

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
 24/10/2019



Date of meeting: Thursday 24th October 2019 1300-1500 hours

<u>Present</u> Nick Ephgrave Julian Bennett Ed Beltrami Sara Lewis Damian McCleave Amy Hudspith David Service Katie Carse Ruth Bloomfield Matthew Pickering Brendan Charnock Nathan Dick Roger McMillan Elsa Mak	NE JB EB SL DM AH DS KC RB MP BC ND RM EM	MPS (CHAIR) MPS CPS MPS HMCTS BTP CoLP HMPPS MOPAC MOPAC MOPAC MOJ / HMPPS MPS MPS (Minutes)
<u>Apologies offered</u> Laurence Taylor Greg Powell Sam Cunningham Claire Lindley Katheryn Hunt Caroline Sparks Damon Williams	LT DS GP SC CL CS DW	MPS Defence Law MOPAC CPS NPS NPS MPS

	<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 217, 229, 235, 237, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 246 - 250 and 252 - 257 were agreed for closure as per recommendations and written updates provided by secretariat.
--	--

1	<p>Action 245 – HHJ Zeidman QC was unable to attend the meeting. The action was deferred and HHJ Zeidman QC to be invited to the November LCJB.</p> <p>Action 251 – SL offered her apology and unable to progress this action due to leave and abstractions. This will be carried over to November.</p>
2	<p><u>Crown Court Performance Inc. discussion of PTRs at Snaresbrook – DM</u></p> <p>DM recapped the current issues and presented the proposal outlined in the paper Item 2. EB commented that Crown Court performance has declined and expressed a view that the Outcomes Board should be asked to focus on performance at the Crown Court to drive improvement. He suggested that the scope of the Outcomes Board may be too broad to oversee Crown Court performance effectively. EB proposed that the Outcomes Board to be split into two, with one part focusing on Magistrate Court and the other for Crown Court.</p> <p>Action – DM to add BTP and CoLP to JMP structure</p> <p>Action – JB to review the agenda of the Outcomes Board to ensure sufficient focus on CC performance. Consideration should be given to splitting the meeting.</p> <p>Action – NE and DW to consider which performance items to discuss at the Nov LCJB with particular reference to the discussion likely to stem from HHJ Zeidman QC's agenda item.</p>
3	<p><u>Probation Reform Programme – ND</u></p> <p>ND delivered a presentation to the board outlining the Probation Reform Programme. ND outlined the current service provision and challenges, and explained the programme vision for 70% of services to be delivered by public sector, with 30% remaining in the private sector. Probation areas structure will change across England, but there will be no change to the structure in London. Nathan presented the Probation Service's strategic aspirations and the transition program, and told the group that the NPS is looking to publish the operational model.</p> <p>NE asked the group what the information sharing agreement may look like in the new structure and whether there is work that MPS can do to support a safe transition of offender management from private sector back to NPS. ND explained Wales will be the first area to pilot the change and will use Wales as learning experience.</p> <p>Action – JB to scope the current information sharing agreement with the NPS</p> <p>ND explained that there are currently 7 NPS areas and 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs). These will transition into 12 probation areas across England and Wales.</p> <p>NE asked whether the NPS Reform Team is liaising with other agencies on the design of their new structure. RB told the group that she has a meeting with NPS next week and JB volunteered to identify a suitable person to provide some practitioner-level insight if needed.</p> <p>ND outlined the Dynamic Framework, which is the contract tendering system for NPS. NPS want to encourage smaller companies to register for the competition, ensuring all areas of need are covered. This will be a challenge, but the NPS is confident the issues can be overcome. KH commented that CRCs have struggled in the past with some providers only able to cater for specific needs areas and not</p>

	<p>others, which led them to sub-contract services. ND explained that contracts have been managed centrally in HMPPS, but in future they will be managed regionally by the people with the right expertise. The reform programme aim to finish by 2026.</p> <p>Decision – NE to invite Nathan Dick back for update on the restructuring program in March/April 2020.</p>
4	<p><u>MPS Diversion Strategy – RM</u></p> <p>RM presented the paper circulated at item 4 and provided an overview of current police-led diversion activity in London and presented recommendations. NE asked for this to be developed further to incorporate a collaborative approach and named this strategy as a LCJB Diversion strategy, involving all partners rather than police-led. RB seconded to the suggestion. EB stated CPS has clear strategy on defendants are proceed with pending on offences type. NE stated which ever person appointed to commission the LCJB strategy to consult with</p> <p>AH agreed in principle, however there is concern whether BTP can sign up to the strategy as they have existing policy. NE would like know each agencies position on diversion strategy and whether they would sign up. JB would like to lead on this project.</p> <p>Action – To draft a prospective LCJB Diversion strategy and to bring it back January 2020 LCJB – JB</p>
5	<p><u>LCJB Communication Plan – SL</u></p> <p>SL provided an outline on the proposed LCJB Communication Plan as per Item 5 to raise the profile and the work LCJB does. The proposal is divide into two phases. For Phase 1 proposal - SL raised to the group whether everyone is content with the structure and whether the group is content to publish the minutes externally.</p> <p>Decision - All agreed for the minutes to be published on MOPAC website and sensitive issues to be redacted.</p> <p>Decision – All agreed for each agencies to provide representative from their communication department.</p> <p>Resource issue raised in implementing the communication plan and who will be responsible to implement the communication plan.</p> <p>Action – SL to work with DW to implement the communication plan.</p> <p>SL then outlined the proposals for Phase 2, the launch of a digital letter and establishment of a wider CJ network of contacts to engage with as critical friends and partners. The group agreed that the newsletter is a good idea. NE stated LCJB is under-utilised and aspire to have a more prominent presence.</p> <p>Decision – SL to oversee and discuss proposals through the Enabling Board</p>
6	<p><u>Declining user satisfaction – MP</u></p> <p>MP provided a verbal update to the group outlining types of survey used to measure the satisfaction. Overall satisfaction with police service has reduced from 79% (2015/16) to 66% (current). The decline has stabilised. MP outlined the top areas that users identified as the satisfactory such as ease of contact and reassurance. MOPAC subsequently completed a deep dive and areas attributes to the reduction of</p>

	<p>user satisfaction such as cut in resources; how users' expectation were managed.</p> <p>NE raised to the group he did not want this to be Met Police or CPS led initiatives. He would like to expand this across agencies to ensure user satisfaction is considered throughout the victim's journey.</p> <p>Action – MP to bring MOPAC pilot back to next meeting</p> <p>Decision – Decline in user satisfaction to remains as a standing item</p>
7	<p><u>Update on listing pilot at Woolwich, Isleworth and Harrow Crown Courts – DM</u></p> <p>DM provided a brief update based on the submitted paper and the board discussed.</p> <p>NE asked when it would be appropriate to bring this item back for an update and evaluation. DM suggested to bring this item back in the new year.</p>
8	<p><u>GPS Tagging – BC</u></p> <p>Not discussed in full details due to meeting overran.</p>
9	<p><u>Sec 28 update –SL</u></p> <p>Not discussed due to meeting overran.</p>
10	<p><u>Risk Register - (Existing risks by exception & new risks) – DW and All</u></p> <p>Not discussed due to meeting overran.</p>
11	<p><u>Agency updates</u></p> <p>Not discussed due to meeting overran.</p>
12	<p><u>Agenda setting for November LCJB</u></p> <p>Not discussed due to meeting overran.</p>
13	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>Not discussed due to meeting overran.</p>

Next meeting on Tuesday 26th November 2019 1300-1500 hours Room 8.3 at NSY