

A review of what works in multi-agency decision making and the implications for child victims of trafficking

April McCoig, Office of the Independent Anti-Slavery Commissioner
Laura Durán, ECPAT UK

12 August 2020



What did we do and why?

Increasing child referrals into the NRM
– and associated concerns.

Calls for an alternative NRM decision
making model for children.

Awareness of existing multi-agency
decision making models.



Scoping review including a rapid call
for evidence and desk based research
to identify models, followed by a **rapid
evidence assessment** of four models.



Multi-Agency
Safeguarding Hub
(MASH)

Multi-Agency Risk
Assessment
Conference
(MARAC) for
Domestic Abuse

Channel panels

A Missing and
Exploitation Hub



The review explored 7 key themes:

1. The function of the model
2. Membership
3. Incorporation of survivor voices and the voice of the child
4. Training
5. Funding and resourcing
6. Information sharing
7. Governance



What function should multi-agency decision making models have?

- Safeguarding + decision making
- Frequency of meetings and follow-up review
- Information sharing between agencies

Recommendations for local safeguarding partners:

1. Decisions are made to attain the best interests of the child.
2. Devolved NRM decision making is intrinsically linked to local safeguarding structures.
3. Suitable information sharing protocols are in place to share information and support the best interests of the child.

Recommendations for UK government:

1. Set out in policy or guidance how relevant government departments incorporate the best interests requirement.



Every Child Protected
Against Trafficking



INDEPENDENT
ANTI-SLAVERY
COMMISSIONER

Who should be involved?

- Core members and flexibility
- The role of the panel chair
- Survivor voices and the voice of the child

Recommendations for local safeguarding partners:	Recommendations for UK government:
<p>4. A core membership of local safeguarding partners with the ability to incorporate other agencies or departments.</p> <p>5. Facilitate the voice of the child within decision making, preferably seeking the active participation of ICTGs</p>	<p>2. Ensure there are key competencies in place for the role of panel chair with consideration to independent chairs.</p>



What else is important?

- Training and awareness raising
- Governance
- Funding

Recommendations for local safeguarding partners:	Recommendations for UK government:
<p>6. Regular training on child trafficking is provided for all local safeguarding partners involved using a tiered structure.</p> <p>7. Situate the model within the governance structure of the strategic local safeguarding partnership.</p>	<p>3. Develop national resources for devolved NRM decision making for children.</p> <p>4. Conduct a new burdens assessment to determine the extra resources needed for devolved decision making.</p> <p>5. Sufficient funding for local safeguarding partnerships to meet the demands of contextual safeguarding.</p>



Learning about what works

- A need for an independent, published evaluation.
- Outcomes for children should be considered.

Recommendations for local safeguarding partners:	Recommendations for UK government:
	6. Commission an independent evaluation of the pilot to test approaches ensuring that this measures impact by on the long-term outcomes for children.



Thank you



Every Child Protected
Against Trafficking



INDEPENDENT
ANTI-SLAVERY
COMMISSIONER