

Criminal Justice Board

28 January 2016 13.30 – 15.00 Rm 9.29a Ministry of Justice, 102 Petty France

Attendees:

- Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (The Rt Hon Michael Gove MP) - **JS**
- Home Secretary (The Rt Hon Theresa May MP) - **HS**
- Attorney General (The Rt Hon Jeremy Wright QC MP) - **AG**
- Minister for Policing, Fire, Crime, Criminal Justice and Victims (The Rt Hon Mike Penning MP) - **MP**
- Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General (The Rt Hon Matthew Hancock MP)- **MH**
- President of the Queen’s Bench Division (Sir Brian Leveson) - **PQBD**
- Senior Presiding Judge (Lord Justice Fulford) - **LJF**
- Director of Public Prosecutions (Alison Saunders) - **AS**
- CEO Crown Prosecution Service (Peter Lewis) - **PL**
- Chair National Police Chief’s Council (Chief Constable Sara Thornton) - **ST**
- Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police (Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe) - **BHH**
- Police and Crime Commissioner Representative (Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Matthew Ellis) - **ME**
- CEO HM Courts & Tribunals Service (Natalie Ceeney) - **NC**
- Director General, Strategy and Change, Ministry of Justice (Indra Morris) - **IM**
- Director of Strategy, Ministry of Justice (Pamela Dow) – **PD**
- Non-executive Board member, Ministry of Justice (Sir Theodore Agnew)– **TA**
- Victims’ Commissioner, (Baroness Newlove) – **BN**

Apologies:

- Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (The Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP)
- Director General Crime & Policing Group, Home Office (Mary Calam)
- CEO National Offender Management Service (Michael Spurr)
- Non-executive Board member, Ministry of Justice (Sir Michael Narey)

Agenda items 1 & 2: Introduction and Matters Arising

1. The JS thanked members for attending and welcomed Baroness Newlove.
2. Board members approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

Agenda item 3: CJB Ambitions

3. The JS thanked members for sharing their ambitions for the CJS. He reaffirmed his role, as Chair of the Board, in helping members deliver these. He also confirmed that the ambitions would be reflected in future agendas that would be shorter to give more time for discussion.

4. Board members shared their ambitions for the CJB which the JS summarised as:
 - a. There is a need to build a picture of what the impact of the CJS reform will look like
 - b. Providing an effective and efficient service to victims and witnesses
 - c. Recognising the role that post-sentencing has in the wider CJS
 - d. Acknowledging CJS agencies as partners, jointly responsible for outcomes
5. Board members reaffirmed that the Board should also focus on *how* it can work together to deliver this change across the criminal justice system.

Action 1. To circulate Board members' ambitions

Action Owner: CJB Secretariat

Date: to circulate by the 4 February

Action 2. To reflect Board members' ambitions in future agendas

Action owner: CJB Secretariat

Date: before the next meeting, 9 March

Agenda item 4: Victims and Witnesses

6. BN summarised the Victims' Commissioner's report on Victim Personal Statements (VPS). She emphasised the importance of the VPS as integral to the Victims' Code and giving victims a voice. Her research found that only 15% of victims recalled having been offered the opportunity to make a VPS. This may be linked to police inconsistently offering the option and a misunderstanding of the VPS role and purpose. BN also described the difficult process of writing a VPS. BN emphasised the importance offering a VPS as it is the only point in the criminal justice process where victims can say in their own words what the impact on them has been.
7. The Board agreed that VPS are hugely valuable to victims. The discussion focused on the purpose of the VPS and that it needs to be better explained and understood by both CJS agencies and victims. There was a discussion on the purpose of VPS. The Board welcomed the report's recommendation to produce a common narrative explaining the VPS and its purpose, and to consider whether organizations other than the police such as victim services should take the VPS. This already happens in some areas.
8. They noted that a cross-system Working Group had been set up to respond to BN's report and recommendations. The JS pointed out that a number of the recommendations in the report were for his department, the Ministry of Justice, and that his officials would release a formal response shortly. He agreed to update the Board after six months on the progress of the implementation of her recommendations. In addition, ME agreed to work with BN to explore the role of PCCs in the collection of the VPS.

Action 3. BN to work with MP to clarify the role of VPS to victims

Owner: Baroness Newlove and Minister for Policing, Fire, Crime, Criminal Justice and Victims

Target date: to circulate an interim paper by the June CJB meeting

Action 4. The JS will report back to the Victims' Commissioner after six months on the MoJ's progress to implement the recommendations from BN's report.

Owner: Justice Secretary

Date: Six months from the date of publication of the VPS review

Action 5. BN to clarify the scope for PCCs to have greater responsibility for collecting VPS working with ME

Owner: Baroness Newlove and Matthew Ellis

Date: to circulate an update paper by the June CJB meeting

Agenda item 5: The Common Platform

9. LJF clarified that the Common Platform (CPP) is essentially a hardware and software solution to provide a comprehensive case management system. It builds on recent advances to digitise every part of the CJS to facilitate cases from charge to sentence through a fully automated system (including, for example, e-judiciary). The objective of the CPP is to avoid delays and inaccuracies, significantly reducing the time it takes for cases to go through the system. LJF noted that the CPP would be implemented incrementally.
10. The discussion focused on the importance of the police as a delivery partner in the implementation of the CPP. The Board agreed that, although there was already a lead representative from the police on the CPP Programme Board, this did not appear to be working well. Members agreed that a police SRO should be nominated to ensure the police are a partner in delivering the programme. They discussed the importance of the Police ICT Company and agreed that they should be considered as the potential SRO or as an additional member of the CPP Programme Board alongside the identified representative.
11. NC flagged that as the police are not formally in scope of the funding for the CPP they cannot be considered a formal 'SRO' in terms of financial accountability for the delivery of the programme.
12. MH thanked the Board for inviting him. He commended the ambition and direction of the project. In particular the 'agile' nature of its incremental, iterative and responsive implementation and that we should not enforce a strict deadline on completion. He was cautious of the paper being too optimistic of risks and accountability given the challenge involved in delivering large digital change programmes.

Action 6. Identify a 'SRO' for the CPP

Owner: Sara Thornton

Date: by the next meeting, 9 March

Action 7. Consider whether the Police ICT Company, if not identified as the 'SRO' should also attend the CPP programme board.

Owner: Peter Lewis and Natalie Ceeney

Date: by the next meeting, 9 March

Action 8. The JS to make a public statement on what the CPP will achieve for the CJS, building on contributions from Board members

Owner: Natalie Ceeney

Date: Justice Secretary to confirm

Acronym list

CPP	Common Platform Programme
CJB	Criminal Justice Board
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
HO	Home Office
VPS	Victim Personal Statements
SRO	Senior Responsible Owner

Please note that the Board members' initials are listed on page 1.