

Research Report 56

Summary

Tackling organised crime through a partnership approach at the local level: a process evaluation

Lauren van Staden, Samantha Leahy-Harland and Eva Gottschalk

Background

In 2010 the Home Office set up an initiative to engage Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) across England and Wales in exploring how local partnership working could be used to more effectively tackle organised crime. This report presents the main findings from a process evaluation undertaken of the 12 pilot sites included in this initiative.

Our understanding of what works in relation to tackling organised crime is limited to a handful of studies focused on police-based responses to particular aspects of organised crime (e.g. people trafficking). However, the range of activity committed by organised criminals is extensive and the effects are dealt with by a range of local and national level partners and organisations.

There is evidence to suggest that partnership working can be an effective component of initiatives to tackle complex crime and disorder problems (Berry et al., 2011). There is, however, no published evidence specifically on the deployment of multi-agency approaches to tackling organised crime.

Approach to evaluation

In April 2010 an evaluation was established to evaluate the 12 pilots included in the initiative, and to investigate the role that local partnerships can play in tackling organised crime. The aims of the evaluation were:

- to understand and describe how partnerships were established;

Contents

Executive summary	
1 Introduction	1
2 Developing a partnership approach to tackling organised crime	7
3 Identifying targets and engaging partners	14
4 Information sharing	22
5 Progress and sustainability	26
6 Discussion	31
Annex A Project sub-stream one: Strategic assessment review	35
Annex B Project sub-stream two: Exploring organised crime and its links to ASB and Integrated offender management	36
Annex C Project sub-stream three: A typology of local partnership initiatives to tackle organised crime	37
References	39

Keywords

Partnerships
 Organised crime
 Community Safety Partnerships
 Information sharing
 Offender management
 Multi-agency

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

- to identify key elements of the partnership approach to tackling organised crime and describe how they were undertaken; and
- to explore stakeholders' perceptions of the mechanisms necessary for information sharing.

All pilot sites were asked to nominate a police lead and a CSP lead to implement the approach. The areas were supported during implementation through Action Learning sets¹ which ran from April to December 2010. No funding was provided to the areas involved and no single approach to implementation was advocated by the Home Office.

A total of 57 interviews were completed with police and partnership leads, analysts and partner agencies. Findings from the interviews were analysed and triangulated with documents from areas developed during the pilot and with information collected during the Action Learning sets. The findings of the evaluation are therefore based predominantly on the perceptions of pilot participants, and any assessment of impact is based purely on these perceptions (i.e. the research was not designed to be an outcome evaluation).

Key findings

- Overall, areas predominantly described the local organised crime problem as being made up of gang activity and drug supply. These were commonly perceived to be the most visible manifestations of organised crime at the local level.
- Prior to the implementation of the pilots tackling organised crime was perceived to have been a police-led activity in which partner agencies had little, if any, involvement. There were, however, a handful of areas where partnership arrangements had been in place prior to the pilots; such arrangements included multi-agency case conferencing for gang members as well as ad hoc involvement in particular operations.

¹ Action Learning sets were designed to provide peer support for pilot sites throughout the lifetime of the pilot. The focus of the sets was sharing the experiences of those involved in the pilot in order to identify solutions and share good practice across all areas. A library of documentation developed in local areas was also made available to all pilot sites. A small grant-based fund was provided to support travel and subsistence to these meetings.

- In the majority of areas the police were described as being responsible for driving the pilots forward in the early stages of implementation. However, a common perception expressed by interviewees in all roles was that in order for the pilots to be sustainable, an equal balance of responsibility needed to be achieved across partners as the process matured.

- A strong and consistent view expressed by interviewees was that a 'one model fits all' approach was not appropriate when developing responses to such a complex crime area. As a result, the way in which partnership approaches evolved in each site varied considerably. However, each area's approach broadly encompassed the following four components:

- identification of organised crime targets;
- engagement of partners;
- sharing of information between partners; and
- partnership activity based on information that was shared.

- The general approach that areas adopted to develop their partnership arrangements fell into one of four categories: two areas looked to adapting existing partnership structures; four areas introduced new partnership arrangements designed to specifically tackle organised crime; four built partnerships around existing approaches to tackling organised crime; and two areas built the process around existing arrangements for Integrated Offender Management.

Identifying targets

- In all areas, decisions about who to target during the pilot were made by the police and were based on data from the Organised Crime Group Mapping exercise². In most areas sensitive information relating to individuals was removed before it was shared with partners; the level of sensitivity allowed was locally decided.
- Decisions about who to target were most commonly based on the size and nature of organised crime in the local area, the threshold set as to what information could be shared with partner

² Organised Crime Group Mapping is a model that identifies the nature and scale of organised crime nationally. The mapping exercise is focused on the sharing and aggregation of data held by relevant agencies.

organisations, and the role it was felt the partnership could play in tackling organised crime (e.g. disruption and/or enforcement activity). The majority of areas decided to focus on tackling organised crime groups, while one pilot site decided to focus on a number of specific organised criminals and another area focused on a discrete geographical area (a housing estate) which was considered to be of particular concern for organised crime.

Partner engagement

- Across areas a wide range of traditional (i.e. those previously engaged in tackling crime and disorder) and non-traditional partners were engaged in adopting a partnership approach. Partners engaged for the pilot fell into four categories: statutory CSP partners; Local Authority partners; national government partners with local/regional representatives (e.g. United Kingdom Borders Agency) and local non-government partners (including third sector).
- A method of developing a shared understanding of the roles that each partner could play was to run a 'tools and powers' event where partner agencies would come together to discuss the pilot. These events were run by several areas and were perceived to be successful in identifying the roles partners could play, the tools and powers available to them and how they might benefit from involvement in tackling organised crime.
- Almost all partners involved in the pilots identified a range of opportunities that arose as a result of working in partnership to tackle organised crime. These ranged from direct benefits and opportunities (e.g. better information to target individuals) to indirect benefits (e.g. developing a wider network of partners to tackle other crime types).
- Partners involved in enforcement activity based on information shared were able to demonstrate perceived immediate benefits of the approach to their role. In particular, these partners described how information sharing allowed immediate enforcement activity to be undertaken (e.g. using police data on an individual involved in a violent assault to prosecute the same individual for claiming disability allowance).

- Key facilitators identified by areas in developing partner engagement were: ensuring strategic oversight of the partnership process (i.e. the right level of senior level buy-in); strong one-to-one communication and the foundation of pre-existing partnership working. Conversely, a lack of understanding of the aims of pilot, lack of clarity around how each partner could play a role in tackling organised crime and lack of information on the outcomes achieved by the approach were felt to have inhibited partner engagement.

Information sharing

- Deciding on what information-sharing protocols were required was described as being a time-consuming process complicated by the breadth of legislation in place governing each partner engaged in the process.
- Sharing information on organised crime was considered to be a complex process in comparison to more traditional CSP information sharing, not only because information was sensitive but also because many partners had not traditionally been involved in tackling organised crime at the local level. Most pilots, therefore, reported a process of trial and error between partners to identify what information was relevant and how that information could be built upon to inform the use of a partnership approach.
- The type of information that was shared included information about individuals' lifestyles, finances, friends and associates, as well as on previous enforcement activity. This information was cross-referenced with what was available on partners' systems to identify new avenues for activity against targets such as additional personal and business addresses, associates or vehicles. This information was then subsequently used to tailor the approach of partnerships to targeting individuals (either through disruption, enforcement or prevention).
- A common view expressed by areas was that dynamic and ongoing dialogue had to be established between data providers and data users to develop a shared understanding of how the range of information that was available could be used to target organised criminals.

Taking action against targets

- Progress in implementing the pilots was slower than anticipated and at the time of undertaking the interviews most areas were not well developed in terms of undertaking activity to target individuals or groups.
- In particular, identification of partners and the types of information required took longer than expected. However, developing this knowledge was considered by partners to be an understandably time-consuming process in response to a complex problem, and most areas were clear that they would continue implementing the approach as 'business as usual' once the pilots had finished.

Perceived benefits of partnership approach

- Most interviewees identified a number of both realised and potential benefits to adopting a partnership approach. The main benefit described was the ability to take action against organised criminals who would otherwise have a limited response against them either because they were too low-level (and therefore would not be the focus of police action) or because police information alone did not provide any avenues for enforcement or disruption activity.
- In addition, working in partnership was felt to provide opportunities to use available resources more efficiently. Many interviewees outlined how partnership working could contribute to joined up approaches to tackling organised criminals and could provide local areas with a greater range of options to tackle individuals, using the tools and powers available across partners to greatest effect.

Conclusions

This evaluation suggests that it is possible to set up a multi-agency approach to tackling organised crime at the local level and identifies ways in which barriers can be overcome to develop more joined up processes to address both individuals and organised crime groups. It therefore takes us some way towards understanding how partnership working can play a role in addressing the harms and risks posed by organised crime at the local level.

Overall, many interviewees outlined how, prior to the implementation of the pilot sites, an informal boundary existed between the role of police and partners in

tackling organised crime. Implementation of the pilots was perceived to have challenged this acceptance of traditional boundaries and developed an understanding of the role that partnership activity could play. As a result all areas felt that, if implemented effectively, a partnership approach could be more effective than a solely police-based response to tackling organised crime.

The delay in implementation, while a finding in its own right, constrains our understanding of the later stages of development, particularly the nature of operations and activity against organised crime groups. The evaluation therefore provides stronger evidence on the feasibility of setting up a partnership approach and less evidence on its potential effectiveness. However, taken together with the wider literature and evidence on multi-agency working, the study indicates that partnership approaches have the potential to be effective in tackling organised crime at the local level.

Recommendations

A toolkit should be developed for partnerships outlining the roles that different partners can play in tackling organised crime at the local level.

Most areas described how a considerable amount of time was spent identifying what role partners could play in tackling organised crime and crucially what the benefits were for individual agencies in engaging in the approach. A toolkit for partnerships detailing the range of partners that can play a role in tackling different aspects of organised crime at the local level should be developed. The toolkit should outline what information partners can provide, what the benefits of involvement for each organisation are and what tools and powers are available to them.

A standardised information-sharing protocol template should be designed and agreed at the national level which can be adapted for use by local areas.

Work should be commissioned to develop a standardised information-sharing protocol template for the purposes of sharing information on organised criminals which can be adapted to suit local circumstances. This template should be agreed at a national level and should include information on the implications of existing legislation around personalised information sharing for partners sharing information locally in the context of organised crime.

Consideration should be given to undertaking further research to understand how the pilot will be implemented when a partnership approach is rolled out across force areas.

The dilution effect that could occur if a partnership approach is rolled out across force areas, particularly in relation to partner engagement and/or the reduction of capacity to target a larger number of organised crime groups, was considered by pilot areas to be a risk to the sustainability of the approach. Further research should be undertaken to consider how different models of working in this context can be developed.

Further information

Further information is available from
CSPenquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Glossary of terms

The below sets out a range of terms used throughout the report.

Anti-social Behaviour Order (ASBO)

An Anti-social Behaviour Order (ASBO) is a civil sanction which can be given to anyone over the age of ten who has committed a number of anti-social offences. They are orders from the court that ban an offender from doing threatening things, hanging out in certain areas or spending time with certain people. An ASBO is effective for a minimum of two years.

Community Safety Partnership (CSP)

Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) are made up of representatives from the police and police authority, the local council, and the fire, health and probation services (the 'responsible authorities'). CSPs were set up as statutory bodies under Sections 5–7 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The responsible authorities work together to develop and implement strategies to protect their local communities from crime and disorder.

Family Intervention Project (FIP)

FIPs are programmes which aim to reduce anti-social behaviour (ASB) perpetrated by the most anti-social and challenging families, prevent cycles of homelessness due to ASB and achieve positive outcomes for children and young people. FIPs use an 'assertive' and 'persistent' style of working to challenge and support families to address the root causes of their ASB.

Information-sharing protocol

An information-sharing protocol (ISP) provides an agreed framework which underpins the work of partners in the exchange and use of information. It aims to govern the secure use and management of information and outline the processes in place to manage information that is shared.

Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

IOM is based on the principle of end to end offender management. The aim of IOM is to co-ordinate all relevant agencies to deliver interventions for offenders identified as warranting intensive engagement, whatever their statutory status. It also aims to ensure, by support and disruption (of potential further offending), the continued commitment by offenders to engage in interventions offered with the express purpose of reducing further offending.

MAPPA

Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) are a set of statutory arrangements to assess and manage the risk posed by certain sexual and violent offenders. MAPPA bring together the Police, Probation and Prison Services into what is known as the MAPPA Responsible Authority for each MAPPA Area. A number of other agencies are under a duty to co-operate with the Responsible Authority. Offenders eligible for MAPPA are identified and information is gathered and shared about them across relevant agencies. The nature and level of the risk of harm they pose is assessed and a co-ordinated risk management plan is implemented to protect the public.

Organised crime group (OCG)

Organised criminals that work together for the duration of a particular criminal activity or activities are classed as an organised crime group.

Organised Crime Group Mapping

Organised Crime Group Mapping is a model that identifies the nature and scale of organised crime nationally. The mapping exercise is focused on the sharing and aggregation of data held by relevant agencies: Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC); Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA); Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA), (as well as ACPOS for Scotland and Police Service of Northern Ireland for Ireland). This data is used to build up a picture of organised crime at the local, regional and national level. Each individual agency collates information that they hold on organised crime groups and the threat they pose.

Partner

For the purposes of this report, partner refers to any agency or organisation involved in the pilot process, for example those from Local Authority departments, local organisations and national and regional agencies and organisations.

Target

An individual organised criminal or organised crime group which is the focus of partnership activity.

Tackling organised crime through a partnership approach at the local level: a process evaluation

Lauren van Staden, Samantha Leahy-Harland and Eva Gottschalk

1. Introduction

Existing research suggests that multi-agency approaches can be particularly effective in tackling complex crime and disorder problems (Berry et al., 2011; Rosenbaum, 2002). However, our understanding of what can be achieved by tackling organised crime through multi-agency working is limited; a recent review of the evidence on the effectiveness of partnership working in tackling crime did not identify any studies which focused primarily on organised crime and criminal activity (Berry et al., 2011).

In England and Wales a partnership approach to tackling crime and disorder at the local level has been present in various guises since the 1960s, and has been a statutory requirement since the Crime & Disorder Act (1998). While the predominant focus of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) is crime and disorder, they are unlikely to regularly share information on, or develop a multi-agency action plan against, organised crime, unless it is identified as a priority through their local strategic assessment.

A partnership approach to tackling organised crime has recently been evident at both the national and regional level. The Organised Crime Partnership Board (set up in 2008) brings together a range of national agencies with the aim of strengthening the co-ordinated response to organised crime across the law enforcement and criminal justice community. At the regional level, multi-agency task forces have been in place since 2009. The aim of these groups is to address cross-border serious and organised crime in a more systematic way (HMIC, 2009). However, this has not extended through CSPs to the local level where tackling organised crime is still considered, in the main, to be the role of the police.

In February 2010 the Home Office set up an initiative to explore whether or not local partnership working could contribute to tackling organised crime. The initiative was

developed in response to a recommendation included in the Cabinet Office (2009) review of organised crime 'Extending Our Reach' which focused on the development of a better understanding of the role that CSPs can play in tackling lower-level organised crime³. Although not prescribing the mechanisms involved, the review proposed a partnership approach to tackling organised crime involving the sharing of relevant information between agencies for the purposes of targeting criminals and/or criminal activity. The review suggested that while not all those identified as being involved in organised crime would be suitable for targeting through a partnership approach, it was likely that a proportion would be known to both the police and partner agencies and could therefore potentially be tackled more effectively by co-ordinating activity (Cabinet Office, 2009, p47).

This study presents the findings from a process evaluation of 12 pilot sites set up as part of this initiative jointly run by the Home Office Community Safety Unit and the Home Office Strategic Centre for Organised Crime.

The nature of organised crime

The harm caused by organised crime is wide ranging and difficult to quantify reliably, although a range of studies have attempted to estimate its impact (Kelly and Regan, 2000; Gordon et al., 2006; Cusick et al., 2009). While there is broad agreement that organised crime comprises several core elements including collusion between people, financial profit as the primary motivation and illegal activity (Bullock, Clark & Tilley, 2010; Maguire, Morgan & Reiner, 2002) no single definition exists,⁴ and the types of activity that can be classed as organised crime range from human trafficking, money laundering, and immigration to more visible manifestations such as organised acquisitive crime, counterfeiting and gang activity.

³ This strategy is replaced by 2011 National Organised Crime Strategy

⁴ The Home Office 2011 strategy outlines how organised crime "involves individuals, normally working with others, with the capacity and capability to commit serious crime on a continuing basis".

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

It is clear from existing research that the public are concerned about the impact of organised crime on local communities and their way of life. Two recent surveys of public perceptions of organised crime (Bullock et al., 2009; and Gottschalk, 2010) found that drug dealing was perceived to be the most prevalent and harmful form of organised crime. However, our understanding of the effectiveness of methods to tackle these more visible aspects of organised crime at the local level remains under-developed.

Partnership working

Partnership approaches to tackling crime and disorder are largely built on the premise that no single agency can deal with, or be responsible for dealing with, complex community safety and crime problems. While partnership working may not be effective in all contexts and against all crime types, a recent rapid evidence assessment into the effectiveness of partnership working identified a modest but promising body of evidence that supports the principle of applying partnership working as a component of effective initiatives to tackle crime and disorder (Berry et al., 2011). The review, which predominantly focused on multi-agency approaches to tackling violent crime, identified a range of mechanisms or characteristics associated with more effective partnership working (Berry et al., 2011). These can be grouped into five categories.

- **Leadership:** in particular developing clear and shared aims and objectives.
- **Data sharing and problem focus:** particularly the regular sharing of information to ensure accurate identification of the crime problem and appropriate targeting of resources.
- **Communication and co-location.**
- **Appropriate structures:** which are flexible and involve only those partners relevant to the problem being addressed.
- **Experience of working in partnership:** both with agencies involved in the partnership and across a wider network.

Community Safety Partnerships and information sharing

A partnership approach to tackling crime and disorder in England and Wales is facilitated through the local statutory Community Safety Partnership (CSP). How these partnerships are constituted and the focus of their activities varies between areas (Cooper et al., 2009; Jacobson, 2003). While most CSPs act at the strategic level, much of the activity undertaken by the partnership is done through other local agencies working together. Whilst these partnerships do not have the same statutory footing as CSPs they often work within the same local framework and act to deliver the services identified as being required by the CSP.

The implementation of a partnership approach to tackling crime and disorder is predicated on the sharing of both personalised and depersonalised information between agencies to improve local operational decision making.⁵ A recent Home Office review identified three main purposes of information sharing across CSPs:

- Performance monitoring (usually requiring depersonalised, aggregated data).
- Development of intelligence products (requiring both personalised and depersonalised information).
- The delivery of tailored services to groups or individuals (requiring personalised information).

[Home Office; 2010]

Existing research: information sharing

The success and utility of information sharing across CSPs, regardless of the focus, is varied. Steel et al. (2010), in a survey of CSPs across England and Wales, found that data sharing was being widely used by respondents to tackle violence and other crime types. In general, personalised information-sharing arrangements (as used by Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs), Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPAs) and Prolific and Priority Offender (PPO) schemes) were reported to be working relatively effectively. However Steel et al. (2010) found that other arrangements – specifically data

⁵ Depersonalised information refers to information that does not constitute personal data under the data protection act 1998 (This is data that can not be used in any way to identify a living individual). Personalised information refers to personal data which is provided in a way that can be used to identify a living individual.

sharing between police and Emergency Departments – posed particular problems in implementation (Steel et al., 2010). Davison et al. (2010) reviewed the process of depersonalised data sharing between Emergency Departments and CSPs for the purposes of tackling violence in the night time economy. They found that data sharing in this context was complex and covered several distinct but linked stages, each of which had its own set of vulnerabilities (Davison et al., 2010).

A report commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) (Office of Public Management, 2008) examined approaches to personal data sharing more generally across a wide range of public agencies (not specifically focused on CSPs). The study identified a range of mechanisms which were found to facilitate the establishment and maintenance of effective data sharing schemes:

- Initial stages: building and communicating a persuasive evidence base, funding to kick start the process and/or pre-existing information systems which were compatible for data sharing.
- Pre-implementation: project management arrangements, appropriate resourcing, and partnership buy-in for the initiative.
- Implementation: Dissemination of positive messages about the perceived benefits of the initiative, particularly if championed by senior staff, and ensuring that staff turnover was compensated for.

The study also identified that getting the initiative mainstreamed (so that it effectively becomes the ‘day job’ or ‘business as usual’ of those involved) was a critical final step to the implementation of effective data sharing schemes. Successful implementation has also been found to be linked to the existence of appropriate structures and resources, in particular analytical capacity (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2008; McGarrell, 2009).

Overview of research

In 2010 the Home Office set up an initiative to explore how partnership working at the local level could be used to effectively tackle organised crime. The main strand of the research comprised of a process evaluation of 12 pilot sites which focused on identifying what, if any, perceived benefits can arise from the adoption of a multi-agency approach to tackling organised crime at the local level. Alongside this, three smaller exercises were undertaken to understand what role Community Safety Partnerships already played in tackling organised crime at the local level.

These are discussed in turn below.

Sub-streams of research

The three sub-streams included in the evaluation were:

- a review of strategic assessments to identify if, and how, organised crime was prioritised by Community Safety Partnerships;
- an offender mapping exercise to identify whether existing multi-agency approaches (including ASBOs, PPO and MAPPAs schemes) were being used by local areas to manage organised criminals;
- a review of existing practice in areas in which a partnership approach to tackling organised crime at the local level had already been adopted.

The review of strategic assessments (SAs) across England identified that the majority of the local assessments reviewed included some references to organised crime. However organised crime was not generally referred to as a discrete priority but was contained within another priority (e.g. gang crime). Overall, partnerships were generally more likely to prioritise types of organised crime that were considered to have a visible impact on the local community such as drug dealing. A more detailed summary of this exercise is provided in Annex A.

The second exercise collated information provided by pilot sites involved in the study on the individuals managed at the time of the pilot by their existing offender management programmes. Only a small number of CSPs were using existing offender management approaches (ASBOs, PPO, and MAPPAs schemes) as a way of addressing organised crime in their local areas. A summary of the methodology and findings of this exercise is provided in Annex B.

The final exercise sought to identify any existing practice across CSPs in England and Wales which utilised a partnership approach to tackling organised crime. The review identified a handful of areas, 11 in total, which had adopted a multi-agency approach. These ranged from undertaking disruption activity against groups to enforcement activity against individuals. This information was used to develop a typology of the range of approaches that could be adopted when tackling organised crime in partnership. This typology, along with short examples of the approaches included in the review, is provided in Annex C.

Process evaluation

The main strand of work comprised of a process evaluation of pilot sites which focused on exploring the potential benefits of adopting a multi-agency approach to tackling organised crime at the local level. All CSPs across England and Wales were invited to take part in the main strand of research from which 12 pilot sites were selected from the responses received. Areas were selected to ensure that a range of upper and lower tier CSPs⁶, urban and rural areas and geographic locations were included in the final sites.⁷ No assessment of partnership activity undertaken to address organised crime prior to the pilot sites was made when selecting sites for inclusion.

The pilot sites were not designed to be prescriptive, to ensure that innovative approaches could be developed across areas depending on local circumstances. However, as with other partnership approaches to tackling crime and disorder, the principle of information sharing across organisations was expected to underpin the activity undertaken (Berry et al., 2011). In particular, the focus of the pilots was on how information sharing between partners could inform the better use of tools and powers of a wide range of agencies against targets. All areas were therefore required to engage a range of traditional partners (i.e. statutory partners of the CSP and co-operating bodies as specified in the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998)⁸ and non-traditional partners (i.e. those which had previously not worked with the CSP) in the pilot process, such as regional/national agencies and local third sector partners.

All areas were required to nominate both a police and partnership lead (the Home Office did not mandate which of these took the lead for implementing the approach). In addition, the pilots were required to nominate a representative to attend Action Learning sets⁹ which ran from April to December 2010, with the sets taking place monthly (except during August). As the overall aim of

the pilots was to use existing partnership resources to undertake the work, no additional funding was provided to the areas involved.

The aims¹⁰ of the evaluation were:

- to understand and describe how partnerships were established between local partners involved in the pilots and between local partners and regional/national agencies involved in tackling organised crime;
- to identify key elements of the partnership approach to tackling organised (including information sharing) and describe how they were undertaken, including identifying barriers and facilitators to the approaches adopted; and
- to explore stakeholders' perceptions of the mechanisms necessary for information sharing in locally-based partnerships set up to tackle organised crime.

Process evaluation methodology

Practitioner interviews were undertaken in each pilot area to explore the perceptions of those involved in the pilots. Two phases of interviews were undertaken: the first phase was undertaken during the set-up stage of the pilots; the second phase of interviews was conducted several months into the lifetime of the pilot. The evaluation focused on understanding the process of implementing a partnership approach to tackling organised crime; it did not include any outcome measures, for example, about the impact of partnership working on reducing organised crime.

The set-up phase

The first phase of interviews took place in April 2010 and involved interviews with the partnership lead, the police lead and the analyst in each of the 12 pilot sites. In total, 37 interviews were conducted.

During the interviews, practitioners were asked to describe:

- their understanding of the organised crime problem in their area;
- any current or previous activity undertaken by the partnership to tackle organised crime;

6 Upper tier authorities are those that operate at the county or unitary level of a local council. Lower tier CSPs operate at the district level.

7 Prior to confirming participation in the project, all pilot sites were subject to an informal review of internal partnership processes to ensure that they were working well against the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships.

8 Statutory agencies of the CSP are: Fire Service, Police Service, Police Authority, Primary Care Trust, Probation and Local Authority. Co-operating bodies of the CSP are: Registered Social Landlords, Parish Councils, NHS Trusts, Proprietors of independent schools and Drug Action Teams.

9 Action Learning sets were designed to provide peer support for pilot sites throughout the lifetime of the pilot. A small grant-based fund was provided to support travel and subsistence to these meetings.

10 As each pilot agency was expected to implement the pilot differently and identify local success measures, an impact assessment was not feasible.

- aims for the pilot process; and
- planned activity and perceived challenges.

The implementation phase

Round two interviews took place in September 2010. Information collected during round one interviews was analysed and used to inform pilot selection for round two. In order to capture a breadth of perceptions the sample was widened to include participants from partners. This meant that (for resource reasons) only six sites could be included from the original 12 areas included in the evaluation. The sample for the second round of interviews was selected from the subset of areas which had set up new partnership arrangements (eight areas), and therefore could compare and contrast previous arrangements with those new partnership arrangements set up for the purposes of the pilots (See Table 2). From these eight areas, a sample of six sites was selected to reflect the breadth of different approaches adopted across areas.

The partnership lead, police lead and analyst were invited for interview along with representatives from a selection of partner organisations identified by police and partnership leads who had been engaged for the purposes of the pilot. In total 20 interviews were conducted across the six pilot sites selected.

Representatives from the following partner organisations were included in this round.

- Department for Work and Pensions
- Children’s Services
- Housing Associations
- Local Authority Housing
- Trading Standards

During this second round of interviews, practitioners were asked to reflect on the activity that had taken place and specifically to provide their views on:

- how the partnership had operated during the set up and implementation phases;
- the partnership activity that had taken place during the pilot;
- lessons learnt during the pilot; and

- views on how the work would be sustained after the pilots had ended.

A summary of the interviews that were undertaken is provided below.

Table 1: Summary of interviews

	Partnership lead	Police lead	Analyst	Partners	Total
Round One (12 sites)	12	13	12	0	37
Round Two (6 sites)	4	7	3	5	19
					56

* In addition one interview was undertaken with a DWP lead who was working with a pilot site not included in the round two site selection.

All face-to-face interviews were recorded and transcribed. A team of six interviewers developed a framework designed specifically for the study.¹¹ A matrix was developed in Microsoft Excel for each round of interviews based on key themes identified by researchers when undertaking interviews and subsequent analysis of transcripts.¹² The initial framework was tested by two interviewers; three interviews were independently entered into the matrix for each round of interviews. These were then compared to ensure consistency of approach and to identify any elements of the framework which needed to be modified. Detailed instructions were then developed for researchers and all interview transcripts were summarised and entered into the framework by the original team of six researchers.

11 This framework approach is based on the National Centre for Social research approach to qualitative analysis. http://www.framework-natcen.co.uk/about_software/why

12 Round one analysis was structured under the following headings; background and understanding of organised crime locally, analysis conducted prior to pilots, organised crime activity prior to pilot sites, overview of pilots current activity, planned activity for the pilots, relationships and culture, perceptions of pilot implementation and perceptions of data sharing. The second round matrix was structured on the following headings; individual involvement in pilot, initial activity during pilot, ongoing activity as a result of pilot, partner engagement, data sharing, analysis undertaken during pilot, overall approach to tackling organised crime and perceptions of pilot

Two of the researchers from the project team analysed the data, noting the general patterns and themes emerging from the interviews. Data was analysed by pilot area and role of individual, as well as across all roles and areas (between and within case comparison) to identify themes as well as differences and similarities in the perceptions expressed by those interviewed. The analysis team held regular meetings to discuss themes and to ensure consistency of approach. Emerging themes were also shared with a third researcher involved in the interviews to validate the analysis. These themes were then triangulated with the documentation provided by pilot sites on the processes and structures set up for the pilot and summaries of discussions held at the Action Learning sets. This iterative process allowed overall themes to emerge from the analysis and ensured a consistency of approach to analysing the data from all interviews in the study. Finally, the findings were presented to the Action Learning set in order to validate the thematic analysis undertaken.

Structure of the report

The report is structured in five chapters. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the approach adopted by areas to implementing the pilot. This chapter summarises the four core components included in all areas: identifying organised crime targets, engaging partners, sharing information and taking action. The subsequent chapters present the analysis in line with these four components: Chapter 3 describes the process of identifying targets and engaging partners; Chapter 4 focuses on information sharing; Chapter 5 describes the progress made by areas and perceptions of the sustainability of the partnership approach, and finally Chapter 6 summarises the themes identified throughout the research.

Quotes are used throughout the report for illustrative purposes, that is, to give a flavour of the language that respondents used during the interviews. The quotes are attributed either to a police lead, partnership lead, analyst or partner organisation; they are not attributed to individuals or particular areas in order to preserve the anonymity of respondents. Unless otherwise stated round one and round two interviews are analysed together throughout the report.

2. Developing a partnership approach to tackling organised crime

This chapter briefly describes the role of Community Safety Partnerships and individual agencies in tackling organised crime at the local level prior to the pilots being implemented. This is followed by an overview of the initial stages of implementation of the pilots described by interviewees in each of the areas, and the structures put in place to support these.

Existing approaches to tackling organised crime

There was a range of views expressed around what constituted organised crime, and personal views were understandably often heavily influenced by what was occurring in a particular local area. However, organised crime was predominantly described as being linked to drug supply and gang activity (spanning a range of criminality) and in some cases gang activity was considered to be interchangeable with organised crime. The majority of interviewees felt that organised crime groups/gangs were fluid with targets moving between groups depending on circumstances. This changing composition was felt to have a significant influence on the nature of the organised crime problem at any given time and so the appropriate response to tackling it.

Overall, areas described how higher level organised crime was dealt with at the force or regional level, whilst lower level organised criminality, such as gangs, was dealt with at the local police force level (i.e. Basic Command Unit (BCU) Level). As one police analyst described:

“The Force has identified a couple of human trafficking ones, but generally the focus of our intelligence gathering is on drugs... things like organised [kind of] immigration crime are so much bigger than the BCU... so we don't tend to identify the group actually at work.” [Analyst]

At round one interviews, all of those interviewed were asked to describe what approaches had been in place to tackle organised crime prior to the pilots being implemented. Tackling organised crime was consistently perceived to have been traditionally a police-led activity in which partners had little, if any, involvement. Many of those interviewed described how CSPs often identified ‘lower level’ crime types through their strategic assessment process which were often higher volume

and/or were identified as being of a higher priority to local communities (such as burglary and anti-social behaviour). While these might have some overlap with organised crime, for example gang activity, this would rarely be the primary focus of partnership activity.¹³ In contrast, police leads described the role of the police as central in tackling organised crime. In many cases organised crime featured in police strategic assessments and force control strategies, depending on the area and the nature of the overall crime in the area.

There were, however, a handful of areas which described pre-existing partnership approaches to tackling organised crime. Existing partnership approaches could be classified along a continuum ranging from regular multi-agency arrangements (e.g. multi-agency case conferencing approaches to develop joint management of gang members) to ad hoc engagement where the police worked with partners as required (e.g. a week of action to tackle a particular problem area). In a handful of cases a combination of approaches was in existence depending on the focus of the activity being undertaken.

“From my understanding they [partners] would come on board when and if required. For example, if there was an undercover police operation... It would be very much, unfortunately, on a needs basis.” [Police lead]

Police and partnership leads as well as analysts were asked to describe what they perceived the aims of the partnership approach to organised crime to be in their local area for the purposes of the pilots. At the outset three broad aims were described by areas.

- Setting up and embedding a partnership approach (an aim shared by all pilot sites).
- Engaging the community in tackling organised crime.
- Effectively undertaking disruption, enforcement and/or prevention activity against organised crime.

Process of implementation

The dominant role of the police described in tackling organised crime prior to the pilots was felt to have continued in the implementation of the pilots. Interviewees in the majority of pilot sites described how the police

¹³ A review of strategic assessments undertaken in 2009 by the Research and Analysis Unit confirmed these views. A summary of the review is provided in Appendix A.

were responsible for driving the work forward in the early stages.¹⁴ This included shaping how the partnership became involved in the pilot, how the pilot was run, and how information on organised criminals was initially provided. In only one area was the partnership lead responsible for initiating the work (and focused on engaging the police as part of the process). In three other areas, the initiative was described as being jointly initiated by both the police and partnership leads.

The dominant role of the police was described as being logical given their traditional role in tackling organised crime (and their ownership of the organised crime mapping information). However, a common perception expressed by interviewees in all roles was that in order for the pilots to be sustainable an equal balance of responsibility needed to be achieved across partners as the process matured (with partner organisations being involved in decisions about the focus of the approach).

While a range of approaches were adopted across areas, implementation of the pilots was described as comprising of four main components:

- **Identification of organised crime targets**

Decisions about who/what to target for the purposes of the pilot was determined by the police Organised Crime Group Mapping exercise.¹⁵ While there were mixed views initially on what to target, most areas decided to target organised crime groups rather than individual targets.¹⁶ The number of OCGs that were targeted varied between areas from up to eight groups to thirty individual targets. The focus was predominantly on ensuring that a manageable number was chosen while still providing a range of possibilities for partnership action.

- **Engagement of partners**

Pilot sites described an iterative process through which partners were engaged by police and partnership leads. Which partners were engaged was often reviewed based on which targets had been identified, what datasets were considered to be of use and what activity might be feasible through the

tools and powers available to agencies.

- **Sharing of information between agencies**

Information sharing was described as consisting of a number of stages: agreeing an information-sharing protocol, deciding what information to share and with whom and then collating the information in a meaningful way to inform analysis. The type of information that was shared and the level of sensitivity that was attached to this varied across areas. In some cases information was shared between all agencies involved (via email or at meetings) while in others information sharing was undertaken between a lead officer and single point of contact in an organisation.

- **Taking partnership action as a result of information shared**

The aim of information sharing was to identify suitable approaches to tackling targets identified (either through disruption, enforcement or prevention). However, at the time of undertaking the interviews, most areas had yet to reach this stage in the development process.


The relationship between these four components is outlined in Figure 1. Interviewees described how the implementation of these stages required a trial and error process, with most areas revisiting the stages outlined in order to refine the approach adopted.

¹⁴ The Home Office did not provide guidance on which agency should lead the pilot, this was determined locally.

¹⁵ Decisions were made based on the data that the police had submitted to the national agency team rather than the collated multi-agency information available at the national level.

¹⁶ One area decided to focus on a housing estate which was associated with high levels of organised crime and undertook the pilot within the context of a regeneration project for this estate.

Figure 1: Flow chart of stages included in the development of a partnership approach to tackling organised crime.



How areas developed partnership working

A strong and consistent theme expressed by interviewees was that a 'one model fits all' approach was not appropriate when developing structures to respond to such a complex crime area, and the way in which partnership approaches evolved across sites varied considerably. A range of local factors were described as influencing the type of arrangements put in place. These factors predominantly related to the nature of the organised crime problem in the local area and the availability of resources with which to implement the approach.¹⁷ This was played out in the range of structures developed, the partners engaged and the information sets that were collated to inform activity. A summary of the different approaches adopted and the decisions made on who to target for the purposes of the pilot is provided in Table 2.

Overall, four broad approaches to implementing the pilots were adopted:

Using existing arrangements without modification

In two areas (area five and area eight) existing partnership structures to tackle organised crime were considered to be sufficiently developed and no additional arrangements were put in place as a result of the pilot project. However, this was considered to be a missed opportunity by one interviewee to identify new ways of working in partnership.

Developing new arrangements specifically for the purposes of the pilot

Four areas opted to develop entirely new arrangements for tackling organised crime specifically for the purposes of the pilot. This included new oversight structures for the partnership approach, new meeting arrangements and information-sharing processes. Both area two and area ten, jointly led by the police and partnership leads, set up new multi-agency meetings which focused on engaging partners in tackling OCGs. Area 12 had begun to set up new processes for engaging partners but decided that this was not feasible; the approach was amended mid way through the pilot process and included within an existing regional enforcement team approach previously developed by Trading Standards to focus on information sharing and enforcement (this ultimately meant that the pilot was incorporated into existing mechanisms rather than being implemented through a new approach). Finally, area nine aimed to set up new multi-agency meeting structures

and oversight mechanisms for the purposes of the pilot although the scope of these was never fully developed (and the area withdrew from the pilots).

Building on existing arrangements focused on organised crime

Four areas decided to build on existing arrangements to tackle organised crime predominantly by creating a stronger partnership focus. In two areas (area four and area eleven), partnership arrangements were added into existing police mechanisms to review and manage organised crime groups; these focused on lead officers "owning" the management of the group and engaging partners when required. In area seven a partnership approach was incorporated into an existing large-scale project to tackle organised crime. Finally, area seven sought to further develop an existing Family Intervention Project to focus on organised crime groups and identify and engage a wider range of partners in this process.

Incorporating the approach into existing Integrated Offender Management (IOM) structures

Two areas decided to incorporate the pilot into existing IOM structures which had not previously focused on organised criminals. In area six the pilot was incorporated into the existing offender management approach, 'one day, one conversation', where agencies came together on a single day to discuss known offenders grouped by intervention (see case study one). In area three IOM was being rolled out to include all offender groups and organised criminals involved in gangs and guns were included as part of this.

¹⁷ In the majority of areas no additional local funding (outside of staff time) was provided to implement the approach.

Case Study One: Incorporating the pilot into an existing Integrated Offender Management approach

The police and partnership lead decided that the pilot did not require a structure over and above what was already in place in the local area to manage offenders. The information-sharing protocol developed for IOM was used for the pilots and new partners were asked to sign up to this agreement when joining the process. Prior to the pilot, the area had adopted a 'one day, one conversation' approach in implementing IOM in which different offender groups (e.g. high crime causers) were discussed during different sections of the day and relevant partners invited to those sections in which it was felt they had a role to play in tackling the offender group discussed. Organised crime groups were added to this day as a result of the pilots. The meetings proved successful in identifying existing intelligence gaps and provided a way of filling these gaps through information provided by those around the table. The next stage was to use the information shared at these meetings to further develop the OCG mapping process which had previously been based predominantly on police intelligence.

Perceived advantages of incorporating organised criminals into IOM approach

- Rationalise structures and avoid duplication of meetings.
- Utilise existing tiered approach to management.
- Utilise and build upon existing information-sharing agreements and partner organisation relationships.

Potential disadvantages

- Change of focus of IOM from high volume to high risk offenders.
- Possibility of diluting existing service provision by focusing on too many aspects of criminal activity.
- Not all targets suitable to be targeted through services available through IOM.
- Not all OCGs involve known offenders (i.e. some have not yet been convicted of an offence).

Table 2: Summary of approaches adopted by all areas in implementing a partnership approach

Area	Perceived lead of implementation	Organised crime identified as priority in partnership strategic assessment before pilot	Type of structure: existing, mixture, new	Focus of OCGs that are being tackled	Structure developed	Stage of development (at R1 interview) 1- choose targets 2- engage partners 3- share information 4- take action	Stage of development (at R2 interview) ¹⁸ 1- choose targets 2- engage partners 3- share information 4- take action
One	Police lead	No: priority is gangs	Existing	Manage prolific offenders involved in organised crime (gang activity predominantly)	No formal group set up to oversee the project although leads report directly to CSP. The approach is built upon tiered approach to dealing with organised crime	4	4
Three	Police lead	Yes: as a result of gang shootings two years earlier	New	Gang focus (Class A drug supply)	Develop partnership group following initial workshop, develop new information-sharing arrangements and tasking process for the group. The group is managed by the CSP	1	3/4
Five	Partnership and police working on different aspects of an overarching project	No: included in guns, young people and drugs	Existing	Gun crime and supply controlled drugs (and lower level ASB / contraband)	Built on existing programme of work to tackle problem estate – most police activity described as being high level	4	4
Seven	Joint: police and partnership	Yes: as a result of previous operation	Existing	Built on existing partnership structures from established project for the pilot	Built on existing partnership structures from existing project and new partners engaged through this mechanism	4	4
Eight	Police	No: priority is serious youth violence	Existing	Youth gangs	Pilot incorporated into existing cross-border multi-agency youth gang forum	4	4
Ten	Joint: Police and partnership	No: highest priority serious acquisitive crime	New	Drug-related	Describe as being, initially, a very police-focused project, with ad hoc involvement from enforcement agencies on CSP. A partnership approach was developed following tools and powers workshop	2/3	2/3

Round one and two interviews						
Two	Joint: police and partnership	No: organised crime considered to be police centric	New	Class A drugs and travelling OCGs	Set up new partnership approach based on tools and powers events	2/3
Four	Joint: police and partnership	Featured under serious crime (drugs)	Built on existing arrangements	Largely targeted disruption activity on identified localities and groups	Built into existing police tactical six- weekly review meetings and set up separate partnership meetings to run alongside this	2/3 Starting 4
Six	Joint leads	No: focus on serious violence	Built on existing arrangements	Gang activity (focused on money laundering, firearms and drugs)	Incorporated into existing 'one day one conversation' offender management approach	2/3
Nine	Partnership	No: identified other priorities which are linked to organised crime (gangs)	New	Gangs (mainly involved in drugs and firearms)	Developed a new partnership arrangement focused on achieving an eight-point plan around lower-level organised crime	1
Eleven	Police lead	No: included in focus on serious violent crime	Built on existing arrangements	Wide range of activity (drugs/acquisitive crime/ knives/guns/street gangs)	Retained existing police OCG plan owners and identified new points of contact for partners who could be contacted by plan owners when needed	3/4
Twelve	Joint: police and Trading Standards	Not a partnership priority as no target attached	Built on existing arrangements	Initially focused on one family involved in Class A drugs	An attempt was made to set up new arrangements but this was unsuccessful. Subsequently incorporated approach into existing regional multi-agency enforcement structure by new partnership lead	2/3

18 (See previous page) For all six areas which were not included in the round two interviews assessments of progress made were based on documents submitted to the research team and information provided at the Action Learning sets held monthly.

Note: Information on those areas only interviewed at round one interviews was supplemented by information provided at Action Learning sets to provide an assessment of distance travelled over the pilot period

3. Identifying targets and engaging partners

Chapter 3 considers the first stages described by interviewees in adopting a partnership approach: identifying targets and engaging partners. The process of engaging partners is grouped into three broad themes: the range of different organisations involved; how they were engaged in the partnership approach; and what the facilitators and enablers of partner engagement were perceived to be.

Identifying targets

Local areas went through a broadly consistent process, predominantly undertaken by the police, in identifying suitable targets for partnership action. All targets were selected from OCGs identified by the police through the OCG mapping process. Based on those OCGs identified, a decision was then made which targets would be suitable for multi-agency action. This decision was described as being driven by:

- the size and nature of the organised crime problem in the local area;
- the level of information the police felt it was suitable to share with partners on a particular group or individual (a locally determined threshold often decided by those outside of the pilot process);¹⁹ and
- what the perceived role of a partnership approach to tackling organised crime was (whether or not this should focus on disrupting the group's activity or aim to dismantle organised crime groups).

In selecting OCGs to target, partners essentially sought to strike a balance: targeting those OCGs that posed the most risk to the community; those which the police deemed 'acceptable' to share information on more widely; and those which presented the greatest opportunity for success, with the resources available.

¹⁹ Ultimately, the overall decision made focused on the appropriate level of OCG that could be shared with partners, which varied across areas. A key concern in sharing information on targets classified as higher-level OCGs was that there could be covert activity being undertaken by the police which could be compromised by partnership activity. However, in some pilot areas this was not considered to be a key area of concern.

While the majority of areas decided to focus on a number of whole organised crime groups, one pilot site decided to focus on specific individuals across a range of groups. Finally, one chose to focus on a geographical area (housing estate) which was considered to be a particular concern for organised crime overall and was already undergoing a regeneration programme.

"the two issues are one, you don't want to compromise anything that's going on elsewhere covertly and the other issue is, the majority of intelligence is source-led, source-driven and that the level of criminality some of these people are operating at there's like an inherent risk about disclosing that because you may compromise potentially your source or sources." [Police lead]

In many cases, the decision of who or what to target was made by the police independently of other partners' involvement. All interviewees felt that while this approach had been adopted initially, once data sharing was more robust and trust had been developed between partners, a more balanced approach to choosing targets would be feasible. As one partnership lead described;

"If somebody comes to the table from another partnership and say, well, [Name of target] causing us more grief than these two OCGs, I think we should be open enough to at least discuss and debate that, and that hasn't happened thus far." [Partnership lead]

For example, in one area two types of organised crime were identified as manifesting at the local level. One consisted of gang networks, predominantly based around gang members who were involved in robbery, extortion and in some instances violence related to retaliation against other gangs in the local area. Members of these gangs were mostly younger people. Higher level organised crime (the second group of organised crime) was identified as being related to Kurdish and Turkish gangs which were involved in gaming clubs and protection/extortion rackets. This later group of more serious organised crime was typically dealt with at the Force level. The focus of partnership activity both before and during the pilot was on the lower level youth gangs.

Identifying partners

The approach to identifying and engaging partners varied across the pilot sites. For some areas, initial activity included a meeting or workshop to which all partners it was felt could potentially play a role in the approach were invited. For others a more gradual approach was

adopted whereby existing meetings with partners were used to raise awareness of the pilot and gauge interest in participating. For example, in area 12 a 'snowball' approach was described whereby an existing partnership group was used initially, with new partners being invited to take part at the suggestion of those already involved in the process. Key to both approaches, however, was ensuring that the benefits of engaging with the process were clearly communicated to potential partners. As one partnership lead described:

"We didn't have many meetings [to identify partners], probably only about three, but it was just getting the principles across and selling it to them." [Partnership lead]

A common activity across pilot sites was the holding of a "tools and powers" event to engage partners and identify what could be achieved through the pilot process. In the round two interviews, three areas (two, six and eleven) described holding these events. They usually involved a range of partners and focused on discussions around

what organised crime was and how it manifested itself at the local level. Partners were then typically asked to consider how they could contribute to tackling this through the use of their tools and powers (e.g. use of licensed premises legislation). These events were developed through conversations in the Action Learning Sets (which were described as being a key arena for sharing what had and had not worked at regular intervals through the pilot process).

"We talked about two scenarios... about an organised crime group. [And we asked] what would you then bring to the table, and how do you think you'd be able to disrupt it? And that got the minds going, really, about how to do it. We spent about two hours on that. They then gave us all feedback about what they could bring. And, you know, some of the feedback that [partnership lead] had, it was a really valuable event." [Police lead]

In one area partners perceived the broad approach to engagement to be beneficial to establishing the partnership approach. The police lead, however, suggested that this had

Case Study Two: Tools and powers event

One of the first tools and powers events to engage partners took place in pilot area six. Strategic level support was sought from the Local Council Chief Executive. Identifying appropriate partners was both time-consuming and labour intensive and as a result the event was delayed in order to provide more time to compile what was perceived to be a complete list of partners and contact details. Invitations were sent out a month in advance of the event and prior to the event one-to-one meetings and telephone calls were held to ensure buy-in and attendance. Both the police and partnership lead considered the event to be a success in identifying what role partners could play in tackling organised crime and received positive feedback from those agencies that attended. However, there was a degree of scepticism that needed to be overcome throughout the event; in particular, partners were concerned about how data would be managed once shared, particularly for those agencies who did not normally work with the police to tackle crime (e.g. DWP/UKBA/Housing services). The event provided a forum to discuss these concerns and ensure that all agencies involved had an understanding of what they and others could contribute to a partnership approach to tackling organised crime. Based on the information shared at the event, agencies were grouped into 'core' and 'periphery' partners for the purposes of the pilot. Each agency was followed up after the event to ensure buy-in and maintain motivation across groups.

Potential advantages

- Establish what the benefit is for individual agencies for becoming involved in the approach and ensure buy-in.
- Identify what tools and powers are available to agencies in tackling organised crime and what information is required to utilise these.
- Identify relevant sources of information across agencies.

Potential disadvantages

- If too many agencies are invited to the event it may be necessary not to include some after the event.
- Low turn-out at the event can jeopardise the success of implementing a partnership approach.
- Balancing the contribution of core and periphery agencies can be difficult and can result in some partners feeling sidelined.

resulted in a large unwieldy group which he felt lessened the likelihood that everyone who had been invited to the event could contribute satisfactorily.

Finally, in the area in which the partnership lead drove activity (area nine), the focus of engagement was not on partners but rather on engaging police leads responsible for organised crime in the process. The partnership lead in this area therefore focused on setting up key strategic meetings between CSP and police leads.

Interviewees generally acknowledged the limited value of adopting a blanket approach to partnership involvement. It was also recognised that the role that partners could play, depending on who was being targeted, could change over time. Interviewees describe how successful partner engagement was linked to the ability to demonstrate what the role was of that particular organisation in tackling organised crime. However, the absence of a definitive summary of what partner organisations could contribute, the process of engaging partners and identifying the potential value they could add, was perceived to be a challenging process that was fundamentally based on trial and error. Ultimately, many felt that had a list of possible partners been available (including what they could contribute and what the potential benefits for each organisation were) the process of setting up the pilots would have been both quicker and less resource intensive. One analyst suggested a toolkit identifying what the potential role of each partner organisation could be would have facilitated the process:

“You don’t know what people can pull out of their bag of tricks, because what we don’t have is almost a resource audit of the partnership, which would be really handy to sort of say, what can everybody bring to the table. Because really, you’ve got no clue.” [Analyst]

Figure 2 illustrates the range of partners involved across the 12 pilots, by allocating the agencies into four categories based on their primary role and the level at which they operate;²⁰

- CSP statutory partners: these agencies were legally required to work in partnership to tackle crime and disorder and would normally play a similar role in tackling other crime types in local areas.

- Local Authority departments: these included organisations which came under the umbrella of the Local Authority but were not represented on the CSP. In the main these partners had previously played a limited role in tackling crime and disorder at the local level.
- Non-statutory local agencies: these included voluntary and community sector bodies and community groups that were active in the local area. In most cases these were described as not having been previously involved in tackling crime and disorder.
- National/regional agencies: this included a range of different bodies across a range of functions (e.g. Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), Job Centre Plus and United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA)).

The specific organisations within these categories that were engaged by each local area are listed in Table 3. While this table demonstrates the range of partners involved, the levels of engagement of each partner organisation differed. The main factors influencing this engagement were perceived to be individual personalities, the extent to which mutual benefit had been established, the structure of the approach that had been developed and the organised crime problem under consideration.

²⁰ At the time of interview pilot sites were still engaging partner agencies which they felt could play a role in tackling organised crime.

Figure 2: Diagram of partner agencies involved in the pilot areas




Table 3: Range of agencies engaged by each area

Area	CSP statutory agencies	Local Authority departments	Non-statutory local agencies	National/regional agencies
One	Local Authority Police Probation Service	Education services Schools Youth services	Local community workers Goals UK YMCA	Connexions (Job Centre) Youth justice services
Two	Fire and Rescue Service Local Authority/District Council Police Primary Care Trust	Benefits and Fraud Section Community Safety Team Housing services Environmental Health Planning Public Spaces Youth Offending	Neighbourhood Watch Registered Social Landlords Association Women's Refuge Church Groups	DWP
Three	Fire and Rescue Service Local Council Neighbouring City Council. Primary Care Trust Police Probation Service	Children and Family Services Neighbourhoods Team Licensing Unit Targeted Youth Support Trading Standards Youth Offending Service	Housing Association Registered Social Landlord(s). Voluntary Drug Agency	DWP Environment Agency Job Centre Government Office Prison Service RSPCA SOCA UKBA Court Service Crown Prosecution Service
Four	Community Safety Team Fire and Rescue Service Police Probation Service	Children and Adults Service Legal Services ASB Team Environmental Enforcement Team Trading Standards TV Licensing	Private Sector landlords Registered Social Landlords	DWP Environment Agency Fraud Investigation Service Team HMRC SOCA UKBA
Five	Local Authority Neighbouring City Authority Police Probation Service	Children and Family Services Targeted Youth Support Youth Offending Service Neighbourhoods Team	Registered Social Landlords	SOCA Crown Prosecution Service. Government Office
Six	Local Authority Police Primary Care Trust Probation Service	ASB Unit Domestic Abuse Unit Environment Services Housing Services Trading Standards Social Care and health Planning/Licensing		DWP UKBA
Seven	Community Safety Team Fire & Rescue Service Local Authority Police Probation	Benefit Fraud Housing Providers Planning Trading Standards Legal Services	Local Prison Passenger Transport Executive Risk business services	Business, Innovation and Skills Crown Prosecution Service DWP D.V.L.A. Environment Agency HMRC HMS prisons Gambling Commission Insurance Fraud Bureau Security Industry Authority SOCA UKBA

Area	CSP statutory agencies	Local Authority departments	Non-statutory local agencies	National/regional agencies
Eight	Local Authority Police Probation Service	ASB Teams Benefit Office Children's Services Educational Welfare Head teachers Pupil Referral Units	Registered Social Landlords	DWP UKBA
Ten	Health Local Authority Police Force Probation	ASB team Trading Standards (inc illegal money lending unit) Youth Service Youth Offending Services		DVLA DWP Environment Agency HMRC SOCA UKBA Vehicle and Operating Services Agency
Eleven	Fire and Rescue Service Health Local Authority Police Probation Service Youth Offending Service	Housing services Licensing Safer Communities Partnership Safeguarding Social Care Regulatory Services TV Licensing		Environment Agency DWP HMRC SOCA UKBA
Twelve	Local Authority Police Probation Service Primary Care Trust	ASB team Benefit Fraud Environmental Health Housing Enforcement Licensing Unit Planning and Building Control Trading Standards Waste and Streetscene		DWP DVLA Environment Agency Gambling Commission Health and Safety Executive HMRC Intellectual Property Office Licensing Authority Post Office Regional Intelligence Unit Trading Standards Security Industry SOCA UKBA Vehicle and Operators Standards Agency

* Area 9 as been excluded from the table as it withdrew from the pilot process

Facilitators and barriers to partner engagement

Several mechanisms were identified as being linked to effective partner engagement in the pilot process. While some interviewees described these as being key facilitators of an effective partnership approach, others described how the absence of these elements had hindered an effective approach being implemented. The three facilitators of partner engagement identified across areas were:

- ensuring strategic oversight of the process;
- one-to-one communication with partners; and
- previously embedded partnership working.

These are discussed in turn below.

Both police and partnership leads described the need for strategic oversight of the pilot to drive the process forward. This was achieved through a range of mechanisms, for example, using existing structures or through the establishment of new oversight boards. Perceptions on what the right level of strategic buy-in were varied across areas. Senior oversight was felt by those at the operational level to demonstrate a partner's commitment to the pilot, which meant that operational buy-in was easier to develop.

Not unsurprisingly, those interviewees who felt that they had more success in engaging partners described spending large amounts of time and effort on communicating with individuals outside of formal meeting structures. One-to-one communication was perceived to allow police and partnership leads to demonstrate what the relevant benefits of the approach were to individual agencies. As one interviewee described:

"[The partnership lead] really pulled together all those partners. A lot of one to ones, a lot of letters, a lot of ringing around and getting buy-in from them." [Police lead]

Partnership leads in several areas also felt that because partnership working was already well embedded in the area prior to the pilot, albeit not necessarily in the context of tackling organised crime, the development of new relationships had been easier. Where strong relationships were already established, information sharing was already happening routinely and securing buy-in for the pilot was therefore considered to be less of an issue. However, some partners and partnership leads described this as being to the detriment of encouraging new relationships.

For example, in one area partners suggested that this may have limited the scope of the organisations that had been involved in the process.

"probably the easiest partners that we've engaged with are the ones that we've got established relationships with"
[Police lead]

Conversely, a range of barriers to the development of effective relationships was identified. Difficulties associated with partner engagement were not described as being partner-specific: that is, no single type of partner emerged as being consistently difficult to engage across pilot areas. Partnership engagement, or a lack of it, was therefore not perceived to be the result of a formal policy of a partner organisation. Rather engagement was perceived to be linked to other, locally determined factors, such as personality of individuals and workload of partners. The importance of individual relationships and personalities appeared to be important in determining the effectiveness of partnership working across the pilot sites:

"Because, actually, partnership working is very, very powerful if you've got the right people. The problem is getting the right people... and sometimes you can have the negativity. I mean, you know, it's not in my job description, I can't do that." [Police lead]

Three main barriers, over and above the role of individual personalities, were identified to effective partner engagement:

- different ways of working across partners;
- differing priorities across partners; and
- poor communication between partners.

These are discussed in turn below.

A large number of those interviewed at both round one and two interviews identified that differences in the ways of working between partners could create a barrier to effective partnership working. This generally arose in relation to the disparity between the 'tasking and coordination' orientated manner of the police in comparison to other agencies. This was often described as creating tension in developing a partnership approach, which consequently risked alienating other partners, particularly in instances when the action suggested by the police was not felt to be appropriate by the partner organisation.

“The police want us to do something and we can't do it. That's pretty much what we've got now... where we're at loggerheads over what action we can and can't take.” [Partner organisation]

“it's...difficult working with different agencies because in the police you've got a definite command structure and if you're told to do something you would, whereas... working with partners is a bit more tricky.” [Police lead]

Outside of this, the main area of contention was between the enforcement-oriented approach of the police on the one hand and those of other partners which focused on prevention and rehabilitation. This was particularly true in cases where the priorities of partner organisations were in conflict around the ‘right’ approach to take to particular targets/OCGs. In these instances good relationships were described as being a key factor in navigating these difficulties and in achieving a balance in deciding the best way to handle a particular problem/case.

“You're talking about an individual and related to that individual will be, I don't know, child care issues and safeguarding issues. Well, obviously if you're social services, your primary concern is about safeguarding the child, whereas if you're the police, your primary concern might be about disrupting or arresting the individual, so there are always going to be tensions.” [Partnership lead]

Differing priorities between partners were also commonly cited as a barrier to effective partnership working, although in some areas police leads noted that aligning the aims of the process with individual partner targets could help to overcome this.

Finally, lower levels of engagement were described by partners, partnership analysts and partnership leads as being linked to poor communication. Specifically, there were three areas in which poor communication was identified as a barrier to engagement:

- **Lack of understanding about the aims of the pilot** – a number of partners noted that they did not have a good enough understanding of what the pilot was trying to achieve. Some attributed this to the lack of direction nationally by the Home Office. Others saw this as a consequence of them being involved too late in the project's development.

- **Lack of understanding around how partner agencies could play a role** – Interviewees across all roles expressed concerns about the lack of clarity around what they could realistically contribute to the pilot and importantly what they could contribute that would have the most value. This also extended to a lack of understanding around how particular powers could be utilised to tackle organised crime.
- **Lack of information about outcomes** – some partners criticised the lack of a ‘feedback loop’; in other words, some partners provided information but never found out what happened as a result. During the second round of interviews, many of those involved in the pilot across roles agreed that to help maintain partnership engagement, partners needed to be informed about what had happened as a result of their involvement.

The way in which these barriers to communication were described by areas was not uniform and communication was perceived differently within and between pilot areas. For example, in one area while the police lead felt that communication between those involved was good, the partnership analyst and partnership leads felt that communication around the progress of the approach was poor (particularly after information had been shared and acted upon). In contrast, in another area communication was perceived to be poor by partners prior to engagement events (particularly around what was required of individuals and what would be discussed). Past this point partners felt that communication improved. Finally, an area using existing structures felt that communication was less of a concern as an established group was being used which had well-established methods of communication in place.

4. Information sharing

Chapter 4 concentrates on the process of information sharing, the third main component of a partnership approach identified by areas. As with partner engagement, information sharing was described as a complex process that had a direct impact on the ability to undertake action against organised criminals. In the context of this approach interviewees described how the information shared needed to be relevant (i.e. it needed to enhance the picture of organised crime in a local area) and/or specific enough to inform the use of tools and powers or other activity against the targets under consideration. In order to facilitate the sharing of this type of information a range of stages needed to be completed including developing an information-sharing protocol, deciding what information could be shared between agencies (and how this would be done), developing an understanding of how to get the best value out of the information that was shared, and overcoming barriers to information sharing overall. These are each discussed in turn below.

Information-sharing protocols

Interviewees described how many of those who had been involved in developing a partnership approach lacked a clear understanding of the Data Protection Act and of what information could be shared under the remit of tackling crime and disorder. This was particularly acute when partners who had not previously been involved in tackling crime were involved, as they were potentially governed by different legislation or were not covered by existing protocols.

As a result differing views were expressed, both between and within areas at round one interviews about what information-sharing protocols needed to be in place before personalised information on identified targets could be shared.²¹ For example, in one area, the police lead felt that a new information-sharing agreement was not needed while the partnership lead felt that existing arrangements were not sufficient. This resulted in a new agreement being developed.

Concerns were also expressed about how to include non-statutory agencies in information-sharing protocols, particularly around identifying the most appropriate

person to sign an agreement. This was particularly the case in fields such as the Youth Services, where there were multiple service providers. Finally, there were particular difficulties in engaging new organisations in information sharing as each organisation had its own rules and regulations which governed the sharing of personal information. For example, when engaging health services it was necessary to refer to the Caldecott Guardian to decide what personal information on individuals could be shared. These had to be taken into account when developing information-sharing protocols to ensure that they were suitable for all organisations involved, and this lengthened the time taken to reach agreement on the most suitable approach to adopt.

As a result, no single approach was identified as being 'correct' and decisions were based on local context and what was already in place at the time of implementing the pilot. Broadly speaking two approaches were adopted by pilot areas.²²

- **Using existing protocols:** in these areas pilot sites cited the overarching framework of the Crime & Disorder Act as the key piece of legislation that permitted the sharing of personalised information about suspected criminals. It was felt that existing CSP protocols were sufficient to share information for the purposes of the pilot. In some cases a memorandum of understanding was added as an addendum to existing protocols (This approach was chosen by seven areas).
- **Setting up new protocols:** in some sites there was a push from a range of partners to develop new information-sharing protocols for the purposes of the pilot. New protocols were predominantly sought when interviewees expressed concerns that current protocols did not provide sufficient protection for the level of sensitivity associated with the information being shared (This approach was chosen by five areas).

Many areas also undertook additional activities to ensure that partners were clear about the regulations around the sharing of information to provide extra reassurance to all involved in the process. This ranged from a focused session at a meeting of partners (to explain the regulations and what they meant) to attaching letters from the partnership

²¹ At the time of the pilot several areas were undertaking a review of the CSP information-sharing protocols to reflect the inclusion of probation as a statutory agency on the CSP.

²² Some areas also considered whether or not those involved in the pilot needed to be vetted, but discounted this as they felt that provisions with the Crime and Disorder Act were sufficient.

legal team outlining the legal position in relation to information sharing and how it applied in this instance.

Overall, reaching agreement about what the necessary protocols were, was described as being a very time-consuming process. This appeared to be true across all pilot sites, regardless of the decision made to either use existing protocols or develop new ones. While many of those involved shared learning from this process during the Action Learning sets, the predominant view expressed by the majority of interviewees in round two interviews was that the availability of a standardised template to provide a core information-sharing framework, which could be adapted where necessary to suit local contexts, would have significantly reduced the time and resource burden.

What information was shared

The first step in the information-sharing process was the provision of personal information on organised crime targets by the police to partners. Core data fields included name and known address of individuals, make/s of vehicles, known associates and family members and suspected business interests. Providing information on why the target was known to the police was also found to be useful by partners.²³ This information was then cross referenced with partner databases, which led to additional information being provided or existing information being clarified/corrected e.g., if the target was registered at a different address for the purposes of benefits claims. For example;

“ I collected loads of information about their family, things they'd been involved in the past, what their aliases were, how one of their mothers had been in league with another drug dealer and been arrested and, you know, all that kind of stuff, because they all knew their histories... And that's how we found out somebody else's alias.”
[Partner organisation]

The range of information that was shared between both police and partner organisations for the purposes of targeting targets can be grouped into the following categories:

- **Background information (including education, previous convictions).**

- **General lifestyle information (including information on family/friends and acquaintances, general movements, housing, vehicles etc.)**
- **Financial activity (including information on benefits, business, financial transactions).**
- **Recent activity (e.g. suspected drug dealing in particular locations).**
- **Previous and current enforcement/management/ investigation activity (e.g. previous convictions, current agency investigations).**

Each category of information was described as having the potential to be useful in developing an understanding of how to tackle an organised criminal (although clearly not all information was available on each target under investigation). In some areas interviewees described how the provision of one piece of information (e.g. a new address) would result in additional information across other categories being identified.

Getting the best value out of information sharing

The main aim of information sharing described across roles was to build up a more comprehensive picture of a particular OCG group and/or targets which could enable better targeting of partnership resources and inform the use of tools/powers. The focus on information sharing therefore was not about further analysis; in most cases this had already been completed through the OCG mapping exercise. As a result the primary role for analysts was described as collating information on a particularly target, rather than undertaking more sophisticated analysis based on multiple datasets in a distinct analytical process. In some areas this was described as involving the collation of a detailed spreadsheet or matrix which identified what information was known and also what interventions were currently in place against targets identified for partnership activity.

“I suppose I see this as a bit of a spider's web that the police data is in the middle and it may take us down different avenues and the partner's role in this is almost to challenge the police in terms of their perceptions of the right avenues to go down.” [Partnership lead]

At the time of the second round of interviews, gathering, collating and subsequently getting the best value out of

²³ As organised crime groups were identified through a verified mapping process based on police intelligence, the sharing of information on targets was considered to be proportional to the severity of the alleged offence (participation in an organised crime group).

the potential information available was described as a complex process. In many areas the difficulties in sharing information were not driven by any specific piece of legislation and the hurdles identified in some areas had been successfully overcome in others. The variation in the approaches adopted was a particular frustration for pilot areas, and was most often perceived to be a result of individuals' decisions on what risk was acceptable, rather than the practicalities of information sharing. As one police lead described;

"[Name of police force] Police shared all their information, sanitized it, but shared everything, whereas our intelligence unit was not prepared to share anything, and that is a real issue. And I think the way information sharing goes around different police forces, different agencies across the country... it's probably the biggest bugbear that I have."
[Police lead]

A range of themes emerged across areas which were described as being linked to effective information sharing and utilisation. These are discussed in turn below.

Identifying the most appropriate information

Interviewees commonly described a cluttered data landscape which included a plethora of different datasets, many of which it was felt had the potential to be of use in developing a better understanding of organised criminals in the local area. An initial hurdle described by most areas, therefore, was the identification of the right information, both in terms of what might be useful to enhance the picture of organised crime in the local area (i.e. relevant information) and/or inform the use of tools and powers against targets (i.e. specific information). However, no areas had a detailed list/map which clarified what information was available and how it could be used (e.g. Local Authority departments had numerous and inconsistent databases for recording information). Ultimately, a list of what information was available and how it could be used would have reduced the time taken to develop effective information-sharing processes.

"Well, we looked at, I suppose, quality rather than quantity because [unclear] get a lot of stuff back that didn't mean anything at all so we very much had the emphasis right at the start is around quality..."
[Police lead]

In some areas work was taken forward by working with partners to identify what information could be useful on a one-to-one basis and through 'tools and powers events'. However, a common perception was that in order to get

the most value out of the information that was shared, the process had to go beyond the simple sharing of information and focus on establishing a more intelligent dialogue between those who could utilise information on targets and the information providers to identify a shared understanding of how the data could be used. For example, an understanding of what information was needed to bring charges against a target for benefit fraud offences could inform what information was provided by other partners to the DWP.

More generic issues around data sharing were also cited as important when identifying and utilising information. These included the provision of data in a useable format and in an appropriate timeframe. Finally information sharing was also hindered by the lack of secure email between partners which made the sharing of sensitive information difficult.

Open and unfettered data access²⁴

At round two interviews, most interviewees described how frustrations associated with the limitations of the information being shared manifested themselves at various points in the information-sharing process. A particular problem was around the partial sharing of information (i.e. the sharing of information that had been sanitised to too thoroughly so was no longer useful) which was perceived to have taken place both internally and externally across police and partners.

"Some of it's absurd because it's not consistent... I'm the lead for [name of programme] and the information that I get sent is a lot more detailed than the information that comes through to certain fairly high ranking police officers who are not in a position to share their information with me. You know, there's that kind of craziness isn't it really?"
[Partnership lead]

This sanitisation of information by all agencies before it was shared created particular problems for receiving agencies. Both police and partners reported that restricting the amount of detail contained in the information shared, especially in the finer detail of the targets that had been identified, consequently limited what information could be identified on police and partner databases. This was particularly acute in instances where partnership analysts and leads had been provided with limited information

²⁴ For a handful of areas, understanding the legislation defining the circumstances under which a partner agency could share information was important. For example, in a minority of cases information sharing was described as being limited because a partner agency could only share information if a particular criminal offence was being investigated.

by police leads (and analysts) working with them which they felt resulted in them being marginalised from the partnership process.

"I thought that it might have been a sort of a level playing field in terms of the information that I would be privy to, to be able to have a fully functioning analytical role in the pilot. But for one reason or another that doesn't seem to have been the case, and I don't know whether that's because of the police restrictions on the intelligence, or what have you, I'm not really sure." [Analyst]

A key hurdle, therefore, was developing trust and understanding around what information could be shared, what would happen with the information once it had been shared and how it would ultimately be used. As one police lead explained;

"I, sort of, gave a load of information which I wouldn't have otherwise given to these agencies, hoping and praying it wouldn't get left on the bus or disclosed. So we led from the front, but we haven't had that sort of level of confidence back. People are still very reluctant." [Police lead]

Identifying and mitigating risk

The level of information shared (and therefore its value) was described by all interviewees as being linked to the level of perceived risk associated with sharing information between agencies. The two primary risks described were juxtaposed; on the one hand there was a risk that the information shared with partners could be shared with other colleagues/organisations associated with them ('secondary' or 'tertiary' sharing). This was a particular concern if it compromised the security of people who had provided the information (e.g. police informants or case workers). Conversely, by not sharing the information with members of their own organisation, there was a risk that these colleagues could be put in danger when undertaking routine action against individual targets. Many areas described how mitigating these risks had in some instances limited the amount of information that was shared.

Most interviewees felt that the hurdles outlined above were a function of the infancy of the approach and were confident that as the process developed, the quality of the information shared and the ease of transfer would improve. The benefits of a more mature approach were perceived to be two-fold; over time it would be clearer to all involved what information could be of use and why, and, trust and confidence between partners would facilitate deeper and broader information sharing.

5. Progress and sustainability

Chapter 5 describes the final stages of the implementation process and considers the progress made by the pilot sites over the lifetime of the evaluation (a period of six months). Many areas described how success was difficult to quantify in a meaningful way given the nature and complexity of organised crime and the nature of the interventions undertaken (e.g. disruption). This in turn meant that the perception of success in this context was linked to the process of embedding the approach rather than on specific outcomes. In addition, the original timetable for the evaluation had envisaged a relatively quick move towards activity to tackle organised crime. However, due to the complexity of setting up the required partnership arrangements the process was slower than expected. This in turn makes measuring the success of the approach more problematic.

Given the pilots' focus on implementation of the most appropriate structure, success against this benchmark is discussed in this chapter. So too are the range of perceived potential benefits associated with developing a partnership approach, which at the time of undertaken the evaluation had yet to be fully realised. Finally, many of those interviewed at round two raised a number of perceived challenges to the sustainability of the approach. These challenges are discussed in relation to the potential solutions proposed.

Progress achieved during pilots

The process of developing and embedding a partnership approach was described as an unexpectedly time-consuming process. Each component of the approach was described as having its own complexities and attempting to navigate these effectively was often based on a lengthy process of trial and error. A consistent message from most of those interviewed was that when all elements of the approach – partner engagement, information sharing, appropriate structures, and partnership action – were embedded as 'business as usual', outcomes would follow quickly behind.

Overall, at the time of round two interviews, most areas' self-assessment of their progress was limited to the first three components of adopting a partnership approach: identifying targets; engaging with partners and information sharing. For those areas which had integrated the approach into existing models, and so had made smaller changes

to the way partnerships were operating (particularly areas four and twelve), some activity against targets had been undertaken. Where activity had occurred it was predominantly focused on individual targets within groups who had been identified for partnership activity (e.g. a target had been charged). Fewer areas had begun to undertake partnership activity as a part of larger operations against OCGs (although these have since taken place). A summary of the action taken and outcome achieved in one pilot site is provided in Case Study Three.

In one area, the approach developed for the pilot to tackle organised crime was not continued. Partnership activity in this area had primarily been driven by the CSP, but agreement around the aims of the pilot had not been secured across police and partners. The failure to secure this buy-in was felt to have contributed to a lack of strategic and operational level support for the project and in turn, was perceived to have ultimately led to the failure of the pilot in this area.

Case Study Three: Operation to target a travelling OCG

Target of activity	<p>Five targets from a mid-level OCG were engaged in a range of crimes from various types of benefit fraud, tax evasion, handling stolen goods and money-laundering offences.</p> <p>The targets lived for part of the year on an illegal travellers' site and then within houses across different parts of the country.</p>
How target/s were identified	<p>The targets were identified from intelligence reports received. The local intelligence office linked the reports and sightings with an increase in reported crime. Further analysis was undertaken by Police Intelligence Developments Officers who developed detailed profiles. This development relied on input from DWP, three Council departments, Land Registry and four Constabularies.</p>
Lead organisation	<p>Local Constabulary</p>
Partner agencies involved	<p>HMRC examined the incomes and tax declared by the targets and also examined the financial background of any companies owned or controlled by them. They then provided evidence of tax evasion offences.</p> <p>DWP examined all benefit claims made by the targets throughout the Country. They then provided evidence in relation to three of the targets who made unlawful claims for various benefits.</p> <p>Area 1 District Council provided evidence in relation to three of the targets committing housing benefit fraud.</p> <p>City Council provided evidence of two targets committing further housing benefit fraud.</p> <p>Area 2 District Council assisted with evidence of various frauds.</p> <p>Land Registry provided details of owners of properties and also evidence on properties which had been transferred into other names.</p> <p>Four Constabularies assisted with evidence gathering and general enquiries.</p>
Activity undertaken	<p>The targets moved to the local area and within a short period of time there were a number of intelligence reports received which suggested they were involved in the rise of burglaries and thefts. Background checks were made with other Constabularies and further intelligence suggested the main target was involved with handling stolen goods. Enquiries were made with various agencies and the targets were found to be claiming benefits but running a block-paving company. The company and the targets were found not to have paid any tax for at least 6 years.</p> <p>Further enquiries were made and despite living on an illegal site the targets were linked to the purchase of five properties in Wales and London valued in excess of £1 million. Warrants were executed at these locations. Staff from HMRC, DWP, the police and immigration also attended the locations.</p> <p>All the targets were arrested for a range of offences and released on bail whilst the agencies worked together to produce the necessary evidence.</p>
Outcome	<p>The immediate outcome was that £500,000 in cash was either seized or restrained, property and vehicles valued at £1.3 million were restrained and £130,000 worth of jewellery was seized. Over 35 items of stolen machinery and caravans were returned to their owners. The targets were charged with 33 counts of money laundering, fraud, benefit offences and tax evasion. Over 150 production orders were obtained to seize bank records and various files stored at their solicitors.</p>

Perceived benefits of partnership approach

While progress with implementing the pilots was slower than anticipated, almost all of those involved in both round one and round two interviews described a range of potential benefits to tackling organised crime through a partnership approach. The benefits were considered to be inter-linked but focused predominantly on sharing information across a wide range of agencies and the subsequent broader range of options and cost savings that this could contribute to. These are discussed below.

Ultimately, almost all of those interviewed felt that there were limits to what could be achieved through a single organisation response. These views were consistent for those individuals involved in both first and second rounds of interview. Working in partnership was perceived to provide an opportunity to broaden the range of options to tackle organised criminals by utilising (often in tandem) the range of tools and powers available to those agencies involved. Police and partnership leads also felt that it provided opportunities to target a much wider range of individuals by providing access to additional non-police resources. This was particularly the case when considering those targets who were deemed to be of lower risk. Due to limited resources, these individuals would traditionally have had limited activity being undertaken against them.

“because we've identified however many groups, and obviously from the force point of view, we haven't got the resources to tackle all those groups... the benefits of it then going to the partners is you've got even more people who can give resources to tackling the group.”
[Partnership Analyst]

Information sharing was described as providing a basis for generating a greater range of options for taking action. The perception was that collating information across partners mitigated against a disjointed approach to tackling targets, and ultimately could lead to more successful outcomes. The development of partnership relationships was also felt to have benefited informal mechanisms of information sharing; this allowed partners to share pertinent information with police leads and vice versa on the basis of relationships that had been built up for the pilot process. This again was felt to have positive consequences for identifying new avenues for action.

“What they've done is built up a relationship where they know that they can ring up [name police lead] and say, I've got this bit of information for you or whatever, and then below those members, each agency has had to develop its own gathering system really.” [Partnership lead]

Most of those involved in implementing the approach noted that successfully engaging partners was based on identifying mutual benefit. While there was a tendency at the start of pilots to view the approach as non-police partners assisting with tackling organised crime (i.e. what tools could partners provide that can help the police tackle identified targets), over time most areas reported a shift in perceptions and partners felt that the a partnership approach could assist non-police partners in achieving their own objectives (while still also tackling organised crime).

In the main, the potential benefits to enforcement agencies were in most cases most immediately apparent. For example, information shared between the police and DWP could be used to inform DWP investigations (or negate the need for them) and allow prosecution of cases which would otherwise have required additional investigation by DWP. However, wider benefits to other agencies also became apparent. For example information shared with partners could also be used to ensure the health and safety of staff undertaking inspections or investigations (by alerting managers to the risks associated with particular premises or persons) or enable housing associations to make informed decisions on housing allocation which could have wider benefits for the community.

“It also gives protection to some of the agencies... can be a bit dangerous sometimes, because they've not got the backup that we've got. If they're working with us and if we're doing stuff together, they will still get the same results, it will be a bit safer.” [Police lead]

“And when it comes to re-housing people it's good to be alerted to the fact that all these people are inter-connected. So, if we accepted one for a property, probably, others would come along as a parcel, so that's really useful to know.” [Partner organisation]

This approach was therefore considered to have the potential to contribute to greater efficiencies by providing an opportunity to pool resources and knowledge and avoid duplication of effort (e.g. undertaking parallel investigations).

“So, actually, as a fact of all coming together and sharing information and data, it’s been more effective and that hasn’t cost us anything.” [Police lead]

Sustainability beyond the pilots

While all but one area planned to continue the partnership approach after the end of the pilots, many interviewees felt that the processes that had been set up were vulnerable to change. Changes in staff, resources, identifying sustained mutual benefit, and the fluid nature of the organised crime problem under investigation were all cited as potential threats. A core component of a successful approach, therefore, was putting systems in place to mitigate these risks; these are discussed in turn below.

Partner motivation

Some interviewees expressed the view that the motivation and engagement of partners that had been involved for the pilot could be difficult to sustain in the longer term. This was particularly the case where the impact that individual partners could have was not clearly identifiable at the outset (e.g. they had no information on the targets identified so were not in a position to contribute at that time). It was also felt that partners could begin to lose motivation if activity waned, particularly where information on the targets identified was limited. One approach offered up by interviewees to mitigate this risk was the development of a regular tasking process to which all agencies could contribute.

A majority of interviewees believed that being able to demonstrate success in effectively tackling organised criminals (which could have benefits for partners) would also act as an additional lever in maintaining motivation. Whilst it was acknowledged that this was difficult during the infancy of the pilots, a commonly held view was that tangible outcomes needed to be achieved in the near term in order to demonstrate the rationale for engagement to partners. In many cases this was felt to be contingent on ensuring that details of a range of OCGs was shared with agencies in order to provide a large number of targets for consideration, depending on the number of OCGs that had been identified in the local area.

“We’ve got to a stage where it’s, you know, actively drying up. There’s nothing happening anywhere else. We need to consider another OCG, another area.” [Police lead]

“think we’re still in the, you know, in the sort of growing stage, in terms of what’s going to be done, what can be done, how it can be done. I don’t think we are at a point where we can say we’ve got the system and it’s all working well. We still have development stuff to do and that development is about ensuring the right people are at the meetings, that they’re confident about what they’re sharing and that they have feedback on what they’ve shared, so that they see it’s worthwhile.” [Partnership lead]

Finally, establishing effective feedback loops, particularly between pilot leads and those partners engaged specifically for the pilot, was considered as being a key component for maintaining motivation. This feedback was considered to be central to ensuring that partners could identify what the information they had provided was used for and, importantly, what outcomes it had contributed to.

“We’ve got to keep putting it in, because we think it’s relevant. But we’re not getting any feedback as to whether or not the police want us to feed that intelligence in, whether or not it’s been useful to them, whether there’s any actions that they’ve taken or that we could then take as a result of that, or no sort of direction as to what anybody wants us to do next.” [Partnership Analyst]

Partnership champions

The influence of individuals – especially those who acted as informal partnership champions – was described as playing a central role in the success of the pilots in some areas. Concerns were therefore raised about the impact on the pilots if these individuals were to leave their roles. A key element of success, therefore, was considered to be the level of enthusiasm and drive of individuals ‘on the ground’ combined with strategic level buy-in. Many interviewees described that the removal of either the operational or strategic level support could pose a substantial risk.

“For me it’s to develop better joined-up working so that you, and also formalising, if you like, the personality-based relationships... [so] if you’ve got this problem, you need to speak to this department as opposed to, you need to speak to this individual.” [Police lead]

Managing rollout of a partnership approach on a wider scale

In a handful of areas there was some uncertainty (particularly expressed by police and partnership leads) around what the impact of rolling out the initiative across the force or county would be. This challenge is demonstrated well by the dilemma faced by one pilot site. Here, two possible models were proposed for rolling out the initiative. In one model the force proposed combining all OCG tasking meetings (and including partner organisations), into a force-wide approach. The principal concern around this model was that lower level OCGs (targeted by the pilot site) would start to be missed. The second approach proposed retaining BCU-level meetings. While this mitigated against the risk of missing out lower-level OCGs, there were concerns that this would induce 'meeting fatigue', if partners were required to go to several meetings across the force on a regular basis. Ultimately interviewees described how establishing which approach would be the most appropriate would be a process of trial and error.

"I think the only sticking point is going to be if this is rolled out across the rest of the force and other [Number] BCUs. There're a lot of partners that are regional, so, realistically, can we expect those partners to come to this meeting four times over every six weeks and the answer to that is they're not going to." [Police lead]

6. Discussion

This report presents the findings of a process evaluation of twelve areas focused on implementing a partnership approach to tackling organised crime at the local level. It did not seek to evaluate the impact of the approaches adopted and all findings are based on the perceptions of those involved in the pilot. Most approaches were in their infancy at the time of undertaking the evaluation and interviewees described a range of challenges to successfully implementing a partnership approach. However, the common perception across areas was that these delays, while frustrating, were a reasonable response to addressing a fundamentally complex set of problems.

As a result of the delays in setting up the required information sharing and partnership arrangements, only a handful of areas had begun to take action against organised crime groups at the time of round two interviews (although this activity has subsequently been undertaken). This needs to be borne in mind when considering the applicability of the findings, which therefore provide stronger evidence on the set-up of the approach. Nevertheless, the findings of the evaluation take us some way to understanding the process of implementing a complex, but potentially powerful approach, to tackling organised crime.

Core components of a partnership approach

Across all areas the pilots sought to embed an approach that would provide a range of different, and potentially more effective, mechanisms for tackling organised crime outside of a traditional police-owned enforcement activity. While this was not a structured series of pilots (with a centrally determined approach), commonalities were identified across areas and four building blocks were repeatedly identified as being core elements of the approaches adopted. These were:

- The use of OCG mapping data to identify which organised criminals / crime groups should be targeted for the purposes of the pilot;
- Engagement of partners;
- Sharing of information between these partners; and
- Partnership activity based on information shared.

Beyond these core components, responses to multi-agency working in this area were hugely varied and ultimately no single blueprint for tackling organised crime through a local partnership approach emerged. Indeed, some areas were clear that models adopted in other pilot sites would not have been appropriate to their own local context, particularly as identifying the most appropriate partners to engage in the pilot was felt to be linked to the particular OCGs being considered which necessarily varied across areas.

Overall there was a common perception that some components were critical for the approach to be successful; a combination of strong partnership arrangements and resources, particularly staff time, as well as information sharing were seen as crucial for the approach to be successful. This is similar to findings from work by McGarrell et al (2009) into partnership approaches to tackle gun crime in the United States; this found that when more components of an approach were implemented, greater reductions in violent crime were achieved.

The complexity of tackling organised crime through a partnership approach

Across areas a range of facilitators to successful partnership working were identified, many of which resonate with existing research into multi-agency working to tackle crime and disorder. Previous evaluations, predominantly from the United States, outline a range of facilitators which aid multi-agency working including: strategic oversight (McGarrell, 2009); scheme champions (Davison et al, 2010); ensuring buy-in and mutual benefit across agencies (Cahill et al, 2008) and good communication between partner organisations (Winterfield, 2006; McGarrell, 2009). These factors were likewise identified in this evaluation.

In addition, previous research and reviews into multi-agency approaches to offender management in the UK have demonstrated similar challenges and benefits to those identified by this pilot. For example previous reviews of MAPPA identified that working in partnership had the potential to increase information sharing and effectiveness and efficiency in the management of offender cases (HMIC Inspections 2005, 2006, 2010). The reviews also suggested that improved communication between partner organisations and the development of common objectives could assist in developing more effective partnership working. Reviews of both Integrated Offender Management (Senior et al, 2011) and the Prolific and Priority Offender

Scheme (Dawson, 2007) identified similar barriers and facilitators to those identified by pilot areas.

Existing approaches such as MAPPA and PPO are based on more well established and relatively consistent processes to offender management and evidenced based interventions in which a range of agencies are required by legislation to participate. While many of the findings of this evaluation resonate with previous research into multi-agency working there are a number of findings that are more particular to the area of local level partnership working on organised crime specifically. The requirement to undertake several iterations to identify a suitable local approach, the difficulties of sharing sensitive personal information and the absence of evidence on what works in tackling organised crime differentiate this approach from traditional offender management processes. The absence of a framework that outlines both which partners to engage as well as evidence on what works in tackling organised crime therefore presents additional complexity to implementing a partnership approach to organised crime at the local level. This raises a series of specific challenges which are discussed in turn below and on which the recommendations of the report are based.

Identifying relevant partners

Both police and partnership leads described the process of identifying the most relevant partners to engage in the pilot as being challenging, both when interviewed at the start of the pilot and six months into implementation. Overall no core group of partners emerged across sites as being central to successful partnership working in this area. In fact a very wide range of agencies, of up to thirty in some areas, were identified as having the potential to contribute. The roles that partners could play were felt to be linked to the responsibilities that each partner had; the specific information partners held; the tools and powers available to each partner (and the thresholds for using these) and, crucially, how these different elements were linked to the nature of the organised crime problem being tackled. This diversity makes it hard to anticipate exactly which specific partners might ultimately be critical to establishing a successful multi-agency approach to organised crime in any given area.

Several areas addressed the challenge of identifying core partners initially through holding a “tools and powers” event. These were seen as a helpful vehicle to identify what potential role partners could play in tackling the local organised crime problem. This approach was perceived by police and partnership leads to reduce some of the time that would otherwise have been required to build

partner relationships. In addition to such events, the key recommendation proposed by pilot areas to address this challenge was the development of a ‘toolkit’ outlining what role each partner organisation could play in tackling organised crime, the potential benefits to each partner organisation, and what information they routinely collected which could help to enrich the picture of the organised crime problem in the local area. The view of areas was that such a ‘toolkit’ could then be used by existing areas and new adopters to identify which partners to involve in the development of the approach.

Challenges related to information sharing

Before information sharing could take place all areas described undertaking discussions, particularly between police and partnership leads, as to whether or not a new information-sharing protocol was needed for the purposes of the pilot. A range of approaches to developing the right framework for data sharing were established. However, in all sites this was described as being a time consuming process, particularly in the context of the inclusion of new partners which were governed by different regulations and legislation. Many areas described how this process could have been foreshortened by the availability of either a core template or memorandum of understanding which had been agreed by partner organisations at the national level which identified how different agency regulations fitted together in the context of sharing information on organised crime groups. This then have could be adapted or used to cross-reference existing arrangements by local areas.

Once information sharing had begun, the process was generally focused on ways of disrupting the activities of a particular individual (and by default group) rather than addressing a particular crime type or level of offending. Information sharing in this context was therefore focused on adopting a problem solving approach to mitigating the risk and harm posed by organised crime through the identification of relevant information on the individuals that were the focus of partnership attention.

It became evident that there were two sets of challenges at work in relation to information sharing: those barriers common to information sharing more generally as outlined above, and those that were specific to the implementation of a partnership approach to organised crime. The more common barriers associated with information sharing, including setting up agreed information-sharing protocols, agreeing access to personalised information and mitigating the perceived risk of information sharing, resonate with recent research into information sharing across CSPs into

partnership working, particularly in relation to violent crime (Davison et al., 2010; Steel et al, 2010; Berry et al).

However, additional challenges that were identified in relation to information sharing which appeared to be specific to organised crime largely related to sensitivity; overall, the information being shared generally had more in common with intelligence rather than data sets that were the currency of other forms of data sharing and this created particular concerns around the sensitivity of the information being shared. In addition, the existence of a broad range of partner groups necessarily meant that information had to be shared more widely; this wider group was perceived to therefore increase the risk of sharing sensitive information.

Challenges to sustainability

Finally, a range of challenges to the sustainability of the approach were identified. Concerns were identified by several areas about how to ensure the approach became 'business as usual' as well as identifying a way in which to maintain the benefits of the approach in the context of a roll out across police force areas. The latter was of particular concern as the perception was that the capacity for partner organisations to replicate their engagement across all CSPs within a region or force area, and the dilution of resource that this could potentially entail, could limit the success of the approach after a roll-out had occurred.

Benefits of partnership approach

Despite the challenges faced by local areas, almost all areas planned to continue implementing a partnership approach after the pilot process. Most areas described how prior to the implementation of the pilot sites an informal boundary existed between the role of police and partners in tackling organised crime. However, many interviewees described how working to adopt a partnership approach had challenged this acceptance of traditional boundaries and felt that if implemented effectively, a partnership approach could be more effective than a solely police based response to tackling organised crime.

At the time of round two interviews four of the six "new arrangement" pilot sites had yet to undertake a wide range of action against targets; however, the common view was that this activity would take place as the pilot sites matured. Most interviewees described how the potential benefits of this approach were centred on being able to take action against organised criminals who otherwise would have a

limited response against them, either because they were too low-level (and therefore would not be the focus of police action) or because police information alone did not provide any avenues for enforcement or disruption activity.

In addition, working in partnership provided opportunities to use available resources more efficiently by joining up approaches to individuals and groups and by providing information to utilise the tools and powers available to partners to greatest effect (e.g. by providing information to utilise Trading Standards enforcement powers), thus creating a situation of mutual benefit for those agencies involved.

Limitations of the research

This qualitative study draws together the perceptions of individuals working across a range of different partnership arrangements which focused on tackling organised crime at the local level. As with all qualitative work, the findings of this report outline the views and perceptions of those involved in the study; they may not be repeated in other similar partnership settings.

The aim of the research was to understand how implementing a partnership approach to tackling organised crime worked in practice; it did not collect data on the impact of the approach other than to consider the perceptions of those involved in the pilot regarding their effectiveness. It is therefore not possible to make an assessment of the impact of the approaches adopted.

As outlined, the second round of interviews was completed before the approach was fully implemented. Whilst this is a function of the selection of the pilot areas (chosen to represent a range of new approaches) the infancy of the approach needs to be borne in mind when interpreting the findings of the evaluation. The evaluation therefore presents stronger evidence in providing areas' assessment of the set up of a partnership approach and only limited evidence on how organised crime groups were subsequently tackled.

Summary

There is limited evidence on successful approaches to tackling organised crime, particularly when addressing the problem at the local level. This evaluation demonstrates that it is possible to set up a multi-agency approach to tackling organised crime at the local level and suggests ways in which barriers to working across agencies and sharing information can be overcome to develop more

joined up processes to address both individuals and organised crime groups. It therefore takes us some way towards understanding how partnership working can play a role in addressing the harms and risk posed by organised crime at the local level.

The delay in implementation, while a finding in its own right, constrains our understanding of the later stages of development, particularly the nature of operations and activity against organised crime groups. The evaluation therefore provides stronger evidence on the feasibility of setting up a partnership approach and less evidence on its potential effectiveness. However, taken together with the wider literature and evidence on multi-agency working the study indicates that partnership approaches have the potential to be effective in tackling organised crime at the local level.

Annex A: Project sub-stream one: Strategic assessment review: prioritising organised crime at the local level

The local annual CSP strategic assessment was considered an appropriate source of determining if, and how, CSPs prioritised organised crime. The primary aim of the annual strategic assessment is to identify the crime and disorder priorities for the CSP, which are then used to organise activity within the local areas between agencies.

A pragmatic approach to selecting the strategic assessments was adopted, based on the available strategic assessment documents at the time of the review (February 2010). Twelve strategic assessments were selected, primarily on the basis that they referred – however briefly – to organised crime. A further five strategic assessments were selected from the pilot sites involved in the study. It is important to emphasise that this exercise was not intended to provide a representative sample of strategic assessments across England and Wales but was instead intended to provide some insight into how CSPs are tackling the issue of organised crime.

Where possible, the sample was chosen from the most recent round of strategic assessments (2010/11). However, it was not possible to take all strategic assessments from the most recent round as, at the time of the review, some areas had not yet submitted strategic assessments for 2010/11. In this case, strategic assessments from the previous round (2009/10) were used. Altogether, 17 strategic assessments were selected between January and February 2010, representing a variety of regions. With the exception of the five strategic assessments from those CSPs involved in the pilot sites, all were taken from three regions: North West, North East and Yorkshire and the Humber (four from each region).

The sample from the North West, North East and Yorkshire aimed to cover a range of different areas covering a number of police forces as well as representing a mix of locality types, for example urban and rural areas, lower and upper tier areas. In deciding which strategic assessments to review in each region, it was recognised that different localities may encounter and describe organised crime very differently. It was also recognised that the breadth of organised crime experienced by areas may vary greatly and may be influenced by the location and make-up of the individual CSP areas.

Selected strategic assessments were assessed against a matrix that was developed by the Home Office for the purposes of this research. The matrix aided an assessment of the strategic assessment by identifying whether organised crime was identified either as a stand-alone priority or in combination with another priority or crime type. It also recorded how organised crime was identified as a priority and the extent to which supportive data analysis was used.

Results

- The majority of strategic assessments included some reference to organised crime. Of the 17 strategic assessments reviewed, only two did not refer to organised crime either as a stand-alone priority or within another priority. It was acknowledged that increased police activity around organised crime may increase the volume and quality of intelligence which could in turn increase the profile of organised crime.
- The quality of strategic assessments varied, as did the range of data sources used. All relied upon police data to some extent, and some relied heavily or almost exclusively on this source.
- Organised crime was often not referred to as a discrete priority but was contained within another priority. A wide range of crime types were identified within the strategic assessments as having links to organised crime.
- Partnerships were more likely to understand and be concerned about types of organised crime that have a visible impact in the local community.
- Organised crime was mentioned most commonly in relation to drug dealing, and most strategic assessments included drugs as a priority in some form or another.
- The method used to determine priorities within strategic assessments was not clear, both in general and specifically in relation to organised crime. Some did, however, incorporate a risk assessment in terms of their consideration of organised crime.

Annex B: Project sub-stream two: Exploring organised crime and its links to anti-social behaviour and Integrated Offender Management

As a sub-stream of the evaluation project, a small study looked at the links between organised crime targets and other offender groups by exploring the number of organised criminals (OCs) that hold ASBOs and the numbers of OCs that are managed through PPO and MAPPA at the time of the pilots in each area.

A questionnaire was sent out to each of the analysts from the 12 pilot areas involved in the evaluation project; seven of which were returned. The questionnaire requested analysts to provide information about ASBOs issued in the local area, organised crime targets with ASBOs, and offenders managed under PPO and MAPPA. Local analysts completed the questionnaire based on information held in their own local areas and provided depersonalised aggregated data across the categories identified below.

The seven CSPs who participated in this exercise reported to have identified 681 OCs in total. Around five per cent of these had received an ASBO. Four per cent were currently managed through PPO and one per cent through MAPPA.

All of the targets with ASBOs were male, and their ages ranged from 15 to 33 years, with most individuals being aged between 21 and 30. The vast majority of targets were British nationals. Over half of the targets breached their ASBOs, with 24 breaches recorded. For those targets who breached their ASBOs, the most frequent outcomes were: fines, imprisonment and community orders/sentences.

The analysis demonstrated that some organised crime targets are managed under IOM, although to a small extent, and more targets were managed via the PPO scheme than MAPPA. The most frequent offences that targets were convicted for were violence against the person, robbery and drug offences. Only one target featured on both the PPO and MAPPA lists.

This exercise should be seen as an exploratory study; it is based on the small sample and does not, therefore, claim to be representative. Access to the ASBO, PPO and MAPPA lists varied and was based on different data sources. The authors also acknowledge that there are other and probably more robust ways to examine links between ASB and organised criminality and ASBOs are only a proxy measure of ASB.

Table B1: Organised criminals with ASBOs and overlaps with PPO/MAPPA

	No. of OCs	No. of targets with ASBOs	OCs with ASBOs		OCs managed via PPO	OCs managed via MAPPA
			Active	Expired		
Area 1	225	46	17 (8%)	10 (4%)	16 (7%)	4 (2%)
Area 2	62	26	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Area 3	17	55	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Area 4	152	52	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Area 5	unknown	13	4 (-)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	unknown
Area 6	22	5	0 (0%)	3 (14%)	7 (32%)	unknown
Area 7	203	43	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)
Total	681	240	23 (3%)	17 (2%)	28 (4%)	5 (1%)

Annex C: Project sub-stream three: A typology of local partnership initiatives to tackle organised crime

The aim of this sub-stream was to provide an analytical assessment of different types of local initiatives to tackle organised crime. In total, 36 examples of partnership initiatives aimed at tackling organised crime were analysed. These examples were drawn from a variety of sources including:

- 15 initiatives chosen from 10 of the pilot sites
- 21 initiatives chosen from a further 11 areas which were engaged via a national request for current practice

A description of each initiative was obtained: in 28 of the initiatives, written documentation was provided with details on the remaining eight obtained via interviews (seven by telephone and one face-to-face). A framework was developed to analyse this information which allowed an assessment of how the initiative was set up, who was involved, the aims of the initiative, the processes established and finally the challenges and perceived successes of the initiative.

Though there are a number of factors that can distinguish one initiative from another (for example, whether initiated and led by the police, a CSP or another partner, whether it is funded internally or through government funding etc), two dimensions were identified that are predominantly relevant: (1) the aim of using a partnership approach and (2) the organisational set-up for information-sharing between the partners.

The first dimension, the aim of using a partnership approach, focuses on the reasons for deciding to seek the involvement of partners to address an organised crime problem in the local area.

There were two main categories that initiatives fall into for this dimension: 'prevention and rehabilitation' or 'enforcement and disruption'.

'Prevention and rehabilitation' initiatives were designed to stop an actual or potential organised criminal from engaging or re-engaging in organised crime (specifically prevention and rehabilitation). These also included initiatives that prevent organised crime by reducing opportunities for OCGs by, for example, educating potential victims (general prevention).

'Enforcement and disruption' initiatives on the other hand, used intelligence, tools or powers of partners with the aim of disrupting or dismantling an OCG. This took a large number of forms, from putting an organised criminal behind bars, to taking away benefits, to closing down premises used for organised crime.

The second dimension, organisational set-up for information sharing between the partners, looks at the process of partnership engagement. This was either on an ad hoc basis, where partners were involved and information exchanged when needed or through a more organised regular engagement within embedded set structures.

Within these dimensions, initiatives can be grouped into the following four types illustrated in Table C1.

Table CI:A typology of approach to involve partners in tackling organised crime at the local level

		Aim of using a partnership approach	
		Prevention and rehabilitation	Enforcement and disruption
Organisational set-up for information sharing	Ad hoc	Type A	Type C
	Set structure	Type B	Type D

Type A: Initiatives in this group used a partnership approach in order to reduce the organised crime problem in their area by drawing upon preventive or rehabilitative measures. Partners were approached when needed on an individual basis, e.g. to support a specific aspect of a particular operation.

Example: Week of activity undertaken against known organised crime groups and individuals in local area. The week was led by the police but involved the support of partner agencies including the development of a DVD by the Community Safety Partnership for viewing by school children.

Type B: For type A initiatives, the focus of partnership engagement was on getting support for preventive and rehabilitative measures rather than on targeting or disrupting criminals or groups directly. The difference in this group of initiatives was that information was shared with partners within set structures e.g. regular meetings for that purpose rather than on an ad hoc basis.

Example: A partnership set up a project which aimed to tackle gangs. The project adopted a blanket approach for all (potential) gang members in the area and focused on both preventing people from joining gangs and helping those who were already in gangs leave. Multi-agency teams including the police, Local Authority resettlement staff, and youth workers were set up to engage with individuals in gangs. These individuals were offered help (including mentoring and housing services), but also warned about possible enforcement activity. Finally, a local community representative was also involved to demonstrate the impact of the behaviour of gang members on the community.

Type C: Initiatives grouped under this type used a partnership approach to improve enforcement and disruption against an organised criminal, an organised crime group or a business run or used by organised criminals. The role of involving partners was to gather more intelligence to inform and/or enable enforcement or to use specific tools and powers from partner organisations. Information to enable these activities was shared when needed to support a specific case or operation.

Example: The Community Safety Partnership undertook a piece of work with the Environment Agency, based on the use of council powers, to help the Environment Agency to undertake action against organised crime groups in the local area. The activity was focused on waste sites and using council and environmental agencies powers to tackle fraudulent activity on waste sites and scrap yards in the local area.

Type D: For type C initiatives, partners were involved with the aim of improving options for enforcement and disruption, to increase the effort and risk to current offenders, by collecting additional intelligence from partners and/or extending the set of tools and powers available to target individuals, groups or premises. However, as with type B, there was a set structure of how and when these partners were involved and how data were shared.

Example: The Partnership employed a gun and gang crime co-ordinator who was responsible for going into prisons to visit pre-release individuals, discuss their options and provide opportunities for change. The co-ordinator was also involved in enforcement activities which involved limiting criminals' opportunities to create further threat. This included the use of licence conditions, restricting geographical area etc. The co-ordinator also worked with partners around issues such as accommodation/rent, TV licences. Partners involved include Probation, YOT, registered social landlords, Benefits Agency, TV Licensing Agency.

References

- Berry, G., Briggs, P., Erol, R. and van Staden, L.** (2011) 'The Effectiveness of Partnership Working in a Crime and Disorder Context' Home Office Research Report 52. London: Home Office.
- Bullock, K., Chowdury. and Hollings, P.** (2009) 'Public Concerns About Organised Crime' Home Office Research Report 16. London: Home Office.
- Bullock, K., Clarke, R. and Tilley, N. eds.** (2010) 'Situational Prevention of Organised Crimes' Devon:Willan Publishing.
- Cabinet Office** (2009) Extending Our Reach:A Comprehensive Approach to Tackling Organised Crime. <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm76/7665/7665.asp>
- Cahill, M., Coggeshal, M., Hayeslip, D., Wolff,A., Lagerson, E., Scott, M., Davies, E., Roland, K. and Decker, S.** (2008) 'Community Collaboratives Addressing Youth Gangs: Interim Findings from the Gang Reduction Programme' USA: The Urban Institute.
- Cooper, C., Brown, G., Powell, H. and Sapsed, E.** (2009) 'Exploration of Local Variations in the Use of Anti-Social Behaviour Tools and Powers', Home Office Research Report 21, London: Home Office.
- Cusick, L., Kinnell, H., Brooks-Gordon, B. and Campbell, R.** (2009) 'Wild Guesses and Conflated Meanings? Estimating the Size of the Sex-Worker Population in Britain'. *Critical Social Policy* (29) 703-19.
- Crime and Disorder Act** (1998) <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/37/contents>
- Davison, T., van Staden, L., Nicholas, S., and Feist, A.** (2010) 'Process Evaluation of Data Sharing Between Emergency Departments and Community Safety Partnerships in the South East' Home Office Research Report 46. London: Home Office.
- Dawson, P.** (2007) 'The National PPO Evaluation –Research to Inform and Guide Practice', Home Office Online Report 09/07. London: Home Office. <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/rdsolr0907.pdf>
- Gordon, L., Tinsley, L., Godfrey, C. and Parrot, S.** (2006) 'The Economic and Social Costs of Class A Drug Use in England and Wales', 2003/04, Home Office Online Report 16/06. London: Home Office.
- Gottschalk, E.** (2009) 'Public Perception of Organised Crime – Results from an Opinion Poll' London: Home Office. <http://www.safernorthdevon.co.uk/Publications/Publications%20Public%20Perception%20Organised%20Crime.pdf>
- HMI Constabularies and HMI Probation** (2006) 'Putting Risk of Harm in Context'
- HMI Probation and HMI Constabularies** (2005) 'Managing Sex Offenders in the Community – A Joint Inspection on Sex Offenders' – November 2005.
- HMI Probation and HMI Constabularies** (2010) 'Restriction and Rehabilitation: Getting the Mix Right. An Inspection of the Management of Sexual Offenders in the Community.'
- HMRC** (2009) 'Protecting Tax Revenues 2009' London: HMRC.
- Home Office** (2010) 'Information for Community Safety Partnerships' London: Home Office.

- House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts** (2008) 'Reducing the Risk of Violent Crime' House of Commons, London: The Stationery Office.
<http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmpubacc/546/546.pdf>
- Jacobson, J., Maitland, L. and Hough, M.** (2003) 'The Reducing Burglary Initiative: investigating Burglary' Home Office Research Study No. 264. London: Home Office.
- Kelly, L. and Regan, L.** (2000) 'Stopping Traffic: Exploring the Extent of, and Responses to, Trafficking in Women for Sexual Exploitation in the UK. Police Research Series, Paper 125. London: Home Office.
- Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. eds.** (2002) 'The Oxford Handbook of Criminology' 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGarrell, E. F., Hipple, N. K., Corsaro, N., Bynum, T. S., Perez, H., Zimmerman, C.A. and Garmo, M.** (2009) 'Project Safe Neighbourhoods – A National Program to Reduce Gun Crime: Final Project Report' US: NIJ/NCJRS.
- Office of Public Management** (2008) 'Research on the Costs and Benefits of Personal Data Sharing at Local Partnership Level.' London: Department for Communities and Local Government.
- Senior, P., Wong, K., Culshaw, A., Ellingworth, D., O'Keefe, C. and Meadows, L.** (2011) 'Process evaluation of five Integrated Offender Management Pioneer Areas' Ministry of Justice Research Series 4/11. London: Ministry of Justice
- Steel, N., Ward, L. and Diamond, A.** (2010) 'Information Sharing Aimed at Reducing Violent Crime: A survey of Community Safety Partnerships' Home Office Research Report 45. London: Home Office.
- Rosenbaum, D. P.** (2002) 'Evaluating multi-agency anti-crime partnerships: theory, design, and measurement issues', Crime Prevention Studies. Vol 14. UK: Willan Publishing.
- Winterfield, L., Lattimore, P. K., Steffey, D. M., Brumbaugh, S. and Lindquist, C.** (2006) 'The Serious and Violent Offender Re-entry Initiative: Measuring the Effects on Service Delivery' Western Criminology Review Vol 7, No 2 Pp3-19.
- Wright, A.** (2006) 'Organised Crime' Devon: Willian Publishing.