

Criminal Justice Board

14 December 2015, 15:00 – 17:00, Committee Room 12, House of Commons

Attendees:

- Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (The Rt Hon Michael Gove MP) - **JS**
- Home Secretary (The Rt Hon Theresa May MP) - **HS**
- Attorney General (The Rt Hon Jeremy Wright QC MP) - **AG**
- Minister for Policing, Crime, Criminal Justice and Victims (The Rt Hon Mike Penning MP) - **MP**
- Minister of State for Government Policy (The Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP) - **MGP**
- President of the Queen’s Bench Division (Sir Brian Leveson) - **PQBD**
- Deputy Senior Presiding Judge (Lord Justice Fulford) - **LJF**
- Director of Public Prosecutions (Alison Saunders) - **AS**
- CEO Crown Prosecution Service (Peter Lewis) - **PL**
- Chair National Police Chief’s Council (Chief Constable Sara Thornton) - **ST**
- Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police (Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe) - **BHH**
- Police and Crime Commissioner Representative (Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Matthew Ellis) - **ME**
- CEO HM Courts & Tribunals Service (Natalie Ceeney) - **NC**
- Director General Crime & Policing Group, Home Office (Mary Calam) - **MC**
- CEO National Offender Management Service (Michael Spurr) - **MS**
- Director General Criminal Justice Group, Ministry of Justice (Indra Morris) - **IM**
- Strategic Advisor to the Board, Director Criminal Justice Reform, Ministry of Justice (Stephen Muers) – **SM**
- Non-executive Board member, Ministry of Justice (Lizzie Noel) - **LN**
- Head of the Crime and Policing Knowledge Hub, Home Office (Mike Warren) - **MW**

Apologies:

- Non-executive Board member, Ministry of Justice (Sir Theodore Agnew)

Agenda items 1 & 2: Introduction and Matters Arising

1. The JS thanked members for attending and asked whether there were any issues arising from the minutes of the previous meeting. He reminded members that the intention is to publish the minutes of this meeting and the previous one in January.

Agenda item 3: Spending Review (SR) Update

2. SM summarised the paper for the Board, highlighting the protected budget for the police and CPS. He emphasised that the Spending Review would require coordinated and joint working in a number of areas, including digital efficiency, streamlining our estate, managing the demand on the system, and collaborating and integrating services especially at the local level.
3. HO and policing colleagues made clear that the outcome of the Spending Review would not slow down reform plans and that they would continue to work with the wider system to achieve this. They emphasised that the police needed to look for savings on an ongoing basis to create headroom for new challenges. They identified digital change as one of the main challenges and opportunities for this, referring to the work on Digital Case Files and the Common Platform. They reminded the Board that police chiefs were currently doing some work to establish what the budgets meant for their force’s

transformation. BHH said the Met, for example, would continue to look at savings from buildings, outsourcing, collaboration with other emergency services, procurement and IT amongst others.

4. Board members commented that the relationship with the police had been effective on the Common Platform and Criminal Justice System Efficiency Programmes. They emphasised the real transformational potential of these programmes for investigating, prosecuting and disclosing evidence in new ways. They commented on the broad range of benefits associated with the Common Platform: from increased timeliness, to a more efficient process throughout, including the potential for financial savings, more effective cases from the start of the process, a greater number of guilty pleas, and an improved victim and witness experience.

Action 1: To inform the CJB about the streamlined process the Common Platform will put in place by 2020, including the change in the time taken for a case to progress through the system before and after its introduction; and given the importance of the Common Platform, a specific articulation of the wider benefits attached to this key reform

Action owners: Natalie Ceeney and Peter Lewis

Target date: An update on the Common Platform Programme will be provided for the January Board. This update will not include the time to progress a case issue which will be provided at the March Board.

5. Board members noted that the SR made clear the importance of collective leadership over the next few years, including to agree data principles and manage the downstream implications of investment decisions at the front end of the system. They agreed that the CJS would need to work with other partners during this period, including the health system.

Action 2: To discuss the interdependencies between the criminal justice and health system at an upcoming CJB meeting

Action owners: Mary Calam, Indra Morris and Peter Lewis

Target date: summer 2016

Agenda item 4: Criminal Justice Performance and Timeliness of Sexual Offence Cases

6. SM summarised the paper and invited the Board to discuss the questions set out in the paper.
7. The Chair argued that improving timeliness should be a key objective of the criminal justice system. Board members commented it was not the only objective - victims' willingness to come forward, their confidence in the delivery of justice and their satisfaction in the system are also of central importance. Board members concluded that timeliness was nonetheless an enabler of many of these other objectives.
8. Board members decided to commission work to further analyse the geographical differences in the timeliness of sexual offence cases. They recognised the need to do so in a way that acknowledges that not all areas are comparable and that lower performance on overall timeliness can sometimes mask positive trends. The HS noted, for example, that the greater number of victims of sexual offences reporting the crimes

they were subjected to and more of these are complex cases going through the criminal justice system was a positive trend that had impacted negatively on overall timeliness measures.

Action 3: To understand what drives the timeliness of sexual offence cases, how and why this differs geographically, and the lessons that can be learned by looking at performance in comparable areas

Action owners: Mary Calam and Indra Morris

Target date: March

9. This discussion led to a general agreement about the positive impact and potential of pre-recorded cross-examination. The pilot suggests it can lead to greater overall timeliness and more guilty pleas. Board members agreed to consider rolling out the programme as soon as its financial evaluation concluded. Lord Justice Fulford said he was happy to update the Board following evaluation, however the financing and roll out of the pilot is owned by MOJ and HMCTS.

Action 4: To update the CJB on the results of the evaluation of the pre-recorded cross-examinations pilot

Action owner: Lord Justice Fulford to provide an update following MOJ evaluation.

Target date: Once the evaluation is complete, current target: summer 2016

Agenda item 5: Drivers of Crime

10. MW summarised the six main drivers of crime, including: drugs, alcohol, the effectiveness of the CJS, character, opportunity and profit. He also discussed the drivers' impact on crime trends, showing a reduction in overall crime, and a move away from traditional acquisitive to more complex crime. MW explained that a change in the behaviour of young people had driven this trend.
11. Board members enquired further about the crime trends related to cybercrime and fraud, paying particular attention to the new data collected through the Office for National Statistics' experimental measure. HO and policing colleagues explained that the label of cybercrime captures a wide range of crimes, including traditional ones that are now committed online and new ones enabled by the internet and associated technology, and that it was particularly complex given its extra-jurisdictional nature. They noted that the police are taking forward a programme of work to address cybercrime including the creation of a specialist unit in the Metropolitan Police Service, looking at officer training, and bringing new skills into the system.
12. Board members discussed design as central to preventing this type of crime, and that it would be important to consider how to incentivise industry to improve the preventative nature of their designs. The HO confirmed that the modern crime prevention strategy under development was looking at all these issues.

Action 5: To update the CJB regularly on the progress of the modern crime prevention strategy

Action owner: Mary Calam

Target date: March

Action 6: To brief the CJB in more detail on the nature of cybercrime and in particular fraud and facilitate a discussion as to the implications for the criminal justice system

Action owner: Mary Calam

Target date: April/May

Agenda item 6: Data technology standards

13. Board members agreed that the sub-board should start work according to the proposed remit set out in the paper – namely: to agree and align cross CJS standards in information, data and technology in support of a digitally enabled Criminal Justice System; doing this through the development of national standards and principles and providing a single source of authority on cross-cutting CJS data issues.
14. Board members asked that the sub-board update them on its work plan, once agreed.

Action 7: To report back to the CJB about the scope of the information, data and technology sub-group's work

Action owner: Peter Lewis

Target date: March

Acronym list

CJB	Criminal Justice Board
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
HO	Home Office
SR	Spending Review

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