

Committee(s)	Dated:
SAFER CITY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY GROUP – For information	June 2017
Subject: Outcome of Information Sharing Workshops	Public
Report of: Peter Lisley, Assistant Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Gary Griffin, Safer Communities Project Manager, One Safe City Programme	

Summary

Better Information Sharing is a key theme and outcome of the Safer Communities project. This paper refers to information sharing not only between the Corporation and City Police, but also internally within City departments and externally between the Corporation and its partners.

Part of the work to look at information sharing between the Corporation, City Police and partners was to run a number of workshops with scenarios to test out how well information was shared and look at deficiencies. This was followed up with extensive engagement with Corporation staff, City Police and partners.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The Safer Communities project has existed in various guises since at least 2014. The original outcomes were suggested to be cashable savings by co-locating staff and putting in place joint teams with single management structures.
2. Revised outcomes dropped the outcome of co-location and joining together teams and instead looked at closer working and information sharing.
3. To this end a number of workshops were run which looked at the following issues:
 - a. Vulnerability
 - b. Domestic Violence
 - c. Anti-social behaviour

Current Position

4. The first workshop on vulnerability was attended by around 20 people from a number of services and partners across the City. It ran through 6 scenarios and covered issues such as shoplifting, substance misuse and rough sleeping.
 - a. Although the intention was to make recommendations in the workshop, prioritise them and allocate them out to people to implement, there was just enough time to get through the scenarios.
 - b. A lessons learned discussion after the event identified a number of areas for improvement of the running of the workshop.
 - i. Some of the attendees were too senior to give operation level discussions of information sharing.
 - ii. Having Police in the room tended to mean that they were either the focus of the questions or the expected answerers, although their attendance was necessary.
 - iii. The number of scenarios meant there was not sufficient time allocated to discuss each of them fully and some of the attendees did not participate until later in the workshop because only the later scenarios referred to their service.

Follow up 121 meetings were held to close off information around the recommendations, the last of these being held in December 2016.

- c. 33 recommendations emerged from this workshop, which were refined with follow up 121s. There were a number of attempts to prioritise and grade the recommendations for ease of implementation by the owning services. This was attempted at first via email and via the 121 meetings, but due to a general lack of response it was conducted as a workshop.
- d. The recommendations were grouped as systems and process issues. Only one recommendation looked at the need for an information sharing agreement, which is being investigated in line with anti-social behaviour.
- e. Issues with some existing systems were investigated and discounted due to misunderstandings as part of the workshop process.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- i. An example is an issue highlighted around problems accessing the social care system out of hours by the Emergency Duty Team. This subsequently turned out to be a one off incident and the service department confirmed access was not an issue.
 - ii. A further example is access to the Chain database used by St Mungo's. This data is confidential and cannot be accessed outside of the St Mungo's network. However St Mungo's were clear that as deemed necessary, they share information with Social Care and City Police. Giving the City and Police direct access to Chain may result in their clients not wanting to share information with them, which would be counter-productive.
 - f. Wider system issues are being examined as part of the corporate CRM solution and have also been covered in the anti-social behaviour workshop and subsequent work.
 - g. In terms of processes, a large number of the recommendations were closed based on issues raised at the workshop which following investigation turned out to be inaccurate.
 - i. An example was an understanding that trigger-offences for drug testing differed between Square Mile Health and the City Police. Upon investigation. This turned out to be based on SMH using a subset of the trigger-offences for brevity.
 - h. One of the scenarios used the example of shoplifting by a vulnerable person, this led to discussions about whether all shoplifting was reported to Police. The theory being that the type of items taken may point to financial hardships and need (e.g. nappies).
 - i. The discussions and subsequent follow up meeting identified that it is very unlikely that shops report all instances of shoplifting, however local recognition in terms of sharing information with shops is happening. This led to the investigation around the Facewatch tool which was and still is being looked at as a pilot by the Cheapside Business Alliance. The project is liaising with CBA and Intelligence and Information to see if there can be wider usage of the system.
 - i. Of the 33 recommendations, there are 6 outstanding. Processes are in place to either complete them or hand them over to current service delivery.
5. The next workshop centred on domestic violence. This was attended by 5 people from Community Safety, Communities and Children's Services - Housing and City Police.
- a. The scenarios focussed on the identification of domestic violence through managed process where at the outset the domestic violence may not have been immediately apparent, particularly relating to public health and education.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- b. At the workshop it was identified that information from Markets and Consumer protection would be useful as part of the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference and this is now requested and included. This means that noise nuisance, graffiti etc. can be taken into account.
 - c. Further training on how to identify signs of domestic violence and abuse was the basis of a number of recommendations. This training is being pursued for external contractors, e.g. through the City Safe Considerate Contractor scheme and also for internal staff via City Procurement and Victim Support.
 - d. 21 recommendations emerged from this workshop. 9 of these are still in progress.
6. A further workshop around anti-social behaviour was carried out on 20 February 2017, attended by DCCS – Housing, Barbican Estates, Markets and Consumer Protection and Street Enforcement, Built Environment.
- a. Using the lessons learned from previous workshops, rather than produce recommendations, the output from this workshop has gone into informing the work with Housing on their anti-social behaviour process and procurement / commissioning of an anti-social behaviour platform as well as feeding into the corporate CRM requirements.
 - b. To summarise the following things were found:
 - i. Occurrences of ASB were low across the City in comparison to other authorities, but are being under reported. This would be helped by a central system and also some analytical capability to bring things together
 - ii. However in some parts of the City, there is a lower tolerance of things which leads to higher levels of ASB being reported
 - iii. There is no a corporate ASB process or a champion or lead for ASB

Implications

- 7. The outcomes of the workshops identified that at operational level, information is being shared and this benefits the vulnerable. They also identified that this was in line with legal frameworks, including Data Protection Act.
- 8. This is also due to the unusually small numbers of cases within the City, which means that staff have personal knowledge of individual vulnerable people .
- 9. It is apparent that a general lack of direction exists with regard to information sharing.
 - a. Departments such as DCCS already make good use of information sharing agreements where they require long term arrangements; examples are particularly around sharing information with public health.
 - b. This approach to sharing is not, however, the case for the majority of the Corporation.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- c. The new Information Board, with representation from Legal, IT and Information Security covering the Corporation and City Police, will help to shape how information sharing operates in the future and also provide some administrative resource to ensure that accurate records are kept of information sharing.
10. Creating scenarios in the workshops was helpful, especially as the project was not given a specific problem to solve other than a general 'deal with information sharing' brief; the workshops helped to start conversations. However this tended to lead people into cul-de-sacs and discussions around the scenarios themselves instead of where information sharing was not as effective as it could be.
11. In the case of domestic violence, the scenarios prevented discussion rather than encouraged, despite them being created with the support of the Community Safety DV representative and Children's Social Care.

Conclusion

12. Overall the project identified that information sharing does take place between services involved in supporting vulnerable people. These are in line with legal frameworks.
13. The project has put recommendations around commissioned services and improvements to information sharing to be built into future commissioning.
14. The Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference allows sensitive information to be shared about cases. This now includes information from Street Enforcement, such as noise complaints.

Appendices

- Current list of outstanding recommendations

Gary Griffin

Safer Communities Project Manager, One Safe City

T: 020 7332 3484

E: gary.griffin@cityoflondon.gov.uk