

# Understanding County Lines in Cambridgeshire

How challenges can be mitigated through Place Based Mapping. A method to improve whole system understanding of county lines and exploitation within a complex 2-tier Local Authority.

Written by Clare Cook, County Lines Pathfinder Lead. January 2022.

This paper is based upon my own observations and feedback obtained from various sources including baseline focus groups, CSP interviews and responses and liaison with the Joint Safeguarding Partnership Strategic Exploitation Lead. This paper is not of research standard and the findings contained within it are open to interpretation and challenge.

## Contents

<b>Background and Context</b>	
Introduction	Page 3
Purpose of mapping	Page 3
Structure and governance	Page 4
Process	Page 5
<b>Case Studies</b>	
Case study 1 – example of Place Based Mapping in Peterborough’s Unitary Authority area.	Page 7
Case study 2 – example of Place Based Mapping spanning districts within Cambridgeshire’s 2-tier authority area	Page 9
<b>Evaluation</b>	
Limitations	Page 11
Enablers	Page 11
Barriers	Page 12
Findings	Page 12
<b>Summary</b>	
Recommendations for England and Wales	Page 14
References	Page 15
<b>Appendices</b>	
Mapping terms of reference	Page 16

## Background and Context

### Introduction

1.1 The Youth Justice Board's (YJB) Strategic Plan for 2019-22 sets addressing serious youth violence as one of YJB's priorities, including an aim to see *"a reduction in the number of children being exploited through involvement with county lines"* and additionally outlines an approach to support improvement in local practice by introducing Pathfinder local authorities to develop and promote good practice and innovation across the system either focussed on strong local service delivery or on good practice in respect to our priorities."

1.2 Cambridgeshire, as part of the County Lines Pathfinder, chose to test innovative ways of working across the partnership with a focus on ensuring that all agencies are taking an effective practice collaborative response to County Lines and Child Criminal Exploitation (CCE) across the County. The pathfinder planned to improve the governance model and strategic arrangements across its 2-tier local authority to ensure a whole system approach. Critical to the effectiveness of this aim is understanding of the county lines business models in place at county, district, city/town and local level.

1.3 *"There is a requirement on agencies to respond to increasingly complex safeguarding and public protection risks, linked to exploitation. As offenders use more sophisticated methods to commit crime, identify, groom and exploit individuals, so must partners and agencies work together to explore innovative and creative opportunities for intervention"*. (Criminal, Civil and Partnership Disruption Options for Perpetrators of Child and Adult Victims of Exploitation; Kay Wallace - National Working Group Exploitation Response Unit and Rachel Hopper - Barnardo's National Counter Trafficking Service)

1.4 This report focusses on learning from Cambridgeshire's 2-tier local authority, though it will also reference the unitary authority of Peterborough, which is partnered with Cambridgeshire across the delivery of many statutory services and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Safeguarding Board.

### Purpose of mapping

2.1 Local, concentrated pockets of exploitation can arise quickly. When such exploitation targets children, there is an expectation that Local Authorities and wider partners respond to safeguard children known to be exploited and those potentially at risk. A number of reviews and reports have highlighted this issue in recent years:

*"Problems with joint working Barriers to information sharing undermine effective partnership working Interviewees reported major barriers to police and other agencies exchanging information efficiently and effectively. These included:*

- *legal requirements to keep personal data secure, and the ways in which different bodies (and sometimes people) may interpret those requirements*
- *disconnected and often incompatible computer systems*
- *insufficient digital storage space*
- *difficulties in enabling secure access to information systems and premises*

- *a frequent requirement for interactions with multiple bodies (particularly in instances where police forces and other agencies don't cover the same area).*

*Many previous reports have recommended sharing information more effectively. These often follow deaths, serious injuries or public service failings. Our findings in this inspection should serve as a further warning that the police and other agencies still don't exchange information as well as they should. The many barriers to the exchange of information for law enforcement purposes need to be addressed". (Both Sides of the Coin: The police and National Crime Agency's response to vulnerable people in 'county lines' drug offending; HMICFRS, June 2020)*

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018 includes a specific section that considers extra-familial harm (chapter 1, paragraphs 33-34). The section details expectations of how local authorities, and wider partners, should respond to extra-familial harm. These paragraphs assert that:

- *extra-familial risks and/or experiences of abuse – including, for example, harm caused by criminal gangs and organised crime groups such as exploitation via county lines, and sexual exploitation – are safeguarding and child protection issues.*
- *intervention plans for extra-familial harm need to consider, and address, environmental factors associated to the abuse, 'which are likely to be a threat to the safety and welfare of a number of different children who may or may not be known to local authority' (DfE 2018:22); as well as meet the individual needs of identified young people.*
- *contextual factors that undermine young people's welfare should be assessed for young people who harm others as well as those who are harmed"*

(The legal and policy framework for Contextual Safeguarding approaches A 2020 update on the 2018 legal briefing Carlene Firmin and Rachel Knowles October 2020)

*"At the local level, there was little information or working knowledge of what intervention strategies were being taken against the perpetrators of criminal exploitation. This is a marked contrast with the dual approach taken to children who are sexually exploited (i.e. to both help the victims and disrupt the activity of the perpetrators)." (It was hard to Escape: Safeguarding Children at Risk from Criminal Exploitation, The Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel, 2020).*

2.2 Place based mapping brings together those tasked with those tasked with safeguarding and those responsible for disruption and enforcement to ensure a joined-up response. The following statements were made during recent partnership focus groups:

*"From our point of view, and our team have only recently become involved in this kind of activity, its become quite obvious that the more people you have who know about an issue, the more people involved, the greater changes can be made."*

*"Individual professionals may see signs but not fully understand. MACE (Missing and Child Exploitation meeting) may get a greater indication but does not have the time to dig into such a localised issue at the expense of the rest of the county. Mapping fills this gap."*

## **Structure and governance**

3.1 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have in place a multi-agency Strategic Exploitation group and an associated Countywide Exploitation Delivery Plan. Strategic aims of this plan include:

- All of the work of the partnership will be underpinned by the principles of contextual safeguarding, recognising the wider relationships and influences around the child or young person
- We will identify and work to deter, divert and prosecute perpetrators of child exploitation.
- Understand and respond to the local picture of exploitation

3.2 Mapping is one method by which these aims are realised. Each place-based mapping activity is a task and finish group underpinned by countywide terms of reference. These terms of reference state that “The group will sit underneath the relevant Missing and Child Exploitation Group and the Lead Responsible Officer will provide a monthly report to the group on the patterns, challenges and successful interventions. It will also report on whether there are any emerging needs or gaps in provision.”

3.3 Normally lead by joint safeguarding partnership, but also been led by pathfinder lead, place based mapping brings together local partners to share information, get a clearer picture of the issue and create a shared response covering both individual safeguarding and contextual safeguarding actions. Groups also ensure a preventative approach, during which engagement is planned with those at risk of being exploited or impacted, as well as those already exploited for a longer lasting impact. Specific objectives are set by each place-based mapping group to ensure a truly local response.

3.4 Mapping involves a series of multi-agency meetings in which information about a particular cohort of young people at risk or about a particular location is gathered and shared. A map is then produced of young people linked to the core cohort (friends/siblings/cousins/neighbours/etc) to consider whether they are also likely to be at risk exploitation. It ensures referrals are made early where young people are currently not known to services. Where they are known, it ensures the professionals working with the child are aware of and addressing the risks.

## **Process**

4.1 The first mapping meeting aims to agree and understand the cohort through review of data and intelligence, and consideration of patterns and trends. It will identify any challenges, concerns or gaps, including those related to group membership and service provision. Updates on relevant police operations will be shared so that all partners are informed, and all agency information will be collated for scanning and analysis. Objectives of the place-based mapping will be agreed and recorded.

Subsequent meetings will use a triangular approach in which victims, locations and offenders are considered in order to specify the problem. The problem is then defined and responded to using the OSARA problem solving method:



OBJECTIVE



SCANNING



ANALYSIS



RESPONSE



ASSESSMENT

4.2 Discussion of individual cases will take place, with the aim of establishing risks and protective factors. A multi-agency response plan will be put in place for each individual, location and offender with clear allocation of responsibility. Where risk is identified but no referrals are recorded, the group will be responsible for ensuring referrals are made and safeguarding processes adhered to. When agreed objectives have been met, or in rare cases when objectives are deemed to be no longer applicable or beyond the ability of the group to achieve, the mapping group is closed.

4.3 Procedural aspects of meetings:

- Meetings will be held at a frequency deemed appropriate for the particular stage of the mapping process. Initially meetings could be set weekly or fortnightly. Later on they may reduce to taking place monthly or even 6 weekly.
- All agencies will be expected to come to the meeting prepared with their information and updates on previous actions. Where possible, updates on actions should be sent to the LRO prior to the meeting.
- The meeting will be chaired by the LRO and in their absence the designated co-chair.
- Minutes will be taken and actions noted by the co-chair. These will be circulated within 48 hours of the meeting taking place to all attendees.
- Following conclusion of the mapping process the LRO will provide a summary report to MACE detailing initial scoping, amendments to scope, findings, progress against objectives and any ongoing actions.

4.4 It is the responsibility of the Lead Responsible Officer to provide monthly updates to the Missing and Child Exploitation Group (MACE). After closure of the mapping group, the Lead Responsible Officer will produce a closure report detailing the cohort detailing the cohort, process, objectives and outcomes. These reports will also detail any outstanding actions which need to be escalated for resolution.

4.5 Expected membership of meetings includes but is not limited to:

- Lead Responsible Officer (previously identified)
- Relevant lead from CSC
- Police Officer for Missing and CSE
- Police Officer from local policing area
- Health representative
- Education Lead (specifically schools subject to the mapping)
- Community Safety Partnership representative
- YOS representative
- Exploitation Strategy Coordinator (CPSCB)
- Youth Services representative (YPW)

- Early Help representative

Attendance and any gaps in membership will be reviewed and addressed via MACE

## Case Studies

### Case Study 1

5.1 The first case study provides an example of mapping that took place in Peterborough’s unitary authority. Firstly, it is helpful to understand the meeting structure for this particular mapping activity.

5.2 Due to the complexity a dual structure was adopted; a tactical level (bronze) and strategic level (silver). The bronze group met weekly and sent minutes to the chair of the Silver group.

Bronze group membership	Silver Group membership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School A (Chair)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Exploitation Lead (Chair)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head Teacher (School A )</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police (Sgt level)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head Teacher (School B)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAFE team practitioner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TYSS Manager</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TYSS practitioner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAFE Team Manager</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police Lead (Inspector)</li> </ul>

The bronze group dealt with tactical, “on the ground”, issues and escalated any wider issue to Silver such as communication plan, finance, resources. The Bronze chair also held responsibility for updating the Safer Peterborough Partnership.

The silver group dealt with wider issues and updated the Board of Governors where appropriate (this was particularly poignant when seeking funding). It provided strategic level oversight with consistent membership. The silver group would also have escalated any funding issues or blockages to the Safer Peterborough Partnership, had it been required.

5.3 The OSARA problem model was implemented as follows:

**Objective** – The primary purpose of the mapping activity was to ensure a multi-agency response to increasing violent crime in a small area of Peterborough. This was being committed by a known group of children and predominantly involved weapons. In addition, the group sought to offer support to two educational establishments who were experiencing disruption due to the increasing crime; offer reassurance to the local community through clear communication and visible activity; and to provide staff safety to those individuals working in the area.

**Scanning** - A cohort of 16 children were identified, either through police enforcement activity and recorded crime, or through reports received from schools. All were known to services and assessed as being at either significant or moderate risk of exploitation.

**Analysis** – The identified cohort of children were responsible for a significant amount of crime and anti-social behaviour in the vicinity of the two schools. The schools were managing the placement of rival gang members in the same group due to lack of information sharing. Police had seen a rapid increase in calls for service as violent crime had increased substantially. As a result of these factors and resulting media coverage, community concerns were heightened.



Response –

Outcomes achieved	
Dedicated activity saw a reduction in reports of violence between groups from: 29 reports in December to 3 reports Feb 2021	
There has been no reported violence between the 2 groups since Feb 2021 (we were recording a serious violent crime every 48 hours at the beginning of the mapping!)	
The Safer Relationships For Exploited Children (SAFE) team had significant positive engagement the with main cohort identified.	
Intelligent use of disruption toolkit saw police using powers such as Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBO) Community Protection Warning (CPW) and gang injunctions against the named cohort, this allowed more powers for intervention.	
Inevitably, due to the nature of the offences, some cohort members have received terms of imprisonment.	
A presentation to the board of Governors saw a grant for additional security lighting around the staff car park.	
A meeting with Peterborough City Council saw the CCTV upgrade escalated in this particular area	
A single communication strategy, managed by the schools, alleviated community concerns	
Enablers	Lessons Learned
Early and consistent buy in from Neighbourhood policing teams	There is the potential for “mission drift”. Partners may try to introduce others they are concerned about, even if no intelligence case exists. Firm boundaries are required to ensure focus is maintained.
The Targeted Youth Support Service and Safer Relationships for Exploited Children Team know their children and are proactive.	There are likely to be varying reporting/concern thresholds. What is significant to one partner may not be to another. These tensions need to be carefully managed.
Realistic expectations surrounding resources.	The chair of Bronze needs to be trained in OSARA.
Open and transparent communication between agencies involved.	The chair must have the confidence and authorisation to delegate across all agencies in the mapping activity.
Regular liaison with Board of Governors	
Single communication strategy for all partners	
Creative interventions and disruptions	

## Case Study 2

6.1 This is an example of a mapping activity which spanned 2 districts within Cambridgeshire’s 2-tier authority area. OSARA will not be discussed in as much details here, as the aim is to demonstrate the additional considerations associated with the 2-tier authority structure.

6.2 The objectives of this mapping activity took account of the anticipated challenges associated with multiple council responsibility:

To increase knowledge of young people being groomed and ensure timely input of services.
To understand the scope of the grooming in order to prevent involvement of other young people.
To create a ‘Business Case’ for further resourcing in the area, including through use of environmental visual audits of the open spaces, police resourcing and youth provision.
To ensure that resourcing already in place, and achieved as a result of the mapping activity, has the maximum impact.
To bridge the gap in information between Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, all of whom have a level of responsibility for the area being mapped.

6.3 Barriers and limitations, although anticipated could not be fully mitigated:

Resources and professional buy in across the districts varied significantly.	This is likely to be due to a combination of factors, most notably, Cambridge City Council having youth exploitation as a priority, whereas South Cambridgeshire District Council did not. The result was significantly greater buy-in from Cambridge City based professionals.
The professional structures within the two districts varied.	A key source of information in Cambridge City was a staff member from the District Council Anti-Social Behaviour Team. There was not an equivalent role in South Cambridgeshire. This affected practical aspects as well as information sharing. For example, The Cambridge City ASB Officer was able to undertake Environmental Visual Audits of the open spaces within Cambridge City and send results to a panel for consideration of additional resourcing. Despite every effort made, environmental visual audits of the open spaces in South Cambridgeshire.
Police resourcing and priorities differ between districts.	South Cambridgeshire had significantly less policing resource available to support the work than Cambridge City. In addition, policing priorities differed: North Cambridge City was an area of priority for Cambridge City Police, whereas the area of South Cambridgeshire it bordered was not. This meant that police resource was inconsistent in terms of attendance at mapping meetings.

6.4 Despite the barriers and limitation, significant successes were realised, including in South Cambridgeshire District. These included:

Identification of primary source of risk both in relation to the adults discussed and the areas themselves.
---

Professional links made with more 'place based' services including Problem Solving Groups (which aim to address anti-social behaviour) and the Think Communities team, which spans county and district levels.

Environmental visual audits were completed for Cambridge City locations and sent to the relevant council department.

Links were made with a Youth development worker from Romsey Mill (a local charitable organisation). Further more, whilst this worker was primarily Cambridge City based, the mapping activity results contributed to a successful grant application to increase youth worker provision, in particular for the area located in South Cambridgeshire District.

Effective information sharing led to appropriate safeguarding measures being instigated for children not already supported:

- Two young people referred and adopted by social care.
- 7 young people welfare checked by former involved professionals.
- One young person engaged with Youth Development Worker and subsequently in positive activities.

## Evaluation

### Limitations:

7.1 This report endeavours to offer a balanced and neutral perspective, but it is acknowledged that a level of unconscious bias is inevitable. It is written by the County Lines Pathfinder Lead who has been a Lead Responsible Officer for mapping activities throughout the duration of the Pathfinder programme.

This paper is not of research standard and the findings contained within it are open to interpretation and challenge.

7.2 The recommendations contained within this report are largely produced as a result of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough successes, enabled by the Partnership's commitment to testing innovative approaches, and willingness to share their journey with the Pathfinder. The recommendations are therefore directed at a National Audience and do not reflect the current development needs of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

7.3 The County Lines Pathfinder has taken place with the backdrop of COVID-19 restrictions. Whilst every effort has been made to consider findings as they may apply outside of a pandemic, it is inevitable that the pandemic has limited and shaped work during this time. Some agencies were less present due to prioritising work to support the COVID-19 response.

### Enablers:

8.1 Having a clear escalation route from bronze, through silver and to the Safer Peterborough Partnership ensures that the bulk of work is possible at front line level where local knowledge is greatest, whilst ensuring swift resolution of issues through the clear escalation route.

8.2 Mapping activity chaired jointly by the local Safer Relationships For Exploited Children (SAFE) worker and the County Lines Pathfinder Lead was successful due to the high level of knowledge held by the SAFE worker about local associations.

8.3 Involvement of local staff from the wider statutory and third sector partnership ensures strong local knowledge, local ownership and increased professional knowledge/networking.

8.4 A jointly agreed and consistent communication strategy can alleviate concerns of local communities, whilst also building their faith in services and increasing their knowledge of the issue.

8.5 In most, but not all, districts, early engagement and effective communication with Community Safety Partnerships has ensured local steering, and that resource and professional networks are available to strengthen responses.

8.6 Engagement of the Think Communities Team allowed for already established networks and planned engagement to be used to support improve community resilience in areas of concern.

8.7 Partners involved in place-based mapping have had the support of their agency leadership teams, which has resulted in openness, transparency and accountability.

**Barriers:**

9.1 A large amount of staff resource is spent mapping local concerns but the reach of each discrete mapping activity is relatively narrow. It is inevitable that some areas will attract the resourcing over others, which can result in fragmented whole county understanding.

9.2 The county lines business models constantly change and therefore mapping success can be time limited.

9.3 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have 6 districts with different agency leads and different priorities. Level of buy in varies considerably between these districts and across agencies. Whilst engaging with CSP's/Place Based Boards has been largely successful, consistent top down/bottom up data/cross-district information sharing, remains a challenge in Cambridgeshire's complex 2 tier LA structure.

9.4 There is no shared platform for recording and managing the cohort of young people who are being exploited/at risk of exploitation.

9.5 Whilst having local staff, for example SAFE workers and Police Constables from Neighbourhood Policing Teams allows for good local knowledge and information sharing, without the bronze/silver structure, Cambridgeshire mapping lacked involvement of professionals who had strategic awareness and the ability to suggest and authorise resourcing that may have assisted.

**Findings:**

10.1 There is better understanding of what information is being held and where and how this can be brought together into a shared space.

10.2 The undertaking of localised mapping exercises has enabled clarity of what works and where improvements could be made.

10.3 The dual structure in Peterborough ensures that the right grade of staff are involved at the right level: for example, at tactical level (Bronze) there is a Sergeant at strategic level (Silver) there is an Inspector. The Silver group has a constant membership. It is chaired by the Joint Safeguarding Partnership Strategic Exploitation Lead, who is representative of the whole system approach. It provides an ever-present virtual team of ownership by those with authority to take actions within their individual agencies.

10.3 A comment received during an evaluation focus group focussed on the strategic partnership arrangements stated: "The undertaking of localised mapping exercises has enabled clarity of what works and where improvements could be made. Mapping sits under MACE in both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough but has differences in each location due to differing LA and partnership organisational structures"

10.4 Engagement of local staff in a shared forum greatly increases knowledge and ability to focus resources. Local mapping exercises are effective in identifying those at risk, ensuring referrals are made, getting support services in place, supporting and enabling staff in vulnerable areas and getting locations 'target hardened'.

10.5 Place based mapping has supported improved links where they were weak before, for example with probation services. Their attendance at the meetings and the subsequent use of probation powers manage perpetrator risks has been key to disruption – right from assessment and recommendation at Court, through to consideration of suitability for release from prison and on restrictions placed upon individuals through licences and community orders.

10.6 Localised mapping is an effective mechanism to increase professionals understanding, identifying young people at risk and implement specific action plans.

10.7 The impact of mapping in Cambridgeshire has been positive with professionals reporting increased awareness, feelings of support and ability to safeguard. The use of disruption tactics was increased, resources to address contextual safeguarding concerns were sourced and children not previously known to services were highlighted and engaged.

10.8 To take this work forward, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough are now considering how OSARA (mapping) training can be rolled out to create a pool of mapping Lead Responsible Officers. The aim of this is to enable further reach through increased capacity. It will now be considered alongside our wider response to implementation of a Contextual Safeguarding approach to manage risk for vulnerable and at risk young where there are Extra-Familial Harm concerns.

## Summary

### Recommendations for Local Authorities Across England and Wales

11.1 Place based mapping, or a similar multi-agency contextual response, should be built into system responses to identified and suspected County Lines exploitation.

11.2 Mapping should be places within an appropriate governance structure with clear terms of reference to support consistent decision making, use of resources and review of outcomes.

11.2 A clear escalation route for support and resolution of 'stuck' issues should be in place, with more senior staff named and available to support front line staff undertaking mapping activity. A structure where professionals are available from front line, through to strategic decision makers is key to swift and seamless responses. Such an escalation route also ensures efficiency in that the appropriate level of staffing resource is targeted where needed.

11.3 Commitment to support mapping from the wider partnership is key to ensuring the right people are present consistently and from the outset. This reduces time wasted by those involved chasing membership and missing information. It also ensures that responses are truly holistic, using the strengths and powers of all partner agencies.

11.4 Mapping chairs need the confidence and ability to delegate across agencies. This ensures all available resources are best used to meet needs and supports a true multi-agency, holistic response.

11.5 A pool of trained staff working at local, front-line level enables wider reach, efficiency of resources, and mapping led by professionals with local knowledge of the exploited population.

11.6 Particular consideration needs to be given to structures and processes within 2-tier authorities to minimise the impact of the added complexity.

## References

Criminal, Civil and Partnership Disruption Options for Perpetrators of Child and Adult Victims of Exploitation; Kay Wallace - National Working Group Exploitation Response Unit and Rachel Hopper - Barnardo's National Counter Trafficking Service

Both Sides of the Coin: The police and National Crime Agency's response to vulnerable people in 'county lines' drug offending; HMICFRS, June 2020

The legal and policy framework for Contextual Safeguarding approaches A 2020 update on the 2018 legal briefing Carlene Firmin and Rachel Knowles October 2020

It was hard to Escape: Safeguarding Children at Risk from Criminal Exploitation, The Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel, 2020



## Appendices

<b>Child Exploitation Mapping Task and Finish Group</b> <b>Terms of Reference</b> <b>March 2021</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>The purpose of this Group is to investigate exploitation issues affecting a specific district or area highlighted at the Missing and Child Exploitation (MACE) meeting or emerging themes and trends identified by District Leads/MET hub. The group will look at available information and intelligence and formulate an appropriate response plan on behalf of the Chair.</p> <p>This is a multi- agency group that will be responsible for setting objectives, scanning available intelligence, analysing the results and setting out a response plan specifically to tackle emerging issues of gangs and county lines.</p> <p>The principles adopted will follow the OSARA model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective</li> <li>▪ Scanning</li> <li>▪ Analysis</li> <li>▪ Response</li> <li>▪ Assessment.</li> </ul> <p>and it will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Collate information from all partners concerning the profile of offending within the area identified.</li> <li>▪ Identify key stakeholders and statutory partners to attend an initial scoping meeting.</li> <li>▪ Identify a Lead Responsible Officer (LRO) to chair subsequent meetings.</li> <li>▪ In cases where exploitation is <b>not</b> identified, the mapping group will liaise directly with the relevant Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to manage the information provided through a Problem Solving Group (PSG)</li> <li>▪ The group will not duplicate or replace the functions of statutory child protection processes in relation to individual children</li> </ul>
<b>Accountability:</b>	<p>The group will sit underneath the relevant Missing and Child Exploitation Group and the LRO will provide a monthly report to the group on the patterns, challenges and successful interventions. It will also report on whether there are any emerging needs or gaps in provision.</p> <p>Each officer attending will have responsibility to take back information, issues and actions to their respective agency and ensure that matters are progressed before the next meeting.</p>
<b>Structure</b>	

<p><b>First meeting</b> <b>(Chaired by relevant person as appointed by MACE)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To review Data and intelligence to understand cohort, patterns and trends</li> <li>▪ To review membership of the group to ensure we have the right people around the table</li> <li>▪ To review the information contained in Return Home Interviews to identify responses/outcomes/safety planning /ongoing risks and actions required</li> <li>▪ To identify any particular challenges/concerns/gaps in service provision</li> <li>▪ To align all agency information on those deemed at risk so that cohort is agreed. This cohort list will be updated for each meeting and will be held by the Exploitation Strategy Coordinator</li> <li>▪ To update on any current police operations so that all partners are well informed</li> <li>▪ To collate all agency information to allow the Exploitation Coordinator to scan and analyse it alongside police intelligence colleagues.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Subsequent meetings</b> <b>(Chaired by LRO and supported by minute taker/co-chair)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The group will discuss individual cases, establish risks and protective factors for the young person and for any other children/young people.</li> <li>▪ It will consider victims, locations and Offenders (VLO) and develop responses to be put in place to reduce the risk.</li> <li>▪ It will develop a multi-agency response plan to support the VLO identified. The plan will be shared and actions allocated to specific partners for activity.</li> <li>▪ In cases where a risk is identified against a child but no referral is recorded, it will be the responsibility of the group to ensure procedures have been adhered to.</li> <li>▪ The response plan will be reviewed through MACE meeting</li> <li>▪ It is the expectation that the allocated LRO will attend the meeting to present the plan (In cases where this is not possible the co-chair can present on their behalf)</li> <li>▪ It is the responsibility of the LRO to provide a closing report to the group once the objectives of the mapping have been met and the risk reduced</li> <li>▪ Members will be asked to provide feedback from their experience of the mapping to ensure continual professional development of the group.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Process:</b></p>	<p>Meetings will be held at a frequency deemed appropriate for the particular stage of the mapping process. Initially meetings could be set weekly or fortnightly. Later on they may reduce to taking place monthly or even 6 weekly.</p> <p>All agencies will be expected to come to the meeting prepared with their information and updates on previous actions. Where possible, updates on actions should be sent to the LRO prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The meeting will be chaired by the LRO and in their absence the designated co-chair.</p> <p>Minutes will be taken and actions noted by the co-chair. These will be circulated within 48 hours of the meeting taking place to all attendees.</p> <p>Following conclusion of the mapping process the LRO will provide a summary report to MACE detailing initial scoping, amendments to scope, findings, progress against objectives and any ongoing actions.</p>

<p><b>Membership:</b></p>	<p>Attendance at this meeting is particularly important as it is an operational meeting that requires the input of all agencies.</p> <p>Representatives will take responsibility for attending meetings, fully contributing by bringing their expertise and updates on the contribution of their agency towards individual safety plans and informing their individual agency of issues and developments.</p> <p><b>Representatives from each agency must be at the appropriate level to commit to actions and resources on behalf of their agency.</b></p> <p><b><u>Proposed Membership</u></b></p> <p>Lead Responsible Officer (previously identified)</p> <p>Relevant lead from CSC</p> <p>Police Officer for Missing and CSE</p> <p>Police Officer from local policing area</p> <p>Health representative</p> <p>Education Lead (specifically schools subject to the mapping)</p> <p>Community Safety Partnership representative</p> <p>YOS representative</p> <p>Exploitation Strategy Coordinator (CPSCB)</p> <p>Youth Services representative (YPW)</p> <p>Early Help representative</p> <p>Any other representative identified through mapping</p> <p>Attendance and any gaps in membership will be reviewed and addressed via MACE</p>
<p><b>Collation and sharing of findings:</b></p>	<p>All concluded mapping summaries will be reviewed for systemic issues, local nuances and trends to be collated and shared with the wider partnership as required. This will be shared at both a strategic and operational level and the data redacted as appropriate for that setting.</p> <p>This activity will be undertaken by the Joint Safeguarding Partnership Strategic Exploitation Lead, supported by the County Lines Pathfinder Lead for the duration of the post.</p> <p>Examples of places shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MACE</li> <li>• Strategic exploitation group</li> <li>• Community Safety Partnerships</li> <li>• Local Problem Solving Groups</li> </ul>

<p><b>Information Sharing Principles</b></p>	<p>Effective information sharing underpins integrated working and is a vital element of both early intervention and safeguarding. Each partner can hold different pieces of information which need to be placed together to enable a thorough assessment to be made.</p> <p>To share information about a person you need a clear and legitimate purpose to do so, as this will determine whether the information sharing is lawful. For partners working in statutory services, the sharing of information must be included within the powers of the service. This will also apply if partners from the voluntary sector are contracted to provide a service on behalf of a statutory body.</p> <p>The sharing of information must have due consideration with the law relating to confidentiality, data protection and human rights. Having a legitimate purpose for sharing information is an important part of meeting those legal requirements. It is important only to share as much information as is needed and records should be accurate, relevant and up to date.</p>
<p><b>Confidentiality Statement</b></p>	<p>Any agency in attendance or in receipt of information will be signed into the local Information Sharing Protocol.</p> <p>All members will sign a confidentiality form at the start of each meeting based on the following statement:</p> <p><b>All information discussed is strictly confidential and must not be disclosed to third parties. All documents circulated in connection with the meeting are to be considered restricted documents and must not be disclosed to third parties.</b></p> <p><b>The retention of all documentation in a secure location is the responsibility of the receiving agency. If disclosure is sought to a third party then permission must be received from the Chair/Co-Chair of the meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Information discussed in respect of specific children (Part 2) can be shared with relevant professionals as appropriate and in line with each agencies protocols. Any information sharing decision will be recorded in the minutes.</b></p>
<p><b>Review of terms of Reference</b></p>	<p>This will be reviewed after 12 months in March 2022.</p>