

## Shield Programme Board Agenda

Monday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2015  
13.00 – 14.00

**Strategic Director's Office, Seventh Floor, International House, Canterbury Crescent**

Item	Topic	Lead Officer	Papers Attached	Timing
1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	Sue Foster	Verbal	1300
2	Minutes of previous meeting, and matters arising	Sue Foster	✓	1305
3	Submission to GLA Police and Crime Committee	[REDACTED]	✓	1315
4	Reflections of the first six months	All for discussion	✓	1335
5	Update on progress from Delivery Group to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from Video-conference</li> <li>• Call in – next step</li> </ul>	[REDACTED]	Verbal	1345
6	Issues for escalation to MOPAC Shield Programme Board	All for discussion	Verbal	1355
7	Any other Business	All for discussion	Verbal	1355
Date of next meeting: Tbc			Close	1400

## Shield Programme Board

Monday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2015

### Attendees:

Sue Foster (SF) - (Chair)	Lambeth Strategic Director - Delivery
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

#### 1. Welcome, introductions and Apologies – Chair

- Round table introduction was made
- Apologies tendered

#### 2. Minutes of previous meeting and actions raised – Chair

- [REDACTED]: Item 3. To produce a paper to reflect on the past experience of the first six months of operation Shield – This has been done and circulated to the members of the Shield programme board, along with the agenda.
- A closed meeting has been held at [REDACTED] – They are keen to get involved but will limit this involvement to gangs / groups who live in/frequent and affect that neighbourhood. The national network was informed of this on Wednesday the 10<sup>th</sup> of September.
- Item 6: Issues for escalation to the Shield programme board. We raised the issue of resources for the help provision, post 'call in'. The MOPAC Board asked Lambeth to provide a paper on what resources were required. This has been done. We also discussed the questions we had about timing of the next call in. What became apparent was that we had misinterpreted the operating model. There was no requirement for us to hold a call in immediately after the collective enforcement phase. That was another element of learning which has been included in the six month report (item 3 above).

#### 3. Submission to GLA Police and Crime Committee, 10<sup>th</sup> September

Lambeth were asked to provide a submission to the above committee. [REDACTED] consulted with the majority of the Programme Board and submitted the paper. There has been no feedback.

4. Reflections on the first six months

SF introduced a paper covering Lambeth's experiences and learning from the first 6 months of Shield. The purpose of the report was for us to reflect, to draw on our local lessons learned, and inform implementation on the other two boroughs. It would also inform MOPAC's final evaluation. ■ highlighted the point that we have followed and adhered to the Partnership Agreement and Operating Model. A discussion was held about the content of the report and the following changes were made:

Para 2.3

*The Programme Board is chaired by the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth. The Board meets bi-monthly and provides strategic direction and oversight to the pilot in Lambeth. It is the view of the Board that strategic governance should have been in place long before the launch in January.*

Para 2.5 Recommendation 1:

*The statutory community safety partnership should have oversight of the pilot, and be part of the overall governance structure. The Shield governance boards should have significant lead in time to plan implementation.*

Para 4.6 Recommendation 7:

*Develop a violence reduction network to address the wider violence agenda in Lambeth.*

Para 5.2 Insert quote from Shield gang member

*'I think the idea about collective enforcement is unfair, but the help if you want it is good. I now have a key worker who has helped me to get help with education and legal services. Access to boxing, music and mentoring if I want it is a good look. I am now in college, and doing things in the evening has kept me out of trouble'.*

The remaining recommendations were agreed.

**ACTION**

Final report to be circulated to the Board and forwarded to MOPAC.

5. Update on Progress from Delivery Group

The Group discussed the 44 people who said they wanted help. We are paying community sector providers to act as a conduit to identify need and sign post accordingly. The GVI model suggests these individuals should be proactive themselves and come forward. It is not for us to chase them. Unless they phone and say that they want help, we shouldn't continue. We are slavishly chasing them, whereas we should be adopting a more pragmatic approach and just follow the model.

Lambeth is now one of only two boroughs that are testing the model, Haringey have withdrawn. Westminster is due to hold call-ins at three locations, but not with different groups (not the model).

Lambeth will continue to follow the Shield model and complete everything that we signed up to do in the Partnership Agreement and Operating Model. We are planning to test 'compellability' of NPS/CRC clients and YOS members of the cohort at a call-in. The call in will be taking place week commencing the 5<sup>th</sup> of October.

It is noted that David Kennedy said that GVI doesn't address juveniles. The Board agreed that we will continue to focus on juveniles as we can have a significant influence on that age group.

### **Guardian article**

Concerns were raised about the Guardian article and the comment that Lambeth and Haringey had withdrawn.

■ According to ■ did not say that Lambeth are withdrawing from the Shield Pilot. He will not be drafting a response to the Guardian article.

Haringey have rejected the pilot

■ asked what takes priority? Is it the people who have developed the model or is it the people who are living here and dealing with the consequences of its implementation. From the outset, he felt that the public voice said that a public meeting was not going to work as 'we know' Lambeth, and everyone around the table knew that too. However we still went ahead with a big public meeting and what we thought would happen did happen. This was because we felt that the priority was to adhere to the model rather than adapting it for this specific environment. His question is "In the future, what takes priority?" The impact that this model has had, means that even now the media are saying that we have opted out and rejected the programme, yet we are still very much entwined with the process. There were a lot of people who were very unsure of what direction we were taking with the programme, hence becoming unsure of the process. It was not made clear to us when to be flexible and when we should stick to the model

■: It appears that we are tied to a flawed operating model and as a result have slavishly adhered to it for seven months before reflecting on its effectiveness. Is it not time to adapt it to meet the needs of Lambeth, the local environment and culture?

■: After seven months we have a better understanding of the model. We still need to test compellability at a call in. We also need to recognise and reflect on the local context but we must not lose sight of the fact that we are delivering a pilot against a set criteria.

6. Issues for escalation to MOPAC Shield Programme Board:  
Reflections paper to be submitted, and response to Action 6.