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Foreword

“Children are bought and sold, subjected to a contemporary form of slavery. Illegal in most societies, such practices persist, often deeply hidden and sometimes blatantly ignored. Children abused through prostitution are treated as discarded commodities to satisfy the demand for perverse sexual gratification. Their rights to survival, protection and development are violated. We must protect our children. Our children are our future” (World Congress 1996)

I was at the world congress in 1996 when the UK Government signed up to the agenda for action and agreed to have in place by the year 2000, a national plan to end the commercial sexual exploitation of children. At that time, ‘sex tourism’ was the particular focus of concern and had recently been highlighted in the ECPAT (End Child Prostitution and Tourism) Campaign.

It was the children’s voluntary organisations, and in particular Barnardo’s and the Children’s Society, who pointed out that there was no need for abusers to wait for their 2 week holiday each year to have sex with children. Children were being bought and sold in all major towns and cities throughout the UK.

In 1994, I created the Barnardos triangles, which I took to the World Congress in 1996. They were subsequently reproduced in the Utting Report, ‘People Like Us’ in 1997, and in ‘Whose Daughter Next?’ in 1998. Over the intervening years I have varied these slightly.

1. Prostitution / Sex Industry Triangle

   Child Prostitute / Rent Boy

   Punter / Buyer  Pimp / Facilitator

2. Abuse Triangle

   Abused Child

   Child Sex Abusing Adult Offender

   Abusing Adult

The model reminds us that language defines our perceptions and informs our attitudes. The sex industry triangle suggests that a child prostitute / rent boy is choosing their lifestyle, it allows the facilitators, pimps and punters to justify and attempt spuriously to legitimise their abuse of children. The abuse triangle clearly defines the adults as perpetrators of abuse and ensures a degree of realism in understanding the harm inflicted on and suffered by these children. The form of the triangle reflects that there is a supply and demand side to the problem and that intervening in the entire system will have a more successful outcome than focussing on any individual part.

Having now completed this review I think the triangles should be moved on one step further, by creating number 3 triangle and turning it upside down.

3. Prosecution / Protection Triangle

   Abusing Adult

   Child Sex Offender

   Abused Child

   iv
Triangle number 3 should ensure that the focus is more, or at least equally, on the abusers and coercers and not the pathology of the individual child or their particular circumstances. Libby Fry, who set up Barnardo’s young women’s project in London, said “Our greatest challenge, through the competing demands of our work, is to hear these young peoples voices clearly, and to respond with sensitivity and courage”. I believe we particularly need the courage to tackle the abusers more effectively.

The involvement of children in prostitution remains an issue about which many individuals feel very passionate and, indeed, one of my telephone calls on the targeted survey lasted for 1 hour and 35 minutes. As one respondent said; “It is the will and commitment of individuals in an organisation that can make a difference”.

This review, while having many limitations in terms of time and resources, will show that we are beginning to make a difference for future generations of vulnerable young people. We have now firmly established that at least 111 ACPCs in England recognise that this is an issue that they need to address.

This report is not about ‘naming and shaming’ who has, and who has not, implemented the guidance. It is about recognising the progress that has been made, while at the same time identifying that there is still a long way to go, and that not only local, but also regional and national strategies must play a part.

I would like to recognise the work of my colleague and co-author of this report, Val Balding, whose tireless enthusiasm and hard work has ensured that this research has been completed. She has made an invaluable contribution with her research knowledge and has always kept me focussed and on track.

Finally I would like to dedicate this report to Anne Van Meeuwen, my former ‘Boss’ at Barnardo’s, who had volunteered to proof read this work, but who tragically died at home on 28 October 2001. She will always be a friend who is sadly missed.

Sara Swann MBE
November 2001
Key Facts

The review was commissioned in July 2001 by the Department of Health to assess the implementation and impact of the Safeguarding Children involved in Prostitution Guidance.

A. Review achievements

- Involved all ACPCs in England
- 100% response rate to both initial overview and targeted survey

B. Children involved in prostitution in England

Initial Overview

- 76% of all ACPCs in England said that there were children involved in prostitution in their area
- 5.5% of all ACPCs did not know whether or not children were involved in prostitution in their area
- 90.9% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area indicated that girls are involved in prostitution in their area
- 62.2% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area indicated that boys are involved in prostitution in their area
- 41.4% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that just girls were involved in prostitution in their area
- 0.9% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that just boys were involved in prostitution in their area
- 49.6% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that both girls and boys were involved in prostitution in their area
- 8.1% of the 111 ACPCs who said that children were involved in prostitution in their area could not give a gender breakdown of children involved in prostitution in their area

Targeted survey

- 84% of the 50 targeted ACPCs said that children were involved in prostitution in their area
- 2% of the 50 targeted ACPCs did not know whether or not children were involved in prostitution in their area
- 69% of the 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that girls were involved
- 42.9% of the 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area suggested that boys were involved
- 28.6% of the 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that just girls were involved in prostitution in their area
- 2.4% of the 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area said that just boys were involved in prostitution in their area
- There are an average of 19 girls involved in prostitution in an area at any given time
- There are an average of 3 boys involved in prostitution in an area at any given time

C. Protocols

Initial Overview

- 89.7% of all ACPCs in England have protocols (either finalised or in draft format)
- 91% of the 111 ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area have protocols (either finalised or in draft format)
- 65.7% of all the protocols are finalised
Targeted survey

- 90% of 50 targeted ACPCs have protocols (either finalised or in draft format)
- 92.9% of 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area have protocols
- 70% of targeted ACPC protocols are finalised
- 48% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have had training on protocols
- 74% of the 50 targeted ACPCs said that the Guidance was helpful in developing their protocol
- 34% of the 50 targeted ACPCs could not provide numerical data on how many times their protocols had been used

D. Procedures and Systems

Initial Overview

- 51.4% of all ACPCs in England have established a sub-committee / steering group to tackle this issue
- 45.2% of 111 ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area have a sub-committee / steering group to tackle this issue

Targeted survey

- 74% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have established a sub-committee / steering group to tackle this issue
- 72% of 42 targeted ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area have a sub-committee / steering group to tackle this issue
- 6% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have young people on their steering groups
- 76% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have some form of specialist police provision
- 56% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have intelligence gathering on both abusers and coercers
- 20% of the 50 targeted ACPCs said they had successfully prosecuted coercers and abusers

E. Impact

Initial Overview

- 30.8% of all ACPCs in England said they have a specialist resource or service in their area
- 0.7% of all ACPCs did not know whether or not they have a specialist resource or service in their area
- 38.7% of the 111 ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area have a specialist resource or service in their area

Targeted survey

- 72% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have preventive strategies
- 32% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have young missing person schemes
- 22% of the 50 targeted ACPCs believed that the Guidance was being successful in meeting the aim of protecting children
- 50% of the 50 targeted ACPCs believed that the Guidance had at least begun to meet the aim of protecting children
- 52% of the 50 targeted ACPCs have a recovery strategy
- 14% of the targeted 50 ACPCs said that they believed that they had at least made a start in prosecuting abusers
- 6% of the 50 targeted ACPCs said they believe they are meeting the dual aims of protecting children and prosecuting abusers.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Government’s National Plan for Safeguarding Children from Commercial Sexual Exploitation was published in September 2001. One of the key areas for future action in this plan is to ensure the effective implementation of the Government's Safeguarding Children involved in Prostitution Guidance - supplementary guidance to Working Together to Safeguard Children - published in May 2000.

The Department of Health commissioned this short-term project to provide basic quantitative data to measure the extent to which the Guidance is being implemented throughout England. The quantitative data is enhanced by in-depth qualitative analysis assessing the extent to which the Guidance is impacting on the working practice of agencies who come into contact with children involved in, or who are at risk of becoming involved in, prostitution.

1.1. Aims and Objectives of the Review

The main aims and objectives of the review can be divided into two distinct elements: implementation and impact.

- **Implementation**
  - assess how well the Guidance has been implemented across the country;
  - identify examples of good practice;
  - identify any difficulties with, and obstacles to, its implementation

- **Impact**
  - Assess the overall effect that the Guidance has had on:
    - preventing children from becoming involved in prostitution and in providing those who are involved with opportunities and strategies to leave
    - Identifying and prosecuting those who coerce children through prostitution

1.2. The Review Process

The implementation aspects are more straightforward to measure in terms of hard data, than the impact that the Guidance has made. Thus, the review process was divided into three components: an initial overview followed by an in-depth targeted survey and finally a seminar for selected participants. The initial overview gives a comprehensive indication of how the Guidance is being implemented on a national basis. The targeted follow-up survey provides a more detailed analysis of how the Guidance is being implemented, the impact the Guidance is having on children and agencies as well as identifying examples of good practice.

**Phase One: Initial overview survey**

The initial overview survey consisted of a brief telephone survey directed initially to Chairs of ACPCs, but redirected in the main to Lead Officers for Child Protection from Social Service Departments. This included all 146 Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs) present in England.

The initial overview sought answers to the following brief questions:

1) Are you aware of the Government Guidance ‘Safeguarding Children involved in Prostitution’?
2) Does your area have any children involved in prostitution?
3) Does the ACPC have an inter-agency steering group established to tackle the issue of children being involved in, or who are at risk of becoming involved in prostitution?
4) Do you have a local Protocol for tackling this problem in line with the Government Guidance?
5) Have you identified any specialist provision / resource for these young people in your area?
All 146 ACPCs in England were contacted; all responded. All ACPCs responded that they were aware of the Guidance.

**Phase Two: Targeted follow-up survey**

The follow-up interviews were again conducted as a telephone survey and involved 50 ACPCs. Participants for the targeted interviews were chosen from specific groups. Inclusion into the groups was determined by their response to the questions from the initial overview and were dependent upon the following criteria:

- ACPCs with no recognised problem of children being involved in prostitution (to include those both with and without protocols).
- ACPCs with a recognised problem of children being involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution (to include those both with and without protocols).
- ACPCs with a specialised resource for tackling the problem of children being involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution.

The fifty ACPCs were divided into these groups, but did not reflect an accurate ratio for each group on the proportions identified in the overview survey. Greater emphasis was given to those groups that were identified as implementing good practice. It was also important to ensure that the review assessed the measures taken to find out if problems exist within an area, as well as including ACPCs from different geographical regions, with examples where possible from Counties, Metropolitans, Unitaries and London Boroughs.

**The Seminar**

It was agreed to organise a seminar for up to 40 participants as part of the review process. The purpose of the seminar was to act both as a mechanism for the dissemination of the initial survey findings and as an instrument for enhancing the findings of the review. The focus of the seminar was on the practical issues of both problems and solutions that have arisen in implementing the Guidance.

ACPC participation in the seminar was based on responses to the follow-up targeted survey. Some of the ACPCs who seemed to be making good progress, had specific issues they were grappling with, or were looking at innovative solutions. It was on an invitation basis, and included representatives from 15 ACPCs, children’s voluntary organisations, Metropolitan Police, as well as Home Office and Department of Health officials. The seminar facilitated a two way process as ACPC participants had access to Government officials who were also able to learn first hand about obstacles and difficulties ACPCs were facing in practice.

Findings from the seminar, which were useful in reinforcing information gathered in the targeted survey, are included in this report as a mechanism for bringing together all aspects of the review.

**1.3 The Guidance**

In May 2000 the Government published “Safeguarding Children Involved in Prostitution”, as supplementary guidance to “Working Together to Safeguard Children”. This supplementary guidance must be complied with unless there are agreed local circumstances that require an exception to be made. It was issued under section 7 of the Local Authority Act 1970 to Social Services Departments, as a Home Office circular to all Chief Constables and applies to all other agencies and professionals working with children under sect 27 & 47 of Children Act duties. It is based on the understanding that children
who are involved in prostitution are exposed to abuse and assault. It deprives them of their childhood; it may even threaten their lives and certainly causes long term harm.

The Objective

The two main purposes for agencies working together under the Guidance are:

- To safeguard and promote the welfare of children
- To investigate & prosecute those who coerce and abuse children through prostitution

The Guidance establishes that the primary law enforcement effort must be against abusers and coercers. Children should be seen as victims and the emphasis must be to prevent their entry into ‘prostitution’.

ACPC Obligations

There is a clear role set out for all Area Child Protection Committees:

- Actively to enquire into the extent of children involved in prostitution
- To develop a local protocol on children involved in prostitution, and to monitor and review the operation of the protocol
- To provide a local resource and a source of expertise for those who have concerns that a child may be at risk of being drawn into prostitution or is being abused through prostitution

Report Structure

This report presents the findings of all 3 elements of the review; initial overview, targeted survey and seminar. It begins by outlining the extent to which the Guidance is being implemented in England, focusing on the obligations required of ACPCs as presented above.

The latter sections of the report consider the impact the Guidance has had on agencies that come into contact with children involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution.

The concluding section describes some of the successes and difficulties of implementing the Guidance and presents some recommendations for moving ACPCs and policy makers forward in their endeavour to prevent children from being abused through prostitution.
2. CHILDREN INVOLVED IN PROSTITUTION: A National Perspective

“Children involved in prostitution are a particularly vulnerable group of children who may become ‘lost’ to the statutory agents whose wellbeing or need for immediate services may be overlooked and for whom subsequent planning and intervention may be less than satisfactory”. (Guidance sect 5.11)

The following section of this report focuses on the extent to which children are involved in prostitution, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution. Data presented in this section reflects responses from both the initial overview and the targeted follow-up survey.

2.1 Active Enquiry

The Guidance gives a clear role to ACPCs to actively enquire into the extent of children involved in prostitution in their area. It should not be assumed that this is not a problem locally. The targeted survey found that a number of mechanisms have been engaged in order to discover whether or not an area has any children involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution.

Occasionally the discovery was made accidentally, with incidents or referrals being brought to the attention of Social Service Departments or youth service. Some areas have recognised this is happening in their local children’s homes. Barnardos SALs project (Annual Report 1996) identified that children were more vulnerable to involvement if they had been harmed through previous abuse (physical, sexual and emotional), and if they were separated from their families. Young people in the ‘looked after’ systems are therefore particularly unsafe and even more so if they have suffered previous abuse. Some ACPCs considered that their local authority homes were being targeted by groups of men, and this was often linked to taxi firms.

Certain ACPCs, such as, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Peterborough and Plymouth have acquired evidence through research (such as questionnaires to all professionals or other mapping exercises).

The most common way in which ACPCs discover and monitor the situation is through multi-agency steering groups formed to specifically share information concerning this issue. Many ACPCs who have acknowledged that children are involved in prostitution are currently discussing how best to find out how prevalent the problem is in their areas.

Most areas that have no perceived problem of any young people involved in prostitution seem to have been less proactive in making any detailed enquiries. Some comments included:

“We know there isn’t a problem here as we’ve asked the police and they said this is not an issue here”

“We checked with the GUM clinic and we were advised by them that there was no problem in this area”

It would appear that some areas still consider it almost a failing to consider they may have a problem and two ACPCs in particular seemed horrified and outraged that it may have been suggested that they had any young people involved in their area.

Some examples of good practice include: In Plymouth research was conducted 2 years ago by a social worker; in Cambridgeshire a social worker was seconded for eight days to scope the problem; Cheshire commissioned a mapping exercise 3 years ago, sending out questionnaires and are going to repeat the exercise.
Peterborough also conducted a mapping exercise, sending out 50 questionnaires to different agencies. Twenty-six were returned and from that 26, 17 said they had experienced or suspected strongly that a young person was involved in prostitution.

It may well be that some areas do not have any children involved in prostitution, although it is difficult to understand the difference between certain ACPCs and why some particular areas are aware and others are not. It would seem that certain ACPCs are forming too narrow a definition of the term “prostitution” and that some ACPCs are assuming there is no problem, purely as they have no designated red light area.

A chair of one particular group commented:

“Now the problem has been acknowledged here it’s on a far greater scale than we thought”.

Similarly when the problem has been recognised, many ACPCs commented that prioritising resources does seem to become an issue. ACPCs highlighted that the Guidance had not arrived with any ring-fenced resources and that finding out about a problem or discovering that it exists does then become an issue of prioritising limited resources. It was hinted by several ACPCs that it was almost easier not to look for these particular young people, not only because of the lack of resources, but also because there appeared to be no simple solutions.

There are many resources available for vulnerable young people, and there does still seem to exist some myths around these young people having made certain choices, they may be seen as less deserving than others, and there is an under estimation of the degree of harm that they suffer.

One respondent commented:

“We have 3 or 4 girls involved here, I call them the ‘good time girls’.

### 2.2 Children involved in prostitution in England

The following tables present data relating to the number of children involved in prostitution in England. The initial overview data is followed by the data extracted from the targeted survey.
Table 1: Initial Overview: All ACPCs in England by Children involved in prostitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>With no children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 (76%)</td>
<td>27 (18.5%)</td>
<td>8 (5.5%)</td>
<td>146 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 1, of the 146 ACPCs in England, 111 (76%) said that there were children involved in prostitution in their area. A further 8 (5.5%) ACPCs suggested that they did not know whether or not children were involved in prostitution in their area and 27 (18.5%) asserted that they did not have any children involved in prostitution in their area.

Table 2: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Children involved in prostitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>With no children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 (84%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that 42 (84%) of the 50 ACPCs in the targeted survey acknowledged that they were aware of children being involved in prostitution in their area.

2.3 Gender

There has been an increased awareness of the involvement of boys and young men in prostitution (Barnardos, 2001). The following tables are intended to measure the extent to which both girls and boys are actually involved in prostitution and whether ACPC representatives considered both girls and boys at risk of becoming involved in prostitution in their area.
Table 3: Initial Overview: Children involved in prostitution by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just girls (Just boys)</td>
<td>46 (41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both girls and boys</td>
<td>55 (49.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Not stated</td>
<td>6 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that more areas have girls involved in prostitution nationally than boys, with a total of 101 (90.9%) ACPCs indicating that girls are involved in prostitution in their area and 56 (62.2%) ACPCs suggesting that boys are involved in prostitution in their areas.

Figure 3: Initial Overview: Children involved in prostitution by Gender

Table 4: Targeted Survey: Children involved in prostitution by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of ACPCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just girls / Both girls</td>
<td>42 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just boys</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 42 ACPCs who acknowledged that children were involved in prostitution in their area, 18 ACPCs said that boys were involved in prostitution and 29 suggested that girls were involved. Whilst 1 ACPC said that only boys were involved in prostitution in their area, only 1-2 individual boys had been identified per year. Twelve ACPCs acknowledge that just girls were involved in prostitution in their area.

Figure 4: Targeted Survey: Children involved in prostitution by Gender

Twelve of the 50 targeted ACPCs said that children were involved in prostitution in their area, but they did not know whether this included girls or boys or both and therefore, did not give any figures for how many girls or boys were involved in prostitution. Only 7 of the 50 ACPCs interviewed said that they did not have any children involved in prostitution in their area and 1 ACPC didn’t know whether there were any children involved in prostitution in their area.
Table 5: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Number of children or young people involved in prostitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of children or young people</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls or young women</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys or young men</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall average number of children or young people involved in prostitution calculated on the basis that 42 ACPCs were able to provide specific data.

Twenty-eight ACPCs from the targeted 50 gave figures of how many girls were involved in prostitution in their area, with a total of 545 girls. This gives an average of 19 girls. Eighteen ACPCs from the targeted survey gave figures of how many boys were involved in prostitution in their area, with a total of 57 boys. This gives an average of 3 boys. As the review can only provide data for the 28 ACPCs who provided specific figures, the total of 602 children or young people involved in prostitution, does not reflect the total number of children or young people identified as being involved in prostitution in England.

Figure 5: Number of children or young people involved in prostitution by Gender

Table 5 above, shows that the average number of girls involved in prostitution per area (19) is far higher than the average number of boys involved (3). The highest number of individual girls involved in prostitution in an area at any given time was said to be 60, whilst the highest number of individual boys was 12. The most frequent number of individual girls argued to be involved in prostitution in one area at any given time was 6 and for boys this number decreased to 1 or 2 individuals.

Children at Risk of Becoming Involved in Prostitution

Table 6: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Children at risk of becoming involved in prostitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Just girls</th>
<th>Just boys</th>
<th>Both girls and boys</th>
<th>Yes, but don’t know who</th>
<th>Neither or don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>36 (72%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 (88%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 (12%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that of the 50 ACPCs interviewed in the targeted survey, 44 (88%) indicated that they thought that children were at risk of becoming involved in prostitution in their area. Thirty-six (82%) of these considered both girls and boys to be at risk of becoming involved in prostitution. Whilst Table 4 showed that 84% of the 50 ACPCs acknowledged that there were children actually involved in prostitution in their area, when asked if they considered children to be at risk of becoming involved in prostitution this increased to 88%.

When the issue of gender is taken into consideration the division between boys actually being involved in prostitution or considered at risk of becoming involved in prostitution is increased. Eighteen (36%) of the 50 ACPCs acknowledged that boys are involved in
prostitution and 36 (72%) ACPCs considered boys to be at risk of becoming involved in prostitution in their area.

This is not to suggest that the problem of boys being involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution is not as serious as the problem of girls being involved in or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution. However, maintaining a realistic perspective on the situation is important, and must be borne in mind when allocating scarce resources.

Many of the ACPCs who were unable to give specific numbers commented that this research was too early from the publication of the guidance.

2.4 Location

The following tables concentrate on those ACPCs interviewed for the targeted survey, who acknowledged the presence of children involved in prostitution in their area.

Table 7: Targeted Survey: ACPCs with children involved in prostitution by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Just visible</th>
<th>Just invisible</th>
<th>Both visible and invisible</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both girls and boys</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 7 above, that children involved in prostitution may be an ‘invisible’ problem. This is to suggest that children are involved in locations, which are not traditional street locations. Thirty-six ACPCs said that children were involved in prostitution in ‘invisible’ or ‘off-street’ locations. These included private flats, bedsits, rooms, sauna/massage establishments, children being taken to hotels and 7 ACPCs indicated that children were involved in prostitution in their own homes.

Figure 6: Targeted Survey: ACPCs with children involved in prostitution by Location

Twenty-eight ACPCs said that children were involved in prostitution in visible locations. These locations included, traditional ‘red light districts’ (25) and Gay ‘cruising / cottaging’ areas (8). Other visible locations included lay-bys in the country and boys being taken to ‘recreation’ areas.

In a significant number of ACPC areas it was apparent that taxi drivers were involved in transporting children to locations for the purposes of prostitution. Given that taxi firms are required to apply for licenses this could be one area where intelligence could be used to withdraw or deny licenses to private hire companies who may be facilitating the sexual exploitation of children. Whilst 2 ACPC said that newspapers were being used to advertise children, a number of ACPCs also indicated that the Internet is increasingly being used for
CHILDREN INVOLVED IN PROSTITUTION

the purposes of prostitution. The Internet is being used by ‘pimps’ to ‘advertise’ individual children, and by perpetrators as a forum for meeting individual children through utilising ‘chat rooms’ and ‘bulletin boards’.

Some comments from the review

“We have had men breaking into homes and dragging children away from parents”
“It’s hard to identify young people who are not visible on the streets”
“Watch for young people in the looked after setting being targeted by older men”
“We had a ‘punter’ tell us about two 14 year olds who had been advertised on the net, as he was so horrified about their age”
“It’s hard to maintain a commitment to this and to keep looking, when there is always something new on the agenda”
“We need ring-fenced resources to research this issue”

Movement between geographical locations

Some ACPCs commented about the lack of national information:

“We need to share intelligence around networks nationally to know if young people go to certain areas / or are found in certain areas where they may be more vulnerable”

Table 8: Targeted Survey: ACPCs with children moving between locations by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taken/ going to other areas</th>
<th>Being brought / coming into area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just girls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both girls and boys</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International trafficking in children has been recognised as a serious problem. There are numerous examples and ECPAT recently highlighted reports of children being taken from Africa, via the UK, to become involved in prostitution in Italy. However there does seem to be a lack of information or hard facts about the trafficking of children for sexual purposes on a national basis. As can be seen from Table 8 above, 35 of the 50 targeted ACPCs recognised that children and young people are moving between areas. This involved either being taken or going to other areas, or being brought or coming into an area.

The review was given some details of locations with clear links between certain towns but it was beyond the scope of this review to explore the issue of geographical locations, or the implications for intelligence gathering.
3. LOCAL PROTOCOLS

“ACPCs should make arrangements to develop a protocol on children involved in prostitution and take responsibility for monitoring and reviewing its operation” (Guidance sect 5.2)

3.1 Requirements

A part of the remit of this review was to ascertain whether protocols had been created and whether they were working in practice. While a simple question could resolve which ACPCs have formed local protocols (overview survey) it was not so straightforward to verify whether they were working in practice.

Table 9: Initial Overview: All ACPCs with children involved in prostitution by Local protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACPCs with children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>Protocol finalised</th>
<th>Draft Protocol</th>
<th>No Protocol</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs</td>
<td>74 (66.7%)</td>
<td>27 (24.3%)</td>
<td>10 (9.0%)</td>
<td>111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>101 (91.0%)</td>
<td>10 (9.0%)</td>
<td>111 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>22 (62.9%)</td>
<td>8 (22.9%)</td>
<td>5 (14.3%)</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>96 (92.9%)</td>
<td>35 (37.5%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>146 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131 (89.7%)</td>
<td>15 (10.3%)</td>
<td>146 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that of the 111 ACPCs who indicated that they did have children involved in prostitution in their area, 101 (91%) have a local Protocol and that 74 of these are finalised and 27 are in draft format. Given that the Guidance had only been in effect for 15 months up to this review, the overall response to prepare and produce protocols shows a positive commitment from ACPCs.

Figure 7: Initial Overview: ACPCs with children involved in prostitution by Local protocol

Table 10: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Local protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACPCs with Children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>Protocol finalised</th>
<th>Draft protocol</th>
<th>No protocol</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs</td>
<td>32 (76.2%)</td>
<td>7 (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>39 (92.9%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution / or don’t know</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>35 (70%)</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 10, 45 (90%) of the 50 ACPCs interviewed in the targeted survey have protocols.
Only 9 of the 50 targeted ACPCs could provide data regarding the actual number of times that their protocols have been used. The number of times Protocols had been used varied from 2 to 20 times within the last 12 months for girls and once or twice for boys. Whilst some ACPCs had only been required to use their protocols for girls, those ACPCs who had utilised their protocols for boys had also used them for girls.

### 3.2 Dissemination

Those ACPCs with finalised protocols seem to have disseminated their documents widely through the ACPC partners linked to their usual channels for child protection information.

There were 3 leaflets submitted to the review, one from Lincolnshire, which was aimed at all professionals from whatever agency who may be working with children. One from Sheffield aimed at parents and one from Swindon aimed at the public in general. While it has not been possible to reproduce them in this report they are all clear and straightforward, outlining warning signs and including sources of help and advice with contact numbers. It was interesting that each of the leaflets was aimed at a different group.

### 3.3 Training

“ACPCs should also consider the need for appropriate interdisciplinary training to raise awareness amongst professionals who work with children and / or with adults who abuse children through prostitution” (Guidance sect 5.7).

| Table 11: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Training |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                               | Training        | No training     | Total           |
| No protocol or draft protocol | 1 (2%)          | 14 (28%)        | 15 (30%)        |
| Protocol                      | 23 (46%)        | 12 (24%)        | 35 (70%)        |
| Total                         | 24 (48%)        | 26 (52%)        | 50 (100%)       |

From the targeted survey of 50 ACPCs, less than 50% (i.e. 24) said they had given training on their protocols. Twenty-two ACPCs said that the training was multi agency. Much of this training was a part of the training on all new procedures, as ACPCs have been re writing all their procedures in line with the new *Working Together to Safeguard Children*.

Five ACPCs with draft protocols and 1 ACPC with no protocol said that they were planning to have training sessions in the future. Seven ACPCs with protocols said that they were planning to have training sessions in the future, 4 said that they did not know whether training sessions were planned for the future and one said that they were not planning any training sessions.

Wirral had a large awareness raising conference and have had 6 multi-agency training days over the past 12 months specifically committed to this issue. These have been funded through the ACPC. They said: “We had not identified a problem here before the training, but now we always get referrals after the training, the more training, the more referrals”
It is difficult to know how professionals and practitioners working in the field will become aware of this issue without training and awareness raising. Some ACPCs such as Derby said there had been briefings on the protocols, and had identified the need for further training. Others had done large multi agency awareness raising events, sometimes linked to the launch of the protocols. From these events some had identified the need for follow up training (Bolton) but for other ACPCs training on this issue has not been included on their training agenda.

It must be recognised that for many ACPCs this is still very early days, although the need for resources impacts on the provision of training.

“We need training and education of professional staff across the county to ensure that the process and system are understood by all staff, but resources are limited and there are so many competing priorities”.

The other competing priority is on staff time. One ACPC training event had to be cancelled through lack of attendance. From the targeted survey 26 ACPCs (more than 50%) have done no training at all.

“We need training and education for professionals across the county”

“Training police officers is difficult as there are so many officers dealing with young missing persons, but only a few will come across young people becoming involved in prostitution – it’s an issue of resources”

3.4 Content

There were 27 local protocols submitted to the review, many following the blue print from Nottingham, who were referred to as an example in the Guidance. Nottingham has sent out more than 200 copies of their protocols and procedures.

The Guidance was deliberately not prescriptive and expected local agencies to develop their own protocols depending on response to identified local need and circumstances. However the 27 varied substantially, the shortest consisting of 2 sides of A4 and the longest was a book of 54 pages. Many did not have a ‘local’ feel or indeed contain local contacts or local resources. Certainly the comment that “ACPCs are re-writing the same Protocols” may mean that many do not reflect the local situation. The Guidance says that protocols should also include:

- What services are available locally and how to gain access to them, and the locally agreed criteria for accessing them.
- What sources of further advice and expertise are available, who to contact, in what circumstances and how.

The following was one comment echoed by many:

"There is a need for a national template protocol from the Government for ACPCs".
A template would allow for local interpretation but could lead to more consistency and certainly may avoid the following comment that; “Procedures can be more for covering your back rather than being proactive”, which seemed to sum up many participants’ views. Another ACPC said that; “The Guidance and procedures are still far too vague”.

Definitions
Definitions within the protocols varied considerably. The following are examples:

“Child Prostitution is a form of sexual exploitation of young people under the age of 18 years, who have needs that would compromise their ability to provide informed consent”.

“Child Prostitution in this document should be regarded as meaning children involved in street prostitution, organised brothels or other sexual exploitation”.

“Children involved in sexual activity for payment / reward or through coercion / exploitation (defined and referred to as ‘prostitution’ by the DoH)”

“The phrases sexual exploitation and abuse refer to the involvement of children in any form of sexual activity, on the basis of exchange for money or goods (that may be necessary to the child’s survival, a place to sleep, or for protection from further abuse by another person)”.

Some protocols referred only to children and young people up to the age of 18 years, while others included young people up to the age of 21 years who are in the ‘looked after’ system and for whom they have a statutory leaving care responsibility.

Helpfulness of the Guidance in developing local protocols

Table 12: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Helpfulness of the Guidance in developing local protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance was helpful in developing protocol</th>
<th>Guidance wasn't helpful</th>
<th>Don’t know or not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-seven of the targeted ACPCs said that the Guidance was helpful in developing their protocol. Five said that it wasn't helpful. Four of these had already finalised their protocols prior to receiving the Guidance.

Figure 10: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Helpfulness of the Guidance

Some comments given to the review

“The Guidance itself was long on concern and short on practical tools”.
“This issue has not been identified as a training need on our training agenda”.
“We’re struggling to find the printing costs for our local protocol”.

4. PROCEDURES and SYSTEMS

4.1 Inter-agency working: Sharing information

‘In essence, all statutory agencies and professionals are expected to work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child’. (Guidance sect 3.2)

The Guidance deliberately does not specify a requirement to form a separate multi agency steering group for this particular issue - ACPCs need to be free to do what makes sense to them. It does, however, stress that “As part of agreeing local arrangements within the ACP protocol, all agencies should identify specific post holders and / or individuals to be the key contacts within their organisation for sharing and co-ordinating information” (Guidance sect 6.2). The review did not identify any other methods for organisations to share and co-ordinate information or systems for monitoring and reviewing the effective working of the protocols, except for some form of steering group.

One of the respondents recognised:

“Inter-agency working is absolutely fundamental to tackling this issue”.

Some ACPCs have included the issue in their existing sub groups e.g. Policy and Procedures sub group. One ACPC had promoted their steering group into a formal sub group.

Table 13: Initial Overview: All ACPCs by Sub-committee / steering group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With sub-committee / steering group</th>
<th>Without a Sub-committee / steering group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in prostitution</td>
<td>66 (45.2%)</td>
<td>45 (30.8%)</td>
<td>111 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACPCs with no children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in prostitution</td>
<td>9 (6.2%)</td>
<td>26 (17.8%)</td>
<td>35 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (51.4%)</td>
<td>71 (48.6%)</td>
<td>146 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This includes those ACPCs who did not know whether or not children were involved in prostitution in their area

Figure 11: Initial Overview: All ACPCs by Sub-committee / steering group

Table 13 shows that over half (51.4%) of the 146 ACPCs have established a sub-committee to tackle the problem of children being involved in prostitution. However, 45 (30.8%) ACPCs who said that they have children involved in prostitution in their area, do not have a sub-committee.

Table 14: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Sub-committee / steering group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With sub-committee / steering group</th>
<th>Without a sub-committee / steering group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in prostitution</td>
<td>36 (72%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>42 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACPCs with no children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in prostitution</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many ACPCs have clear terms of reference for their steering groups, although it is recognised that they might change over time. The remit of the groups seems to have focused initially on formulating protocols and procedures and developing services and meeting frequently. Over time when these have been established they have redirected their focus to identifying networks, to monitor and review the processes, to recognise gaps in services and training needs. The groups may then be meeting bi-monthly or less frequently.

Overall most ACPCs in the targeted survey reported good inter agency co-operation and working together. In general, people often talked about 100% will and commitment from the different agencies, but that there were still some difficulties to overcome, and this was not an area of complacency. One comment was:

“We have struggled with the issue of agency confidentiality, but in a very positive way.”

A few ACPCs commented that there were difficulties around health and specifically GUM clinics. In some areas clinics were insisting on total patient confidentiality, particularly if young people were 16 years of age. It is concerning that confidentiality issues appeared in some cases to outweigh the need for child protection concerns. There seems to be confusion that a moral judgement on young people’s sexual behaviour implied child protection procedures as opposed to the clear decision as to whether they were suffering, or likely to suffer significant harm. One ACPC commented:

“We have spent a lot of time building trust between the agencies, a lot of time exploring individual attitudes, to reach a shared sense of understanding, almost a shared morality, and we are constantly re stating this and sharing the risks.”

Several London Boroughs commented on the improved relationship with the voluntary sector and in particular street based projects, acknowledging that this was often around a greater understanding of their work and roles. There were comments appreciating the enthusiasm and the commitment from the voluntary sector:

“We have had to communicate better with each other, to understand different agency’s thresholds for referring on and for referring to, and this has been particularly successful with the voluntaries”.

Similarly, relationships with the police often revolved around a greater understanding of their powers and abilities:

“This has made a huge difference to our working with the police, as many of these cases would not have been looked at before”.

---

**Figure 12: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Sub committee / steering group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-committee / steering group</th>
<th>Area has children involved in prostitution</th>
<th>Area does not have children involved in prostitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (74%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 50 ACPCs interviewed for the targeted survey only 3 said that they have young people present on their steering groups.

4.2 Processes for individual cases
The review identified a lack of consistency in terms of both processes and responses to individual cases.

“The identification of a child involved in prostitution, or at risk of being drawn in to prostitution, should always trigger the agreed local procedures to ensure the child’s safety and welfare, and to enable police to gather evidence about abusers and coercers” (Guidance sect 5.10).

The diversity of ACPC responses included:

- Some only implement protocols when there is clear evidence of involvement as opposed to young people being at risk
  - Often defined as ‘street prostitution’ and not sexual exploitation.

- Some only implement for under 16 year olds and make a clear distinction for 16/17 year olds.
  - E.g. “for under 16s there is always an inter-agency planning meeting, but with 16/17 year olds we consider if a planning meeting is necessary”.

- While all are concerned with ensuring the safety and welfare of the child, there appears no consensus as to when to initiate a child protection section 47 enquiry following an initial assessment, and when not to.
  - E.g. “the decision as to whether to proceed to a child protection enquiry will depend upon the risks identified, in particular whether a parent is knowingly failing to protect the young person or actively encouraging the prostitution”
  - “we never consider sect 47 for 16 / 17 year olds”

Responding to individual children

Whilst the Guidance states that:

“The protocol should outline the processes and possible responses to dealing with young people” (Guidance sect 5.8),

it also states that this should also include when and how to refer to SSD and /or the police (Guidance sect 5.9).

Table 15a: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by How young people are responded to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in need, not requiring protection</th>
<th>Children in need, requiring protection</th>
<th>Children in need requiring protection, who are victims of organised abuse</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15b: Targeted Survey: ACPCs with children involved in prostitution by How young people are responded to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in need, not requiring protection</th>
<th>Children in need, Requiring protection</th>
<th>Children in need requiring protection, who are victims of organised abuse</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by How young people are responded to

A = Children in need, not requiring protection (Sect 17)
B = Children in need, requiring protection (Sect 47)
C = Children in need requiring protection, who are victims of organised abuse (Sect 47)
D = Not stated

The Children Act, 1989 gave social services lead responsibility for assessing the needs of the young person in conjunction with other agencies. The Assessment Framework provides guidance on the assessment of children in need and their families. In some areas the assessment of the needs of the young person is being completed in isolation from a multi agency meeting, and can result in a single agency (i.e. social services) making an independent decision for ‘no further action’. This does not facilitate a full investigation or intelligence gathering by focussing exclusively on the young person. One ACPC’s protocols recognised that their Barnardo’s multi agency resource may be more appropriate to complete an assessment. The local SSD, however, retains lead responsibility, even if an assessment is undertaken on its behalf. For the vast majority it was always a referral to SSD for assessment.
Responses to the targeted survey varied from:
- Sometimes we have a full meeting, but sometimes it’s just a phone call and then social services do an assessment.
- We always hold a full meeting within 2 days, chaired by a child protection manager.
- Each time we identify a young person as actually involved we use the organised abuse procedures with a high-level strategy meeting.
- Where the local authority is the carer we hold a looked after children review.
- We always start with a section 47 enquiry as initially we always consider a young person to be at risk of significant harm.

4.3 Policing

“This Guidance establishes that the primary law enforcement effort must be against abusers and coercers who break the law and who should be called to account for their abusive behaviour” (Guidance sect 2.5)

As was recognised at the seminar held for the review, in looking at the difficulties in identifying and prosecuting those who abuse:

“Police need evidence before they can begin an investigation”.

Specialist Police Provision

Table 16: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Specialist police provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just vice squad</th>
<th>Just Child / Family Protection Team</th>
<th>Both vice squad and child / family protection team</th>
<th>Neither vice squad or child / family protection team</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPs with children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPs with no children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one ACPC which did not know if children were involved in prostitution in their area.

As can be seen in Table 16, 76% of the 50 targeted ACPCs had some form of specialist police resource for tackling prostitution or child protection. Twenty-one of the targeted ACPCs has a police vice squad, 27 ACPCs have child or family protection police teams, and 10 have both vice and child or family protection team. Six ACPCs did not know if their area had a vice squad, 3 of these were aware of child protection teams, but 2 did not know what resources the police had for tackling this issue. Of the 7 ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution, only 1 has a vice squad, 2 don’t know whether or not their area has a vice squad. Of the other 4 who do not have a vice squad, 2 had child protection teams and the other 2 had no police resource for tackling this issue.
Table 17: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Intelligence gathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intelligence gathering on both abusers and coercers</th>
<th>Not gathering intelligence</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>28 (67%)</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 (56%)</td>
<td>18 (36%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 50 ACPCs involved in the targeted survey, 28 (56%) have intelligence gathering on both abusers and coercers on-going in their area. Of the 42 ACPCs with children involved in prostitution, 28 (67%) are either collecting intelligence on both abusers and coercers themselves, or the police are doing so.

Table 18: Targeted Survey: Intelligence gathering by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>ACPC or representative agency / organisation</th>
<th>Both police and ACPC (or representative agent)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 18, Intelligence gathering in the 28 ACPCs is being carried out by a variety of sources. In the majority of cases both the police and ACPCs or representative agents are carrying out the intelligence gathering. It must still be recognised however that 33% of areas where ACPCs recognised that children were involved in prostitution, no intelligence gathering was being carried out.

Prosecutions

At the seminar, a voluntary project manager reported that:

"78 young people have been identified in my area but no perpetrators have been convicted"

Ten ACPCs said they had successfully prosecuted coercers and abusers, although 4 of these related to only 1 offender. None of the London Boroughs in the targeted survey were unable to identify any successful prosecutions. However, it was recognised that the Clubs and Vice Unit were best placed to gather intelligence and to focus on the networks which crossed London Boroughs.
In the main it was child protection lead officers from Social Services Departments who gave the information to the review. Information received may well have been different if the review had been able to follow up by asking the police representative on the ACPC for this information, or if the review had been approached from a criminal justice position rather than a child welfare one.

**Comments:**

“We had a 15 year old working for an escort agency. It took 2 years from the complaint, to gather the evidence about the man who was running this in order for it to go to court”.

“Evidence gathering is very difficult against the abusers”.

“Two glaring pimps and a good few others and no one is doing anything about it”.

“We are looking at the Child Abduction Act as we can never get any young people to make a complaint”.

“There can be links to the public protection register and yet they’re still accessing young people”.

“Charging him with USI made him a Schedule One offender”.

“Police won’t act unless they are sure that a prosecution is possible”.

“Others will not share information if they don’t believe that action will be taken”.

“We are looking at obscene publications legislation as we have had examples of young girls being advertised on the net”.

“There are real implications when CPS agree at court to lesser charges being brought”.

### 4.4 Monitoring and reviewing

“ACPCs have a responsibility under the Guidance to monitor and review the operation of their local protocols” (Guidance sect 5.5).

**Table 19: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Number of times protocol used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Use</th>
<th>Never used</th>
<th>Between 1 and 10 times</th>
<th>Between 11 and 30 times</th>
<th>Over 30 times</th>
<th>Not stated or don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with a protocol*</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>14 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>17 (34%)</td>
<td>45 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Draft or finalised

Seventeen (34%) of the targeted ACPCs could not provide numerical data on how many times their protocols had been used. The number of times protocols have been used varies considerably from never to 130 times.

**Figure 15: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Number of times protocols used**
As can be seen from the table 19 some ACPCs were not able to provide the review with information about the use of the protocols. Some ACPCs were very specific, being able to supply the numbers of individual young people dealt with under the protocols, and others could give the number of strategy meetings held.

It was recognised that sometimes a strategy meeting could relate to several young people, and that the number of strategy meetings in itself was not an accurate reflection of the number of individual young people dealt with.

![Table 20: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Monitoring of implementation of protocols](image)

One ACPC while recognising that at present they had 7 young people involved in prostitution, over the past 18 months had held 56 strategy meetings. Overall there was a lack of numerical data given with very little monitoring, particularly in regard to outcomes for individual young people. However, one ACPC was able to supply some very detailed monitoring figures.

**Involving children and young people**

“Children may be at a particularly important turning point in their lives and will need to be enabled to express their wishes and feelings; make sense of their circumstances and contribute to decisions that affect them”. (Guidance sect 5.12)

![Table 21: Targeted Survey: ACPCs monitoring implementation by Child / young person involvement](image)

Thirty-two of the targeted ACPCs were monitoring the implementation of their protocols. Of these, 10 said that the child or young person was always involved in the review process, and a further 3 said that the young person was sometimes involved. Thirteen ACPCs stated that young people were not involved in the process and 6 did not answer the question.

There was also variation in opinions as to when to include families in strategy meetings, although the ‘Assessment Framework’ guidance is clear that young people should be involved appropriately in such meetings, and several ACPCs commented on the lack of consistency in their interpretation of the ‘Assessment Framework’ guidance in terms of young people’s participation.

**Some comments**

“We need to consider how we involve children effectively, perhaps allow them to communicate through video”.

“Need to include young people in strategy meetings”.

“Need to understand how difficult it is for the young women to give evidence”.
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5. **IMPACT**

The size and scope of the review restricted the amount and quality of information gathered on service provision. This section of the report is divided in to 3 components: prevention, protection and recovery.

Prevention focuses on children and young people and the strategies engaged to prevent them from being coerced into and abused through prostitution.

Protection highlights the need to prosecute coercers and abusers in order that children and young people are protected from any further crimes committed by these perpetrators.

The final component, recovery, outlines strategies and services for children and young people designed to assist them leaving prostitution and to begin the process of recovering from the abuses they have experienced.

It was evident from the review that whilst a few areas are working on all three elements, the provision of specialist resources or services is an area that requires greater commitment and funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22: Overview: All ACPCs by Specialist resource / service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With specialist resource / service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With children involved in prostitution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without children involved in prostitution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that 45 (30.8%) of all ACPCs in England have a specialist resource or service in their area. One ACPC did not know whether or not they have a specialist resource for tackling this issue in their area. Of the 111 ACPCs with an identified problem of children being involved in prostitution in their area the number of ACPCs with an identified specialist resource is below 50% (38.7%).

**Figure 16: Overview: All ACPCs by Specialist Resource**
5.1 Prevention

Table 23: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Preventative strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventative strategy</th>
<th>School work</th>
<th>Missing Person scheme</th>
<th>Both school work and Missing Person scheme</th>
<th>Other preventative strategy</th>
<th>No preventative strategy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (72%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 50 targeted ACPCs 36 (72%) have strategies for preventing young people becoming involved in prostitution. Of the 14 ACPCs who said that they did not have any preventative strategy, 8 suggested that their area needed such a strategy.

Of the 44 ACPCs who considered that children were vulnerable and at risk of becoming involved in prostitution, 30 (68%) indicated that they had preventative strategies.

Figure 17: Targeted Survey: All ACPCs by Preventative strategy

Of the 3 aspects, prevention appears to be the area with most resources. However, it must be remembered that the ACPCs in the targeted survey are not representative of ACPCs in general, as most were chosen for their positive work in tackling this issue.

Preventive strategies

Of the 50 ACPCs interviewed in the targeted survey, 16 said they have preventative strategies that include some form of missing persons scheme or protocols intended to reduce the risk of children becoming involved in prostitution. Some of these protocols were for children in the ‘looked after’ system. Eight ACPCs have preventative strategies, which include work in schools.

Bradford

Bradford has 3 preventive strategies, most particularly their missing person’s scheme Misper (initially funded through DoH section 64 monies), work in schools through the ‘Things we don't talk about’ education pack and the ‘In Place’ Project specifically identifying young people in the looked after system who may be vulnerable. The Misper scheme and
the work in schools evolved through the work of the Barnardo’s Street and Lanes Project set up in 1994.

Wolverhampton

Wolverhampton has had a multi-agency steering group meeting monthly for 3 years. They have had their own procedures in place since 1998, and were working on this issue before this date, as the ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) pilot. Their protocol is triggered every time a young person (up to 18 years) is referred, which always involves a full strategy meeting. They have regular (4 annually) multi-agency training as part of rolling child protection training. Again, they have a range of resources and do work with schools.

5.2 Protection

Table 24: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by helpfulness of the Guidance in achieving the aim of protecting children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieving aim</th>
<th>Begun to achieve</th>
<th>Limited achievement</th>
<th>Too early to tell</th>
<th>no problem / not stated</th>
<th>Not achieving aim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of ACPCs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25 (50%)</td>
<td>25 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 indicates that of the 50 ACPCs interviewed in the targeted survey, 11 believed that the Guidance was being successful in meeting the aim of protecting children, although another 14 thought that some progress was being made towards these aims, and only 9 did not consider that the guidance was not achieving its aim. Of the 11 ACPCs that thought the guidance was achieving its aims, it may be relevant to note that 8 had a police vice squad in their area. Further, of these 11, 7 said that in their particular area, prosecutions had been brought against abusers and 5 suggested that prosecutions had been brought against pimps.

Again, it must be stressed that these ACPCs were targeted for their achievements and are not representative of ACPCs in general.

Figure 18: Targeted Survey: ACPCs by Guidance protecting children

Tower Hamlets

Tower Hamlets have had a multi-agency steering group meeting bi-monthly for 3 years, which police and social services jointly chair. They have a Specialist Police Unit (Metropolitan clubs & Vice). The training consists of a series of multi-agency workshops, which are a part of an ongoing strategy. The protocol is triggered every time a young person (up to 18 years) is referred, which always involves a full strategy meeting. Young people are always involved in the evaluation of whether their intervention has been successful.
Again they have a range of resources, including specialist provision from their NSPCC project, again led by a multi-agency steering group and preventative work around missing young people. They had clear guidelines on confidentiality in place early, and whilst they have experienced some hiccups, they are working through these.

**Prosecuting abusers and coercers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieving aim</th>
<th>Begun to achieve</th>
<th>Limited achievement</th>
<th>Too early to tell</th>
<th>Don’t know / no problem</th>
<th>Not achieving aim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of ACPCs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>43 (86%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 indicates that ACPCs in general do not feel that they are achieving the aim of prosecuting abusers or coercers, with only 14% of targeted ACPCs stating that this is being achieved to any degree.

Nottingham City and Nottingham County were 2 out of the only 3 ACPCs to say they considered that they were achieving the aim of prosecuting abusers. They were one ACPC until Nottingham City became a unitary authority (1998) and they still share the same specialist police provision. This consists of a dedicated permanent police team known as the ‘anti vice squad’ who also took part in the original ACPO pilot scheme. This team has 2 dedicated police officers specifically for children, one for girls and one for boys and they have had 60/70 successful prosecutions for offences against children. Commonality for success includes:

- 2 specialist police officers for children working within a dedicated vice unit.
- Joint police and SSD protocols since 1996
- Wide ranging representation on a multi agency steering group.
  - Social Services (Child protection & residential)
  - Police specialist officer
  - Health (consultant from family planning + GUM + child protection Nurse + voluntary partnership health worker)
  - 5 Voluntary Organisations
  - Education Welfare
  - Youth Service
  - Youth Offending Team
- Housing
- Probation

- Clear links from the steering group to ACPC in terms of regular updates and briefing reports.
- ACPC regular training
- The protocol is triggered every time a young person is referred.
- Nottingham County were the only ACPC that gave specific information on 4 Strategy meetings held in line with their local protocols concerning abusers only.
- There were clear systems in place for monitoring outcomes and young people were always involved in this process.
- There was clear accessible information both on the number of times protocols had been implemented and regarding individual young people.
- There was clear accessible information concerning perpetrators.

Doncaster, Nottingham City and Nottingham County are in fact the only 3 ACPCs who considered that they were being successful at both prosecuting abusers and protecting children.

Many ACPCs who gave information recognised that they considered that the current law to a large extent was failing to protect children in these situations and that it was very difficult to bring appropriate offences against abusers.

“This Guidance can never help prosecute abusers, we need the law to be changed....”

To give a brief example of the difficulties in the present legislation:

This case was widely reported in the press last year when a reporter asked a 23 year-old ‘prostitute’ where he could get sex from children. He was directed to her house, on a housing estate on the outskirts of a northern city, where her mother and 13 year old sister lived. He took photos of two men entering and leaving the house. When he entered, her mother offered oral masturbation to be performed on him by her 13 year-old daughter and the daughter’s 14 year-old friend.

The police were called and took time to consider what offences were being committed and what charges to bring against the mother, sister and two male customers. They considered brothel keeping (not arrestable), causing or encouraging a girl under 16 (and over 13) into prostitution (not arrestable), facilitating allowing premises to be used (not arrestable). All were charged with enticing a child to gross indecency. If the men had had full sexual intercourse with the two 13 & 14 year old girls then it would have been USI (unlawful sexual intercourse), which again in the present law is not seen as a serious offence if the young person is over 13 years. Interestingly that when it was brought to court the 2 women were remanded and the 2 men got bail. The outcome of the case is yet unknown.

Through the work carried out by Barnardos, there are many examples of young people being too frightened or too intimidated to give evidence and with good cause. One young woman had her head held back, with a kettle of boiling water held above her head when she was going ‘to tell’. Another retracted a statement (a solicitor’s letter to the police had said that she had made a mistake at the ID parade when she had been threatened to have her face ‘slashed’). In other cases it can remain as agency attitudes and misconceptions. The CPS withdrew a case when a 14-year-old was living with a 49-year-old man, when charges of abduction had been brought. It was seen as a domestic issue and not in the public interest to proceed with prosecution. Young women have been kidnapped to prevent them giving evidence at court. As consent continues to be an important part of the present
legislation, one 15 year old was cross examined for a day in the witness box to reinforce that she had been a prostitute since the age of 13 years, during a trial for a USI offence.

This information in general, was however largely outside the scope and remit of the review as it was not possible to focus on criminal justice issues.

Several ACPCs made mention of the Sex Offences Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposes a set of new offences to deal with the commercial sexual exploitation of a child (child refers to boys and girls up to the age of 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To buy the sexual services of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To recruit, induce or compel a child into commercial sexual exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To participate in, facilitate or allow the commercial sexual exploitation of a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To receive money or other reward, favour or compensation for the commercial sexual exploitation of a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes a set of new penalties for those found guilty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Life imprisonment where the child is below the age of 13 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 years where the child is over 13 but under 18 except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 years for buying the sexual services with a child over the age of 16 but under 18 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is also proposed that these offences would be of ‘strict liability’, which means it would not be an excuse to believe that a young person was 18 years of age. If the young person was under 18 years of age, an offence would have been committed but belief that the young person was an adult would be taken into account as a mitigating factor in sentencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the review states: “These specific offences would set an unambiguous standard in society that it was wrong for an adult to expect to buy or deal in the sexual services of a child” (Setting the Boundaries sect 7.6.2)

5.3 Recovery

“The Government recognises that creating a successful exit strategy from prostitution for a child is not a simple process. It requires a careful, caring and concerted inter-agency approach that may have to be sustained for a long period of time” (Guidance sect 2.4)

The Guidance acknowledges how difficult it can be for young people to ‘exit’ prostitution. The review asked people to consider the term ‘recovery’ for the following reasons:
- It will often more accurately reflect the reality and the complexity of young peoples situations.
- It implies that the process will take time
- It recognises that there has been suffering and harm inflicted on the young person
- It facilitates the young persons participation in the process, (it is done with them and not something that is done to them)
- There can be set backs in the recovery / healing process, but this does not negate the overall intent.
- It is easy to say “when exit has failed”, but there are severe consequences for saying ‘when recovery has failed’

Table 26: Targeted ACPCs by Recovery strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With a recovery strategy</th>
<th>Without a recovery strategy</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>26 (52%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>42 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPCs with no children involved in prostitution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 (52%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 50 targeted ACPCs 26 (52%) had strategies aimed at assisting young people recover from their experiences of abuse through prostitution, 11 (22%) ACPCs did not have a recovery strategy and 13 (26%) did not know whether or not there was a recovery strategy in their area.

Some of the difficulties highlighted

Five ACPCs focused on some of the difficulties of working directly with these young people with the following comments:

- “Trying to engage young people is compounded by drug use”
- “There’s a real brick wall with trying to work with 16 / 17 year olds, its their choice”
- “Heroin use has increased dramatically over recent times”
- “Young people are into denial and do not want to help themselves”
- “The only way you can be sure of protecting is by putting in secure accommodation”

However the majority of ACPCs recognised their inability to provide an adequate service for these young people as an issue of resources. Many ACPCs recognised the need for practical resources of:

- safe houses,
- drop in centres,
- time out spaces,
- appropriate placements (not residential care establishments),
- drug treatment centres.

Others needed resources for training and educating staff.

- “As this appears to many, as such a small issue (but is it really) then it will always fail to get resources that are limited unless specific monies are targeted at this issue.”

Doncaster

Doncaster has a multi-agency forum meeting monthly, a close professional group that they see as absolutely fundamental to their success in tackling this issue. They have had a
finalised protocol since September 1999, although had been working on this issue for some years before that.

The protocol is triggered every time a young person (up to 18 years) is referred, which always involves a strategy meeting. They are doing preventative work in schools (directly through PHSE and with INSET for teachers). They have worked closely with the police in developing ‘exit’ strategies and have a range of resources in place for recovery i.e.

- One dedicated young persons’ worker from Streetreach (a multi-agency project, managed through the youth service but lead by SSD / Youth Service with a multi-agency steering committee), pupil referral unit and The Foyer (work programmes & accommodation)
- Pupil Referral Unit
- Garage (a drugs project)
- Barnardos Leaving Care Project
- The women’s centre

Doncaster has recently won a community care award for their innovative educational programmes for this work.

Many of the ACPCs who dedicated resources or services specifically identified for this particular group of young people recognised the role of the voluntary sector. Barnardo’s are fronting specific projects in Bradford, Bristol, Middlesboro, Wolverhampton, London, Southampton, Birmingham, Merseyside and Kirklees.

“In Bristol we could not have achieved anything without Barnardo’s”.

Similarly, Manchester recognised the important role that the Children’s Society project played in promoting this issue.

Across the London Boroughs there are a range of voluntaries providing services for these young people, while other areas have no voluntary input at all.

As several comments to the review recognised there is no national overview to this issue.

“We need national organisations to develop links and networks of services for young people to access”.

Some ACPCs who were working through recovery programmes recognised the need for:

“An immediate response to these young people and sometimes we need to place them away from their local areas for their own safety”.

**Individual Young People**

The Guidance replaced Home Office Circular 109/59 which means that young people cannot receive a ‘prostitute caution’ and should be dealt with under the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 through reprimands and final warnings as other juvenile offenders. It recognises that:

“The initial presumption should always be that a boy or girl is not soliciting voluntarily . . . Police would not normally take criminal justice action unless there had been inter-agency discussion to consider the full circumstances of each case . . . ” (Guidance sect 6.24 and 6.26)

Of the 50 ACPCs interviewed in the targeted survey, only 1 stated that young people had been referred to the youth offending team. However, they did claim that this:
“is very diminished to our previous experience, it’s now very low numbers as police are taking the welfare approach”.

Some comments received by the review

“There is an inability to prosecute under current legislation”
“The police are reluctant to get on board, it’s not on their targets”
“We are hampered on the police front for lack of a vice squad to investigate perpetrators”
“We need the law to be changed”
“The new sex offences legislation will be crucial”
“The message has not yet got out to abusers”
6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Implementing the Guidance: Successes and difficulties

This review has identified the following key points concerning the national implementation of the Safeguarding Children Involved in Prostitution Guidance:

**Children involved in prostitution**

- Some ACPCs are forming too narrow a definition of the term "prostitution".

- The most common way in which ACPCs discover and monitor the situation is through multi-agency steering groups formed to specifically share information concerning this issue. Some areas that have no perceived problem of any young people involved in prostitution seem to have been less proactive in making any detailed enquiries.

- The number of ACPCs in England who acknowledge that they have children involved in prostitution in their area vastly outnumbers the number of ACPCs who said that they did not have any children involved in prostitution in their area.

- The review was able to conclude that girls appear to be far more likely to be involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution than boys. This is not to suggest that the problem of boys being involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in prostitution is not as serious as the problem of girls, but that maintaining a realistic perspective on the situation is important, and must be borne in mind when allocating scarce resources.

- Children involved in prostitution may be a hidden problem. ACPCs who could give information concerning location stated that children were involved in prostitution in ‘invisible’ non-traditional street locations. These included private flats, bedsits, rooms, sauna/massage establishments, children being taken to hotels and in some cases children being involved in prostitution in their own homes.

- The Internet is increasingly being used for the purposes of prostitution. The Internet is being used by ‘pimps’ to ‘advertise’ individual children, and by perpetrators as a forum for meeting individual children through utilising ‘chat rooms’ and ‘bulletin boards’.

**Protocols**

- All ACPCs in England are aware of the Guidance and most have either got or are developing local protocols in line with the Guidance. While some ACPCs have been working on this issue for a number of years, there are others who are just beginning and a few who haven’t yet made it to the starting block.

- Those ACPCs with finalised protocols seem to have disseminated their documents widely through the ACPC partners linked to their usual channels for child protection information.

- Less than 50% of the targeted ACPCs said they had provided training on their protocols.

While there is the responsibility to form protocols and to consult with local statutory and voluntary organisations, the Guidance does not prescribe what to include. The Guidance did not intend to be prescriptive and expected local interpretation and variation. However the protocols received by the review varied substantially (from 2 to 56 pages). Many did not have a ‘local’ feel or contain local contacts or local resources and definitions within the protocols varied considerably.
CONCLUSION

The Guidance has put the issue on the ACPC agenda and in many has raised the level of consciousness, although others remain at a loss to understand why this issue should be presented in front of others. Some ACPCs would appear to be writing their protocols for the sake of having one and not making it a useful document.

It has been impossible to judge how successful ACPCs have been in disseminating the information although one comment from the seminar.

In general the Guidance was found to be helpful although there was concern that there were no extra resources for implementation.

PROCEDURES and SYSTEMS
The Government has recognised the complexity of working with this issue by publishing separate Guidance specifically in regard to these children. However, most of the ACPCs who are working in this area are using existing systems for processing these young people, as opposed to looking more imaginatively at their procedures.

- Some ACPCs have included this issue in their existing sub groups e.g. Policy and Procedures sub group. One ACPC had promoted their steering group in to a formal sub group. Over half (51.4%) of the 146 ACPCs do have a sub-committee or steering group established to tackle the problem of children being involved in prostitution

- The remit of the steering groups seems to have focused initially on formulating protocols and procedures and developing services and meeting frequently. Over time when these have been established they have redirected their focus to identifying networks, to monitor and review the processes, to recognise gaps in services and training needs.

- Overall most ACPCs in the targeted survey reported good inter agency co-operation and working together.

- Generally there was a lack of numerical data given with very little monitoring, particularly in regard to outcomes for individual young people.

The Guidance does not specify the requirement to form a separate multi-agency steering group for this particular issue. However the review did not identify any other methods for organisations to share and co-ordinate information or systems for monitoring and reviewing the effective working of the protocols, except for some form of steering group.

The police and social services have been seen as the ‘main players’ in the implementation of this Guidance. This is not surprising given the role of the Department of Health and the Home Office in the joint publication. Certainly multi-agency working would appear critical in the success of this work. However, many respondents actually questioned whether social services were indeed the best agency to lead on this issue - although the statutory responsibility does of course lie with Social Services - whilst others recognised that ‘it is still impossible to get the police on board’.

The Guidance recognises the important role that the voluntary sector contributes to this issue, and the areas that seem to be making progress certainly all have various voluntary agencies on board. However, the areas that have committed steering groups consisting of a wide range of both statutory and voluntary agencies would appear to be having the greatest impact.

These areas have often begun this work through a ‘champion’ and those people nationally have come from all the different agencies.
CONCLUSION

Individual Cases
- The review identified a lack of consistency in terms of both processes and responses to individual cases. While all are concerned with ensuring the safety and welfare of the child, there appears no consensus as to when to initiate a child protection section 47 enquiry following an initial assessment.

- It is concerning that it would appear that confidentiality issues in some cases outweighed the need for child protection concerns. There seems to be confusion that a moral judgement on young people’s sexual behaviour implied child protection procedures as opposed to the clear decision as to whether they were suffering, or likely to suffer significant harm.

- It was recognised that sometimes a strategy meeting could relate to several young people, and that the number of strategy meetings in itself was not an accurate reflection of the number of individual young people dealt with. The number of times the protocols had been used varied considerably between areas from never to 130 times.

Realistically it is only those ACPCs who always convene multi-agency strategy meetings (often within 24 hours) that are beginning to make progress with this issue. In practice there is a lack of clarity and consistency around procedures and protocols.

Policing
- The Guidance seeks to encourage local agencies to gather evidence around abusers and the possibility of networks of organised abuse and not to exclusively focus on the needs of the young person. In some areas the assessment of the needs of the young person is being completed in isolation from a multi-agency meeting, and can result in a single agency making an independent decision for ‘no further action’. This does not facilitate a full investigation or intelligence gathering around perpetrators.

- In the main it was child protection lead officers from Social Services Departments who gave the information to the review. Information received may well have been different if the review had been able to follow up by asking the police representative on the ACPC for this information, or if the review had been approached from a criminal justice position rather than child welfare.

- Many ACPCs who gave information considered that the current law to a large extent was failing to protect children in these situations and that it was very difficult to bring appropriate offences (i.e., abuse and not prostitution offences) against abusers.

- Those areas who had vice squads or specialist police provision were being more successful in prosecuting abusers.

Again and again it was pointed out that while this issue did not appear on any police targets then it would not be prioritised, particularly as seen from a police perspective. A clear need has also been identified for a regional and national perspective, both in terms of sharing information and good practice, as well as identifying networks of abusers.

The Guidance replaced Home Office Circular 109/59 which means that young people cannot receive a ‘prostitute caution’ and will be dealt with under the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 through reprimands and final warnings as other juvenile offenders.

- Only 1 ACPC stated that young people had been referred to the youth offending team. It was beyond the remit of this review to access whether this presented an overall decrease in the number of prosecutions against young people.
Specialist Resources and Services Provision
The size and scope of the review restricted the amount and quality of information gathered on service provision.

- It was evident from the review that whilst a few areas are working on all three elements, the provision of specialist resources or services is an area that requires greater commitment and funding.
- The majority of ACPCs recognised their inability to provide an adequate service for these young people as an issue of resources.
- Many of the ACPCs who had dedicated resources or services specifically identified for this particular group of young people recognised the role of the voluntary sector.

6.2 The Review process
The scope of the review did not include an in-depth study of the issue of children involved in prostitution and therefore didn't ask:
- ages of children and young people involved in prostitution
- details of what service provision was available - other than the basic questions regarding type of specialist resources.

Time restraints resulted in:
- no opportunity to obtain and read all the protocols
- not being able to contact the service provider for accurate information concerning specialist resources

It was impossible to extract information regarding coercers and abusers because:
- lack of information available from / to ACPCs
- lack of communication between agencies
- the remit of the review didn't allow for any follow up , i.e. contacting police or other criminal justice organisations

Telephone survey: advantages and limits:
- allows for greater geographical scope
- reaches more ACPCs in the time available
- only extracts basic information
- have to rely on information given by ACPCs being correct
- no in-depth investigation in to how individual ACPCs operate and therefore reduces the ability to clarify information, particularly on processes
- impossible to measure the extent to which practitioners from any agency are aware of their protocols and what to do

ACPCs are multi-agency and therefore contacting one member of the ACPCs resulted in the review relying on them to know what all agencies within the ACPC are doing.

6.3 Recommendations
The review recommends that:
- ACPCs are given advice on how to actively enquire into whether or not young people are involved in, or are at risk of becoming involved in prostitution in their area, and how to respond in a more flexible way.

- Areas with no perceived problem should be given specific information about methods for identifying the issue, as well as the need for local multi-agency awareness raising and training amongst their practitioners.
• ACPCs should be provided with a blueprint proforma template of a local protocol, which they could adapt for their own particular needs. This should include more clarity in definitions, consistent language, processes and procedures, particularly monitoring and review, and how to include young people participation.

• Resources should be allocated for strategies to assist prevention and aid recovery. There should be ring-fenced resources for services /awareness raising / training and regional events.

• This issue should be included on national police targets.

• An Internet web-site for ACPCs is set up to communicate and share information and to highlight good practice particularly with regard to successful prosecutions. This should be Government led through inter-government departments (not just DoH).

• These review findings should be used to support the proposals for a change of legislation as per the sex offences review (*Setting the Boundaries*, 2000).

• A review of criminal justice agency responses to the Guidance should be conducted.

• More detailed information in terms of links to geographical locations and movements of children involved in prostitution should be collected and disseminated between ACPCs.

• A national audit of specialist resources and service provision is undertaken, published and disseminated.

• The targeted survey should be replicated in 12-months time and extended to include the remaining 96 ACPCs to provide a more accurate national view of the number and gender of young people involved in prostitution. This will also provide information on the impact of the Guidance over time.
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APPENDIX 1

Guidance Review Seminar Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ACPC</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Davies</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Norley</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Jones</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Roscoe</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Leblock</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan King</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Barnardos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Docherty</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Warrington</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Taylor</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Farrer</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Woods</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Kochanowski</td>
<td>Middlesboro</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Gregory</td>
<td>Nottingham City</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Collett</td>
<td>Nottingham City</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN other</td>
<td>Nottingham City</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Leach</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele Weir</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Risky Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Lucas</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Whitehouse</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Maxwell</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Evans</td>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Sammel</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Gough</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Legget</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Brien</td>
<td>Wirral</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Wilkinson</td>
<td>Wirral</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Duffin</td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Broome</td>
<td>Clubs and Vice</td>
<td>Met Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Willshire</td>
<td>Clubs and Vice</td>
<td>Met Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnardos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasima Patel</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSPCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui McCluskey</td>
<td></td>
<td>NCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy McCullough</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSPCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Collier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Sosna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Workshop Discussions

The Young People

- How do we know if young people are involved in sexual exploitation or abuse through prostitution?
- How do we prevent young people particularly in the care system from becoming involved?
- How do we respond to 16 and 17 year olds?
- How do we protect young people:
  - Children in need
  - Child protection
  - Organised abuse
- How do we measure outcomes?
- How do we monitor young people sexually exploited through the use of new information technology?

Abusers and Coercers

- How do we identify abusers and coercers?
- What are the blockages / barriers to prosecution?
- How do we collect intelligence in terms of data protection and ECHR?
- Is there any particular legislation that has been useful / successful?
- How do we use Public Protection Panels, Potentially Dangers Offender Panels and Sex Offenders Registration?
- How do we monitor and review whether we are successful?

Procedures, Systems and Protocols

- How do we manage confidentiality and working together?
- Who takes the lead on prevention?
- Who takes the lead on service provision and resources?
- Should there be national strategies around provision and monitoring offenders?
- How do we share good practice and disseminate information?
- With competing demands on our time and resources how do we make this a priority?
Government's response to each of the recommendations in the report of the review of the Safeguarding Children Involved in Prostitution guidance

**Recommendation 1:** ACPCs are given advice on how to actively enquire into whether or not young people are involved in, or are at risk of becoming involved in prostitution in their area, and how to respond in a more flexible way.

**Response:** We will use the ACPC web-site to encourage sharing of good practice.

**Recommendation 2:** Areas with no perceived problem should be given specific information about methods for identifying the issue, as well as the need for local multi-agency awareness raising and training amongst their practitioners.

**Response:** Again, we will use the ACPC web-site to encourage ACPCs to share identification methods, awareness raising and training experience.

**Recommendation 3:** ACPCs should be provided with a blue print proforma template of a local protocol, which they could adapt for their own particular needs. This should include more clarity in definitions, consistent language, processes and procedures, particularly monitoring and review, and how to include young people participation.

**Response:** We will invite ACPCs to put protocols on the ACPC web-site. We are reluctant to be too prescriptive about the content of the protocol - this must be a matter for local determination.

**Recommendation 4:** Resources should be allocated for strategies to assist prevention and aid recovery. There should be ring-fenced resources for services/awareness raising/training and regional events.

**Response:** It is for Local Authorities to decide how to allocate resources, but this should already be a priority for social services as children involved in prostitution will be children in need (under s.17 of the Children Act 1989), and are likely to be children at risk of significant harm (under s.47 of the Children Act 1989).

**Recommendation 5:** This issue should be included on national police targets.

**Response:** We believe a co-operative approach needs to be adopted to tackle this problem, with responsibilities placed on all relevant bodies to commit to working together. Therefore, we would be happy to consider a cross-cutting target or performance indicator that demonstrated Government's overarching commitment to preventing the sexual exploitation of children, rather than one which placed a performance indicator on a single agency.

**Recommendation 6:** An Internet web-site for ACPCs is set up to communicate and share information and to highlight good practice particularly with regard to successful
prosecutions. This should be Government led through inter-Government departments (not just DoH).

Response: This has already been set up following the ACPC conference last November.

Recommendation 7: These review findings should be used to support the proposals for a change of legislation as per the sex offences review (Setting the Boundaries, 2000).

Response: We are committed to tackling those who seek to sexually exploit children and recognise that effective legislation is an essential piece of the jigsaw. The proposals made in the Sex Offences Review are currently being considered by Ministers in the light of the responses to public consultation, and we will be taking forward strengthened legislation as soon as Parliamentary time allows.

Recommendation 8: A review of criminal justice agency responses to the Guidance should be conducted.

Response: We will give further consideration to this proposal. Such a review may increase in value if it is conducted after strengthened legislation has been implemented.

Recommendation 9: More detailed information in terms of links to geographical locations and movements of children involved in prostitution should be collected and disseminated between ACPCs.

Response: We will consider how this could be achieved in practice and what sort of information might be shared. There are issues about information sharing and confidentiality that will need to be thought through. It may be more realistic for such information to be shared through existing networks.

Recommendation 10: A national audit of specialist resources and service provision is undertaken, published and disseminated.

Response: We will consider this.

Recommendation 11: The targeted survey should be replicated in 12 months time and extended to include the remaining 96 ACPCs to provide a more accurate national view of the number and gender of young people involved in prostitution. This will also provide information on the impact of the Guidance over time.

Response: We will consider doing this.