

Key Document 25

Letter from Former Home Office Official to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council



Home Office

Research, Development and Statistics Directorate

Policing and Crime Reduction Unit
Room 401, Clive House, London SW1H 9HD

Direct Line: [REDACTED]

E-Mail: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Education, Culture and Leisure Service
Rotherham Borough Council
Norfolk House
Walker Place
Rotherham
S65 1AS

26th February 2002.

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear [REDACTED]

Re: Issues raised during the Home Office evaluation of the pilot project run by Risky Business.

I am writing about the recent e-mail and other correspondence to and from the Home Office regarding the use of taxi firms for transportation of young people by Rotherham Borough Council Education, Culture and Leisure Services and Social Services.

Firstly I am writing to clarify actions taken with regard to the above. As you are aware, some concerns were brought to our attention by the University of Luton team working on evaluation of the Home Office funded pilot within the Risky Business Project.

I would like to state that as we are the contract managers, the University of Luton report directly to us regarding the evaluation. It was therefore appropriate that they contacted us and I would not view this as a breach of confidentiality. They acted in a responsible way by informing us of their concerns. However, it would have also been appropriate for the evaluators to have first spoken to the project team at Risky Business with regard to their concerns (and this may have pre-empted the need for further action).

I would also like to clarify what happened after we were contacted about these concerns. The Home Office policy section is the initiative owner and is responsible for all of the projects funded under the crime and disorder related to prostitution initiative. For this reason the team here at the Policing and Crime Reduction Unit (in

initiative. For this reason the team here at the Policing and Crime Reduction Unit (in Research, Development and Statistics) are obliged to inform our policy officer, [REDACTED] of any concerns regarding projects funded under this initiative. Given the nature of the concerns, it was appropriate that she contact colleagues in the Department of Health (child protection section) and DfEE (responsible for education services). I believe that they in turn contacted the relevant departments at Rotherham Borough Council to find out what action was being taken.

However, it would also have been appropriate for us to contact Risky Business directly, when the concerns were first raised with us. The information they could have provided about current investigation and actions instigated by the Education, Culture and Leisure service and Social Services may have meant no further action would have been necessary. This would have prevented a significant amount of time being spent in resolution of this issue.

I can only reiterate that following up concerns regarding child protection was appropriate and notifying relevant government departments was acceptable. However, I acknowledge that alternative courses of action could have been taken that may have made this a more straightforward process for everyone involved.

Secondly, I am writing about your concerns about the distribution of an e-mail sent to us by the evaluation team. The email outlined the concerns regarding child protection and also contained direct quotes from an interview undertaken by the evaluation team. I would like to make a formal apology to you on two accounts.

In raising the concerns with us, it was not appropriate for the evaluation team to use direct quotes from an interview. As you quite rightly point out this means that the individual interviewed could be identified. (Although they were not named sufficient information was given to make it clear who this was).

Secondly, and more importantly, it was not appropriate to send the e-mail in its original form to colleagues in other government departments and to Rotherham Borough Council. Given the nature of the concerns, a separate and formal process should have been used.

I would therefore like to apologise for any anxieties, concerns or difficulties that this caused to the Risky Business project team and management committee, the evaluation team and to the Directors of Education, Culture and Leisure Services and Social Services at Rotherham Borough Council.

As you will see, this letter has been copied to all of the above plus [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at the Home Office. For future reference, I have recommended that in the event of any further concerns being raised with the Home Office, the process will be:

- i. Home Office to contact the project team or management committee to find out about the issue of concern from their knowledge / perspective.
- ii. The Home Office will then make a decision as to what action will be taken and inform the project accordingly.

- iii. Any correspondence across government departments or to any other organisation / agency will not include forwarding of original e-mails (but may refer to them).

Child Protection particularly with regard to the vulnerable young people you deal with is the primary concern of all concerned. I hope that we will be able to put this incident behind us in the knowledge that all of the participants were acting in the best interests of the young people concerned.

I also hope that we will be able to proceed now with the evaluation process as agreed at our joint meeting on 13th February 2002. I look forward to meeting with yourselves and the evaluation team later this month to look at the next steps to evaluation.

Yours sincerely


Research Officer

Cc:

Ms J. Jenkinson, Head of Children & Families, Social Services, Rotherham Borough Council
Ms D. Billups, Executive Director, Education Culture & Leisure, Rotherham Borough Council
Ms , Risky Business Steering Group
Ms Margaret Melrose, Senior Research Fellow, University of Luton
Ms , Government Office Yorkshire and The Humber.
Ms , Violence Against Women Initiative Manager, Home Office
Ms , Senior Policy Officer, Home Office

Key Document 26

Submission from Former Home Office Official concerning Assessment of Bids for the purposes of Awarding Funding

From: Deborah Grice
Sentencing and Offences Unit
Room 320a
Queen Anne's Gate
☎ [REDACTED]

cc Permanent Secretary
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

30 November 2000

Charles Clarke

TACKLING PROSTITUTION: WHAT WORKS?

ISSUE

The Selection Panel for 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works?' met on Friday 24 November. Information about the bids selected and matters arising from the decisions is contained within.

TIMING

2. Pressing. We need to discuss part-funding with some of the bids before you announce the results. The date provisionally fixed for the announcement is **13 December.**

SUMMARY

Bids not considered in detail

3. As outlined in [REDACTED]'s submission of 16 November, 16 bids were rejected at the pre-selection stage. The panel briefly discussed these bids and considered a number of them in detail before agreeing that they should not be considered further.

Bids considered by the panel

4. The bids were scored blind by all members of the panel and placed in rank order before the meeting. A copy of the score sheet used is attached at **Annex A** and the results of this exercise at **Annex B.**

5. The bids were then considered in order according to the scores given. As you requested, we drew up a list of bids that best met the criteria for funding in excess of a total of £500,000.

6. Eight bids were selected to fund from the £500,000. These are located in Liverpool, Huddersfield, Hull, Stoke-on-Trent, Hackney, Rotherham, Bournemouth and Nottingham. It was decided to part-fund three of these bids either because some aspects did not fit Crime Reduction Programme criteria, or due to the limited funds available. The total cost of these bids is £500,449. Further detail is given below.

7. A further three bids, from Bristol, Manchester and Sheffield, were placed on a reserve list. It was thought best to part fund each of these bids at £60,000 each.

8. The bids on the reserve list are strong and, in the panel's opinion, the aim of finding out 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution would be furthered if further funds were found to fund or part-fund all 11 projects.

RECOMMENDATION

9. That you:

- agree to the decision of the panel to fund, or part-fund where appropriate, the 8 bids described in paragraphs 10 to 26;
- agree to further discussion about increased funding to part-fund three bids discussed in paragraphs 27 to 32;
- write to MPs whose constituencies contain a successful bid. A draft letter is attached at **Annex D**;
- you write to Fabian Hamilton MP to inform him that the bid for Leeds was unsuccessful (a draft letter is attached at **Annex E**); and
- you write to Gisela Stuart MP and Julia Drown MP on the unsuccessful bids from their constituencies (draft letters at **Annex F**).

The letters to Fabian Hamilton and the other MPs should go out by hand on the morning of **13 December**.

CONSIDERATION

Bids selected for funding

10. The **Linx Project, Liverpool** (£69,453) seeks funding to (a) reduce violence and sex offences against sex workers (b) reduce the disorder caused by prostitution in communities (c) encourage adults to exit from prostitution. Other aspects of the project, for which funding is not sought, aim to reduce the incidence of children involved in prostitution and reduce drugs misuse among sex workers.

11. 'TRAX' will build on an existing 'ugly mugs' scheme to identify known violent clients to build a regional database of dangerous individuals and efficiently disseminate the information to sex workers. Sex workers will be recruited to encourage others to report incidences of violence. The project will also employ a liaison officer to work with residents and community groups to tackle the problems caused by street prostitution. The officer will act as a mediator and encourage dialogue between those involved in and affected by prostitution. The Linx project already provides employment and training advice to sex workers, as well as information about housing, debt and welfare rights. This service will continue.

12. Although the panel did not consider this bid particularly innovative, it is solid and comprehensive in the interventions both planned and on-going. Moreover, the widely used 'ugly mugs' has never been evaluated. Doing so would be a valuable contribution to finding out 'what works'. The components for which funding are sought are clearly focused on tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution.

13. **Taking Action for A Safer Kirklees, Huddersfield** (part fund £69,000) is a holistic programme intended to stabilise the lives of sex workers and provide them with alternative ways of life. Women will access the programme by self referral or mandatory referral following the third arrest. Although the Government Office for the region expressed concerns that the mandatory nature of the programme may be contrary to probation policy, the panel noted that the aim of this initiative was to find out 'what works' and so new approaches should be encouraged. Officials will, however, discuss the matter with colleagues in Probation Unit.

14. The total bid is expensive (in excess of £150,000). However part of the funding requested is for a police liaison officer. As the bid noted that the police were able to

meet future costs of this post, it was agreed not to finance this element which amounted to £27,000. A further part of the bid concerned work placements. However the amount of funding requested and what the money would be used for is not clear and it was decided to limit the funding for this aspect to £25,000. It was therefore decided to speak to the bid and discuss part-funding to the value of £69,000. This figure would enable the main elements of the programme to function, but without some additional elements about which too little information was given or could be met from other sources.

15. **The Way Out Project, Hull (£39685)** aims to reduce both soliciting and kerb crawling, as well as reducing the violence against sex workers. Support services will encourage prostitutes to exit sex work. These interventions will take place during awareness raising phases to discourage kerb crawlers and increased law enforcement to allow support workers access to sex workers. Anti Social Behaviour Orders will be used against kerb crawlers where appropriate. CCTV will be used to gather evidence, which will be collated on a lap top and used in court.

16. The bid is clearly focused on CRP criteria and appears to be cost effective. The CCTV/evidence gathering aspect is an innovative method of tackling a difficult problem.

17. **The Potteries Housing Association, Stoke-on-Trent bid (£76,574)** is centred around a 'peer support' programme. Funding is sought for two co-ordinators who will oversee the recruitment of ex-prostitutes to encourage and support others in leaving sex work. A police crackdown on kerb crawlers and a media campaign to highlight the enforcement will create a 'window of opportunity' to allow support to be offered.

18. Although the panel had some doubts about the availability of ex-prostitutes who would wish to participate in this scheme and were concerned that the bid did not acknowledge the role of pimps in keeping women within sex work, this is one of the few truly innovative ideas. We decided that the bid should receive funding as it presents an genuine opportunity to try a different approach to find out 'what works'.

19. **The Maze Marigold/YWCA project, Hackney (£42737)** follows on from outreach and drop-in work by the agencies involved. These interventions have a good track record and take a proactive approach. The funding would be used for two outreach workers who will operate two nights per week and provide food, condoms and advice. A drop-in session will operate two afternoons per week and provide information on housing, benefits, health and access to basic skills training. Referrals will be made to specialist agencies. Increased police resources will result in more enforcement and sex workers will produce a booklet to address the concerns of residents, in particular the litter created by used condoms.

20. Again, this bid does little that is new, but it builds on proven partnerships and is expected to deliver.

21. **Risky Business Project, Rotherham (£53000)** is one of the few bids focused on the exploitation of children. The project, in conjunction with the work of CROP, would employ a development worker to target pimps by encouraging prosecutions at all stages of the 'grooming' process. It would encourage prosecutions under the little used Child Abduction Act 1984. Young people would be offered one to one support and safe accommodation. The support would be available around appointments to health clinics, court visits and drug agencies. The funding would also identify and train four specialist foster carers to provide accommodation as an alternative to care homes and hostels known to pimps.

22. This bid is both well focused and innovative. It affords an opportunity to make use of existing but under used legislation to see if it is able to tackle the grooming of

children for sexual exploitation, as well as supporting the young people themselves so they are able to resist pressure to become involved in sex work.

23. **Bournemouth Police's** (part fund £90000) would use the funding to enhance existing CCTV systems so that the areas affected by prostitution could be monitored by one person in a location close by. This would allow rapid response by the police. The second aspect of the bid involves fast track drugs detoxification and rehabilitation for sex workers. Money would also be used for instant response street cleaning to alleviate the problems for local residents.

24. This bid, at £139000, is expensive, and the panel questioned whether the improved response times as a result of moving the CCTV monitoring room justified the cost. However, the fast track drugs detox facilities and environmental improvements were considered worthy of funding and so it is proposed to offer £90000 funding to the project and work with it to decide how best the money can be spent.

25. **Nottingham Police's** (part fund £60000) bid builds on a road closure scheme to disrupt kerb crawling. The money would be used to finance the increased policing needed, including better equipment such as radios and an observations van to collect evidence needed to prosecute both kerb crawlers and pimps. A part time project worker would also be employed to identify vulnerable boys and to provide support needed to encourage them to exit sex work.

26. Although not particularly innovative, this bid does focus on CRP criteria. Given our limited budget and a suspicion that some of the work would be done whether it was financed by us or not it was decided to part fund at £60000 (the tender asked for £99672).

Bids on reserve list

27. **Pandora Project, Bristol** (part fund £60000) focuses on children at risk of involvement of prostitution. The funding would employ out reach workers to identify and provide support to such children, as well as a drugs worker, sexual health workers and the Terrence Higgins Trust to make contact with and provide services to men selling sex.

28. Although this bid was not considered as strong as others, it is on the reserve list because of the limited budget rather than because the panel did not think it should be funded.

29. **Real Choices, Manchester** (part fund £60000) would use funding to employ two referral workers, managed by Manchester Drugs Service. The workers would encourage access to drugs treatment, liaise with local colleges to provide basic education, and provide information on benefits and debt advice. Other aspects of the project, for which funding is not sought, tackle the kerb crawlers and public nuisance elements of prostitution.

30. The panel were concerned that key elements of the bid had not been sufficiently thought through. For example, the short period for which funding is available would not give time to liaise with colleges and persuade them to assist in the project. Details such as this should be in place already as they could take several months to set up. Similarly, the targets were vague and would be very difficult to evaluate. The drugs work could not be evaluated within the short time-scale. Nevertheless the bid had potential and could be usefully supported if funding for the projects were to be increased.

31. The bid from Sheffield (part fund £60000) would be overseen by the Area Child Protection Committee and would use the funding to (a) increase awareness among professionals about child sexual exploitation (b) support for young people referred via case conferences and (c) strategy co-ordination between the ACPC and the Prostitution Forum.

32. The bid gives insufficient detail about the proposed interventions to determine how well focused on CRP criteria it is. However, the link between tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution and the aspects of the project that funding would be used for appears to be weak. Nevertheless, it again contained promising aspects which make it attractive if resources permit.

Bids not selected for funding

33. A summary of the reasons for not recommending the remaining 13 bids for funding is given at Annex C. None of these bids meet the criteria even were further money available. If such further money were to be provided **we strongly recommend increasing the amount to be given to those for which we are recommending part-funding** rather than drawing any further projects into the list, to maximise the chance of successful outcomes.

HANDLING ISSUES

Sensitive bids

34. As set out in [REDACTED]'s submission of 16 November and mine of 22 November, the bids from Leeds, Bristol, Stoke-on-Trent, Birmingham and Swindon are politically sensitive.

35. The panel decided to fund the bid from **Stoke-on-Trent** because it took an innovative approach to the problems. Joan Walley MP has supported this bid throughout its history. The draft letter at Annex D will inform her of the news.

36. Although the bid from **Bristol**, which Jean Cortson wrote to you about, was not the strongest tender, it is first on the reserve list and we hope that further funding can be found.

37. As described in Annex C, the **Leeds** bids was not selected for funding. The draft letter attached at Annex E explains to Fabian Hamilton why the bid was not considered suitable for funding.

38. Similarly, the bids from **Birmingham** and **Swindon** did not fit the criteria. Draft letters to Gisela Stuart MP and Julia Drown MP are attached at Annex F together with a draft letter to Jean Corston if funding for the Bristol project is not forthcoming..

Announcement handling

39. Communications Directorate will submit a draft press statement and handling plan nearer the time of the announcement.

DEBORAH GRICE

Tackling Prostitution: What Works?

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting	Score
1. Are the proposals in line with those suggested by the prospectus? See areas identified for funding below	Points out of 10	
2. Feasible timescales: Are the goals of the project achievable in the time available? Are there stages defined with deliverables at the end of each stage?	Points out of 10	
3. Measurable: Can the goals of the project actually be measured. Is this in an ethical way? Can the proposals ensure that repeat victimisation (if appropriate) can be measured?	Points out of 10	
4. Achievable: Is what is being proposed actually do-able? Are the project plans sensible?	Points out of 10	
5. Focussed? Does the project have a clear focus? Is the project adequately focussed on Crime Reduction Programme objectives, or is there a sense that Crime Reduction Programme funding is as means to a different end? Are the deliverables clearly defined?	Points out of 5	
6. Multi-agency: Are the appropriate agencies involved? Do they appear fully committed to the project?	Points out of 10	
7. Inclusive: Does the project aim to reach all of the possible target groups in its catchment area?	Points out of 5	
8. Good track record or evidence of good working relations: What has the multi-agency group achieved to date? Is what is in place at the moment e.g. protocols, training plans, etc. indicative of progress to date?	Points out of 5	
9. Agreed policies and protocols in existence. What is in existence at the moment – does it indicate that this group can work together?	Points out of 5	
10. Appropriate, qualified experienced personnel involved: What are their track records? Is there evidence to show that they can deliver?	Points out of 10	
11. Police and other consultation: Have the police and appropriate bodies been consulted in the development of the bid, even if they are not involved in the delivery of the services. Is evidence available that the police endorse the bid?	Points out of 10	
12. Value for money: Does the proposal aim to deliver a good return on investment i.e. do the estimates of no. of crimes reduced warrant the amount of money asked for?	Points out of 5	
13. Overall assessment of quality of proposal: Does it present in a sensible, achievable format a project that fulfils Crime Reduction Programme objectives?	Points out of 5	

The crime and disorder associated with prostitution, and to be targeted in this initiative, includes but is not limited to:

- soliciting;
- associated thefts and muggings;
- associated violence;
- the nuisance caused to neighbourhoods such as unacceptable levels of noise, kerb-crawling and discarded needles and condoms. These problems may not only affect residential areas. Local business and those working within industrial estates may also be adversely impacted;
- very serious offences such as abduction, rape; sexual exploitation of children; grievous bodily harm; false imprisonment; supplying drugs to a minor and witness intimidation;
- drug-related offences.

BID	HOHO	DoH	Pol	RDS	TOTAL	
Linx Project, Liverpool	78	90	94	77	79	418
Taking Action for A Safer Kirklees	85	94	79	78	71	407
Way Out Project, Hull	69	90	89.5	77	66	391.5
Stoke-on-Trent	88	87	91.5	62	62	390.5
✓Capital Care	87	82	74	72	72	387
<i>Real Choices, Manchester</i>	83	78	79	68	72	380
Risky Business, Rotherham	81	88	77.5	67	63	376.5
<i>Sheffield MAG</i>	86	88	67.5	70	62	373.5
YWCA, Hackney	88	83	62	75	63	371
Bournemouth Police	66	85	79	80	61	371
Nottinghamshire Police	68	80	65	80	65	358
<i>Pandora Project, Bristol</i>	82	80	73	57	58	350
Hackney MAG	63	82	75.5	66	60	346.5
✓South Wales Police	75	75	75.5	57	59	341.5
Plymouth CSP	70	75	68.5	58	67	338.5
✓Middlesbrough MAG	73	77	62	65	58	335
Lancashire Constabulary	64	75	62	60	55	316
✓Terrence Higgins Trust	70	61	54	72	55	312
WHIP, Leicester	51	77	64	58	56	306
Leeds CSP	47	72	66	65	56	306
Streetreach, Doncaster	61	73	52.5	50	55	291.5
Swindon C&D Implementation	45	68	47	55	59	274
WM Police, Birmingham	42	63	48.5	53	58	264.5
EDGE, Derby	46	69	42	48	52	257

Projects in **bold** are recommended for funding from the £500,000; projects in **bold italics** are on the reserve list.

Annex C

BID & REGION	SUMMARY	REASONS FOR REJECTION
Capital Care drop-in centre, London (this bid scored well but on careful consideration had serious defects coupled with being very expensive to fund)	Support services for those wishing to exit prostitution, directory of services, media awareness campaign.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested funding for two years • At very early stage of development • Unlikely to produce results in period of funding
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of drop-in centre not clear – bid contradictory in places
South Wales Police, Cardiff, Wales	Sexual health out-reach project, training for Victim Support volunteers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little information or detail given in bid • Not an existing partnership
Hackney Community Safety Partnership, London	Residents' newsletter, signage, community services worker, neighbourhood wardens.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols and procedures not in place • Targets sketchy and difficult to evaluate • Many interventions – no clear focus
Plymouth CSP, South West	Road closure scheme to disrupt kerb crawlers, increasing policing to target kerb crawlers, better equipment including observations van, part time project worker.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral service dependant on success of other bids • not clear how funding would be used
Middlesborough MAG, North East	Research post, support worker and dedicated Police prostitution liaison officer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly a research project to highlight what is needed for an intervention • Funding is for interventions only • Project would not consider funding without the research post • Does not tackle crime or disorder
Lancashire Constabulary, Preston, North West	ABCs and ASBOs as alternative to prosecution, with a focus on the deterrent effect of the 5 year penalty for breach of an ASBO.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wholly focused on use of ASBOs for sex workers and kerb crawlers instead of the criminal law • ASBOs favoured due to high penalty for non-compliance compared to substantive offences • Funding should not encourage increase in penalties 'by the back

		door'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies have not worked in partnership to date
Streetreach, Doncaster, Yorkshire and Humber	Arrest referral scheme to include training and education advice and drugs rehabilitation.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details of the programme that funding would set up • No evidence that relevant agencies are committed, eg. Drug detox providers • No plans for maintenance when CRP funding ceases
Leeds CSU, Yorkshire & Humber	Kerb crawler re-education programme. Support workers to develop exit strategies. Increased enforcement by police.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCRP has already been tried and evaluated • It was found to be not cost effective by the police • Funding should not be used too duplicate work already done • Bid does not tackle problems discovered in pilot of KCRP • GOR comments on police ambivalence • Not clear how outcomes of Genesis project could be evaluated
Terrence Higgins Trust, West Midlands	Drop-in centre and out reach services for sex workers and women at risk of becoming involved in prostitution.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new partnership • Unlikely to deliver within short time-scale • Possible contender for future funding
WHIP, Leicester, East Midlands	Worker to focus on training for those wishing to exit prostitution.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets 11 women but no case made out for this • no clear targets • no protocols in place
Swindon Implementation, West	C&D South Environmental improvements action plan, , out-reach and referral programme, promotional work to enhance understanding of support and referral activities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on children but few specialist agencies involved/consulted • bid not clearly focused • research aspects do not fit criteria • no clear strategy or targets
West Midlands Police, Birmingham, West Midlands	Establish steering group, fund two project workers. Use of ASBOs for persistent soliciting. Arrest referral scheme.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOR reports that agencies to not deliver high quality outputs • Scheme designed to spend £100000 rather than tackle crime and disorder • Very difficult to evaluate outcomes • Depends on outcome o report – premature
EDGE Project, Derby,	Drop-in for sex workers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOR comments that

East Midlands	with a drug addiction. Workers to provide assistance on training, employment, counselling, child care and housing.	<p>EDGE not forthcoming about achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At too early a stage of development • Would not deliver for 2/3 years • Not intended to reduce crime
---------------	--	---

DRAFT LETTER FOR CHARLES CLARKE TO SEND TO THE FOLLOWING MPs (by hand on Wednesday 13 December):

George Howarth MP (Linx project)
 Eddie O'Hara MP (Linx project)
 Maria Eagle MP (Linx project)
 Louise Ellman MP (Linx project)
 Peter Kilfoyle MP (Linx project)
 Jane Kennedy MP (Linx project)
 Bob Wareing MP (Linx project)
 Angela Eagle MP (Linx project)
 Rt Hon Frank Field MP (Linx project)
 Barry Sheerman MP (Taking Action for a Safer Kirklees)
 Kevin McNamara MP (The Way Out Project)
 Rt Hon John Prescott MP (The Way Out Project)
 Joan Walley MP (The Potteries Housing Association)
 Dennis McShane MP (The Risky Business Project)
 Diane Abbot MP (The Maze Marigold Project)
 Brian Sedgemore MP (The Maze Marigold Project)
 John Butterfill MP (Prostitution in Boscombe)
 David Atkinson MP (Prostitution in Boscombe)
 John Heppell MP (Nottingham police)
 Graham Allen MP (Nottingham police)
 Alan Simpson MP (Nottingham police)

Jean Cortson MP (if Pandora project is funded)
 Tony Lloyd MP (if Real Choices project is funded)
 Graham Stringer MP (if Real Choices project is funded)
 Rt Hon Gerald Kaufman MP (if Real Choices project is funded)
 Keith Bradley MP (if Real Choices project is funded)
 Rt Hon David Blunkett MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)
 Clive Betts MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)
 Rt Hon Richard Caborn MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)
 Richard Allen MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)
 Bill Michie MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)
 Helen Jackson MP (if Sheffield City Council bid is funded)

I am announcing today the outcome of the selection process for bids submitted under the Crime Reduction Programme's 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works' initiative.

I am delighted to inform you that [The Linx Project/the Taking Action for a Safer Kirklees bid/The Potteries Housing Association/The Way Out Project/The Maze Marigold Project/The Nottingham Police bid/The Prostitution in Boscombe/The Risky Business Project/The Pandora Project/The 'Real Choices' bid/The Sheffield City Council bid] has been selected for [funding/part funding].

I believe that the funding provided will bring us closer to understanding 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. Independent evaluators will be appointed to ensure that we can learn from the interventions funded and develop models of best practice for dealing with this difficult area.

I hope that the funding will also provide shorter term benefits to those affected by the nuisance to which prostitution can give rise, as well as assisting those men and women who wish to exit from sex work.

CHARLES CLARKE

**DRAFT LETTER FOR CHARLES CLARKE TO SEND TO FABIAN
HAMILTON MP (by hand on 13 December)**

Fabian Hamilton MP
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

I am announcing today the outcome of the selection process for bids submitted under the Crime Reduction Programme's 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works?' initiative.

We received 40 bids in total and have a limited budget of £500,000 [or more]. We have decided to fund 8 [11] bids in total, and have selected those that best fit the criteria as set out in the invitation to tender. Although the Leeds bid was short-listed for consideration by the selection panel, I regret to have to inform you that it is not one of those selected for Crime Reduction Programme funding.

We were concerned that the Kerb Crawler Re-education Programme has already been run as a pilot project and evaluated by Leeds Metropolitan University. The scheme proposed in the tender for funding did not address the problems inherent in the pilot project or acknowledge that it had already been the subject of evaluation. Moreover it was felt that to duplicate evaluation would not be an appropriate use of limited resources.

The evaluation considered that the KCRP did not add any value to the policing of prostitution or kerb crawlers and noted that the scheme was more expensive than then the prosecution of kerb crawlers.

While I sympathise with the problems caused by kerb crawling in Leeds, our aim is to find out 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. I think that the funding is best used to try out a wide range of interventions so that we can develop models of best practice that will be of benefit to all.

The other aspects of the bid were discussed but, on balance, it was decided that other tender better matched the selection criteria.

CHARLES CLARKE

DRAFT LETTER FOR CHARLES CLARKE TO SEND TO JULIA DROWN MP

Julia Drown MP
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

I am announcing today the outcome of the selection process for bids submitted under the Crime Reduction Programme's 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works?' initiative.

We received 40 bids in total and have a limited budget of £500,000 [or more]. We have decided to fund 8 [11] bids in total, and have selected those that best fit the criteria as set out in the invitation to tender. Although the Swindon bid was short-listed for consideration by the selection panel, I regret to have to inform you that it is not one of those selected for Crime Reduction Programme funding.

We were concerned that, although the bid targeted children at risk of becoming involved in prostitution, relevant agencies such as Youth Offender Teams and the Area Child Protection Committee were not involved in the project. It was also thought that the proposed interventions and targets were unclear. The proposed Crime and Environmental Assessment was at too developmental a level to fit Crime Reduction Programme criteria, which mean that only interventions to tackle crime and disorder can attract funding.

I would like to stress that I do sympathise with those affected by the problems to which prostitution gives rise. I believe that the funding provided will bring us closer to understanding 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. Independent evaluators will be appointed to ensure that we can learn from the interventions funded and develop models of best practice for dealing with this difficult area. These models can then be used to tackle prostitution in all areas affected by this problem.

**DRAFT LETTER FOR CHARLES CLARKE TO SEND TO GISELA STUART
MP**

Gisela Stuart MP
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

I am announcing today the outcome of the selection process for bids submitted under the Crime Reduction Programme's 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works?' initiative.

We received 40 bids in total and have a limited budget of £500,000 [or more]. We have decided to fund 8 [11] bids in total, and have selected those that best fit the criteria as set out in the invitation to tender. Although the Birmingham bid was short-listed for consideration by the selection panel, I regret to have to inform you that it is not one of those selected for Crime Reduction Programme funding.

We were concerned that aspects of the bid were at too early a stage to attract funding. For example, the establishment of a steering group will take time and outcomes are unlikely to be forthcoming in the short time for which funding is available. It was also felt that the bid lacked clear focus and measurable targets.

The Invitation to Tender made clear that funding would only be available to existing multi-agency partnerships or those working in a multi agency context. This bid would formally establish such a partnership and so does not fit the criteria.

I would like to stress that I do sympathise with those affected by the problems to which prostitution gives rise. I believe that the funding provided will bring us closer to understanding 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. Independent evaluators will be appointed to ensure that we can learn from the interventions funded and develop models of best practice for dealing with this difficult area. These models can then be used to tackle prostitution in all areas affected by this problem.

**DRAFT LETTER FOR CHARLES CLARKE TO SEND TO JEAN CORTSON
MP IF FURTHER FUNDING IS NOT FOUND FOR THE BRISTOL
PROJECT**

Jean Cortson MP
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

I am announcing today the outcome of the selection process for bids submitted under the Crime Reduction Programme's 'Tackling Prostitution: What Works?' initiative.

We received 40 bids in total and have a limited budget of £500,000. We have decided to fund 8 bids in total, and have selected those that best fit the criteria as set out in the invitation to tender. Although the Pandora project, Bristol was short-listed for consideration by the selection panel, I regret to have to inform you that it is not one of those selected for Crime Reduction Programme funding.

Although we were attracted to the proposals' focus on vulnerable young people we were concerned that the partnership was not sufficiently established to produce measurable outcomes within the short time-scale for which funding is available. For example, the establishment of the steering group and working out of the appropriate protocols will take time and did not meet the requirement stated on the invitation to tender, that only existing multi-agency partnerships will be considered for funding.

I would like to stress that I do sympathise with those affected by the problems to which prostitution gives rise. I believe that the funding provided will bring us closer to understanding 'what works' in tackling the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. Independent evaluators will be appointed to ensure that we can learn from the interventions funded and develop models of best practice for dealing with this difficult area. These models can then be used to tackle prostitution in all areas affected by this problem.

Key Document 27

Rotherham Research Project Bid Assessment Sheet

PROS/94/02

RISKY BUSINESS PROJECT

Tackling Prostitution: What Works?

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting	Score
1. Are the proposals in line with those suggested by the prospectus? See areas identified for funding below	Points out of 10	8
2. Feasible timescales: Are the goals of the project achievable in the time available? Are there stages defined with deliverables at the end of each stage?	Points out of 10	8
3. Measurable: Can the goals of the project actually be measured. Is this in an ethical way? Can the proposals ensure that repeat victimisation (if appropriate) can be measured?	Points out of 10	7
4. Achievable: Is what is being proposed actually do-able? Are the project plans sensible?	Points out of 10	8
5. Focussed? Does the project have a clear focus? Is the project adequately focussed on Crime Reduction Programme objectives, or is there a sense that Crime Reduction Programme funding is as means to a different end? Are the deliverables clearly defined?	Points out of 5	4
6. Multi-agency: Are the appropriate agencies involved? Do they appear fully committed to the project?	Points out of 10	9
7. Inclusive: Does the project aim to reach all of the possible target groups in its catchment area?	Points out of 5	3
8. Good track record or evidence of good working relations: What has the multi-agency group achieved to date? Is what is in place at the moment e.g. protocols, training plans, etc. indicative of progress to date?	Points out of 5	4
9. Agreed policies and protocols in existence. What is in existence at the moment – does it indicate that this group can work together?	Points out of 5	3/4
10. Appropriate, qualified experienced personnel involved: What are their track records? Is there evidence to show that they can deliver?	Points out of 10	8
11. Police and other consultation: Have the police and appropriate bodies been consulted in the development of the bid, even if they are not involved in the delivery of the services. Is evidence available that the police endorse the bid?	Points out of 10	7
12. Value for money: Does the proposal aim to deliver a good return on investment i.e. do the estimates of no. of crimes reduced warrant the amount of money asked for?	Points out of 5	4
13. Overall assessment of quality of proposal: Does it present in a sensible, achievable format a project that fulfils Crime Reduction Programme objectives?	Points out of 5	4

PROJECT DATA
ISSUESNOT X THERE
BUT CONSIDER
IS.NOT ALL ♀ P
HAVE PIMPA FEW COMMENTS
ABOUT POLICE
= ? STRENGTH OF
PARTNERSHIP?

77 1/2

The crime and disorder associated with prostitution, and to be targeted in this initiative, includes but is not limited to:

- soliciting;
- associated thefts and muggings;
- associated violence;
- the nuisance caused to neighbourhoods such as unacceptable levels of noise, kerb-crawling and discarded needles and condoms. These problems may not only affect residential areas. Local business and those working within industrial estates may also be adversely impacted;
- very serious offences such as abduction, rape; sexual exploitation of children; grievous bodily harm; false imprisonment; supplying drugs to a minor and witness intimidation;
- drug-related offences.

RISKY BUSINESS PROJECT

PROS/4H/02

SD £53,000

development
worker
TARGET PIMPS

TRAIN 4 FOSTER
CARERS

EQUIPMENT:
MOBILES/ALARM
EVIDENCE GATHERING

✓ - OVF/HOMELESS/LEAVING CARE/CPSSD/SSD/POLICE./EDUCATION/
HEALTH

?YOT? DAT?

✓ Group est. 1997

- ~~UNDER~~ UNDER 18 ♀ INVOLVED OR AT RISK OF P. } TARGET GROUPS
- COERCERS WHO PERSUADE ♀ INTO P. - improving likelihood of prosecution. - sending warning letters!?

x - GOOD WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH POLICE? = NEGATIVE LIGHT IN APPLICATION. "Advise ... [parents] that police attitudes may not always be well informed" - why not try to improve P. attitudes with info. sharing?

② - GOOD IDEA FOR EVIDENCE GATHERING SO x RELY ON ♀ - BUT SOURCES = INFO. SHARING PROBLEMS (SAMARITANS - keep records of calls; PR - protect confidentiality)
[APPROACH TO THESE AGENCIES & INFO NOT UNTIL JAN-MARCH]
③ DATA PROTECTION/HUMAN RIGHTS ACT?

✓ PROTOCOL IN FINAL STAGES OF FINALISATION

✓ CONSIDERABLE FINANCIAL SUPPORT ALREADY

✗ DB - INFO. : CURRENTLY HAND-WRITTEN - NO DB FOR PROTECT = x EVEN GOT A PC.

✓ POLICE/SSD DB - CAPTURES REPEAT VICTIMS etc

④ How - from project records - = Assem pater x like with Gls who do get PC DB CP + training!

✓ PROTOCOLS

⑤ BROAD ESTIMATES OF ONGOING RESOURCES - WHY?

Research?
Use of Child
Abduction Act
1984 + its
relevance

Key Document 28

Draft Submission concerning Bridging Funding for Crime Reduction
Programme Prostitution Projects

DRAFT

From:

[REDACTED]
 Crime Reduction Programme Unit
 Room 621, Clive House
 [REDACTED]
 Fax: [REDACTED]

cc

Home Secretary
 Permanent Secretary
 [REDACTED] PCRG
 [REDACTED] CPG
 Deborah Grice, SOU
 [REDACTED], SOU
 [REDACTED], SOU
 [REDACTED], PRCU
 [REDACTED], PCRU
 [REDACTED], PRCU
 [REDACTED] AFU
 [REDACTED] PSMU
 [REDACTED] CD
 [REDACTED] Private Office
 [REDACTED] Private
 Office
 [REDACTED] Private Office
 [REDACTED] Private Office

8 March 2002

John Denham

BRIDGING FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROSTITUTION PROJECTS

Issue

Bridging funding to continue successful Crime Reduction Programme prostitution projects pending an SR 2002 bid for mainstream funding.

Timing

2. Pressing – the contracts of many of the staff on these projects expire on 31 March 2002, and they will have to be given notice to quit if funding is not available.

Summary

- The Crime Reduction programme 'Prostitution – What Works?' Initiative includes a number of successful projects dealing with the crime and disorder associated with prostitution.
- Funding for these projects expires with the end of the CRP in March 2002.
- The projects are successful in themselves, and their evaluation is yielding valuable information about ways of dealing with problems in communities arising from prostitution.
- SOU have included the continuation of these projects as an essential element of their SR 2002 Aim 3 bid, which if successful would provide funding from 2003/04. This would be negated if the projects were to close in the meantime. They are accordingly applying for funding to keep the projects running through 2002/03.

- To maintain the projects and the expertise of supporting staff through 2002/03 would require a further investment of £850,000. Alternatively, funding the projects for a further three months until the outcome of the Fundamental Expenditure Review is known will require bridging funding of £210,000.

Recommendation

3. That you approve funding for the continuation of these projects through 2002/03, or alternatively, for a period of 3 months into 2002/03, pending the outcome of the FER.

Consideration

4. There are currently 11 Prostitution Initiative projects (details at Annex A) funded out of the Crime Reduction Programme. These meet a wide number of key Home Office policy interests including the Home Secretary's interest in community regeneration, child protection and drug use and trading. The projects have been fully up and running for just over a year, and evaluation is revealing some valuable preliminary findings.

SOU regard these projects as core to their work in developing policy on prostitution and tackling its anti-social aspects. They believe the work to be groundbreaking, and it is not being funded or carried out by other parts of the office or other Departments. They regard the continuation of all but one of the projects to be an essential element of their SR 2002 Aim 3 Bid, which, if successful, would provide continuation funding from 2003/04.

These 10 projects will have a direct input into the Anti-Social Behaviour Delivery Plan, and will provide valuable evidence on what works in relation to reducing the numerous crimes (often also drug related), as well as the anti-social behaviour associated with prostitution. This is an area where there is very little data available.

7. The projects have already been allocated £870,000 from the Crime Reduction programme. They are due to complete early in 2002/03, and no further funding is available to sustain them until SR 2002 funding comes on stream. SOU are therefore seeking a further **£850,000** to sustain the projects and their evaluation through 2002/03.

8. An alternative option would be to approve continuation funding for a period of 3 months, which would allow the projects to continue until the result of the Fundamental Expenditure Review is known. This would require a commitment of **£210,000**. If further funding is available from the FER, this could be used to sustain the projects until new SR 2002 funding comes on stream. If the SR 2002 bid is unsuccessful, the extension of the projects will have added to their impact on community problems and to the knowledge base of responses to the crime and disorder problems associated with prostitution.

9. This commitment has been noted as a potential demand on the crime reduction funding available in 2002/03 for the Safer Communities Initiative and other purposes (see accompanying note). However, a decision cannot await the outcome of the Fundamental Expenditure Review, as the contracts of staff delivering the initiatives are about to expire and they will need to be given a statutory period of notice very soon if the projects are to close.

Handling



10. Continuation of these successful projects will be a good news story in the communities in which they operate, and will ensure that full knowledge is gained from their evaluation to inform future policy. There will be further gains from the continuation of the projects if the SR2002 bid is successful. If the projects have to close, there will be some protest locally, and the evaluation evidence will be incomplete. More significantly, however, with the loss of the schemes, the foundation for the SR2002 bid will be lost, and the bid will have to be withdrawn.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Annex A

What Works in Tackling the Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Associated with Prostitution?

The projects have been divided up, for the purposes of evaluation, into three streams.

These are:

- Children and Young People
- Policing and
- Exiting

Children and Young People

These projects are primarily concerned with supporting young people who have become involved in prostitution and providing them with the support required to help them to exit prostitution. They have demonstrated a very alarming trend toward procuring young boys and girls for sexual purposes.

These projects are yielding useful information regarding how young people become involved and devising preventative strategies to deter young people from entering. Initial findings have revealed that the influence of peers and boyfriends, a history of abuse and/or violence and drug use are all push factors leading to a young person's involvement. Evaluation has also fed back that there is a lack of support for such socially excluded youngsters and that they have had very negative experiences of the public sector, particularly social services.

Policing

These projects are designed to equip the police with effective measures to tackle the crime and anti-social behaviour associated with prostitution. The evaluation team have been assessing the innovative use of penalties and civil orders, how to curb the presence of street workers, kerb crawlers and pimps and how best to ensure the safety of those working as prostitutes.

The main issues arising are how to effectively deal with the consequences for a residential area of an increase in its sex trade. These include a detrimental effect on quality of life, the dangers of the detritus of drug use and sexual activity and concerns for the safety of women and young people in the area.

Exiting

These projects are dedicated to helping adults involved in prostitution exit from the profession. They provide the support are involved in mediating between the

individual and various agencies including housing, the employment service, healthcare professionals and social services in order to help the individual make the transition into regular employment. Initial findings have revealed that the success of a person trying to exit prostitution is hugely dependent on this form of support as, in giving up prostitution a person may also be surrendering the only friends and sometimes family that they have, an addiction to drugs, high levels of earnings and a whole way of life.

All of the projects were commissioned in January 2001, and have not had time to fully achieve their objectives. However, despite this, the interim evaluation reports show some interesting findings that are of relevance and concern to policy e.g. use of ASBOs, and drug treatment programmes.

Key Document 29

Submission concerning Continuation Funding for Crime Reduction Programme
Prostitution and Demonstration Projects

From: [REDACTED]
 Crime Reduction Programme Unit
 Room 621, Clive House
 ☎ [REDACTED]
 Fax: [REDACTED]

13 March 2002

cc Home Secretary
 Permanent Secretary
 [REDACTED] PCRG
 [REDACTED] AFU
 [REDACTED] PSMU
 [REDACTED] CD
 [REDACTED] Private Office
 [REDACTED] Private
 Office
 [REDACTED] Private Office
 [REDACTED] Private Office

John Denham

CONTINUATION FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROSTITUTION AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Issue

Background to accompanying submissions covering proposals for funding to continue 15 crime reduction programme projects into 2002/03. These are not new projects and relate to issues raised in [REDACTED] submissions of 23 January and 8 February about meeting crime reduction commitments in 2002/03.

Timing

2. Pressing – the proposed expenditure will be a potential commitment against available crime reduction funding in 2002/03 and is therefore tied up with the Fundamental Expenditure Review, but to ensure continuity of the projects on the ground, decisions cannot await the outcome of the Review.

Summary

3. The attached submissions give details of two proposals for continuation crime reduction funding into 2002/03.

(1) Prostitution – ‘What Works?’

4. **£850,000** is sought to continue 10 successful prostitution projects through 2002/03 pending the outcome of an SR2002 bid from SOU which would allow these projects to continue into and beyond 2003/04.

5. Following your comment in [REDACTED] e-mail of 7 January 2002 that you were not keen on developing new work relating to prostitution, [REDACTED] confirmed in his submission of 23 January 2002 on Crime Reduction programme expenditure in 2002/03 that no funding had been granted for new prostitution projects. A compelling case has since been made, as outlined in the attached submission, for continuation funding to allow 10 existing prostitution projects to continue through 2002/03 until they can be picked up by SR 2002 funding that has been applied

for by SOU. There is no other source of funding for this expenditure, which would be a potential commitment on the available crime reduction provision for 2002/03, as described in [REDACTED] submission of 8 February 2002.

6. No final decision can be made on these commitments until the outcome of the Fundamental Expenditure Review, which is not expected to report for some time. However, there is a pressing need to make an early decision on continuation funding for these prostitution projects, as staff are nearing the end of their contracts and will have to be given notice of termination very soon.

7. An added factor has arisen following the Home Secretary's visit to Bristol on Monday, where he heard about the funding difficulties of one of these prostitution projects, the Bristol Pandora project.. The Home Secretary has asked what resources might be available to enable this project to continue.

8. The cost of continuing the 10 prostitution projects for a full year would amount to **£850,000**, which would amount to a substantial prior commitment against the FER were it to be agreed in full. The alternative proposal in paragraph 8 of the submission to approve extension funding for 3 months at a cost of **£210,000** would meet the immediate problem while leaving room for manoeuvre when the outcome of the FER is known.

Recommendation 1

9. That you approve 3 months' continuation funding for the 10 prostitution projects at a cost of **£210,000**, a decision on further funding to be made in the context of the FER.

(2) Crime Reduction Demonstration Projects

10. A maximum of **£925,000** is sought for the continuation of 5 successful crime reduction programme projects covering reducing burglary and targeted policing to the end of 2002/03 as part of the programme's dissemination strategy to spread the details of 'what works' in crime reduction to practitioners and others. Such dissemination of good practice is a key purpose of the crime reduction programme. The proposal also covers funding for a dissemination training event. The funding will be supported by contributions from the police and other sources.

11. Again, this is a potential commitment against the 2002/03 funding stream, and is referred to in [REDACTED] submission of 8 February 2002 as one of the items to be dealt with in the context of the FER. As in the previous case, staff running the projects will require early reassurance that funding will be continued, as in some cases their contracts of employment end this month. This is a particular concern with the highly successful 'Hull Cop Shop' scheme, where a key worker will be lost if the funding is not confirmed soon. You are therefore invited to agree to the continued funding of these projects in advance of the outcome of the FER.

12. Although not mentioned in the accompanying submission, the initiative owner has agreed that 3 months' funding, around **£231,000**, would be sufficient to meet the immediate need, with further continuation funding being considered in the context of the FER.

Recommendation 2

13. That you agree to continuation funding of around **£231,000** in 2002/03 to cover 3 months' operation of the proposed 5 demonstration schemes, further funding decisions to be made in the light of the FER.

Handling

14. The handling issues associated with these decisions are set out in the accompanying submissions.



Key Document 30

Briefing Note apparently produced for purposes of the Crime Reduction Programme Board

Tackling Prostitution: What Works? Information for CRP Board

Extension of Funding: Additional Notes/Amendments

By extending the funding to the young people's projects, we would expect the following outcomes over time:

BRISTOL

Consolidation of work being undertaken with young men and women who are already involved in the projects and engage more young people in the long-term

Given time, police may be able to bring prosecutions against the men involved in coercing young people into prostitution. There is some intelligence gathering going on at the moment. These operations may, over time, significantly disrupt the drugs/prostitution nexus

We believe that over time, this project may develop into a good model of unisex practice that may be adopted in other areas of the country

ROTHERHAM

We believe that over time, this project will result in disrupting the activities of men involved in pimping and grooming young women into prostitution and possibly lead to prosecutions

Through the work of Risky Business (to which the CRP initiative is attached) the young women will be protected from further abuse

It is possible that given time, the project would also be able to develop a response for young men involved in commercial sexual exploitation

The project may provide a model for other areas in terms of how to go about tackling the men involved in grooming and pimping while at the same time, protecting the young people

SHEFFIELD

Given time, this project would be able to develop its practice in relation to the young people with whom it is working

Consolidate its multi-agency approach to identifying young people at risk and the men with whom they are involved with a view to taking action against the men with whom they are involved

Develop a sensitive and appropriate response to young men involved in commercial sexual exploitation

We would also suggest that extending funding to the projects in Rotherham and Sheffield would enable better communications to develop between Sheffield and Rotherham police. This might enable them jointly to target the men involved in abusing the young people

C & D Associated with prostitution (Young People)

ROTHERHAM

1. Description of aims, intervention & context

The Rotherham project has developed from the work of an existing project, 'Risky Business', that works with young women involved or at risk of involvement in commercial sexual exploitation. This project had identified a problem with young women being targeted by men in the area for the purpose of sexual exploitation. The aims of the CRP funded initiative are to tackle the men allegedly involved in procuring/pimping the young women for the purpose of sexual exploitation and to support the young women concerned through the work of the Risky Business project. The Rotherham project is also concerned to raise awareness of the problem of commercial child sexual exploitation with various professional groups, for example, social workers, educational welfare officers, judges, the CPS and foster carers. The project also works with the police to develop effective and appropriate methods of tracking young people who go missing in Rotherham and to provide an appropriate response to the problem at this level. In addition, the Rotherham project aims to develop specialist foster carers and to place the young women with them where appropriate. To date, two such specialist carers have received training around the issues of child commercial sexual exploitation and two young women have been placed with them. Where necessary, the project also provides 'keep safe' equipment to the girls and their families.

2. Expected outcomes

Reduction in the number of young people who go missing; Increase in prosecution of known pimps; Raising awareness in CPS and other agencies around the issue of child abduction; Awareness and increased understanding of the issue amongst parents, carers, residential social workers and other professional groups.

3. Progress towards achieving these outcomes

We believe that to date the Rotherham project has undertaken very positive work to develop a model for tackling the men involved. We believe that eventually this model may become nationally applicable. Data has been collated on 6 men who have links with each other, drug dealing and many of the young women considered to be at risk in Rotherham. Negotiations are continuing with the police to develop appropriate methods of gathering intelligence on the men suspected of being involved in procuring and pimping the young women concerned so that the young women need not give evidence in court. The project and the police continue to work to develop effective means by which young women who go missing may be identified, tracked and responded to. In this respect, the Rotherham project might learn a great deal from the project work being undertaken in Sheffield. There appear to be some very obvious tensions on the one hand (Rotherham) but good practice on the other (Sheffield) in the police cultures and in the ways that the police in the two areas have implemented new government guidance and protocols for dealing with these young people. Training has been undertaken with a variety of professionals and awareness of the problem in Rotherham has been increased as a result of this work. The project continues to work with the young women through the Risky Business project and encourages them to give information about these men that the police may act on.

4. Recommendation to fund whole or part of project - and rationale

We would recommend that the whole project receive further funding. The process of gathering evidence against these men, and encouraging the young women to give information about them, is very lengthy. To date some young women have come forward with information but to secure convictions against these men, who are also involved in other serious crime, it is vital that the project continues to engage and support the young women. If the project does not secure further funding, we are concerned that the good work undertaken to date would be very quickly undone. Extending the funding would enable the project to work with the young women to support them in giving information about the men involved and enable workers to collate this information with a view to prosecution. It would also enable the project to recruit and train more specialist foster carers so that more young women considered to be at risk can be placed in safe accommodation with responsible adults who understand the issues.

5. Whether would particularly benefit from extension of funding - and rationale

We think the project would benefit from extending funding for at least another year. This would enable the project to develop and improve its relations with the local police and to establish effective relationships with the CPS. The process of gathering intelligence about the men on which the police can act without the young women themselves giving evidence is extremely time-consuming and resource intensive. It is essential if successful prosecutions against the men are to be achieved that the young women are offered continued support and encouragement to provide information. Having encouraged some of the young women to give information, it would be regrettable if the project were not to receive continued funding in order to develop relationships with the young women further. A problem with young men involved in commercial sexual exploitation has also been identified through fieldwork in Rotherham and it is possible that continued funding would also allow the project to investigate and respond to this level of need. We are aware that in this area of work there are unfortunately no quick solutions and to achieve any substantial results, we would feel it necessary to extend the funding to the project.

6. Quality & level of data available for evaluation - level of data (named or aggregate), from which agencies etc.

The Rotherham project has co-operated fully with the evaluation team. They have provided good quality data based on reports from Risky Business, minutes from meetings with agencies involved in the project and minutes from steering group meetings. Case study material on the young women concerned is also being made available. Evaluators have observed 'Key Player' meetings and have been invited to examine the police intelligence gathering operation in order to monitor its progress.

7. What would be gained from extending evaluation

Extending the evaluation will enable us to monitor the extent to which the project is moving towards achieving successful prosecutions against the men concerned. Project workers, the police and the evaluators acknowledge that gathering the necessary intelligence and actionable evidence is a time consuming and resource intensive exercise. We accept that results cannot be achieved overnight and just as the process

C & D Associated with prostitution (Young People)

SHEFFIELD

1. Description of aims, intervention & context

The Sheffield project delivers services to young women involved or at risk of involvement in commercial sexual exploitation through a multi-agency partnership involving statutory and voluntary organisations. The young women are referred to the project through the local ACPC. The aims of the work are to prevent young women from becoming involved in prostitution or to divert those who may already be involved. A need for such a service was identified by work undertaken jointly by the police and social services in Sheffield, which undertook to explore the scale of the problem through Operation Insight. The project also aims to raise awareness of the problem in Sheffield by providing training for managers and practitioners from a variety of agencies. In addition to this work, the project aims to establish a database to collate all the information about the young women and their associates. This should enable the police and the project workers to track all the young women with whom the project is working.

2. Expected outcomes

Raised awareness amongst various professionals; Consistent referral of young people to appropriate services; Exiting from prostitution and influencing a harm reduction approach for the young women who are involved.

3. Progress towards achieving these outcomes

A number of training and awareness raising events have been delivered and practitioners report that they are now more aware of the issues involved. 39 young women have been referred to the project through the ACPC and the 'Taking Stock' (youth work) element of the project is working on a one-to-one basis with approximately eight young women. Workers report that the young women are difficult to engage and as yet the evaluators have seen little evidence that the young women are being diverted from prostitution if they are already involved or prevented from becoming involved if they are not already.

4. Recommendation to fund whole or part of project - and rationale

We have some concerns about the work being undertaken with the young women in the project. There has been a move away from formal group work with the young women towards more informal contact on a one-to-one basis. Youth workers meet with the young women for one hour per week for a minimum of six weeks, despite this, the young women appear to remain in 'at risk' situations – for example, in relationships with much older men. We also have concerns that the meetings with the young women do not take place in dedicated premises – instead they meet up in informal locations (e.g. cafes) in the city centre. We also have concerns that in the one-to-one work, the young women are not necessarily confronted directly about their behaviour. It is possible of course, that with further funding the elements of practice which are giving cause for concern could be rectified and improved but given our concerns, we would suggest that the decision to extend funding would need serious consideration. On the other hand, however, there is an obvious need for provision of

some sort. Given that service provision for this group of young people is thin on the ground and that the project has succeeded in engaging at least a few young women, we would also be reluctant to see it fold.

5. Whether would particularly benefit from extension of funding - and rationale

Although we appreciate that the project has undertaken some very positive work in terms of raising awareness around this issue, we feel that the project would only benefit from an extension of funding if there were substantial changes in the way that practitioners are currently working with the young people. We do acknowledge that such an informal approach may be necessary initially to engage and gain the trust of the young women but we feel that this would need to be developed into a more structured and formal approach that directly confronts their behaviour if any real progress were to be achieved. It is possible of course, that with continued funding, this element of practice could be developed and extended. There is also some evidence that young men are also involved in commercial sexual exploitation in Sheffield and extending the funding may enable the project to develop a response to young men, as well as young women, who are involved in commercial sexual exploitation.

6. Quality & level of data available for evaluation - level of data (named or aggregate), from which agencies etc.

The data provided by Sheffield has not been of a particularly high quality. We have asked that monitoring forms, developed by the development consultants, be completed in respect of all young women with whom the project is working. This would enable us to track and monitor repeat contacts and the process of referrals. As yet, these monitoring forms have not been forthcoming and we feel this may be as a result of poor communication between the project co-ordinator and other agencies. So far, we have been unable to access any of the young people with whom the project is in touch.

7. What would be gained from extending evaluation

Extending the evaluation would enable the development consultants to work intensively with the project in order to develop those aspects of practice that are giving cause for concern. There is also emerging evidence of young men's involvement in commercial sexual exploitation in Sheffield and extending the evaluation would enable us to determine the extent to which the project has developed to respond to this level of need.

8. Length of the extended evaluation

If this project were to receive continued funding, we would suggest that this should be for one year and that the evaluation should therefore continue for 18months.

9. Ball park evaluation costs

£36,000 for 18 months work (estimated costs)

C & D Associated with prostitution (Young People)

BRISTOL

1. Description of aims, intervention & context

The Pandora project has developed from the work of the Bristol Prostitution Forum that had previously identified a problem with young people involved in commercial sexual exploitation in Bristol. The aims of the project are to support young women and men at risk of or involved in commercial sexual exploitation, improving the process of referrals, ensuring that these young people have access to appropriate services and thereby reducing the crime and disorder associated with prostitution. The intervention is provided by a multi-agency partnership involving numerous agencies – Barnardos BASE, Terrence Higgins Trust, Bristol Drug Project, One25, Milne Sexual Health Centre and Bristol Police. Outreach and drop-in services are provided by Barnardos BASE, Bristol Drug Project and Terrence Higgins Trust. Many of the young people involved in Bristol are also involved in the heavy end of drug misuse and workers report a great deal of heroin and crack use. There are therefore a number of strands to the intervention – support and counselling are provided for the young people through Barnardos BASE and Terrence Higgins Trust – these attempt to influence harm reduction and/or to work with the young people towards exiting from commercial sexual exploitation. Drug services are provided by the Bristol Drug Project and sexual health services by the Milne Sexual Health clinic. The police for their part have launched initiatives to tackle kerb crawlers and to target the men involved in coercing young people into prostitution – these men are also believed to be involved in drug dealing.

2. Expected outcomes

Improvements in process of referrals; Quicker access to appropriate services and more survivor/victim centred services; Improvements in self-esteem and confidence of the young people concerned; Promoting understanding amongst the young people as to why they are involved in commercial sexual exploitation; Reduction in associated reported crime and complaints to police about disorder in the target area

3. Progress towards achieving these outcomes

The Pandora project is making very good progress towards achieving its outcomes. Terrence Higgins Trust is working with approximately 30 young men and in the past three months, Barnardos BASE has made contact with 24 young women, of whom 14 are new contacts. Although there have been some initial difficulties in developing an effective partnership approach, these have now been overcome and good communication has been established between the various agencies involved in the partnership. This in turn has resulted in effective information sharing and referral processes. As a result of information sharing, practitioners in Bristol have come to realise that the scale of the problem in the area is much greater than they had originally anticipated. The young people we have spoken to comment very favourably on the support and services they have received from Pandora.

4. Recommendation to fund whole or part of project - and rationale

We would recommend that the whole project receive continued funding – for a minimum of two years but ideally for a further three years . A time-scale such as this would be necessary because the young people concerned can be extremely hard to reach and the process of engaging them can be very long. However, in the relatively short time that the Pandora project has been operational, both Barnardos and Terrence Higgins Trust have successfully engaged a number of young people and extending funding would enable the project to continue the good work that has begun with these young people. Continued funding for a sustained period of time would allow the project to consolidate the good practice that has been developed to date and to continue to provide much needed services to the young people. Further funding would provide us with the opportunity to look at a wider multi-disciplinary and multi-professional service framework and to examine the positive outcomes that may result from the long-term commitment by agencies working together with substantial resources. It may even enable the project to extend the range of services it offers to the young people. Drug use (heroin and crack) has been identified as a substantial problem in the Bristol area and continued funding would allow the project to respond effectively to this level of need.

5. Whether would particularly benefit from extension of funding - and rationale

We believe this project would benefit greatly from extension of funding. It has developed an effective multi-agency response to young people involved in commercial sexual exploitation and as a result of the project work, has identified a much greater level of need, especially amongst young men, than had previously been anticipated. Extending funding would enable the project to continue to work with the young people who have already been engaged as well as to continue to deliver outreach and drop-in services to identify new young people who require support from Pandora. In order to move young people away from involvement in commercial sexual exploitation they require a wide range of services and support over a long period of time. We believe that extending funding will enable Pandora to provide these services and support and to achieve success with the young people in the long term.

6. Quality & level of data available for evaluation - level of data (named or aggregate), from which agencies etc.

Pandora has provided the evaluators with all data that has been requested by them for evaluation purposes. The quality of most of the data provided is very good. They have supplied reports from Terrence Higgins Trust, police reports on associated crime, minutes from steering group meetings, data from Barnardos and the Milne Sexual Health Clinic relating to the young people with whom they are working. We have also been provided with access to some of the young people with whom the project is working and they speak very highly of the support they have received from the project.

7. What would be gained from extending evaluation

Extending the evaluation would enable us to determine the success of the project in the long term. With the consolidation of the project, we would expect that in time it would be successful in terms of diverting young people from prostitution and preventing others from becoming involved. As I have noted above, the young people

can be difficult to engage and success in terms of diverting them from prostitution can only be achieved by providing them with long-term support. Extending funding to this project would enable us to build a longitudinal element into the evaluation and track the young people with whom it is working over time. This would be especially important in situations such as these when the danger of recidivism may be particularly high if nothing is done about other factors in the young people's lives, for example, housing, drug use, working opportunities and so forth.

8. Length of the extended evaluation

We would consider that the evaluation should run in tandem with the project. Therefore, if the project were to be extended for 36 months, we would consider it appropriate to extend the evaluation for 42 months.

9. Ball park evaluation costs

£84,000 for 42 months work (estimated costs)

Key Document 31

Email Chain concerning Approval for Extension of Crime Reduction
Programme Project Funding

FD02 25/69/2

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 25 March 2002 18:00
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: [REDACTED]
 Subject: FW: BRIDGING FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROJECTS IN 2002/03 - URGENT

Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 25 March 2002 12:30
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: [REDACTED] (CRPU); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
 Subject: FW: BRIDGING FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROJECTS IN 2002/03 - URGENT
 Importance: High

To note approval of this expenditure as below. Four months' funding for the prostitution projects will amount to £283k rather than the £210k mentioned in the submission. Please note also the Home Sec's wish for MPs to be notified of this approval.

Further funding of these prostitution and burglary/tpi extension projects in 2002/03 will depend on the outcome of the Fundamental Expenditure Review.

Sorry this has taken so long to resolve.

CRPU

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 25 March 2002 12:07
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: Home Secretary (Submissions); Gieve John (Submissions); [REDACTED] (Submissions); [REDACTED] (Submissions); [REDACTED] (Submissions); [REDACTED] (Submissions)
 Subject: BRIDGING FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROJECTS IN 2002/03 - URGENT
 Importance: High

Thank you for your submission of 13 March of the above title. The Home Secretary has seen this and has commented that he would like to extend the funding for the prostitution projects for a **four**-month period rather than three, to give a longer period of time to consider the questions about alternative forms of funding. The Home Secretary would also like MPs to be advised about this.

John Denham has seen the above comments and is content; he would be grateful if you could take work forward as necessary.

Thanks,

APS/John Denham

Tel: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 13 March 2002 14:59
 To: Denham John (submissions)
 Subject: sent jt BRIDGING FUNDING FOR CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMME PROJECTS IN 2002/03 - URGENT
 Importance: High

Please see the attached 3 linked submissions + 1 Annex which require an urgent decision from Mr Denham over the funding proposals therein. We would be happy to attend a short discussion with Mr Denham to explain the issues if that would be helpful.

<< File: Prostitution - Demonstration covering note 110302.doc >> << File: Prostitution 0803021.doc >> << File: demosub.doc >> << File: Demoprojects.doc >>

CRPU