

Positively Affecting Lives

Evaluation of Four Anti-Social Behaviour Projects in Wales

Executive Summary

Report for Welsh Assembly Government

August 2007



Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an independent evaluation of four pilot anti-social behaviour projects in Wales. Funded by the Welsh Assembly Government, the projects ran between April 2006 and March 2007 and operated in four different areas of Wales: Torfaen, Melincryddan (Melin), Lliswerry and Cardiff.

The Welsh Assembly Government takes the problem of anti-social behaviour very seriously and supports Community Safety Partnerships to ensure a joined-up, multi-agency approach to combating the problem in Wales. Each of the 22 Community Safety Partnerships in Wales has designated Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinators who play a strategic role in reducing anti-social behaviour at the local level.

The funding for the four pilot projects was awarded on the basis of detailed proposals submitted by Community Safety Partnerships across the country. Proposals were invited for innovative ways of tackling problems of anti-social behaviour that were of particular concern in their respective localities.

Evaluation Processes

The evaluation took place over an eight-month period between September 2006 and April 2007 and sought to examine how each of the projects was established and managed. Where possible, it also sought to provide an indication of how successful each project had been in achieving its initial aims, and the extent to which they were able to tackle anti-social behaviour within their localities.

An additional aim was to identify incidental learning from the pilots, for example, the most effective ways to measure outcomes or engage with at-risk young people. The specific aims were to:

- systematically collect and analyse information about how the projects were operating during their first year of funding and to identify key factors affecting project implementation;
- identify the key factors and underlying principles which allowed projects to successfully tackle anti-social behaviour;
- where projects were less successful, to identify the factors and underlying principles which can prevent or undermine attempts to reduce antisocial behaviour; and
- assess the extent to which the projects achieved the particular objectives they set when making their submissions for funding.

The evaluation was not a critical review but was essentially about learning for the future. As such, the evaluation was carried out in close collaboration with those managing the schemes. It was non-directive and was flexible in its design to allow for changes in the schemes' operations to be accommodated within the evaluation process. The evaluation essentially involved consultation with the staff and participants involved in each of the four pilot projects, as well as liaison with key stakeholders and partner organisations who supported the schemes in each area. Background literature reviews and analysis of secondary data held by the schemes in relation to the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour pre- and post- pilot were also explored.

The independent evaluation of these four pilot projects was seen as a unique feature of the operation of this pilot programme and as a necessary part in maximising learning from the venture.

Introducing the Schemes

Four very different models were implemented in the pilot areas. Two of the projects sought to work with young people in reducing anti-social behaviour at the local level (Torfaen and Lliswerry) whilst two had a more environmental focus, concentrating on ways of designing out crime in communities and public places as a first step towards reducing nuisance behaviour (Melin and Cardiff).

Given the different models employed by each scheme, it is not possible to compare the outcomes or successes of them all. Indeed, this was never an aim of the evaluation exercise. Instead, what this report seeks to do is outline the key learning from each of the projects which may be used for rationalising the way that similar schemes are developed in the future so as to maximise impact in their local areas.

The Torfaen Project

The 'Time to Engage' project in Torfaen was based on the notion of getting young people more involved in activities which would result in benefits for their community. The scheme was based in three areas of Torfaen: Trevethin, St Cadocs and Penygarn.

Focussing specifically on the most at risk young people in the community, namely those who were already known to be involved in anti-social behaviour, the project used a system of rewards to incentivise young people to spend time working on activities to help others.

A core group of ten young people were targeted by the project. A central tenet of the project was to involve these young people in sharing their own ideas about the types of things which they considered might benefit the community and determining appropriate rewards for taking part in different activities.

The types of activities that the young people undertook included litter picking in the local area, voluntary work on summer camp schemes for young people, painting an anti-graffiti wall in the Trevethin shopping area, working at youth centres, for example in the tuck shops, leaflet drops for various community organisations and gardening for elderly residents.

The type of rewards handed out by the scheme included purchase of bicycles and sports equipment, attendance at canoeing courses, swimming trips and archery lessons. Both the activities for earning credits and the rewards themselves had a physical, outdoor focus – a preference expressed by the young people involved.

Consultation with project participants suggests that the scheme was successful in increasing young people's community participation. For the young people involved, the immediate gratification of receiving rewards was cited as the main way in which they had benefited from the project. That said, they also recognised that they had achieved a greater appreciation of the need to engage with older members of the community in order to understand the origins of their attitudes towards young people, as well as to make older people more aware of young people's needs in the current social climate. There was evidence from the participants that they had developed a greater respect for older members of their community based simply on having spent time in their company and seeing that their efforts to help older people were appreciated. The young people who invested time in cleaning up their community also expressed views which indicated that they had developed a greater sense of community pride and ownership.

Changes in the young people's attitudes were complemented by a noticeable reduction in anti-social behaviour being committed by those involved in the scheme. At the general level, Torfaen experienced

an overall decrease in the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour reported during the project period. This was despite an increase in policing to target anti-social behaviour in the area over the time which would, intuitively, have led to an increase in recorded incidents.

When the project first began, all of the participants were in receipt of an Acceptable Behaviour Contract. However, no more sanctions were issued during the project and a displacement order which had been introduced in the local shopping area to prevent young people hanging around and causing nuisance was removed. This provided further tangible evidence of the success of the project.

The pilot project allowed the project team to explore the role of existing relationships with other youth agencies, and at the same time raised questions about utilising new partnerships. The reliance on internal networks within the youth service has emphasised the importance of collaborative work within the youth arena. Whilst this has benefited the running of this project and influenced the young people's experiences, stakeholders also noted incidental learning outcomes regarding their own understanding of partnership work. As such, the project has also enhanced the local youth workers' understanding of youth culture and aided their personal knowledge of available, and suitable, resources for engaging young people.

Unfortunately, from a limited number of consultations carried out with local residents, it appears that the outcomes of the project were not widely recognised. Local residents demonstrated only limited awareness of the project and some maintained that anti-social behaviour was still a problem in the area.

That said, a model has been developed which the team are confident can be rolled out elsewhere and they seem keen to widen the eligibility criteria in the future to ensure that more young people can benefit from the scheme. Funding to roll-out the model in other areas is currently being pursued.

Overall, the project appears to have had clear benefits for the young people involved and the staff who implemented the scheme. The consultative philosophy of the project appears to be one of the central features which helped in making it a success. The main question that remains is the extent to which work with such small numbers of young people can result in visible and readily identifiable differences in the community.

The Melin Project

The Melin project operated in the Neath East ward of Neath Port Talbot, a recognised Communities First area. Unemployment in Melin is above the national average for Wales and the area has a disproportionately large number of homes that are rented from the local authority, housing associations/registered social landlords.

Previous community surveys carried out in the Melin area suggest that there are considerable differences within the area with regards to the main types of incidents experienced. This made it difficult to operationalise the main issues that needed to be tackled in the area and the project's initial bid for funding was ambitious in that it sought to tackle a wide range of issues over the 12-month period. As the project progressed, however, there was some refinement of the project's objectives and the its remit became a focus on designing out crime through a programme of clean up activities in the local community as a first step towards increasing community pride and ownership among residents in the area.

Summary

The Melin project adopted a whole community approach rather than focussing on a specified age range of residents. The main restriction was a geographical one with efforts being concentrated on one main street in the area, Meadow Road, with wider community issues being a secondary concern.

The single biggest activity to be undertaken in this area was an effort to remove fly tipping and tidy up the area of garages in Meadow Road. In the first instance, a rubbish amnesty was carried out to remove small items of rubbish in the area and allow residents to dump unwanted larger items. Considerable efforts then went into organising the removal of a significant amount of refuse that had been dumped in the gardens of houses on the street, along with rubbish (including furniture and white goods) which had been dumped in the Valley. This was completed by the erection of two fences at either end of a row of houses which back onto the local Eaglesbush Valley to prevent anyone from accessing the site for rubbish dumping in the future.

To complement the fly-tipping work, the co-ordinator arranged for a large-scale garden tidy in Meadow Road, and in the communal walkways and lanes that link the community to the town. Brambles, bushes and grass were cut back which exposed rubbish (including a small number of syringes which may have been used for drug taking), which was also removed. The co-ordinator reported that many of the residents in the area had little or no means of maintaining the gardens, many were on short-term tenancies and did not care for their gardens and others were not aware that they had a garden.

The co-ordinator also worked with the local Probation Service to arrange a programme of work to remove some of the dilapidated garages that sit on one of the main pedestrian access routes onto Meadow Road. The garages are privately owned but sit on local authority land. They were considered to be dangerous and a place where local youths and those taking drugs may hang around.

Other activities included clean ups in other streets and work with young people to raise awareness of the consequences of anti-social behaviour. The coordinator was also central to the setting up of three new Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in the area and the introduction of a regular article in the local newsletter keeping residents updated with local initiatives designed to tackle anti-social behaviour.

The main outcomes of the project appear to be the significant visual improvements in the area and the introduction of measures to prevent the re-emergence of fly-tipping in the future. The number of incidents of reported anti-social behaviour in the Meadow Road area of Melin also showed some decreases at the times when the project was most active in the area.

Another undisputable project success was the role of the co-ordinator in bringing together key partners in the community to affect change. In particular, the coordinator worked closely with the local authority to initiate several of the tidy up activities and to get local residents involved in setting up a tenants' association.

At the end of the project, there was still a lack of consensus among local residents about the extent to which anti-social behaviour had decreased as a result of the pilot project. Further, there was still some inconsistency in residents' views about whether the area was in need of attention to reduce anti-social behaviour and fear of crime. Indeed, some members of the public reported that they did not consider the area to be unsafe either pre- or post- pilot.

Most importantly, the evaluation failed to uncover robust evidence of attitude change in the area among residents, which is the key to creating long-term change in this model. What this shows is that physical interventions alone may not be sufficient to create long-term change and that this needs to be complemented by an active strategy for educating communities of their own role in ensuring that long-term solutions can be found.

The Lliswerry Project

Based in the east side of Newport, the Lliswerry project focussed specifically on reducing the number of disaffected young people who carry out anti-social behaviour, as a means of reducing fear of crime in the wider community. It also focussed on increasing young people's self-esteem and skills through education.

Known as the 'Young Empowered Lliswerry Leaders' (YELL) project, this pilot engaged both 'at risk' and 'in need' young people through offering youth service provision in an area that had previously received few or no such services. Two youth workers were moved into a local community building to work at the heart of the community in gaining the trust of young people and their parents and to encourage engagement in positive social activities. The staff carried out considerable outreach work to identify young people who would benefit from the scheme and introduced structured programmes of education and recreation to allow young people to develop their personal and social skills.

Unlike the Torfaen project, the Lliswerry scheme sought to reward young people's involvement by allowing them to work towards recognised qualifications and certificates including the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, which, it was hoped, would assist them in pursuing opportunities later in life. It also sought to develop young people's 'soft skills' including increased self-esteem, sociability, team work and negotiation skills.

Over the twelve months of the pilot, two core groups of young people took part in activities (one boys group and one girls group). They engaged with the project separately with the boys group preceding the girls group.

The boys group met weekly and comprised a core of 8-9 boys attending each week. They undertook a range of social and recreational activities but the main focus of their activity was organising a charity football match with the local police in the area. This event was held during the summer of 2006 and the police later asked for a rematch. All of the boys used the weekly sessions to carry out activities which fell in line with the requirements of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme, as well as more broadly-based activities focussing on raising self-esteem and encouraging positive behaviour. Engagement with this group lasted around 16 weeks and was completed early in the pilot year.

The girls group, which had a core of four members, worked with the youth workers one evening a week over a 16 week period, meeting in a local community centre to undertake a range of activities including self-development awareness activities, discussions of social issues such as racism and discrimination, as well as to undertake physical activities (sports and arts). The central remit of the activities was delivering 'citizenship' education. That is, teaching the girls how to achieve change in the community by becoming active citizens and engaging with local residents to work together in tackling local issues.

The single biggest focus of the girls' group was the planning of a charity fashion event that was attended by members of the local community, Councillors and parents as well as other young people, at which over £110 was raised for the Breast Cancer Awareness charity. Over 25 young people were involved on the day, either performing or making up the audience.

The project appears to have provided some positive results for the young people involved, the main outcomes being greater community involvement and achievement of credits towards nationally recognised qualifications. This provided the biggest measure of success.

As with the Torfaen project, however, the main question that remains is the extent to which the work with these small numbers of young people impacted on a reduction in anti-social behaviour in the

Llswerry area. In particular, how it has helped to reduce fear of crime in line with its original objectives. Whilst it is important to recognise that the lack of data collected to reflect this (which is, perhaps, a limitation of the evaluation project), it seems likely that there would not have been any tangible reduction in incidents due to the narrowly targeted nature of the project with small groups of young people. The team have made it clear that, in order to measure real impacts on reducing levels of anti-social behaviour, a longer period of engagement with young people may be required. They consider that this pilot had enabled them to make a valuable first step towards introducing a youth service presence in a previously un-serviced area and that, as they continue into the future with the funding that they have secured from elsewhere, levels of youth engagement will increase and diversionary activities will help to remove young people from the streets and from carrying out criminal acts or acts of nuisance behaviour.

Further, there is, perhaps, some doubt about the extent to which the project met its aims of engaging the most at risk individuals in the community since the girls group, who may be considered as more 'in need', were those who perhaps benefited most from the pilot. Problems with engaging the 'at risk' boys provided valuable lessons for the future and the team in Llswerry have used mechanisms such as a formal debriefing exercise to ensure that this learning is not lost.

The conclusion to be drawn is, perhaps, that the model employed only allows for possible reduction in anti-social behaviour to be measured in the medium to long term.

The Cardiff Project

The Cardiff project had the biggest geographical remit of all four pilots, the focus being to reduce anti-social behaviour in Cardiff's parks and open spaces.

The project was based on historical evidence of a number of issues around anti-social behaviour in parks including gangs of youths, underage drinking, joyriding, illegal use of motorcycles, arson, vandalism, intimidation, drug and alcohol abuse, rough sleeping, aggressive begging, violence, dog fouling, litter, fly tipping and numerous other bylaw infringements. Of these, the two issues which were consistently most apparent in official statistics of recorded incidents, as well as being the issues raised most frequently by Council staff working in the parks and complaints received from the public, were sex and drug related litter and nuisance (over 800 needles were recovered in Cardiff parks and open spaces in 2004/05); and motorcycle nuisance. It is against this backdrop that the Cardiff Parks project was established.

In tackling motorcycle nuisance, the project set up new partnership working arrangements between the police and the council to allow them to target specific areas of concern and make arrests/confiscate bikes with greater efficiency. Council staff developed a bespoke database and recording forms that enabled them to keep a record of the main sites of motorcycle nuisance (and other anti-social behaviours) as well as the perpetrators of offences and this intelligence was shared with the police. By sharing their local knowledge of incidents and accompanying police staff to main sites of concern, there was a notable increase in the number of arrests made over the course of the pilot. Outcomes included over 1000 1st stage cautions being issued, 300 anti-social behaviour cautions being issued, 50 stolen motorbikes being recovered, over 200 motorbikes seized, arrests for various offences and numerous individuals reported for various document offences relating to road traffic infringements.

In tackling sex and drug related litter and nuisance, the co-ordinator undertook clean up activities along with park rangers to remove drugs paraphernalia which was hidden in bushes/shrubs around parks, as well as removing the belongings of rough sleepers who were using the parks out of hours. The same individuals who were involved in drug abuse and rough sleeping were also seen to be attracting sex crimes to the parks, for example, with people selling their bodies to earn money to pay for drugs.

Educating rangers to identify signs of drug and sex crimes and giving them support in the safe removal of associated paraphernalia was a focussed effort on behalf of the co-ordinator who was appointed.

A tertiary aim of this project was to divert young people away from carrying out acts of anti-social behaviour in parks by creating more social activities such as the provision of dedicated graffiti walls.

As with some of the other projects, there is little evidence to suggest any real public awareness of the council and police efforts to reduce incidents of anti-social behaviour over the pilot period. Further, a park survey carried out as part of the evaluation suggested that some of the main concerns of members of the public using the parks were different from those that were targeted by the project (for example, dog fouling and general litter).

As a result of improved mechanisms for recording incidents of anti-social behaviour that were introduced by this project, it is also difficult to say whether the number of incidents increased or decreased as the pilot progressed. Indeed, an increase in the number of incidents may have been considered a success of the pilot insofar as it provided an indication that the new system of recording was working.

As with the Melin project, one of the greatest measures of success of this project was, perhaps, the role of the project in co-ordinating existing initiatives, rather than through the introduction of any 'new' methods of dealing with anti-social behaviour. The project co-ordinator led the way in improving local partnership working and sharing of intelligence between organisations to ensure a more efficient and collaborative response to anti-social behaviour in parks and this is a model which can be used in the future to continue to target local problems.

Key Findings

All schemes were at least partially successful in meeting their initial stated aims and objectives. In none of the areas were all of the initial stated aims met. In some cases, there was a redefinition of the pilot aims at an early stage, which meant that it was difficult to judge performance against initial targets. Instead, we have attempted to review performance against modified objectives. Whilst this is not problematic in itself, it may indicate a need for greater clarity and rationalisation at the early stages of planning for similar schemes in the future.

In each of the areas there appears to have been either a correlation between the operation of the projects and a reduction in the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour being reported to the police, or engagement with the populations most at risk of carrying out anti-social behaviour. It is, however, difficult to make explicit causal links between any reductions in reported levels of anti-social behaviour and the schemes' operations.

None of the projects have convincingly demonstrated a clear link between their operation and a perceived decrease in anti-social behaviour among members of the local community. Whilst qualitative data with some of the local residents in the areas suggest that the pilot schemes were welcomed, there does not appear to have been widespread awareness or resulting attitudinal change in perceptions of anti-social behaviour per se. Linked to this, it seems that some of the schemes may have been targeting types of anti-social behaviour that were not the main concerns of local people.

The financial and staff resources allocated to each of the projects appear to have been sufficient for a one-year period. Whilst there was a common view that the one-year pilot period was not sufficiently long to create a real presence and make a noticeable difference in the target areas, the schemes all managed

to operate reasonably unconstrained by resource issues over the year. In three cases, continuation funding has been secured.

Each of the pilots has demonstrated excellent practice in partnership working and the pilots appear to have generated much interest across a number of key stakeholder organisations. It seems that the pilots have acted as a driver for change in most areas and that there are sustainable outcomes in each area.

Lessons Learned

Across the four projects, several key points of learning emerged which would seem central to any thinking with regards to the development of similar schemes which may be introduced in the future. These were:

- the need for project aims and objectives to be clearly rationalised and based on evidence of real community need rather than that implied by small number of local people. The projects which appeared to demonstrate the greatest success were those which had the fewest and most clearly defined objectives.
- use of local known staff to ensure that the pilots were up and running as soon as possible after the award of funding and that projects could benefit from local knowledge held by such staff in bringing together local partners in delivery.
- use of local facilities to house the staff employed to work on the pilots. In all cases, it seems that this co-location of staff alongside existing stakeholders for the projects meant that they had easier access to some of the key stakeholders who they were required to work with to ensure the smooth running of projects. Importantly, the use of local accommodation seems to have benefited not only the projects but also those who acted as hosts. Qualitative consultation suggests that there were mutual benefits in sharing accommodation since partners were often able to draw on the skills/experience of the pilot staff.
- effective use of participatory, non directive approaches to working with the target communities. This is especially true of the two pilot projects that worked with young people (Torfaen and Lliswerry) where the young people were consulted at various stages in the year to help shape the way in which the schemes ran.
- creating exit routes for sustainability. The schemes that have demonstrated themselves to have the greatest potential for long-term sustainability are those that have created clear exit routes for their participants.
- in extending the scope of who was being targeted, the schemes seem to have captured participants who may not previously have been considered in scope for reducing or tackling anti-social behaviour. This was especially evidenced in the two schemes that worked with young people since working with young people on the periphery of risky behaviour seems to have helped in accessing the most at-risk friends in their peer groups.
- an unanticipated outcome of the schemes has been the reported levels of staff satisfaction among those employed to work on the projects. Whilst this is perhaps an added benefit of the schemes, it does not necessarily impact directly on reducing or tackling anti-social behaviour, except that increased motivation of staff may have facilitated greater levels of activity during the pilot period and into the future.

Summary

- the need for greater community engagement to ensure the long-term success of projects. Almost all of the projects accepted that they had been less successful than originally anticipated in undertaking proactive community engagement.
- arguably, each of the schemes could have benefited from more robust public consultation at an early stage to create a clear picture of the perceived problems regarding anti-social behaviour in the local area.
- where the objectives of the projects were revised during the pilot, it is not always clear that this was undertaken as a result of better understanding of the issues in local areas (which may have been considered positive), but instead, as a result of what was felt to be achievable having reassessed the initial aims and the timeframe available. An alternative interpretation may be that, in some cases, the projects chose to spend more time on tasks that the workers felt comfortable with rather than the more difficult issues that needed to be addressed. This may have been inevitable due the project being 'pilot' projects and is not, in itself, a negative indicator of the way in which the projects were run. Indeed, in all areas the schemes appeared to build on individuals' strengths and individual characteristics, including maximising on local knowledge held by the project staff. Where this would become problematic, however, is if the main focus of the project was directed by the strengths of the project staff such that projects were tailored around staff skills rather than local needs.
- finding a way for alienated young people to make a positive contribution to their communities may have the double benefit that these young people are less likely to behave in inconsiderate or anti-social ways (because of the respect they get from adults in the community) and, at the same time, reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour because the local young people are perceived more positively.
- there was an inherent assumption that the targeted behaviours would result in reduced levels of fear of crime or increased levels of feelings of safety. Despite this, in each of the projects, it might be argued that the main benefits to arise were for participants' quality of life rather than any notable decrease in communities' fear of crime or feelings of safety. This might suggest, again, a need for greater public consultation at an early stage of project planning to ensure that the activities undertaken are matched to the desired changes. It is recognised that this is a challenging target.
- continued funding of such projects may be critical to ensure that nothing undermines the development of durable links between local communities and service providers. The pilot seems to suggest that there is a danger of the schemes simply reinforcing short-term thinking of initiatives and lack of acceptance among communities unless longer-term commitments are made.

Conclusions

The spirit of the pilot schemes as an experimental exercise was, for the most part, embraced by the schemes and almost all were able to reflect on their experiences positively and highlight learning to emerge. The pilots have been useful in kick-starting continued efforts in the local areas and many of the key stakeholders consulted appear to have committed to long-term action to ensure that progress continues to be made.

MVA Consultancy provides advice on transport and other policy areas, to central, regional and local government, agencies, developers, operators and financiers.

A diverse group of results-oriented people, we are part of a 350-strong team worldwide. Through client business planning, customer research and strategy development we create solutions that work for real people in the real world.

For more information visit www.mvaconsultancy.com

Birmingham

Second Floor, 37a Waterloo Street
Birmingham B2 5TJ United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)121 233 7680 F: +44 (0)121 233 7681

Dubai

PO Box 123166 Dubai, 803 - 805 Arbift Tower
Baniyas Road, Deira, Dubai UAE
T: +971 (0)4 223 0144 F: +971 (0)4 223 1088

Dublin

First Floor, 12/13 Exchange Place
Custom House Docks, IFSC, Dublin 1, Ireland
T: +353 (0)1 542 6000 F: +353 (0)1 542 6001

Edinburgh

Stewart House, Thistle Street, North West Lane
Edinburgh EH2 1BY United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)131 220 6966 F: +44 (0)131 220 6087

Glasgow

Seventh Floor, 78 St Vincent Street
Glasgow G2 5UB United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)141 225 4400 F: +44 (0)141 225 4401

London

Second Floor, 17 Hanover Square
London W1S 1HU United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)20 7529 6500 F: +44 (0)20 7529 6556

Lyon

11, rue de la République, 69001 Lyon, France
T: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 29 F: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 28

Manchester

25th Floor, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester M1 4BT United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)161 236 0282 F: +44 (0)161 236 0095

Marseille

76, rue de la République, 13002 Marseille, France
T: +33 (0)4 91 37 35 15 F: +33 (0)4 91 91 90 14

Paris

12-14, rue Jules César, 75012 Paris, France
T: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 00 F: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 01

Woking

First Floor, Dukes Court, Duke Street
Woking, Surrey GU21 5BH United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)1483 728051 F: +44 (0)1483 755207

Email: info@mvaconsultancy.com

Offices also in

Bangkok, Beijing, Hong Kong, Shenzhen and Singapore

mvaconsultancy