

## **Trafficking and Exploitation Strategy Review**

**All Action Areas Combined Meeting: 6<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

### **Event Report**

#### **Event description**

As part of a wide-ranging engagement programme to inform the statutory review of the Trafficking and Exploitation Strategy, all members of the three Action Area implementation groups, as well as the Child Trafficking Strategy Group, were invited to a joint all-day session on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2019. This was the first time members of these groups had been invited to a joint session.

The day was split into two sessions. In the morning attendees were asked to discuss the Strategy itself, what if any changes were needed to the focus of the Strategy and the outcomes it was seeking to achieve, as well as reflections on what had been done so far and what we should do more of.

In the afternoon attendees were asked to reflect on the mechanics of implementing the Strategy including any changes to the action area groups themselves, as well as processes for monitoring and reporting on progress.

Attendees were asked to sit in specific groups on four tables with each group having a mix of the four implementation groups. Action Area Chairs were asked to facilitate discussions specifically around their Action Area, and the groups moved from table to table as they discussed each Action Area.

#### **Morning discussion**

The heading for this session was “Strategy Focus and Outcomes”. Prompt questions included:

- Are the outcomes and goals set out in the Strategy for this Action Area right? What if any changes are needed?
- Are there specific actions which should be included as a priority in the next three years?
- Looking back on the last two and half years, what have we achieved? What should we have done more of?

#### **Afternoon discussion**

The heading for this session was “Delivering the Strategy”. Prompt questions included:

- Looking forward at the next three years, how will we deliver on the aims of the Strategy?
- What if any changes should we make to the structure and management of the Action Area/CTSG group?
- How should we manage monitoring and reporting on implementation?

## **Action Area 1 - Summary**

A representative from COSLA chaired the Action Area 1 table and welcomed each of the groups, providing a brief overview of the aims of Action Area 1 (AA1).

There were a number of key themes emerging from the table discussions with many cross overs between the individual groups and both the morning and afternoon sessions. The key themes are listed below:

1. Structure, Membership & Purpose
2. Awareness/Training Strategy
3. Who is being missed/not identified?
4. Victim engagement/Survivor involvement
5. Reporting
6. Future

### *Structure, membership & purpose*

- Outcomes/actions are correct
- Current high level outcomes are appropriate.
- Children's voice is perhaps lost in AA1, need its own Action Area
- High level outcomes are fine but a number of the lower levels are now business as usual so would need updated to be smarter/more strategic
- What are the next steps to the lower outcomes? What are the tangible actions?
- We should have short life taskforces to deal with specific issues and to deliver concrete actions.
- We need to define the outcomes more specifically and then develop any taskforce around those actions
- Extend membership of shorter-life working groups to people not sitting within the AA structure
- Can the working groups pull in relevant actors to deal with the issue if necessary (ie the difficulties with interpretation services)
- Increase focus and be more directive across AA groups to deliver action. Consider better use of short life working groups to deliver tasks.
- The AA meetings need to be more focused on actions rather than roundtable updates. Needs to be more direction
- Groups need to be much more directive, activity happens without the group but AA1 needs to be clearer on actions, tasks and responsibility.
- AA1 should focus on 2 or 3 concrete issues to deliver
- Define purposes of each AA/CTSG better, set out the process for escalating issues
- CTSG members populate the other AAs but the members of other AAs don't replicate this in the CTSG

- Would be helpful for all Action Area members to understand what is being discussed across the other groups
- More specific updates at the AA1 meeting highlighting issues in other groups
- Meetings could be thematic based and involve members from across the other Action Areas where appropriate

### *Awareness/Training Strategy*

- Awareness levels are still low, good that those who understand they don't know attend training but concern at how low the knowledge is. HT ambassadors need to fight for time within organisations to promote HT training and there are resource issues. Funding creates barriers to developing awareness raising. COSLA handbook is fine but face to face training is much more powerful, impact of material via a handbook is perhaps lower although it has a wider reach. Perhaps not doing as much as we could.
- Should awareness raising and communication be within one action area as they crossover all action areas.
- Mainstream human trafficking awareness across all areas of government
- Awareness raising and pathway procedures could be set out much better through training, there is no training strategy in the Strategy, this could definitely be improved and would assist with higher quality of NRM referrals and the provision of information
- Need a more coherent rolling training programme, learning from TARA training needs to inform this and different levels of training required
- Training is never complete, there needs to be an ongoing and consistent approach
- Training strategy
- Trauma impact training and frontline training, improving NRM quality needs to be a focus for this moving forward
- Why is the NRM/HT not a core part of social work training?
- Need a clear consistent message from training rather than variable interpretations across the country, needs implemented from the SG down this can't be dealt with locally as the message will not be consistent
- Awareness raising needs to be more consistent and rolling, (media campaigns and training sessions need to be better planned)
- Awareness raising needs to be more embedded within education, from secondary onwards
- Definitely embed training across education and in professional training packages (social work, health visitors). Secondary schools need to be considered, brilliant feedback from recent Rah Rah theatre performances this is informing the communities of the future
- We need a long term engagement strategy
- Consistent and mandatory training for front line officials
- Targeted activity at grassroots levels

### *Who is being missed/not identified*

- UK nationals and lack of identification needs to be looked at
- People being picked up in services but not being recognised as victims of trafficking but are being supported in other ways.
- Disconnect in what is available for UK nationals and other victims
- Need to focus on those victims that we are missing. Target homeless sector/shelters
- More targeted work in communities focussing on vulnerable and at risk groups.
- Domestic trafficking needs more focus including within the night time economy
- Need more recognition of the groups we are not reaching – UK nationals, other vulnerable groups.

### *Victim engagement/Survivor involvement*

- Should survivor engagement have a focus like the child strand of work?
- Longer term support would be beneficial for survivor recovery and would enable police to re-engage with victims to glean some intelligence once they are recovered
- Victim consultation, would be helpful to understand what would help victims engage in a police investigation and court process. Organisations working with victims of trafficking could discuss with survivors to understand what would help them participate? Highlight special measures that victims of HT are entitled to access
- It can be difficult to keep track of victims once they enter the NRM, and there is an issue with UK nationals being reluctant to identify themselves as victims in the first instance
- Accessing information/intelligence from survivors further down the line by Police Scotland should be considered, towards end of NRM or post CG decision
- Understand link between supporting victims and identifying perpetrators, how can you keep victims engaged
- Involve the survivor voice regularly, not just a focus group every now and then, JustRight have survivors who could be supported to participate in the AA group
- Need to ask victims whether the Strategy is working, how did they come forward?
- Could we explore co-production and running ideas past survivors?
- How can AA1 incorporate meaningful survivor engagement – this could be an issue for AA1 to consider.
- Resilience work with lived experience of those in the care system that model could be applied to victims of trafficking
- Increase use of peer to peer support
- We need a victim engagement plan and cultural learning embedded in victim support
- Need to do more on lived experience, this session is full of professionals

## *Reporting*

- How do we measure long terms outcomes for victims and what do these look like
- Move away from being numbers orientated
- More ongoing monitoring throughout the year rather than waiting until the end?
- Reducing the size of the report would reduce onus on SG HT team, simplify the report, too much text to be useful at the moment.
- Annual report is important as it is but it might be useful to produce a distilled version
- Who are the annual reports written for?
- Report format depends on who the report is for
- Can we slim down the annual reports with a more substantial report at the end of each 3 year period?

## *Future*

- Create an action plan to sit alongside the Strategy rather than rearrange the Strategy
- Would like to see a more gendered approach to reflect how trafficking impacts on women. Look at each aspect of the HT journey and how this impacts on women and children across the different types of exploitation. May need more specific actions in the future.
- Should outcomes around identification be separated out from support
- Alternatively training and identification should come together
- Look at compensation for victims, including how to involve the victim voice
- Consider appropriate specialist support available – this needs developed to manage a person through the court/investigative process
- Is the 90 days relevant period enough to support victims over the long term and through court cases which can last for over a year
- Consider/assess what medium to long term outcomes for survivors look like
- Need more focus on sea ports to prevent access to the country/identify victims at points of entry
- International links/networks should transcend the whole strategy
- Develop some sort of source country analysis to sit alongside the Strategy
- Increase awareness of County Lines/criminal exploitation
- What evidence is there of best practice in victim identification/support that could be reviewed
- How can support be made more culturally sensitive, we need to speak to people about this rather than doing something to them, these views need to be represented in the Strategy
- Engage with academics to better understand conditions in source countries and how this impacts on survivors' views of exploitative conditions in Scotland/UK
- Consider a 'train the trainers' model for the roll-out of trauma informed practice
- Mapping victim pathway to ensure service provision is sufficient throughout the length of the journey. This can be the first stage to deciding where resources are allocated
- How do you measure whether the Strategy is working or not?

- Regional partnership work hasn't moved on – how can we get this moving
- Quality performance management for support services and looking at longer term needs
- Issues should be shared across AAs when this can aid response. How can we achieve this flexibility?
- How can we ensure existing literature/materials are used effectively?
- Need to incentivise organisations to work together (AA1 lower level outcome 4)
- Continue public surveys, very useful tool and provides evidence for action
- Create a collective database that would be widely accessible and host survivor demographics, experiences, trends
- There are a number of themes that have come up across all the tables today and how is this joined up across the AAs?

## **Action Area 2 - Summary**

A representative from Police Scotland chaired the Action Area 2 table and welcomed each of the groups, providing a brief overview of the aims of the Human Trafficking Partners/Action Area 2 (AA2) Group

There were a number of key themes emerging from the table discussions with many cross overs between the individual groups and both the morning and afternoon sessions. The key themes are listed below:

1. Structure, Membership & Purpose
2. Challenges
3. Measures
4. Intelligence
5. Perpetrators
6. Children
7. Entry Ports to Scotland
8. Victim Engagement
9. Future

### *Structure, Membership & Purpose*

- Operational activity could be improved ensuring a more multi-agency approach to bring in **all** partners utilising their unique skills, experience and tools available to them.
- Reference made to Lothian where an operational/tactical group is being created to mirror AA2 at a local level. Could this be rolled out across Scotland?
- AA2 needs to be more proactive rather than waiting on instruction from the NCA
- NHTU are a small resource, do they have capacity to manage increase in NRMs
- AA2 is very police focussed – should membership be wider to cover the whole criminal justice system
- Does every division need to be represented physically at the meeting?
- AA2 needs to be more directive and achieve things
- Outcomes in the strategy are all business as usual – there is no innovation

### *Challenges*

- Is internal trafficking being looked at by AA2

- Is there more to be done with linking the Missing Persons Strategy and CSE work to identify internal trafficking
- Multi agency structures are already in place and being utilised to the max
- There are questions of consistency across local authorities and Police Scotland divisions.
- It's possible that the enforcement approach has become too victim-focussed – it's important to take a tough approach to perpetrators in line with serious organised crime policing.
- We need to take the victim's word at point of referral – cannot validate this before deciding whether to refer into NRM or not
- Victims are telling the same story but what are law enforcement doing about this?

### Measures

- Current measures for AA2 are not reflective of success
- Current measures do not match what AA2 is ultimately about
- There are softer, non-figure based, measures that show success – refusals at border, HMRC activity, GLAA activity – that could be included
- Qualitative data should be increased
- Can case studies be used more to demonstrate success
- Submission of intelligence from partners could be added
- Convictions don't reflect the challenges each body in the criminal justice system face
- Tendency to measure final outcome rather than good work that goes before this
- If there were zero victims and convictions would this be seen as success
- Report on softer targets – more community based prevention work and links to AA3
- Report on activity – no of flights targeted, no of individuals whose condition has improved (proper pay, suitable accommodation, paid leave etc.), no of individuals safely returned home
- Part 3 of the Act is not mentioned

### *Intelligence*

- What other ways are there to receive intelligence
- There is a disconnect between Police and others sharing intelligence
- Information flow must be both ways
- Police need to let others know what action is being taken so victims are not put at further risk if operations or activity is planned

### *Perpetrators*

- If disruption doesn't happen the problem will continue
- How do we ensure Police Scotland have the resources to actually tackle perpetrators
- Demand for cheap drugs drives exploitation – disrupt using other tools available

- Why are victimless prosecutions not used?
- Why are there not financial investigations into assets/proceeds of crime?
- What is behind a prosecution? What is the narrative – how many victims were recovered and other crimes stopped
- The number of victims identified doesn't relate to the number of perpetrators. What is the barrier to perpetrators being identified? Are there any other agencies that can provide this intelligence to police and fiscals?

### *Children*

- AA2 could be more joined up with children's groups
- Perpetrators assume information will not be shared between agencies so abusers will allow children to access sexual health services – need to take this into consideration if we become better at joining up the dots and working together
- What value does AA2 add for children
- Police should consider when is the best time to re-engage with children

### *Entry Ports to Scotland*

- Open ports and borders in Scotland make it easy for people to get in – there is not a large police or border presence
- A lot of good work at the airports may be dispersing the problem to sea ports
- Does there need to be more engagement with British Transport Police and traffic police on use of road and rail networks?

### *Victim engagement*

- Are there any criminal justice service agencies that are working with victims/perpetrators that can feed in their views
- Perspective from survivors is missing – their views should be fed in – how can we improve engagement/trust with Police
- No follow up from Police if victims choose to speak to them – makes victims feel like there is no point engaging
- Where and when is the best time to speak to a victim to receive intelligence on traffickers for prosecutions?
- Trauma informed interviewing – can this be used to help build trust with victims

### *Future*

- Create a specific outcome about targeted activity
- Create a specific outcome about county lines and child criminal exploitation
- Outcomes need to be more specific and tactical for non-business as usual activity
- Consider a specific outcome on identifying the barriers to successful investigations and finding the solutions to overcome this
- Invite criminal justice agencies onto the group

- Is there a way to skill people up to manage risk
- Cross action area group activity
- Distribute or make available each AA's minutes so members of all groups know what is happening and to avoid duplication of work
- Are there any lessons to be learned from the Essex lorry tragedy and quick arrest of individuals?
- Make more links with AA3 and its focus on working with communities
- Secondment of officers to assist in disruption

## **Action Area 3 – Discussion Summary**

A Scottish Government official chaired the Action Area 3 table and welcomed each of the groups, providing a brief overview of the aims of Action Area 3 (AA3).

There were a number of key themes emerging from the table discussions with many cross overs between the individual groups and both the morning and afternoon sessions. The key themes are listed below:

1. Strategy outcomes and goals
2. AA3 group structure and membership
3. Making connections with other relevant policy areas
4. Awareness
5. Business links
6. International work

### *Strategy outcomes, goals and reporting*

- High level goals and outcomes are broadly ok – changing at this stage could risk losing focus
- Lots of work has been done on the first two outcomes, but the third (people at most risk get help to increase their resilience against trafficking) is difficult
- There's overlap with other Action Areas, especially AA1. Looking at reasons why victims might not come forward would sit more naturally with AA1.
- The outcomes in the Strategy need to be clearly linked to the overall aim of eliminating trafficking – raising awareness isn't an end in itself. We need to be empowering and facilitating people to do something, and to be clear what we're asking them to do.
- Annual reporting is sensible but be clearer what is happening as a result of AA3 and what would have happened anyway.
- Some felt the current approach to annual reports is too detailed and not worth the work involved; others felt it was important to be capturing and reporting on the range of work being done
- The current measures reported on don't always make it clear what the benefits are – think about how to capture less tangible outcomes. Repeating data already reported by NRM is of limited value.

### *AA3 group structure and membership*

- The Corporate Group needs to be reinvigorated/relaunched. We should make links with businesses e.g. Tesco, Amazon etc, get named champions and sponsors

- Could be asking other Action Areas to identify challenges that businesses could help with and then use the Corporate Group to leverage support.
- Consider inviting DFID to join AA3?
- Consider involving more international human rights NGOs?
- Current AA3 membership is quite strategic – involve more frontline organisations to better reflect experiences of victims?
- Some had a perception that AA3 was all about business engagement – do more to pick up on other elements
- The AA3 group needs to be more task and target focussed, initiating short life working groups on specific projects, working across AA groups where this makes sense. The business guidance was a good example of this approach.
- AA3 meetings shouldn't just be everyone updating on what they've been doing – need real joint work and actively tasking people to drive forward these issues.

### *Making connections with other relevant policy areas*

- Victim focus is crucial, and we should be looking at groups at risk of trafficking, e.g. homeless
- More could be done to link in with homelessness policy, including with frontline workers. These services also have links to seasonal workers.
- The Trauma Training Framework is an example of making strong links across policy areas, and framing specific challenges as part of wider issues.
- Work in other context including GIRFEC, Equally Safe, Sustainable Development Goals.
- Links with drugs and prostitution policy, violence against women.
- Make better links with education – awareness should be embedded in the curriculum to increase resilience of children not to be exploited
- There's overlap with the Serious Organised Crime Strategy, which includes good links through the Scottish Business Resilience Centre to existing business networks including the Federation of Small Businesses, Retailers Against Crime etc
- Poverty is a key barrier to consumers making ethical choices
- Poverty is also a key factor that puts people at risk of being trafficked, both in Scotland and overseas

### *Awareness*

- There's a lack of UK nationals being referred to the NRM from Scotland – comes down to frontline professional awareness. More to be done, and link with County Lines issue for Child Trafficking Strategy Group
- More could be done around financial trails – ask where is the money going – it's going into hostile and dangerous countries, into terrorism, drugs and organised crime – that's a powerful message
- Building awareness through popular culture is having an impact – tv, plays etc. How do we continue to push this? The human story is what connects with people.

- These issues can be intangible – we should focus on case examples, raids, prosecutions etc in our messaging.

### *Business links*

- Business engagement so far has been too high level – focus on smaller businesses where exploitation is actually happening, e.g. car washes. GLAA already have some of these links.
- How do we encourage people to make positive choices as consumers. Can we learn from how Fair Trade has made an impact?
- We should challenge businesses around what they count as being in their supply chain, e.g. car washes for a fleet of cars, activities in supermarket car parks
- We should be more ambitious for a Scottish approach, not just implementing UK legislation
- Pick up on specific examples of positive corporate activity – e.g. Tesco responded to police uncovering issues with their recruitment in Romania and Albania by doing direct advertising in country to raise awareness of what exploitation is
- We should do more to tap into resources potentially available from big business – build a network of champions and data sources
- The Bright Future scheme is good but only open to those with a right to work. Could we explore businesses offering pre-employment training or support before right to work comes through, to help with victims' personal development?
- Look at the Nottingham University city centre network project
- Think about how to make employment more accessible to victims – learn from Small Business Investment Companies and work to help ex-offenders and homeless people into employment, e.g. Timpsons, Greggs, Wilmot Dixon construction. Staffline have experience with this.
- More could be done around licensing e.g. nail bars, car washes – follow up on work under AA1 from local authorities. Incentivise legitimate businesses in these areas, e.g. BAPTAC, Petrol Retailers Association.

### *International work*

- Vietnam as the most common source country warrants closer look. Any potential for work in country?
- ECPAT and others already have work underway in Vietnam – scope and connect up?
- International focus should not just be on supply chains
- Other links that could be explored include Global Contact, CEDAWs, UN Committees doing work in this area.
- Border Force has done some international activity but it's resource intensive. We could be making more of links, e.g. with Consulates and British Embassies in relevant countries. The Scottish Government has hubs in some overseas countries – we should link in.
- Survivors returned to their home country are at significant risk of re-trafficking

## **Child Trafficking – Discussion Summary**

A Scottish Government official chaired the Child Trafficking table and welcomed each of the groups, providing a brief overview of the aims of the Child Trafficking Strategy Group (CTSG).

There were a number of key themes emerging from the table discussions with many cross overs between the individual groups and both the morning and afternoon sessions. The key themes are listed below:

1. Who is being missed/not identified?
2. The transition of victims from child to adult services.
3. The long term recovery of victims
4. Improved consideration of children across the other Action Areas
5. Scope for the child trafficking strand to be broadened to other forms of exploitation but need to ensure that trafficking not lost in the wider work
6. Strategy outcomes and goals

### **Who is being identified/missed/not identified?**

- In general there has been progress and work has been done on awareness raising. However more can be done.
- Greater focus required on internal trafficking as well as continuing work on international trafficking. UK nationals being exploited
- Stronger focus on internal UK trafficking
- Practitioners who identify trafficking victims do it well however not all practitioners are identifying victims.
- Police Scotland try to ensure IRD approach however each local authority works differently.
- Information gathering. More information required around why certain cohorts of victims come to Scotland.
- Better information sharing on how things are changing on the frontline.
- Working groups could be created to work on live issues like significant increase in Vietnamese nationals being identified through the NRM.
- Stronger focus on preventive work around trafficking - for example, Northern Ireland did some work in the education sector with children at risk of trafficking. They focused on the children's resilience and self-worth to address factors which make them more vulnerable to trafficking.
- What about missing children
- Raise awareness for frontline staff on the role of the Scottish Guardianship Service (not well known to adult services or police).

- Work in schools and universities to raise the profile of trafficking. This would help raise awareness with children and their peers. Targeted work could be on groups which are more vulnerable.
- Limited knowledge by school children
- Quite a few children who have been going to school who are victims of domestic servitude.
- UK nationals and domestic trafficking.
- Loss of family structures, looked after, high risk, etc
- High numbers of children in England referred to NRM
- NRM recording - under reporting in Scotland so there are issues with resourcing for local services; how do we get people to report and make a referral to NRM? Might be worth surveying practitioners through Child Protection Committees Scotland to find out how many are currently referring to NRM.
- One of the criticisms from trafficking awareness raising workshops last year was that trafficking was seen by professionals as something special which meant many were unsure how to deal with victims.
- Many frontline practitioners unsure what makes up the components of the trafficking offence. Work is required so there is a greater understanding.
- The structure of the strategy should include UK children who have been trafficked. For practitioners it is hard to understand that UK nationals can also be trafficked.
- Group reflected that not all service providers and professionals aware of the work SGS do to support child victims of trafficking.

### *The transition of victims from child to adult services*

- Transition of victims from child to adult services and long term support to prevent re-trafficking.
- Look at the continuity of care for children and the movement from child to adult services.
- There is variability across Scotland on the provision of care of child victims of trafficking. In smaller local authorities there is inconsistency in practice as children who are aged 17+ seem to get care/support through adult services rather than child protection.
- Service mapping exercise might be required so we can understand resources.
- All authorities seeing increase in children being trafficked. Figures on the rise and have to support children within current structures.
- Additional services for children – befriending service, etc.
- Not specialised services for children of victims just statutory through local authority, health boards and police, etc.
- Some potential working groups could be on the NRM, longer term support (transition – 18+), awareness for practitioners on trafficking ( shared awareness).
- Support for transition from adult to children needs more connectivity within all the groups.
- 16 -17 transition part needs to be looked at
- There are issues around age assessment. Some Local Authorities do not realise it is their responsibility.

- Issues with 16 -18 years old. Some young people declare their age is 17 years old however no formal age assessment is carried out. Question raised who has the responsibility.
- Limited age assessment carried out and not always done during an IRD.
- Guidance is useful but in general there is a limited knowledge around how to carry out an age assessment in practice.
- Accommodation for children inconsistent with some young people going to residential care unit, foster home, half-way house, etc.
- There are fears by professionals that adults are potentially housed in accommodation for children as an age assessment has not been carried out.
- Timescales for age assessments can take a really long time (up to 8 weeks).
- Movement of young people around the UK
- Some young people arrive in Glasgow from other areas in the UK. They have been age assessed and applied for asylum in another area of the UK then come to Glasgow but don't want to leave.
- Biometrics
- Police Scotland have put out guidance that frontline staff should take biometrics of adults but there has been backlash about taking the biometrics of children.
- Question raised how do we verify children coming from England if we have no biometrics on record?
- Some nationalities have their finger prints taken at 15 so it could be useful to take a child's biometrics.
- Other agencies will have this information like border force
- Biometrics for children – guidance requested by Police
- Border Force already take biometrics – there is legislation if a child with a responsible adult.
- Needs to be consent based – many young people don't want their story to be identified.
- Potential to help police with their investigations. They could potentially see routes of trafficked individuals which could help Action Area 2 detect and disrupt.

### The long term recovery of victims

- Issues around later stages after they no longer engage with services. What happens after they are supported?
- More coherence and longer term action required.
- For children we can look at outcomes which help promote wellbeing and reduce the risks of trafficking through GIRFEC, health, education, stability, social skills, career development
- Question around funding for child services out of local government budgets with no additional assistance.
- Young people get good accommodation, 2 months later dip in mental health one of the mitigating factors is structure through ESOL or education.
- Mental health issues
- Mental health services. Adults who are victims of trafficking have access to a tailored national service. However children are referred through CAMHS.
- Anchor lowered their age limit to include young people aged 14 onwards.

- Big Issue accommodated 45 UASC on a waiting list for placements
- Student accommodation being used to accommodate UASC.
- UASC can't be placed unless students and currently being housed in care unit with children who are UK nationals who are transitioning out of care.
- College places limited – issued raised with SG and need money to resolve this.
- Target for education within 20 days (unsure where it is).
- Glasgow waiting list of 45 young people and looks like they won't get places until August positions (long time).
- Education key to building resilience and factor to prevent trafficking
- JustRight did a research piece on adults and education featured as the key to prevent re-trafficking.

### Improved consideration of children across the other Action Areas

- Some people felt that the child trafficking group was tagged on to the strategy and there was a potential for child trafficking to be its own action area.
- Key players are already round the table in each Action Area but the link between action areas is disjointed, for example SGS sit on Action Area 1 however children are not a strong feature in this group.
- Child Trafficking becomes Action Area 4 or alternatively outcomes for children should be embedded in all 3 action areas.
- It can be really hard to get perspective across especially for children and women.
- Sometimes 'one size' fits all is taken rather than specific needs of children, women, etc.
- Potential for cross Action Area working groups to be formed to carry out specific actions.
- Action Area 3 could look at raising awareness of children in the supply chain.
- CTSG have been able to achieve a lot as it sits separately from the other Action Areas.
- However the other areas which focus on identification and support falls short at including children. Needs to flow through all areas.
- Children should be separate as sits within Child Protection procedures.
- Some of the members of the CTSG on other action areas however questions need to be raised around the intention and purpose.
- Not a proper mechanism in place to take forward actions out with CTSG.
- Each action area should have an action plan and ensure children are listed. This might help ensure that the needs of children are considered and discussed by the other action areas.
- The CTSG could be restructured and the membership reviewed.
- CTSG sits separate from the other areas which it makes it feel excluded and disconnected from the other action areas.
- It could be helpful if child victims is included within three other areas so voice of the child is heard throughout the strategy.
- Alternatively, if child trafficking kept as an individual strand then voice of the child will be clear.
- Children have different pathways from adults and are supported through child protection procedures so makes sense to have separate strand in the strategy for

children. This would also prevent children being underrepresented in other action groups.

- The CTSG could become Action Area 4.
- Concern was raised about how children's voices are not currently heard in the parts of the strategy already so would having a separate group mean the protection of children gets lost?
- Child trafficking area is already taking action but not formalised as an action group so should be, for example NRM reforms and age assessment driven by CTSG.
- CTSG looks and feels different.
- Should other members be part of the CTSG? Different themes have arisen today there were specific topics which are interest of other group members then maybe they could come along – for example a focus on age assessment the organisations like Migrant Help might want to come along as they have children in their services.
- People already attend a lot of groups so need to be cautious.
- Feedback from other areas
- Representation on all groups
- Currently one member of the CTSG sits on the other groups however at the moment no other action area members sit on CTSG.
- Group agreed that it makes sense to have representation from other areas in the CTSG.
- However given people's limited time is it a reasonable ask of members to attend more than one action area meeting?
- A larger child trafficking group might not ensure that actions are being taken forward on operational delivery.
- Currently there is limited tasking being done on an operational level by all action areas.
- Look at cross representation from other areas.
- In legal terms children are treated separately and have different legislation so it would make sense for children to have their own action area.

Scope for the child trafficking strand to be broadened to other forms of exploitation but need to ensure that trafficking not lost in the wider work

- Child trafficking could be looked at under the umbrella of exploitation - work required to rationalise landscape and identify gaps.
- Useful to have a group that looks at other forms of exploitation.
- Barnardos are internally reviewing how they look at all forms of exploitation.
- The context of child exploitation would need to be clear and should be looked at in all its forms including CCE, Missing, trafficking, CSE, etc.
- The strategy is on trafficking and exploitation so a focus should be on exploitation too.
- Potentially child exploitation could be separated from the Trafficking Strategy however it was clarified that the group would feed into the main group for child exploitation.
- Children's experience is complex and shouldn't be badged. Should look at legislation and services available.
- Accountability is key to reflect complexity of the issue.

- Need to be careful that trafficking victims do not get lost in a wider exploitation strategy.
- Would children who are being exploited vs county lines take over the conversation/focus
- What are the unintended consequences of viewing trafficking through exploitation?
- Widening the definition of trafficking to exploitation means that potentially anyone who is vulnerable could fit under this term so how do we ensure specific actions are taken forward?
- How broad should we go? How do you ensure focus?
- If you expand the definition to exploitation how do you ensure the specific needs of trafficked children are retained and recognised?
- Example of Equally Safe which covers women who are victims but aspects get lost due to the breadth of the strategy.
- It could become complicated for example the alignment of responsibilities, where does a topic sit and who takes responsibility? How do the issues have equal weight?
- How do we ensure trafficking is not just a tag on?
- One of the issues is that trafficking gets lost in the system. If it is part of a whole system approach then how will it be looked at as a whole picture rather than it being separate?
- If we are looking at exploitation more broadly then need to ensure that children who have been trafficked aren't lost in larger population of children.
- How do we ensure it is not just an add on?
- Good legislative grounding for trafficking which is helpful and better than other areas of exploitation.
- Trafficking is child abuse so it is treated as child protection but the partners might be a bit different.
- Makes sense on the ground as it is linked to exploitation and trafficking however fear it might be lost in exploitation.
- Is trafficking strong enough to stand alone with all forms exploitation.
- What is unique about a child who has been trafficked and ensuring their needs are met?
- Don't want trafficking to be subsumed into exploitation needs its own place.
- Helpful way to frame trafficking under the umbrella of exploitation as it will help unpick blocks in understanding. It was noted that not all exploitation is human trafficking but all trafficking is exploitation.
- Further thought required by members of the CTSG.

### Strategy outcomes and goals

- A more gendered approach was suggested
- Feedback that in general the outcomes in the current strategy were deliverable and had some key outcomes and identifiable goals set down like age assessment, etc.
- More focus on Child Criminal Exploitation, implications of immigration and Brexit, how can potential victims be discouraged from coming to the UK in unsafe conditions?

- The Action areas need to be more disciplined and focused with more tangible actions.
- Sometimes meetings are just update sessions rather than taking action to move things forward. Groups can be talking about the same thing for years and not have progressed.
- There is a lot of work they want to do however question around capacity and resources.
- Actions need to be achievable and concrete.
- Agreed that some of the actions would have happened anyway so need to think about the role of the group.
- SG taking more of stance and it would be good to get more weight from SG to move things forward.
- Some meetings not really action lead.
- Currently some of the actions are quite woolly.
- Need for continuous action and long term planning to ensure after an action is delivered there is follow up.
- What is the sustainability of the work and what happens after a campaign and training takes place to ensure longevity.
- More focus on County Lines (Child Criminal Exploitation)
- More focus on high risk children
- Look at funding and resourcing. Currently funding is a big issue.
- County lines and criminal exploitation.
- Women who have been sexually exploited abroad and arrive in the UK heavily pregnant (sold for "fatherhood" in the UK).
- Children of people who are victims of CSE and/or trafficking.
- Exploitation online, people at risk of trafficking (often forgotten)
- Try and keep it simple for children – use the good structures in place.
- The strategy should be more action and target focus.
- The strategy needs to be resourced and funding provided for key actions.
- Organisations committed so we need to be accountable and outcomes focus however need financial and resource support.
- Volume of referrals needs to be considered.
- Issues with interpreters ( Glasgow no interpreters for Vietnamese).
- Action areas
- Look at way Chairs are sharing info/report in actions to each other.
- The actions should be simplified and made more operational focused.
- CTSG have done some operational tasks.
- CTSG would fit more naturally into revised structure as operating that way already and are tasked forced.
- There is a need for concrete objectives.
- The group has not been good at reporting and measuring actions
- Right people around the table.
- Glasgow has a group on trafficking which meant those who sat on that group now sit on CTSG.
- Need right people at the right time looking at the right thing.
- Consider the role of Barnahus.

- How do you know if the strategy is not working currently? What is your measure of outcomes which can be hit at an operational level? How do we hold people account? How do we measure that ? How are you achieving?
- It would be good to have specific actions people are directly accountable for.
- The strategy should be action focused and specific.
- The current actions are quite woolly. They need to be direct actionable outcomes.
- Outcomes should be specific so they can be measured.
- What are we measuring and why? how does it help us going forward? Will it keep our partners on board? What do you want to achieve?
- Do we need a shared database where people feed in data?
- The Strategy needs to focus on frontline operational activity
- The Strategy needs direct deliverable actions.
- Currently organisations report to SG on annual basis and SG then select which area the update should sit under within the progress report.