

**ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP ON PENAL AFFAIRS**

**Chair:** Pam Cox MP

**Officers:** Lord Garnier KC; Tessa Munt MP; Baroness Prashar CBE

**Minutes of the Meeting of the All-Party Group on Penal Affairs, held on  
27 January 2026**

***Lessons in devolved and regional justice***

**Guest speakers:**

**Kate Green:** *Deputy Mayor of Greater Manchester for Safer and Stronger Communities*

**Andrew Scott:** *Deputy Head of Community Integration and Senior Commissioning and Partnership Manager for Greater Manchester Probation*

**Dr Tom McNeil:** *CEO of the JABBS Foundation for Women and Girls and former West Midlands Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner*

**Present**

Pam Cox MP (Chair)  
Lord Bradley  
Richard Hanford (obo Grahame Morris MP)

**Apologies**

Jake Richards MP  
Baroness Prashar CBE (Officer)  
The Lord Bishop of Gloucester

**Attendees**

Julia Braggins (minutes)  
Peter Braggins  
Tracey Burley  
Mark Day (clerk)  
Susan Dungworth  
Emily Evison (assistant to clerk)  
Richard Garside  
Oliver Glick  
Claire Hubberstey  
Tanya Lightfoot-Taylor  
Leonie Loftus  
Andrew Neilson  
Lucy Russell  
Pia Sinha  
Carla Slim  
Liat Tuv

**Pam Cox MP** opened the meeting at 5m and welcomed members and observers to the meeting.

**Pam Cox MP:** Today's topic is devolved commissioning, which is important because so many areas will soon be having mayoralities for the first time. Some areas such as Greater Manchester have been doing this for some time and had a lot to teach people about how to commission responsive local services. I am not sure how enthusiastic my colleagues are, but when the Justice Select Committee, of which I'm a member, visited Manchester and sat down with local criminal justice commissioners I thought what a fascinating issue this was.

It's my pleasure to introduce the three speakers. **Kate Green**, Deputy Mayor of Greater Manchester for Safer and Stronger Communities and a former MP, who had had a lot to do

with justice and with education, whilst in Parliament; **Andrew Scott**, Deputy Head of Community Integration and Senior Commissioning and Partnership Manager for Greater Manchester Probation; and **Dr Tom McNeil**, CEO of the JABBS Foundation for Women and Girls and former West Midlands Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner. So, there is a huge amount of expertise in the room.

Pam invited **Kate Green** to speak first.

**Kate Green:** Thank you very much. I won't say it's nice to be back here: I always get a sense of imposter syndrome when I come back to Parliament, and it's an enormous privilege to do the job that I do now, as Deputy Mayor for Safer and Stronger Communities. Many will be aware that statutorily the mayor holds the role of Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester, and the scrutiny and oversight responsibility in relation to holding Greater Manchester Police and Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service and their chief officers to account. But day to day he delegates those functions to a deputy mayor. There are two or three things he can't delegate: I am not able to hire or fire the chief constable. He has that power. He has to present the budget and the precept, which is a very live issue for us now. But broadly I am carrying out, as is my friend and colleague Susan from Northumbria, the function of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester. In addition to that I am also the commissioner for the Greater Manchester Probation Service, and we are very lucky in Greater Manchester that our Probation Service exactly maps to the Greater Manchester mayoral combined authority geography, the Greater Manchester Police geography, the Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue geography: everything is coterminous.

I have those commissioning powers, and indeed we have had them in varying and iterating forms for the best part of 10 years in GM (Greater Manchester). As I will come on to say, there is a real opportunity in being part of a combined authority to align the commissioning that I do with criminal justice funding from the MoJ and the Home Office with other funding streams that are devolved to the mayor.

As I said, we have evolved GM-specific arrangements, and we were the pioneers for the whole system approach to women. A lot of what we continue to do is modelled on and has developed that. We have had a series of memoranda of understanding with the MoJ (Ministry of Justice), giving us more powers and devolved funding, in return for agreed outcomes that we were required to deliver. I commission our integrated rehabilitative services. We will be reprocurring them next year including CAS 3 our step-down accommodation for those leaving custody. We are now in very productive negotiations with the MoJ for further devolution agreements around the management of low harm high volume prolific offenders and in relation to youth justice, which is really exciting. We are discussing with Minister Jake Richards the devolution of the youth justice core grant to GM – not in the immediate future but within the next year or so.

What works about being in the mayoral combined authority structure? Well, we can combine the work I lead in overseeing the police, the fire and rescue service, and the commissioning of the GM Probation Service with the other mayoral priorities, which were set out last year in the GM Strategy. Part of that strategy is enabling everyone in GM to live a good life. The mayor has a number of devolved responsibilities and funding streams which align really well with the kind of preventative work which we want to do in relation to criminal justice. So, for example the adult education budget is devolved to the mayor, the mayor has a homelessness budget – a 'bed every night' scheme, which is to get people off the streets and into accommodation every night.

We have a very strong voluntary, community and social enterprise sector and a covenant agreed with them in GM. This covenant specifically says that they will have a powerful role in

the delivery of services that we as a combined authority commission. So, we are not trapped in these national commissioning contracts and models as the rest of the country is. And although the mayor does not have direct responsibility for things like education and children's services, which are out in our 10 constituent local authorities, the combined authority as a whole, which is the 10 local authority leaders and the mayor, works as a single unit that is more than a sum of the parts. To give an example, for the youth justice work we are currently negotiating with the MoJ, which is delivered down to the youth offending teams in each of the 10 authorities, we can work really well together as a whole system, because we have got a habit of doing that in GM, and it is really effective.

There are still challenges. Some of you will wince when I say that health and justice remains a challenge, and the significant amount of change that is going on in the health world just now makes it even more challenging. Drug and alcohol services, commissioned by local authority public health directors, are not terribly well suited to meeting the needs of the criminal justice world, and therefore I will use the opportunity when we are recommissioning our integrated rehabilitative services next year to use some of my criminal justice funding. We will commission some substance misuse services directly so that they meet our needs.

There are huge backlogs, as you'll know, in the criminal justice system. This is putting immense pressure on the whole system but also giving us the opportunity to ask the MoJ to work with us to iterate to the next generation of devolution. This is where the work of diverting prolific offenders away from the criminal justice system has really come into its own. Following yesterday's statement by the Home Secretary on the Police White Paper, there are now some uncertainties about the benefits of co-terminosity between the mayoral authority geography, the GM probation geography, the GM police geography; I am now concerned that those benefits may be compromised by the creation of bigger regional forces into which GMP would be subsumed. A couple of GM MPs very kindly asked the Home Secretary about that yesterday in response to the statement. I am not sure I can really say that the answer made me any clearer about how they are going to deal with that conundrum. It is something that does concern us.

Overall, I am hugely positive about the mayoral model as the context for oversight, scrutiny and commissioning of criminal justice services in GM. It is a model I commend to every part of the country, particularly as more people will have mayoral models coming into local areas. But I would just finish by cautioning that we are a mature model. We have been at this for more than 10 years, so people don't want to run before they can walk. But we are really excited to share experiences and our learning. I am already talking to my counterparts in West and South Yorkshire. We are very interested in working closely with colleagues in Wales, where there are real opportunities to do some of what we have been doing within their own geography, and I am really excited to be here today, so thank you very much for the invitation.

**Pam Cox MP** thanked **Kate Green** very much and said that everything she was saying was so exciting. She invited **Andrew Scott** to speak next.

**Andrew Scott:** I am senior commissioning partnership lead for GM Probation. I have been a probation officer since 2003. I have worked in the West Midlands, Cheshire and Greater Manchester so I have seen quite a wide range, including working in HMP Risley, and also the courts. In 1876 Frederick Rainer, who was part of the Church of England Temperance Society, saw in Southwark that people kept coming back into the court system. He decided to give five shillings to pay for two members of staff to help support those people who were going in and out of court. That was the birth of the probation service. Probation was born alongside partnership work, and without partnership work probation would find it a lot more of a struggle.

In GM we are very lucky to have the opportunity with the combined authority to co-commission our services. It has allowed us to be what is required for the people of GM to receive what is needed. It is also about acknowledging that the people we work with are not a cohort on their own: they are part of our neighbourhoods, part of our communities, and what we want is those community partners to engage with us to ensure that those people can still feel part of their communities in the future. We have had some really successful projects. We have mentioned the GM integrated rehabilitative service. Kate has mentioned the GM women's services, we decided to look at was the success of these services and create something very similar for men.

We created our wellbeing hubs, and we now have a wellbeing hub in each one of the 10 districts of GM. We can refer somebody into that hub and they will get all the help and support under one roof. So that person doesn't have to continue to tell the same story to a number of people, on a number of different appointments on different days. We focus in on emotional wellbeing and support; finance, benefits and debt; and education and employment support. We have got family mediation support, which as you can imagine can help to support accommodation need, because, let's face it, accommodation is probably the biggest problem for everyone across the country.

When I joined the service in 2003, probation staff were expected to do everything. We were expected to be knowledgeable on all different areas of work. I can remember taking people to job centres and filling forms in and staying there for two or three hours. That was what was expected. We didn't particularly use our partners. This allows partnership working across GM. It also allows us to be very innovative.

On top of the wellbeing hubs, we created a programme with the Fire Service, the first across the country to have a specific programme that is aimed at people who have committed arson offences. That has encouraged them to work with the Fire Service, to look at different aspects, not just about that fire setting but also what was going on in their lives, their emotional wellbeing, mental health etcetera. We have worked with providers, so that someone who completes this programme might be helped to get into accommodation or employment. Finding accommodation and jobs for people who have committed fire setting offences is significantly difficult. People automatically think it's difficult for a sex offender. It's not, compared to someone who has committed an arson offence, because of insurance, predominantly.

So, we have created that programme. It's been running now successfully for two years. The GM Fire Service have taken that to America. They have sold it across the world, two or three times to two or three countries, and it really offers that innovative approach to the work that we do. We are currently engaging with our local football teams, Manchester City, Bolton, Rochdale etc, looking at how physical health can improve people's mental health.

So, with regard to the services, we have got an accommodation support service, to help people who have got properties stay in their properties, help with family mediation if they are living with their parents, helping them to stay there. We have got drug and alcohol services. We are the only area in the country, because of our commissioning, to keep our ETE (employment, training and education) contract. At the beginning of last year, all the other probation areas across the country lost their ETE contracts. We have also got the specific women's service, and a mentoring service.

Just a few statistics before I finish: Over two years since the beginning of 2024, the financial year 23/24 - we have got roughly a quarter left of this year – 32,282 referrals were made to our services, a significant number. Of those, 53,079 appointments were offered for accommodation alone; wellbeing 29,668, approximately. What we noticed was that, once they attend, non-compliance is significantly low. I will admit that it is sometimes difficult to get

people across the threshold, to make those appointments, but when they are there non-compliance is low: in 24/25 there was 0.26% non-compliance. Then in 25/26, the first three quarters, 0.28%. So, the overall success rate is quite significant. The two things that we are really proud of creating for GM are the ones that are leading the way for us.

**Pam Cox MP** thanked Andrew Scott for the comprehensive overview of what could be commissioned, once the power and the funding was in place. She then welcomed **Dr Tom McNeil** to speak.

**Dr Tom McNeil:** You know sometimes when somebody says something it makes you think about something you hadn't thought about for years and years. You did that, Pam, when you said that some people don't find devolution very interesting. It made me think back to a past life when I was a parliamentary candidate in a totally and utterly unwinnable seat, just taking one for the team I think they call it. I went to a hustling and gave it my best shot. A really nice chap came and spoke to me afterwards and he had a paper about devolution with him. He said you should really have a look at this. This was years and years ago, and I did not know what the word devolution meant. I tried my best to be polite, but I thought: that's so boring! I just cannot believe that, now that I am such an evangelist about devolution. I really get interested in it; it's genuinely exciting.

I'm coming from a West Midlands perspective, which is not as evolved as the GM area, but in some areas there are innovations. Some things that I think are pioneering, other elements that are a bit further behind. I'm obviously talking from a Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) perspective, because there they haven't merged with the mayor's office, mainly down to party politics actually, but that is evidently going to change – I think personally for the good, for all the reasons that Kate was talking about.

But I was trying to think: how do I articulate why those devolved entities, like mayoralities and combined authorities, add something different from local authorities? And the reason I think that's worth touching on is because I remember at the time when we, the PCC's office, were trying to pioneer some project and lead the way and bring partners together, some of my local authority friends were a bit irritated by it, saying 'No, no this is real devolution, this is real localism, you are just taking it up another level.' And I thought there are just a couple of extra elements that supplement and complement proper local authority led devolution which is the fact that there is just a little bit more visibility and authority from something that has a bigger footprint. It is small enough to be able to do something real at a local level – but it's big enough that your stories get noticed. You have got slightly greater convening power. You do get all sorts of innovation pots of funding, because the Government thinks if we give it to that regional representation then we are making our job a little bit easier, rather than constant lots of hyper-local negotiation. So, I think that that really adds something.

Obviously, it is only as good as the quality of leadership. But that's the same in any position of power, central or otherwise. Sometimes people say: well, you have got all these PCCs and mayors, some will do a really bad job. Yes, but some ministers do a bad job, some ministers do a good job. So, you have to talk about how the structure best lends itself to a good result. That is why, for me, devolution should never be looked at in isolation. It's the local and it's the national. It is at its best when given some proper government momentum and support for particular kinds of innovation. Albeit one of the great things about devolved authorities is that you don't actually have to wait for permission on a lot of things.

So, what I thought I would do is just talk about two particular innovations. One doesn't really count as an innovation, but it is an example of how devolved authority can really make a difference, and without it I think there would be less evolution and progression. My emphasis really is on greatly enhancing community rehabilitation. Everything I talk about is alternatives to prison for the majority of people guilty of non-violent crimes. For better integrated support,

preventing some of the harms of prison, preventing some of the family separation and loss of homes and that cycle of problems, but also getting better support. Also, I should say that the West Midlands PCC's office, and the West Midlands as a whole, the combined authority, did a lot of things which I couldn't get near, and that is testament to the fact that it isn't truly integrated. But these two things I think are really good.

The first one is the establishment of the Birmingham problem solving court. Not the first in the country, there is a very well-known and well cited one in GM, which was a government-backed pilot. It was something that we were advocating a lot behind the scenes. Whether or not we had any influence I don't know. But what I think we helped to do was show the government that we would be up for trying something that potentially had risks involved. This was the last government, so there seems to be some cross-party interest in this as well. Genuinely, and this does offend some people, but I really believe it to be the truth, the court would not have existed without the PCC's office. The bid would not have been put in. But importantly I don't think that some of the ingredients would have been nearly as good. It could not have succeeded without the brilliant work of everybody. I'm not just saying that to be friendly. Probation played a fantastic role in it; the health agency played a fantastic role. Initially, in some of the conversations that were had, they were not really thinking about bringing in health agencies. They were not necessarily talking about restorative justice. In this case it was a women's problem-solving court. They were not talking about the women's centres or specialist women's services, or some of the things they developed that really did mean they were pioneering in some of the work they were doing.

Also, there was not really much awareness of other things in the locality from which we could learn a huge amount. I have heard Kate talk about this. The family drug and alcohol court agenda, which is predominantly children's social care, has taught us a huge amount for the criminal justice context. It is multi-disciplinary, co-located, takes a compassionate lens, takes on particularly complex cases that otherwise would almost certainly go into the very adversarial and harmful routes. It changed the ethos, changed the parties very affected.

Bringing in all these different ingredients only happened because the PCC had the authority to say it, to convene these partners and to act without bureaucracy. That's the real thing: devolution done well can help get things done in a way that government could not do on their own, and probably local authorities would struggle on a regional footprint to do on their own. I think it is those ingredients that really help make it a success. They stood up governance quickly, the office was really excited about the project, so when all sorts of stumbling blocks came up – they are easily resolved. You make a quick complaint to somebody more senior and then it's done, and it's successful. That is one of the models, including GM's, that has been used to influence wider national roll-out. Really exciting, and devolution played a key part in that.

The other example then is slightly different. It is something that I think, again, with good leadership in the mayoral model is not so much of a problem. But I am a little bit worried about the scrapping of PCCs without giving this more thought. I am not a PCC evangelist; I'm a devolution evangelist. But I do want to know how they are going to ensure they protect accountability, and the police role in local accountability.

In the West Midlands, this is one of the things we are doing well. We have got quite a range of different community rehabilitation programmes, some specialist for women, some for people with very long-term serious addictions, restorative justice, specialist stalking programmes, several different substance misuse programmes, all varied in all sorts of ways. Some with some national backing and national funding, some completely locally led, some even led by the police themselves, whereas with others they weren't a willing party. Every single one of them had an independent academic evaluation. For all of them people can conclude they were effective. But the referral rates for these things were just stubbornly low.

There might be a big announcement, the police would know about it – the police were not the only referral agent, but that’s the context we’re talking about here. They would know about it and refer in the first few weeks, but then they would just forget, or somebody would move on, and so these schemes that had excitement from them, that had partnerships, that were trying their best to be more holistic – some of them were still one-dimensional, but they were doing all the things that experts keep saying, and were just not being used.

I won’t get into too much detail but fundamentally it was the PCC. It took seven years or so to work out what the levers were to get them to listen. It was a combination of suggestions and then hard-nosed accountability. The hard-nosed bit was: if you don’t improve this, given that you say in public meetings that you are supportive of the agenda, we will top-slice your budget and get in somebody else to do it. That was the stick. But the carrot was: there is an opportunity to save huge amounts of policing time. A lot of these things would not require CPS files. They are supposed to reduce reoffending, they often do and have been shown to. It was suggesting:

1. Get some data about whether you are using them, so that you know.
2. Please have a hand-over plan, for when key police officers who are responsible for this leave.
3. Please appoint a senior officer, Assistant Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable.

I am really proud of that work, because it did create a gear change in the use of it. It was not perfect, but much better.

Transform Justice did an analysis which found West Midlands still aren’t brilliant at using out of court resolutions. They have heard me talk about this before and they are a little bit sceptical. But I did say to them is that a 1% or 2% increase, depending on the year, is actually hundreds of people in the West Midlands police area going through these schemes. I represent JABBS Foundation for Women and Girls. We are interested in stopping women being caught in the justice system, and it’s the women’s diversion programme that is particularly effective.

As a final remark it is certainly my interpretation that the Government is interested in more diversion, more community rehabilitation for appropriate cohorts of people, and less imprisonment. Whether it’s an economic rationale, a moral one, or anything else, if police forces and other agencies can be strongly encouraged to embrace this – some PCCs seem to really get this, so we need to platform them – then that’s the way we make that government agenda work. It’s in everybody’s interest as well.

**Pam Cox MP** thanked Dr Tom McNeil and noted the importance of the innovation and agility that devolved administrations could have. She too questioned what would happen in respect of accountability without the PCCs. She then opened the meeting up for questions.

**Susan Dungworth** is the PCC for Northumbria. Susan explained she thought this was the sixth biggest PCC area in the country. Susan continued that she has always been a fan of devolution, but thought that the way it was being organised at present posed real challenges. In her area there was a directly elected mayor for the Northeast, but she didn’t cover Teesside or Yorkshire. The Northumbria Police Force fitted within the mayoral model, but she also had Durham. Durham Police Force had Darlington, which was part of Tees Valley mayoralty. So, it was all a bit of a mess, and she shared the speakers’ concerns. Local government and police reform were both going at pace but not meshed. She hoped parliamentarians would exert their influence to improve things.

Susan continued that she would not be carrying on after 2028 so the disappearance of the PCC model didn’t bother her personally, but she thought there were massive issues around accountability. She was very accountable locally, but she was not convinced that the old

local authority police committee formats would be so. The level of scrutiny on her local fire authority was dismal. The PCC could act quickly, as was demonstrated in the 2024 disturbances. They had a budget and could get in resources quickly. But currently the mayoral model does not have a precept and does not raise its own funds. Susan continued that problems arise when they needed a decision from government, which takes forever. Her office expressed an interest in doing an intensive supervision (problem-solving) court for the women's pathways. The team worked hard to ensure all partners including judges were involved and are still waiting for an answer. Meanwhile women were still going to prison, not getting support, families were being broken up. She and her team are innovative but held up by a creaky system. GM had the benefit of maturity, so had more access to funds, but most PCCs had to apply for money all the time.

**Pam Cox MP** said she would take more observations and questions and then ask the panel to respond.

**Claire Hubberstey** asked the panel for reflections on how organisations could best position themselves to transition from one situation to the other. In her area the PCC was standing as mayor, and all the focus was on that. The new mayoral area did not map onto the PCC area. She welcomed any comments.

**Pam Cox MP** noted that many members of the APPG were organisations that offered services, and that was partly why this session had been arranged, almost as a clinic to assist people.

**Andrew Neilson** said the first policy paper he wrote for the Howard League eighteen years ago was on localism, about justice reinvestment, which went to a pilot in Manchester. At the last election, people got in touch to ask whether the concept of justice reinvestment could be pushed again with the new government. Then rapidly the capacity crisis in prisons took over, and the need to reduce the workload of probation. The implication of the Sentencing Act being to shift the burden from custody to community. The idea of looking again at the structure of the probation service, and whether it was sufficiently localised, disappeared as an opportunity, because of the need to reduce the workload by say 25%. Andrew added he was interested to hear the panel's views, in the light of what was happening in the Home Office.

**Pam Cox MP** said this was an interesting question. She used to lecture on justice reinvestment. The language had shifted, and no-one talked about that now. She invited the panel to respond to any of those questions.

**Kate Green** responded to Claire's Hubberstey's question about how organisations should take advantage of the coming of the mayoral model. Kate advised clarifying the new mayor's ambitions and priorities. One of the powerful things GM had developed was the mayoral strategy, which set out the mayor's priorities. Kate's team played themselves explicitly into these priorities, e.g. housing, employment, education etc. The mayor agreed that to achieve the things he wanted, they had to build safer stronger communities. So, Kate continued that her advice would be to speak to the broader ambitions of an incoming mayor, and show how by reinvesting the gains from good preventative work you would achieve other objectives. For example, GM is developing a prevention demonstrator, which was a piece of work owned by the mayor. One strand involved the DWP, and getting 4,000 economically inactive people back into work. They knew that many of those people would have been involved, or at risk of involvement, with the criminal justice system so both CH and employment outcomes could be identified from use of the DWP budget. N At present work was on-going. Kate added that she used to be a proponent, when Labour was in power in the early 2000s, of Opportunity for All, an index of socio-economic outcomes which the whole government was signed up to achieving. Unfortunately, it got scrapped after a few years, but she urged

people to look at it again. It spoke to the justice reinvestment model, which was not just about saving money on the criminal justice system but contributing to a range of socio-economic gains, nationally and regionally, across the board.

**Dr Tom McNeil** noted that, although it would differ according to area, in his experience there were not that many people interested in crime and justice, no matter how relevant it was to the bigger picture. So, similarly to Kate, his organisation was deploying certain strategies. Firstly, to make the narrative relevant to issues that were core mayoralty and combined authority business: local skills shortages and how they tied into local economic growth and homelessness for example. Secondly, identifying people locally who were interested in championing it, for example a couple of supportive MPs, who could get you through the door. Good relationships could take you a long way. From a different perspective, the West Midlands PCC didn't really have much money and lots of people were fighting over scraps. Tom added that the ones who came out winners were those who presented themselves as flexible team players, so far as it fitted the work of their organisations. They were the ones most likely to agree to a slightly unlikely co-location arrangement, or to stick with it when trying to get a new NHS budget aligned locally. That could make a big difference. He was thinking of a couple of women's centres in particular. Finally, Tom concluded something that could be done now would be around siloed efforts of integrated work. Under the new government's recent budgets there were some bigger investments in these things, and if more areas could follow GM's lead in integrating work, this money could be made to work more effectively for criminal justice. Legitimate but clever framing could yield more return.

**Andrew Scott** added that the 25% work was continuing, and innovation was important. He could not hide away from impact of overcrowding on those in prison and probation. Over the past five or six years the voice of probation had not really been heard. They were not round the table: they were an add-on. How could you look at crime panels if people from probation were not there. Something they were doing in Wigan involved a 'problematic caseload', the top 20 people who were causing most problems for police and localities. Not from probation, some of them had never touched the criminal justice system, but what probation were doing was providing their help and support to steer them away and make sure they never reached the criminal justice system in the first place, via a multi-agency decision panel of providers and partners. Integration was important so that the cohort of offenders was not seen in one place and everybody else in another.

**Kate Green** mentioned that GM was building a shared data platform for all the agencies so that police could refer people quickly across to wellbeing hubs, and probation could plan a sequenced series of interventions, having a full picture of an individual's different social needs. That had had great support from the MoJ. Other areas might be interested, though there would be data-sharing implications to be worked through. It would be so powerful for GM to have that, because for example sometimes you needed to sort out someone's housing need before you sent them to a drug treatment service. They would build in peer support too.

**Lord Bradley** asked whether this data sharing would flow throughout the criminal justice system, from the police through health, the courts and the prison system and back out again. Too often these agencies did not speak to each other, and if this were possible it would be a massive achievement

**Andrew Scott** said that information from the court perspective could be gained from the probation element, and similarly from the prisons. Starting with Probation, Police and health, they would hope to build out. One problem, however, was that everyone had different systems.

**Pam Cox MP** asked Kate Green if she could come and present on that topic to the Justice Select Committee.

**Richard Garside** contrasted the ability of PCCs and the Mayor's office to embrace innovation and get things done with the centre's apparent inability to do so. Why were the MoJ and the Home Office so bad at this? What were the lessons for Whitehall?

**Pia Sinha** asked as a subsidiary question how the £700 million that had been promised could be prevented from going down a black hole.

**Lord Bradley** noted that it was the Treasury's assessment that mattered in central government. Because of the Treasury's 3 to 5-year time frames, when looking at preventative programmes they never looked at what would happen in 20 years. A classic example was SureStart. If you looked at that, 20 years on, the benefits not just for the children but the families, had been immense. He hoped that the Government was on a path to reinventing SureStart, but they had had to convince the Treasury. When he had wanted money for developing Liaison and Diversion services, the critical moment was convincing two Treasury officials who were interested. He had showed them the pilot scheme in Bristol, and they became the advocates to get the money into mainstream funding.

**Pam Cox MP** thanked Lord Bradley for that interesting thought and said that unfortunately time was running out. An hour had not been long enough for such a meaty topic. She thanked everyone for coming and travelling to be there. She was concerned lest we had seen the high point of devolution in Greater Manchester. There was danger of that unravelling, given all the changes in prospect.

There was a round of applause for the speakers.

The next APPG meeting will be 24 March, speaker to be confirmed.