

County Line Vulnerability Tracker

FAQ's

Q- Who actually physically fills it in?

- A. Generally, there would be either an assigned person or team to fulfil this role but this could be the professional referring the subject.

Q-From an analytical point of view – who has responsibility for maintenance?

- A. Good practice, based on the exploitation subject matter would be an analyst already looking at Vulnerable Children or the ACE's / Health model. The assigned team or person would be responsible for the upkeep and oversight but it depends on which organisation holds the CLVT

Q- How many CLVT's would a force need?

A – It is suggested that Forces who historically have found vulnerability within their county line imports should start with one CLVT. Exporting Forces such as large Metropolitan areas may require multiple CLVT's depending on the geographical makeup, political frame work or force, Local Authorities etc....

Q- What about 'within force' County Lines issues?

- A. This is still something that would be overseen within the CLVT, however the investigation aspect would be dealt with locally by whichever unit was investigating, within the particular force.

Q- If it sat in the MASH, it would depend on the skillset of those making up the teams.

- A. The CLVT should sit within the department that is agreed by all safeguarding leads. MASH, Safeguarding Hubs and YOS have all been suggested.

Q- When do people come off the tracker/ do they come off the tracker?

- A. A person can come off the tracker. There are a number of factors taken into consideration when looking at their removal. The assessments are made between police and key partner professionals as to the necessity of retaining a person.
The subject stays within the CLVT document but is shown as CLOSED, allowing the team to audit the report for any data requests.

Q – When someone is referred in, who has the responsibility for populating the system?

A. This would go through the designated team who would assess the referral and populate a profile although the onus is on the professional referring to provide adequate information and rationale.

Q – Would it not just be easier to have PNC flags on them? – We could get the information from name and DOB(?).

A. There are PNC flags so if the person is located out of their force area, contact can be made and information shared accordingly. The CLVT provides one place to record all relevant

information about the individual, without having to look through several different systems and piecing together the information. To date there is not a dedicated CL PNC marker but it is something that hopefully will be addressed in the near future.

Locate trace markers, which are frequently, used for Missing Persons is a good option and allows free text for immediate signposting.

Q- What about disclosure? Who has responsibility for disclosure?

- A. The CLVT for that individual may form part of a disclosure document at court to prove or even disprove that subject's involvement in an offence. Particularly the S45 duress defence, which is ever increasingly used.

Q_ If you identify someone in Lambeth who is going out to GMP, does this system alert GMP?

- A. In short yes, if the subject is found within GMP and he/she resides elsewhere, the immediate investigation and or safeguarding would commence within GMP but the subject would be signposted back to Lambeth's Child Exploitation Team and their CLVT record updated or if new, completed.
This will allow a support network to commence within that subjects home borough.

Q – It should be the home force that update it, are we not just duplicating work?

- A. Each subject will have a unique reference number.

Scenarios could be : OPEN case with HOME FORCE (victim Trafficking)

OPEN case with INVESTIGATING FORCE (Suspect)

CLOSED case with INVESTIGATION FORCE (signposted to home force)

CLOSED suspect in custody

If a child is located within your force, safeguarding measures are put in place and the subject is added to the Force CLVT. That child is then signposted to the Force where they currently live or have responsibility for. Or the investigation commences with the found force. Not all the information required for the CLVT will be known to the finding Force hence the signpost to the Home Force CLVT.

Q- Should it not just be part of the Re-dive tracker?

- A. The CLICM captures data from a wide range of data but is NOT a safeguarding tool. Nor is it used to provide a record of engagement for individuals. The CLVT does not hold confidential operational information, but provides a structured safeguarding plan for children and vulnerable adults within the county lines landscape. However, the CLVT does provide a recorded cohort assessed at risk of County Lines who can be uploaded on to the CLICM, if appropriate, and increase opportunities for identifying crossovers with other forces and regions. Which can further inform the local picture of risk and inform ongoing safeguarding decisions.

Q – It should sit within an overall vulnerability tracker, not just County Lines.

A. The term vulnerability is an extremely broad spectrum. County lines is it's own issue and already very widespread. Having a specific tracker makes it much easier to link information and individuals together, in addition to being a useful tool for investigating teams. It will also support the capture of vital data that has been previously unrecorded.

Q - Do we have to implement the CLVT?

A- The CLVT is not mandated however, there is an expectation that forces have something in place to capture the vulnerability and proactively safeguard and share information and intelligence with other forces and key partners. It would naturally make sense for it to be compatible with a package that can be shared nationally.