreciation for the pre LCJB engagement that had taken place and for the opportunity to review and provide feedback in relation to the

ToRs.

It was recommended that the Board invite partners from Defence to attend LCJB. The Chair noted the recommendation with advice that consideration would be given to inviting a defence partner to attend according to LCJB agenda items.

The role of the prison service was discussed with advice there was more than one prison director for London. It was advised that whilst it was possible to cross consult ahead of and for the purpose of reporting to LCJB, it would be beneficial to have representation from all London prison directors on the board. The Chair noted this advice and agreed to consider inviting both prison directors to ensure the new board moved forward in the right direction.

- Action – Consult and consider extending LCJB invitation to all London prison directors and partners within defence (SL, WB, TB)
- Decision – The ToR was approved, subject to the caveats to be addressed by MOPAC officers and as raised by partners.

2. Priority outcomes for LCJB to drive in partnership in this period

The previously circulated LCJB priority outcomes was presented and taken as read.

The importance of the outcomes to accelerate movement and ensure progress across LCJB, whilst influencing processes and outcomes within the CJS was noted.

It was advised a consensus amongst partners regarding the key aspects which should be improved upon was being sought. It was noted LCJB outcomes should align with the Police and Crime Plan (PCP).

Partners were taken through each outcome:

- Outcome 1 – Increasing public trust and confidence in the CJS as a whole

Partners discussed whether this was a standalone outcome or one which was closely tied to outcomes 2 and 3. It was suggested that increasing trust and confidence should be incremental with indicators that are tied to progress rather than an implicit implication of trust. It was considered that this outcome could only be achieved once all other work had been done.

It was discussed increasing trust and confidence refers to the CJS as a whole rather than solely the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) which it was acknowledged, does have a significant role in the outcome being met.

The overlap between law enforcement rights for vulnerable individuals and young people was put forward for discussion.

It was argued a child focused CJS and the elimination of the unnecessary criminalisation of children should be a focus of the LCJB and therefore included in the framework. Partners deliberated this point and considered whether it was an objective

CONFIDENTIAL

which sat best within one of the LCJB sub boards.

Partners discussed the need for accurate and relevant data in term of victims of crime and the impact of crime on Londoners and also the most affected. The over-reliance on the data gathered from the Public Attitudes Survey (PAS) and the importance of a wider data source was addressed.

The issue of data gathering and data sharing was further deliberated. The crime related data held by the NHS was suggested as one source that could be shared with partners. Such data held information regarding the victims of violent crime and those individuals which are impacted. It was advised this information could be gathered across the spectrum of services within the NHS and could assist in building a full picture.

The issue of disproportionality in the CJS was raised and how vital it was that this was reflected in all the outcomes and across the boards. There was a discussion on the gaps in data and how this board might be able to augment the data out there, with the NHS stating it had some data and partners were asked to share any data on disproportionality going forward

Action: Review disproportionality data and inclusion in outcomes.

Decision: Partners agreed to the terms of outcome 1

- Outcome 2 - Deliver swift access to justice

It was considered whether this outcome sat best with the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB). It was agreed that this outcome would be a placeholder and if necessary the wording of the outcome would be updated.

It was agreed overall that outcome 2 was fundamentally within the remit of LCJB. It was agreed the specific wording would be reviewed subsequent to the focus session.

- Outcome 3 - Reduced reoffending rate

The various focus points within the outcome was considered and discussed such as the whether the outcome should be keeping as many children as possible out of the CJS also whether the success of this action should be one that is measured. It was discussed that a child first approach must be intrinsic to all work relating to children.

The issue of terminology within this outcome specifically 'disproportionality' was highlighted noting that when seeking to analyse disproportionality and its impact, this should be clearly specified to ensure the matter was addressed correctly.

The example presented was that of disproportionality and race which was viewed as being distinct to other areas of disproportionality. It was viewed that this would enhance how data was measured and effectively assist in achieving the desired outcome (3).

Partners agreed and pointed to significant issues that existed in the reporting of knife

crime. Assurance was sought that LCJB would seek to address such weighted issues and that they would not be deferred or fall solely within the remit of the sub boards.

The point was acknowledged and it was understood disproportionality included issues within VAWG also, therefore specific terms was essential to ensure partners were clear what was being looked at. It was stated disproportionality was a cross cutting issue that would be given focus across LCJB and the sub boards.

It was put forward that it was important to consider this outcome from a youth justice perspective. The importance of ensuring young people within the CJS are safe and that they are not subject to the National Referral Mechanism (NRM) whereby they are held in a state of limbo whilst waiting for a decision. It was suggested that it would be good for London to be part of the NRM pilots for swifter decision making.

The point was made that broadly speaking the identified outcomes are those that all LCJB partners should seek to support (the outcomes can be wordsmith if deemed necessary). It was stated the sub boards are an opportunity to delve into the detail and the measures.

Further to this point, it was acknowledged that going forward, LCJB was an opportunity for partners to collectively contribute to the key issues for discussion whilst working together in setting up measures for the issues to be addressed. It was considered that the board operated at a level which allowed it to be reactive and make an impact on the issue of crime in London and the effects of crime on Londoners.

The Chair recognised the pertinence of this point particularly in terms of current issues i.e. court backlogs and provided assurance that the action to ensure current issues on the agenda would be taken forward. The need to be clear how the outcomes and measures are taken forward and not reliant on public perception was considered to be a matter of key importance.

Partners were asked to act as conduits in order to facilitate the outcomes being taken forward. The importance of continuous engagement of partners and engaging with MOPAC's Head of Partnerships was highlighted as a means for working together to implement and achieve each outcome

3. Accelerating progress: LCJB workplan

It was advised that under the new structure, LCJB had adopted a set of outcomes for partnership working and as part of this, it is necessary to put forth a forward plan for its quarterly meetings with the focus of partner delivery.

The proposed approach to a workplan and forward agenda was set forth with advice that the agenda for each quarterly LCJB meeting would be structured around: a deep dive on a single LCJB outcome; a substantive update on key work from a sub board; enhanced data sharing and collaboration between partners and any emerging CJS concerns or issues escalated by the sub-boards.

It was recognised from time to time there would be events that may overwhelm the agenda, the murder of Sarah Everard was noted as an example. Assurance was

provided that at such times the board would seek to be reactive escalating such issues for placement on the agenda for discussion by the board.

It was noted MOPAC would seek to engage with partners ahead of each meeting to ensure connectivity and full engagement with the agenda and the identified and agreed outcomes.

4. Spotlight: LCJB's role in delivering the VAWG strategy

Partners received a presentation of the strategy noting that it was an opportunity to give focus to the key actions in the delivery of the strategy and to discuss the support that would be needed from partners. It was advised the VAWG board was due to convene in September. It was therefore noted that a specific issue would not be presented for discussion, rather partners were asked to give focus to the examples that had been shared regarding how the board might work together to deliver the strategy.

It was discussed that it was important partners reached a stage where inter-agency reporting and data sharing was possible, as currently database systems do not speak to each other and this is an issue. In terms of the VAWG strategy, it was acknowledged that there had been significant achievement in reaching its current stage however, data was crucial to evidence the progress that had been made.

Partners were advised there continued to be unprecedented demand from victims of VAWG following the recent pandemic and that staff in support centres experienced burnout additionally, staff retention was an issue.

It was stated better outcomes within CJS should be linked to supporting VAWG survivors and that the VAWG board would be an opportunity to highlight many of the issues that survivors experienced in the CJS. The issue of access to therapy for victims including child therapy was highlighted. DM shared guidance within the online meeting chat function regarding therapy for victims.

It was noted that whilst the wording of the strategy implied there was a lack in the provision of therapy whilst there are many services available however, the issue is access. This point was made to illustrate the importance in remaining strategic in how issues are viewed at LCJB.

There was further discussion around the points raised specifically access to data and data sharing leading to possible gaps in the issues being addressed. It was discussed that access to existing data was an opportunity for partners to work together for example on issues such as rape and domestic violence.

Action – MM agreed to share available data held on NHS database which helped to identify ethnicity and/or protected characteristics to facilitate partners gaps in knowledge due to lack of available data.

The Chair advised that it was important this conversation was picked up and pursued further in roundtable discussions due to convene the following week.

Partners gave focus to the terminology within the VAWG strategy and that it should be reframed in order to place the emphasis on male violence towards women as it is the attitude of men that needs to change. This point was acknowledged and the progress that had been made in terms of placing the lines of enquiry where they need to be for example, women are no longer required to hand over their phones, was noted.

In summary, it was advised that the points raised would be taken to the VAWG board and that focus would also be given to lower volume crime such as Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) as all VAWG formed part of the issues that women in London experienced.

5. Any Other Business

Partners referenced the LCJB's inter-relationship with the National Criminal Justice Board (NCJB). The Chair advised the frequency of NCJB meetings would be looked into for the purpose of inter-connectivity and upward reporting to NCJB.