

Statement of Wendy Ghaffar

Statement No: 3

Date: 23/09/2020

IN THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE  
THE INVESTIGATION INTO CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION BY ORGANISED NETWORKS

---

WITNESS STATEMENT OF WENDY GHAFFAR

---

1. I, Wendy Ghaffar, make this statement as on behalf of the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills ('Ofsted'). This is my third statement in this investigation and follows my first dated 2 March 2020 [OFS012532] and my second dated 7 August 2020 [OFS012678] I say as follows:
2. The Inquiry previously requested a supplementary written statement under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 in relation to its investigation into the sexual exploitation of children by organised networks ('CSEN'). This request is contained in a letter dated 17 July 2020.
3. In that statement I explained that I was unable to provide all the information requested as this was not available at that time. This information has now been gathered and is set out in response to the questions below:

***In respect of the most recent inspections carried out by Ofsted: The number of cases of child sexual exploitation reviewed by Ofsted overall, and in each of the five geographical areas in England, and how many cases involved a male victim or a child with a disability, if known.***

4. As explained in [OFS012678], the lead inspector has a high-level overview of all the cases and is responsible for creating a balance in the diversity of cases. However, on the overall evidence record for each inspection cases are not listed by the protected characteristics present and the record may not always log all this information if it is not the primary focus.

We do not always categorise cases according to the characteristics of the children or the nature of all of the issues for which they are receiving support services. For example, a case may be recorded as a neglect case when there are also concerns about exploitation. It is therefore not possible to give a full and comprehensive answer to the Inquiry's questions about the number of cases of child sexual exploitation that inspectors have reviewed overall.

5. We are not able to give a figure for the number of cases reviewed by inspectors across the whole of England. Following work carried out over the summer we can, however now provide some figures for cases reviewed during the most recent inspections of the five local authorities that are the subject of the investigation. It is important to stress that these figures are based on a manual sift of the evidence that is still available to us from those inspections. Also, since inspectors are not required to record every detail of a child's case as explained in paragraph 7 of my second statement [OFS012678]; it is quite possible that the numbers provided are an underestimate of the cases of sexual exploitation and criminal exploitation and missing children cases reviewed for each local area.
6. As well as identifying cases where a child appears to be affected by sexual exploitation, we have looked for cases of other forms of criminal exploitation. This is because of our growing awareness that these different forms of abuse may be interlinked, for example children who are vulnerable to criminal exploitation are often also at risk of sexual exploitation. Increasingly, inspectors will examine how local authorities work to tackle all types of extra-familial risks to children, rather than focussing exclusively on child sexual exploitation. In order to give a fuller picture, we have included figures for the number of cases of child criminal exploitation that we have identified from the inspection evidence.
7. Taking those notes of caution account, the numbers of cases we have identified for the five authorities are as follows. These figures apply to inspections carried out since March 2017.
8. In inspections of Bristol, we have identified 26 cases that are relevant to the Inquiry. These are made up of 14 cases of sexual exploitation, nine cases of criminal exploitation (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation) and three cases of children going missing. In addition, in 10 cases of sexual exploitation there were risks of going missing.

9. In inspections of Tower Hamlets, we have identified 56 cases that are relevant to the Inquiry. These are made up of 28 cases of sexual exploitation, 17 cases of criminal exploitation (two of which also explicitly mention sexual exploitation) and 10 cases of children going missing (five of which also explicitly mention sexual exploitation). 23 cases of exploited children included risk of going missing.
10. In inspections of Durham, we have identified 25 cases that are relevant to the Inquiry. These are made up of 18 cases of sexual exploitation, three cases of criminal exploitation and four cases of children going missing (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation). 10 cases of exploitation included risks of going missing.
11. In inspections of St Helens, we have identified 29 cases that are relevant to the Inquiry. These are made up of 10 cases of sexual exploitation, seven cases of criminal exploitation (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation) and 12 cases of children going missing (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation). 5 cases of exploited children included risk of going missing.
12. In inspections of Warwickshire, we have identified 53 cases that are relevant to the Inquiry. These are made up of 33 cases of sexual exploitation, two cases of criminal exploitation (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation) and 18 cases of children going missing (one of which also explicitly mentions sexual exploitation).

***Question: The number of cases of missing children reviewed by Ofsted overall and in each of the five geographical areas in England, and how many cases involved a male child or a child with a disability, if known.***

13. Ofsted does not keep a central record of the individual children's cases that inspectors review during inspections, nor do we categorise those cases according to the characteristics of the children or the nature of the issues for which they are receiving support services. It is therefore not possible to give a full and comprehensive answer to the Inquiry's questions about the number of cases of children going missing that inspectors have reviewed overall.

14. We are not able to give a figure for the number of cases of missing children reviewed by inspectors across the whole of England. We can, however, provide a limited breakdown of the cases of missing children that we have identified from the most recent inspections of the five local authorities that are the subject of the investigation.
15. There is no requirement for inspectors to record the sex or other characteristics of children whose cases they review, such as whether the child has a disability. We are therefore only able to give a partial answer to the Inquiry's questions about the cases of missing children that have been reviewed on inspection.
16. The information that we have been able to identify from the available inspection evidence is as follows.
17. In inspections of Bristol, three cases of children going missing were identified, of which two were male and one was female. In addition, 10 cases of exploited children included the risk of going missing. One of these children was female but the sex of the other nine children was not recorded. No information about disabilities is recorded for the cases in Bristol.
18. In inspections of Tower Hamlets, 10 cases of children going missing were identified, of which five were male, four were female and one has no sex recorded. In addition, 23 cases of exploited children included the risk of going missing. 14 of these children were female, seven were male and the sex of the other two children was not recorded. Two of the children identified as missing cases had information about disability recorded.
19. In inspections of Durham, four cases of children going missing were identified, of which two were male, one was female and the sex for the other child was not recorded. In addition, 10 cases of exploited children included the risk of going missing. Five of these children were male, three were female and the sex of the other two children was not recorded. No information about disabilities is recorded for the cases in Durham.
20. In inspections of St Helens, 12 cases of children going missing were identified. The sex of these children was not recorded. In addition, five cases of exploited children included the risk of going missing. Three of these children were male, one was female and the sex of

the other child was not recorded. No information about disabilities is recorded for the cases in St Helens.

21. In inspections of Warwickshire, 18 cases of children going missing were identified, of which seven were male, four were female and the sex of the other seven children was not recorded. In addition, 14 cases of exploited children included the risk of going missing. Four these children were male, nine were female and the sex of the other child was not recorded. No information about disabilities is recorded for the cases in Warwickshire.

**Statement of Truth**

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed: **DPA** \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: 23/09/2020\_\_\_\_\_