

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on 28 January 2010 at 10 a.m. in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.**

**Present:**

**Members:**

Kit Malthouse (Chairman)

Tony Arbour, Jennette Arnold, Reshard Auladin, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Christopher Boothman, Victoria Borwick, Valerie Brasse, Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Caroline Pidgeon, Deborah Regal, Graham Speed and Richard Tracey.

**MPA Officers:** Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Bob Atkins (Treasurer), Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive) and Nick Baker (Head of Committee Services).

**MPS Officers:** Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner), Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner), Anne McMeel (Director of Resources) and Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing).

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, before we begin can we locate ourselves in the room please? I am Kit Malthouse.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Catherine Crawford.

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Bob Atkins

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Steve O'Connell.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Tony Arbour.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Richard Tracey.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Victoria Borwick.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Toby Harris.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Dee Doocey.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Jenny Jones.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Clive Lawton.

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Chris Boothman.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Valerie Brasse.

**Deborah Regal (AM):** Deborah Regal.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Kirsten Hearn.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Graham Speed.

**Faith Boardman (AM):** Faith Boardman.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Joanne McCartney.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Jennette Arnold.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing, MPS):**  
Ian McPherson.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Tim Godwin.

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** Reshard Auladin.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Ok, thank you. Good morning. Before we start I would like to formally welcome Tony Arbour back onto the Authority.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Good to be back.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** An alumnus of the Metropolitan Police Authority.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** He is cheered by the school from Waltham Forest he is so well known!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Exactly. Well we will look forward to receiving his wisdom over the next few years. In terms of other welcomes, we welcome Assistant Commissioner Ian McPherson who has taken up his appointment as Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing so this is his very first meeting. We will look forward to working with you in the future.

Just a word in terms of events yesterday; nothing has formally taken place in terms of change of control at the Authority because everything is subject to confirmation hearings at the London Assembly until changes here at the Authority can take place. So, on that basis the Mayor [Boris Johnson] offers his apologies for absence, since he is in Davos promoting the city.

Any other apologies? No? OK, great. Declarations of interest? No? Minutes of the last meeting then.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Oh, Chairman, I wonder if you could acknowledge the presence of the school from Waltham Forest in The Chamber with us today?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I was going to do that when we got to the item for Waltham Forest if that is all right? Just so we are concentrated in one area.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** OK.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Nothing on the minutes? Great. On Chairman's and Vice-Chairman's Update, just a word on the events of yesterday for those of you who are slightly confused. The intention was that the Mayor was going to announce his proposed changes to the Metropolitan Police Authority at the meeting of the London Assembly yesterday morning, but unfortunately once a fair number of people got to know about it it leaked a little early. So, apologies that the notice to you as Members did not go until the formal announcement was made in the Authority. A timetable for the changes that he announced will be sent to you shortly once the confirmation hearings have been agreed with the London Assembly, but for the moment, assuming that that all goes well, I would like to offer my congratulations to Reshard [Auladin] for his prospective appointment as Vice Chairman of the Authority.

We have not met for some time since we did not have a meeting in October but since then there has been a fair amount of activity so I have got a number of things that I wanted to report to you. First of all I wanted to offer our congratulations formally to those members of the Metropolitan Police Service and of the Authority who received honours in the New Year's Honour list, there was quite a batch for us this so our congratulations to them.

A couple of items of information: the Domestic Violence Board of the Authority published its first annual report this month. Hopefully you will all pick that up and have a look; very important piece of work. I wanted to introduce and welcome Bob Atkins here, who is our new Treasurer, here for his first meeting. Bob [Atkins] comes to us from Thames Valley which he helped to take to being a very high-performing police authority and we look forward to his wisdom over the months to come.

Between the last meeting and this I have, on behalf of you and the Mayor, met various people: the MPIA to talk about Airwave; attended the Olympic Security Board; had meetings with London councils; chaired the first meeting of the Violence Against Women Board here at the Greater London Assembly (GLA) which will be working with our Domestic and Sexual Violence Board to further that work across London; I met the Director of the Centre for Prison Studies at King's College London to talk to them about what further work we can do for re-offending; been in the lobby with members of Parliament (MPs) of all parties on dangerous dogs; met the Chief Executive of London Probation, the chair of the Antisocial behaviour Board of the LCSP; spoke at the Serious Youth Violence Board Youth Summit and the Metropolitan Police Public Order conference at Wembley which went down extremely

well and examined some of the issues that the Civil Liberties Panel has been looking at over the last few months.

We have had GEM meetings with Redbridge, Sutton, Haringey and Waltham Forest, about which more later; I visited Thamesmead to look at some of the issues they have following a particularly unpleasant murder there last year; lots of meetings with the Metropolitan Police Authority Inspection Team about which hopefully we will have a bit of an update later, and I know a lot of you have met and spoken to them - thank you for that; also Supposer The Race independent advisory group (IAG), very good regular meetings with them; and sometime ago but on your behalf along with other Members attended the annual service of remembrance at Hendon.

That is my update, so if we can move swiftly on.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Could I ask you a question?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, fire away.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** The Race and Equality Report; can you tell us what has happened with that?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** You mean the Race and Faith Board?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** The Race and Faith, sorry, yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, the Race and Faith Board is currently being drafted by the team that are drafting it. It will be going to Cindy's [Butts] panel in the next two or three weeks for them to amend, approve, add - all the rest of it - and we anticipate it coming out at some point in March and April, although there is no specific date for it yet, but we are working our best to try to get it out this spring.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Right, thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Could I just pick up on that report because I am sure I am not the only Member who is rather concerned that this huge piece of work that was launched seems to have been delayed. I was wondering if you could clarify who is actually writing up this report please.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Well, we have a team at the Metropolitan Police Authority that is writing the report. Catherine [Crawford] has taken responsibility for its production overall although it is not obviously being personally written by her.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** OK, I am just checking because I think Catherine [Crawford], the Chief Executive, gave evidence so I think we have to be very careful having someone who

gave evidence to this to actually be writing it, so I think we need to make sure there is some independent element there.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, well the report will be finally amended and approved by the panel that produced it. Nothing will go out without their say-so. Just before Christmas we held a facilitated day with the panel to collect all of their thoughts and the work that had gone on so far and the document will be a product of that. I have discussed it with Cindy [Butts] and the idea is that the panel will eventually approve whatever goes out and if they don't approve it they will not put it out.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Thank you.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, I am glad that Jenny [Jones] brought this up because I recently met with the Metropolitan Black Police Association, as I have done over the years, and they quite rightly - and I agree with them - are concerned at the delay. I do not think they are the only organisation. Can you assure us that a letter will be sent to organisations who have given their time and individuals giving them an update because, as Caroline [Pidgeon] says, I think we must regret the delay between the evidence and the Mayor sitting in this Chamber and heralding it as the base of the way forward. So, let us get on with this report. I do think that the people who gave their time and gave evidence need a letter or some contact, if not from yourself then certainly from Catherine [Crawford].

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** That is a very good idea and we shall do that. I should just say, that notwithstanding the production of the report, pleasingly some of the conclusions and actions recommended in the interim report that came out in the autumn work is already underway at the yard and I think, Tim [Godwin], you have launched your diversity action panel.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We have and I will be picking up some of that in the Commissioner's Update on behalf of Paul [Stephenson] [Commissioner for the Metropolis].

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, great. Any other questions? No? Fantastic.

Right, we move onto Item 5 which is a petition from Waltham Forest. Welcome to Waltham Forest and to the children from Waltham Forest, delegates and councillors. Thank you for coming. We have the leader of Waltham Forest, Councillor Chris Robbins, who is going to present his petition. Chris [Robbins], over to you.

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** Thank you very much Deputy Mayor. I would first of all like to say thank you for the opportunity of speaking to you today and also, may I say, for the courtesy with which our previous meetings have taken place as well, both with the Deputy Commissioner, yourself and the Mayor. I am here representing Chingford Hall School as well as a number of residents here, also supported

by our local paper, The Yellow Advertiser, but as importantly I am here speaking on behalf of the three groups within Waltham Forest, the Labour group, the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives, so that should tie you up for the day. It is not a partisan presentation.

I am going to, if I may, read a prepared statement to you which I hope will keep within the time that has been given. Why are we here? In 2008 the Met Intelligence Bureau (MIB) commissioned a review of crime in our borough. They felt the need to specifically look at the problems within Waltham Forest. There were 11 key recommendations within that report. I am not going to go through that very comprehensive document, but I do wish to highlight two recommendations which said: (1), there should be a consideration of the review of the resources in the borough to ensure that they are in line with crime patterns, and (2), any review of resource allocation to include accurate population figures and a development of the 2012 Olympics. I have discussed with you, Deputy Mayor, the importance of the Olympics in our appreciation of how crime is developing within Waltham Forest.

Since that review crime figures in our borough have dramatically increased, which I am sad to say. The latest figures show that last year Waltham Forest had the second highest increase in London of 5.9%. Now, during that time the overall figures in London dropped by 1.7%. This is clearly unacceptable both to us and I am sure it is unacceptable to you as well. There was only one borough which was over 6% so we were in very high figures. The main issues in Waltham Forest are gangs, drugs, knife crime and burglary. You are familiar with all of them, you are aware of all of them but it is how it affects Waltham Forest which is important to us. You may also be surprised to know that Waltham Forest has the highest rate of serious crime as a percentage of all crime in Waltham Forest across London. Violent crime is actually going up in Waltham Forest, as is robbery and this is against the London-wide trend and reinforces our view that we simply do not have enough permanent police.

Waltham Forest is clearly seriously under resourced to deal with these circumstances. If Waltham Forest only had the average number of police officers across London we would deserve a further 120 personnel. Those are figures that have been endorsed by our local police force; they are not figures we have made up ourselves. We have inner London problems, particularly in the south of the borough, but we have outer London resources. The current allocation formula has clearly created a major injustice. I want to be clear about this because I have said this before, we are not just here to whine and complain and say that we should be a special case and so on. My borough has recently provided resources to employ ten extra police officers to go out into the community so we are putting our money where our mouth is, we are prepared to accept our responsibilities and we are prepared to do as much as we can to ensure that we provide the appropriate police resources for our community.

We have an excellent group of Safer Neighbourhood teams, which we are very proud of and they do an excellent job, and we also have an excellent - as far as we are concerned - borough police force as well. We have no problem with our local police force; we have an excellent relationship with them and we have been working together on major issues over recent years. The truth is we need to have permanent officers to get to grips with the criminal elements

within our borough. We know that the Metropolitan Police Service provide us with short-term assistance as and when that is necessary, but to deal with the core issues in our borough we need permanent resources.

As I said, we do not want special treatment; we just want a fair deal. It has now been five years since the resource allocation formula was reviewed. There have been major changes in both population and crime during that period. We all have a duty to protect our citizens as best we can and Waltham Forest, in particular as an Olympic host borough, wants to show the world that we can look after our citizens and the visitors that will be with us during that period effectively.

Finally, Deputy Mayor, you will recall that you, I and the Mayor met a number of months ago and I said that Waltham Forest was on a mission. Well, we will continue that mission until our objectives are achieved. We believe we are right and we believe that we have put a fair case forward. We are not asking for special treatment, we are just asking for fairness. Thank you very much for your time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you.

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** I wish I got that at every council meeting!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We have a formal response from the Chief Executive and then the chance for other Members to come in if they want to.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Thank you, Chairman. This is the formal response and I know that there are other points that people may want to make. The Metropolitan Police Authority is responsible for the resource allocation formula, which is known as RAF, and is the primary mechanism for determining the distribution of police resources across all London's 32 boroughs.

The RAF takes into account a whole range of policing demands and social factors which varies from borough to borough and aims to maximise efficiency across the organisation. The formula is designed to apportion a finite amount of resources available for distribution but this core number of officers and staff does not represent the totality of policing in a borough and, significantly, does not include Safer Neighbourhood teams and Safer Transport teams who provide visible policing to communities on every borough across London over and above the numbers allocated under the formula.

All boroughs also benefit from a variety of units deployed from the centre, such as armed response vehicles (ARVs), the Territorial Support Group (TSG), Trident and units concerned with serious organised crime and counterterrorism. Both the MPA and the MPS are satisfied that the formula is fair and robust and there are no plans to review it in the near future. The MPA asked for a comprehensive review of RAF in July 2003 to produce a formula that

provided a fair and rational basis for the allocation of resources. An extensive consultation process took place to change and improved all components of the RAF. The new formula was agreed by the MPA in February 2005 and implemented from the financial year 2005/06.

The formula is comprised of four separate components representing different aspects of policing: demand, need, opening the shop and capital city and security. Demand captures the number of reported incidents and crimes and the associated investigations. Need reflects the social and environmental longer term characteristics of a borough, such as levels of deprivation, and moderates the year-on-year fluctuations in demand. Capital city and security relates to the special requirements of London as a capital city, including the additional volume of people drawn to central London such as tourists and commuters. Opening the shop relates to the core infrastructure posts that are designated as mandatory for every borough, such as the Borough Intelligence Unit, and are essentially not related to volume.

These components are combined within the formula by an assigned high-level weighting. The need and demand components comprise approximately 85% with the other two components making up the remaining 15%. The Authority understands that in making the petition for an extra 120 people, Waltham Forest Council have used Metropolitan Police crime data; this is only one subset of the overall formula.

When RAF was implemented in April 2005 it was done on a no-loser's basis to ensure that those boroughs who fared least well under the formula would suffer no reduction in officers. There is also the discretionary element known as Commissioner's Judgment - this is not part of the formula itself but is applied in exceptional circumstances when the Commissioner decides that the addition of police officers in one borough results in a safer city than if those officers were allocated according to the formula. As I say, Chairman, both the MPS and the MPA are satisfied that the formula is fair and there are no plans to review it in the near future.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you. Chris [Robbins], you actually get the right to respond but I do not know if wanted to wait till you have heard other comments?

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** I am happy to wait.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, thank you. Congratulations to Chris [Robbins] and his colleagues from the borough for pulling their case together and for presenting it here today. I just want to say a couple of things. This does not sit in isolation and, with respect to Chris [Robbins], the issue here about resource and their appropriate level of resource to Waltham Forest and boroughs like Waltham Forest did not start in 2008. What the 2008 Met Intelligence Bureau report did was actually work on issues that certainly myself and the Cabinet Leader and the Chief Executive of the borough, and partners around the crime and



disorder reduction partnership safety net in Waltham Forest, had been concerned about for many years.

One of those issues was we could not have known in 2003, when this body first started the discussion under the leadership of Toby [Harris], the changes that we would see in London and in some of our boroughs, we could not have known when we put the rubber stamp in 2005 that Waltham Forest would become, if you like, a place where we would really have to be constantly looking at the borough in terms of security. Why I say this is that when myself and members of the safety net partnership made a similar presentation that Chris [Robbins] is making today to, what I call, the high command of the Metropolitan Police Service every member there of every directorate confirmed that Waltham Forest was within the top three boroughs of their agenda.

I just wanted to concentrate on security. That was not the case in 2005/06. We had no idea that we in Waltham Forest would find ourselves in that position and we still find ourselves there in terms of the major issue of security for our country and related to the world. So, that alone, I think, underpins one of the recommendations that came out of the report. It is about: is it right for Waltham Forest in terms of, as Catherine [Crawford] has said, demand and need? Well, I think we would need some further and new evidence to say that that is still appropriate. The lived experience of people in Waltham Forest and individuals like myself who are involved with Waltham Forest on a regular basis - and we had a conversation last night in the town hall; I was there - it is a constant conversation and that is it is clear there is something wrong in the allocation relating to Waltham Forest.

Then the second point I wanted to raise is - and it is flawed in law - this no-loser's basis where boroughs - and I am not going to name boroughs, but we know where they are; and they are in the west of London - whether or not they started high or not they did not lose out. I remember arguing and getting an increase for Waltham Forest as did other colleagues at the time of the RAF. The element there that was looked at was the fact that there are a number of boroughs who have, what we call, inner London policing activities, demands and needs for the majority of their time, but they have a huge swodge(?) of suburbia of wonderful lush greenery - and it is the case in Waltham Forest. The experience you get in Leyton and Walthamstow is totally different to the experience you get of life in Chingford and so there are boroughs where I believe there is an issue about how we look at it. I know that you would have the concern and say, as we have had a brief discussion, if you open the lid of the RAF for Waltham Forest then it would be like taking the lid of the Pandora's Box and that is not what you would want to do in your new elevated position.

I would urge you to listen and to consider that there are boroughs, and Waltham Forest is one, where because of situations that have changed since 2005 that a review is necessary so that we can feed back to that population and say, "We have listened and we have done some work." Certainly the work has started as far as Waltham Forest is concerned which Catherine [Crawford] has confirmed and the 2008 report, even though it is just - I think you said, Catherine [Crawford] - only one element of it; the Metropolitan Police Service's stats.

Well, I will go with the Metropolitan Police Service's stats but if we need somebody else's stats and we need some more work then let us have that and let us see if we can get a reasonable answer and hopefully a response to the demands that have been made on the behalf of community and policing in Waltham Forest.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, having been through the resource allocation formula on the other side as a councillor it was not a pleasant experience in local government. It is not a process that encourages cohesiveness amongst the boroughs, but there we are. John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I do not want to repeat what Jennette [Arnold] has said but I will just make a few observations. First of all, clearly Waltham Forest feel aggrieved and that they are short-changed by the current formula and have been persistent. I was once a borough leader and I am aware that no self-respecting borough leader would do anything other than argue that they were not adequately resourced. The case does appear persuasive in that it is evidenced and the statistics have changed and there are trends in the borough which are causing some alarm to the borough and civic leadership across the parties and that is legitimate concern. In much the same way, as I guess, central London is seen to have special factors so it is possible that other parts of London will change in a way in which criminal or other behaviour happens which may cause changes in the demand and the incidence of crime and fear of crime.

The second observation I had is that I was a member of the Metropolitan Police Authority between 2000 and 2003 when Toby Harris was the chair and we went through a very long process of reviewing the resource allocation formula. It was quite painful from all sides because there is always special pleading, there is always special cases. So, Romford Town Centre always used to pop up because Havering was a link borough for me and we would say, "Well, the nightlife in Romford is very lively on a Friday and Saturday and therefore we need extra policing to cover that," and we examined those things in great detail.

The next observation though is that if we look at the way London has changed in the last few years, there are two particular issues which strike me. One is there are parts of London - and I think the south of Waltham Forest is one of them - I think large parts of Newham are and bits of Lambeth, Southwark and people would probably point to many others where there is a far greater volatility of population than there used to be, far higher incidents of short-term residents who do not have connections that changes the way in which the community networks work and so on. Off the top of one's head, one would assume that we need to have an evidenced-based approach that will have consequences in terms of recorded crime and incidence of crime.

So, what I am heading towards is the view that although Catherine [Crawford] said that was no plan to review the resource allocation formula, much of the Metropolitan Police Authority is a new police authority compared to when it was reviewed previously. It would certainly be worth the Members' time to look at this issue and whether there are changes in the way in

which demand has arisen in bits of London over the last few years and whether it is worth us reviewing the formula.

I could be some special pleading for my patch. For example, we are going to have a massive new shopping centre at Stratford. Does that affect the policing demands of the borough even though the population of the borough may not change? It clearly may well do that and it is worth us looking at the facts which have changed. The point I would make is about transience. There is also in parallel with that a big issue which is bubbling around in London government at present and one of your boroughs, Westminster, was big on this a couple of years ago and one of my boroughs, Newham, is very exercised about it at present and I believe Waltham Forest is as well, which is about under recorded population.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely.

**John Biggs (AM):** I think that is a factor which we may want to look at and whether there are other measurements of population which would help us to understand this better. So, I would argue that there is value in us looking at whether a review of the resource allocation formula is merited. I am aware that there will always be special cases in pleading the case and Waltham Forest has been well-assembled and had been persistent as well. I think it does have some merit, Chairman, so I would like us probably offline to examine whether we can look at this further.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Well, I am more than happy to do that. The only thing I would say about it is, (a), it is not a pleasant experience, but, (b), it is also quite a long process. I remember the last resource allocation formula was something like two to two and a half years from start to finish and that unfortunately does not address the immediate problems in Waltham Forest.

**John Biggs (AM):** Right. Well, in that case then there is a second piece which is that the Commissioner, or the Deputy Commissioner today, I guess can respond to how operationally the demands of Waltham Forest have affected its need for policing.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Well, that is what I was just coming onto. The Leader and I have had a number of meetings now to discuss the issues of Waltham Forest and I have raised it at a senior level at Scotland Yard and I do not know, Ian [McPherson], if you want to comment?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing, MPS):** I think there are a number of issues at play here, it seems to me, and firstly I would be very happy to come out - maybe even with you, Chairman - to speak to the chief executive and leaders at Waltham Forest.

I think there are a couple of points that I would want to make, and one has actually been made within this meeting, around the volatility of population. The reality is that London's

population, in many instances, is in flux with significant numbers of churn. I think that represents a reason why you need a degree of flexibility. We have flexible resource at the centre within Territorial Policing within the SC department and we shift that resource accordingly. That is led by intelligence that we are dealing with at the time. So, in a sense, because of the churn that is naturally there it is incumbent upon us to keep that flexibility based with a bedrock at a certain level that the RAF has allocated.

I think the danger is that you could end up in a position where you are revisiting the resource allocation formula every 12 months or every 18 months and that is not necessarily the sensible thing to do. Maybe the sensible thing to do, as has been done with things like Strongbox, which has been led when the Deputy Commissioner was heading TP, those things were developed for just this kind of scenario.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. Tim [Godwin], did you want to say something?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think the point is well made in terms of keep rerunning formula means we have to keep swapping police all over the place and, as a result of that, long-term strategy get a problem. There is the Commissioner's Judgment piece in there - we use that very sparingly because, again, that 120, for example, if that was the Commissioner's Judgment would have to come from other boroughs. I think we would end up with 31 other petitioners here as to why those police officers are going.

I do take the point that having had a chat with the young people that have come down today we do need to have a look at what is going on. We have got a new borough commander going to be appointed in the near future. We have a new Assistant Commissioner of Territorial Policing so I know Ian's [McPherson] quite keen to come and have a chat, pick up those strategic analysis, look at the problem profiles and then see what our response is. The one thing is to start at the dialogue, or continuation of the dialogue, but we will actually give you an answer swiftly.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. One thing that we can do, and I think it is probably a good idea, is we can arrange a briefing on the resource allocation formula for Members so they can understand exactly how it is made up, what the process was last time and then we can start to make a judgment about what we might do in the future over the next couple of years in terms of reviewing it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Just a piece of paper would be fine actually.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Chris [Boothman], did you want to say something?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** I just wanted to throw into the mix whether or not we could also have something on what is being done to address those boroughs like Waltham Forest where there seems to be a particular problem and if we could try to understand why things like violent crime are so high in these places.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes. Waltham Forrest is going through a change of borough commander at the moment and I guess as soon as the new borough commander is in place there will be a strategy in place to deal with some of that stuff, so perhaps we can have a report back once that is done about what some of the issues might be. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** First of all, I would like to congratulate Waltham Forest on managing to get several meetings with Kit [Malthouse], by the sounds of it several meetings with Tim [Godwin] and a wide-ranging discussion here. I do not actually think there are many other borough leaders that would be in that ballpark so well done for that.

For the reasons that other Members have very well articulated I think there ought to be a review of the resource allocation. I have a lot of sympathy for what Waltham Forest is saying. As you know, I argued yesterday that boroughs that have high incidence of knife and gun crime should have an extra police officer in each of their wards and I notice just looking at the figures we produced for working at the rate of 1,000 - so, the population figures - that Waltham Forest actually comes sixth in gun crime as the highest in London and third in knife crime. So, I have a lot of sympathy for the point that is being made but I do think it needs to be in the round and I think it needs to be part of a wider discussion.

I am not sure that actually doing a briefing for Members on the resource allocation formula is necessary as a lot of us have been former councillors. I think a briefing is great but I think a piece of paper rather than a two-hour meeting somewhere. I think that would be very good.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Whatever form it comes, yes.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Well done to Waltham Forest.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Yes, absolutely.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you. Valerie [Brasse]?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** In my case I just wanted to make the obvious caveat and why it may be well versed and argued that we should have a review of the formula and it needs to be done periodically. Of course, presumably though not in a financial climate where going forward there would be no losers. I just wanted to make that obvious point.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I well remember the pain of the development of the RAF and I stayed well away from it because it was so appallingly complex. I have always assumed that it was something that was a computer programme that every year you could just feed in all the facts and figures about each borough and it would just be slightly tweaked. I have always assumed that is how it was. I cannot believe that it has been five years without any of the boroughs

being reassessed. I actually think five years is a long time to have something fixed like this when there is so much churn. So, is there annual tweaking, a computer programme that makes it very easy for reassessment?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There are some annual movements. Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Well we have had previous discussion in the Authority in that period and the decision has been taken. There has been a rerun between 2005 and now and I cannot remember what it was in terms of looking at it for population shifts and need indicators, because social deprivation indicators do change; late night refreshment houses are in there; the point that has been mentioned about Romford, etc. When that resource allocation formula was first established there was a fairly high correlation between the needs indicators and the actual demand, except for one or two boroughs that were outlined with a higher crime event that would have actually been felt.

Now, one of the key challenges for that is: are you rewarding failure by going for the ones where the crime is high against those need indicators? As a result of that - I will not name the borough at the time - we did put in, which we will do with Waltham Forest in the sense of a team to actually look at how the policing was being done, and how the partnership was working - there is a very strong partnership in Waltham Forest - and is there anything we can bring, is there other stuff that we can do. If there is necessary time to put in some Commissioner's Judgment in there to bring it back down to the level it should be then we will do it.

It turns of keep rerunning the formula on the point of the flux, and equally how we record population which I think was made by John [Biggs], those figures change. I think there was a quote on one east London borough that the population has been decimated more in one east London borough than the whole of the blitz did to it. It was: how did that happen overnight that suddenly the population fell by this entire amount? So, that is quiet a key driver as well and we need to get those things right. If you constantly keep doing it though it means we will be changing the numbers across all the boroughs every year and for that you get lots of challenges and we will have lots of debate about it rather than the other issues. So, the decision was taken to do it infrequently. If this Authority felt the need to run it again against the new figures then that would be a matter for this Authority that we would do.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Do not forget there are two phases to the process as well. There is the first phase which is devising the formula and that is often the most bitter because you lobby groups and all the rest of it come up and you have all sorts of reviews, and then there is running it and then there is the consequence of running it. The issue for me is the time frame on it; it will be two years before we get a result and even then it will be a result which may need to be tweaked and Waltham Forest have an immediate issue which I think we are willing to look at and address straightaway because there is something on performance there.

Just in terms of the resource allocation formula - I am conscious we have got a fair amount to get through - it might be worth us, as I say, doing a briefing on the resource allocation formula and then we can talk about that as a principle in the future against the background of performance in the rest of the budget. I do not know if there are comments on the resource allocation formula or particularly about Waltham Forest at the moment. Clive [Lawton] was next.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Well, I think it is really important that we separate the two matters very clearly. It would, in my view, be quite wrong to make some midyear, midterm and/or mid-period decision about a single borough which somehow gets locked in which then simply loads or overloads whatever formula we have got. Temporary ameliorations, recognitions of particular problems, allocations of temporary resources which might be for a year or two, or however long it is, but that it is not recognised as an entitlement because that knocks on all around.

In terms of the formula, before we review or decide to review the formula the two elements of it which are presumably the various categories and the various weightings given to those categories, it seems to me that it would be very useful to have advice or an insight into whether there are indeed new categories which have arisen, what they are and how serious we think they are, whether they are cancelled out by old categories which have fallen out.

I must say I assumed with Jenny [Jones] that the categories and the weightings were there and information was fed in and then there was some kind of transitional process as this or that borough went up or down in the scheme of things. I really do hope - and I agree with Dee [Doocey]; I think it is astonishing how Waltham Forest has managed to get them onto this map - if they have particular needs then they must be responded to somehow, but they really should not be seen as impacting on the larger and important discussion about the formula.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you. Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I just wanted to raise that this debate has signalled that we really need, as Members, to understand fully the resource allocation formula and also the way that historical trends have been factored into that because, you will know, Kit [Malthouse], that Enfield has been quite persistent. So, how do you try to do that? By saying, very similar to Waltham Forest - it is a neighbouring borough - that we are seen and traditional have been seen as an outer London borough whereby we now have some, what were traditionally known as, inner London problems and the feeling that that is not taken into account in the resource allocation formula. So, there is that feeling that the model itself has not been fair and has not kept pace with recent events which are not just one-offs but seen to be consistent trends so I would welcome the offline debate to look at this and to look at the model itself.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, all right. Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes, I think there needs to be a distinction drawn between the data which is used, which obviously will change over time, and the process by which new data is incorporated in any allocation process. There is also the question of the formula itself and it was a tortuous process which I remember only too vividly.

I also remember that I think we gave an undertaking that, having gone through that tortuous process, that the formula itself and the weightings given would be looked at every so often and that would be normal in terms of any allocation formula. I have a memory - though I would have to check back on the papers - that we said we would review it after three years. If that is the case then three years has probably gone through and people are hoping that that might have been forgotten because it was tortuous.

I think it would be worth looking again at whether or not now is the time to see whether or not that formula still has the right weightings associated with it because there has to be very difficult questions in terms of balance. This is a zero sum gain so people need to be under no illusions. If the formula is changed so that Waltham Forest gets more then there will be less for other people and that is in the absence of any general trends in terms of the population. At the time that the formula was introduced, of course, was a time when the numbers of police were rising quite rapidly. Now, we are not going to be in that scenario so this will be an even grimmer exercise than it was when it was done the first time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There is an element of careful-what-you-wish-for, you are right. Steve [O'Connell]?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Yes, just to add to that very briefly without extending the debate. Thank you to Waltham Forest coming along and getting themselves very well organised but the profile of your borough is exactly the same as one of my link boroughs which is Croydon, which is the outer London aspect, the green verdant suburbs and the inner London issues around losing young people basically to all sorts of crimes. So, Croydon - and I need to have it minuted - will also be coming to talk about it but I would like to look at it more strategically.

Just the fact there are boroughs like Waltham Forest and Croydon that have changed in character which is something that was picked up earlier, over the last three or four years and new challenges and new populations have brought that to bear. So, I just wanted minuted really that actually Croydon and Waltham Forest are pretty much in the same boat but it does need to be looked at with zero-sum gain and looked at more strategically. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. All right.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Just quickly. I was terrier-like when Toby [Harris] was leading it - and he got equally fed up of me about this - and he is right we did agree and we have not done that review. Before you sum up can you bring the Deputy Commissioner back? I heard him make an offer and I am not clear what that offer was.



**Tony Arbour (AM):** A bit dangerous!

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I heard him make a positive offer for Waltham Forest.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think the offer was, notwithstanding a long process that may take place, about resources to have an immediate look at Waltham Forest and see what can be done immediately in terms of action plan.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** And the Commissioner's discretion.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** What I said, and reinforce, is that where we went through the resource allocation formula it was a painful process - and we have had two actually; the first one that then was changed into the second one in 2005 and made more sophisticated - and there was a high correlation in terms of crime and demand against the needs indicators. Actually, as a result of that, numerous boroughs that were unhappy because they felt they needed to get more asset challenged it. They got statisticians and a whole range of different individuals to try to take it down and could not actually defeat the formula and the logic behind the formula. As a result, it was the best we could come up with to be a fair distribution, but where you have a borough that, for whatever reason, is outlying that then there is an issue there for you to look and as a result of that, what is it?

Now, what we found in those boroughs is actually the way it was organised there were issues about the policing strategy, there were issues in terms of some of the partnership stuff as well we could do better and as a result of that we put a whole project behind it. In order to get that ground back we did make a Commissioner's Judgment for a very small period of time, as Clive [Lawton] was saying, to assist in getting it back under control. Now, I have not promised that that will be the outcome because we need to look at whether that is the case, but what I am saying is we will have that dialogue and we will look at it for you. Waltham Forest crime is going up, we have to do something about it and that is our job. It is Ian's [McPherson] job as ACTP to come and have a look at that and we will consider what is necessary to be done to make Waltham Forest safe and that is the commitment offer I make.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Great, thanks for that.

**John Biggs (AM):** I would like to make one point which is somebody said that we should not reward failure. At risk of being overly brutal I think if there is a failure then what we need to do is take the responsible police officers out the back and shoot them rather than punish the community in whom they are working. We need to be clear about where the failure is and what we do about it. So, we should not punish the people of Waltham Forest if it is the police that are failing.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I do not think anyone could interpret that as what I was meaning. What I was saying is if you are not doing it right automatically then to

respond and give more people at an allocation more asset would be wrong. It is actually about putting right. Whether someone is to blame is another issue. What we are talking about is actually making sure we are doing the best we can with the assets we have got to actually combat it and to actually identify why it is over.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We need to look at quality as well as quantity; it is clear, obviously. Leader, I do not know if you wanted to say anything in response?

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** Yes, unfortunately, Chairman, just a couple of quick points if I may. I am delighted with the debate by the way it is clearly an issue which you are going to return to across London.

A couple of quick points: one is we do not want to be treated any differently to other boroughs and we are not in the blame game either; we are not saying somebody is at fault here. We are simply saying that circumstances have changed quite dramatically over recent years. The police's review identified the issues; it was not ours, it was your own. It said look at change in population, look at the oncoming Olympics and look at resources linked with crime. There are three areas that the review of the allocation formula is something which I know is going to cause you major problems, but it is a long-term thing you have got to deal with.

There are other avenues. One is the allocation of resources within the borough - the new commander will deal with that and we will be in discussions there; but there is a third option and that is you do have exceptional powers to be able to intervene where there is a problem. I would simply finalise by suggesting that any formula which shows a major city in Europe dropping crime by 1.7%, but one of its boroughs has an increase of 5.9%, shows that there is a major issue that needs to be addressed immediately. I cannot go to the victims of crime in my borough and say, "Sorry, the review is not up for three years so you will have to live with it," they will not find that acceptable.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, we understand. It sounds like you will be getting some visits from some fairly senior police officers in the near future.

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** We very much look forward to it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you very much for coming. Thank you everybody for coming. We salute you for doing your duty by your residents.

**Councillor Chris Robbins (Leader of the London Borough of Waltham Forest):** Thank you very much indeed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you Members. We move onto Item 6 which is the Commissioner's Report. The Commissioner is away sadly on a well-earned break but we have the Deputy Commissioner standing in.

**John Biggs (AM):** Where is the Chair?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I would like to say first of all a welcome to our new Chair in Kit [Malthouse] --

**John Biggs (AM):** Not Chair yet by the way.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** -- and we look forward to working with Kit [Malthouse] as we have been doing with Boris [Johnson] and additionally to welcome back on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service Tony Arbour as well to the Authority who we have known for many years and it is business as usual I guess for Tony [Arbour].

Commissioner apologises that he is away and on his behalf just to tell you where we are at. Obviously the report has been circulated. Key points around performance that we wish to raise is that the crime is down by a further 2% overall. That brings us to a level which is lowest since about 1998 in terms of overall crime in London, with 12,500 less offences. That is when, in that period, we have had a number of additional crimes created that have been put on as well. So, in that sense the overall trend of crime itself is down, albeit only 2% this year.

Serious violence; we mentioned before that that was slightly bumping up but predominantly flat-lined. That has now fallen back a bit and we are now into going under; we are down 0.5% but again it is fairly flat-lined in terms of most serious violence but again that follows reductions previously. One thing to note, one of our key things around Blunt 2 and the whole range of other initiatives and the concerns that we and you shared from the last few years is that of teenage homicide. In terms of the previous year we had 22 teenage homicides at this point; so far this year, in the financial year, there have been 9. That is still nine too many and we cannot claim too much on that other than that is far better position than we were before, but we need to still keep driving that forward and that is one of our highest priorities in terms of maintaining that.

We raised residential burglary as an issue that was actually bubbling up. That was following a national trend and then nationally it started to go down whilst we were still going up. We have put in Bumblebee; we have got some specific dedicated task forces out there in the boroughs that have been suffering most from burglary and that is now coming down as well. We have hit an increase of about 10%; that increase has fallen back to 6.8% and that will now fall back. My expectation with a fair wind, because we are catching quite a few burglars and we went through the bail(?) piece, they are now getting locked up and we can see that burglary is actually coming down. It is my expectation we will be about 4% or 5% over at the end of the year, but again, it is one we need to keep the foot on the accelerator to keep

pursuing them whilst still maintaining our efforts to prevent teenage homicide and knife crime.

In terms of our confidence in local policing; that has actually gone up again under the British Crime Survey - national key performance indicator. It is at 51%; that is a rise of about 4% since the baseline in September 2008 so that is continuing. That is a lot to do with the efforts that Safer Neighbourhoods and other teams have been making in terms of getting the message out as to what we are doing and to listen to citizens.

What are the challenges that concern, Paul [Stephenson], I and colleagues? Gun crime - and Cressida [Dick] is here from the Serious Crime Directorate (SCD) to talk about human trafficking as well; we maintain that as another key priority with operations Verano, Trident, Argon all running against intelligence-led activity. Where we had the big spike at the beginning of the year in terms of gun crime, that is coming back and as a result we are making inroads in there. We are looking at the actual use of intimidation of weapons, i.e., going into a corner store with a hand in a bag and saying, "Give me your money or I'm going to shoot you," those have gone up, as have imitation firearms and intimidations. So, we are trying to separate that in terms of what the actual shootings are and where weapons are discharged from overall gun crime, which includes a number of other things, even when a gun is not present.

In terms of knife crime that is down 3.3%. It would be disingenuous if I didn't say we'd had a slight hick going upwards in the run in to Christmas but that seems to now be under control and coming back down again and, as a result, the trend is to continue downwards, and we maintain the efforts there in Blunt 2, etc.

Homophobic crime is up significantly; it is up 26% which is, whilst on small numbers, that is a 226-offence increase, but that is still a 226-offence increase. So, we are making sure that we actually get some intelligence around what is going on there and make sure that we respond to that if there is a rise in that crime. The other one that is significantly rising is rape, and we have discussed that before. That is now up nearly 30% with 470 more offences being recorded. It features in what is another ongoing issue for us that we have to focus on and rethink and re-look at what we are doing. That is around the overall agenda around violence against women.

We previously have prided ourselves, actually, on being the force in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Authority who lead and won The Havens for all the victims of crime in our city and we were the only place that had done that in terms of the partnership with health. We were the first to actually build dedicated Sapphire teams specialising in serious sexual assault on all the boroughs. The SOITs came from us in terms of how we operated the SOITs. We introduced Ambra(?), which is the domestic violence initiative which was building on Betsy Stenko's long running work to identify what the risk factors were for violence. We put in place a whole process of assessing risk and multi-agency to respond which has been replicated in lots of other places now.

The one thing that has come out for me over recent past with the case of Warboys, Reid and others is: have we assumed that all that is going on and therefore we have actually done our duty in that or do we need to revisit that? I think the message, having had conversations with the IPCC and others, is it needs reviewing. Cressida [Dick], as a result, has taken on that role as the lead in terms of management board to pick up the issues of violence against women for the new Sapphire unit within her command together with a review of our domestic violence and how that interacts and all those other factors we need to revisit because we must not be complacent.

In terms of the Stern Review, Baroness Stern is looking at all these issues about whether detection performance measures are the right ones for serious sexual assault and looking at different ways of measuring success. That is, I am told, not just the Metropolitan Police Service, that is national thing for our English and Welsh forces to pick up and, as a result, we will be working with ACPO in that in terms of how we can learn.

The one thing that also concerns me and worries me is that people listening to the debate around Warboys, Reid, etc, may get the impression that what is the point coming to the police in terms of investigating serious crime that has been committed against me because the outcome is horrendous and I do not want to go through that process." So, one of the things we need to say is that we always strive to do better. We have people who make mistakes and when they make mistakes they can have significant and tragic consequences to individuals and we have to learn from those mistakes.

In terms of serious sexual assault, which is rape and what would previously have been called indecent assault, we deal with 7,600 of those a year; we deal with 2,500 rapes a year in our city. In terms of rape only 11% of those are what we would call stranger rape, the rest there is some connectivity, contact, acquaintances, etc, or people that they have met and various other bits. The rise in rape is not about strangers dragging women off the street, it is other factors at play that we need to explain.

Additionally, I asked how many complaints have we had out of that 7,600, and out of that we have had 61 complaints out of the 7,600 infractions. So, whilst a lot of people do not complain what I would like to say to anyone who is a victim of crime is do trust us, we do really want to help you and we do really want to respond positively to your crime and help you get through it, and we do want to catch the person who has done it to you. We do make mistakes and those mistakes that we make we do want to pick up and learn from. We are profoundly sorry about all those cases I mentioned.

In terms of issues that were raised with me by some Members at the time of the IPCC press conference about officers laughing at the victim that was giving her comments in terms of that press release. I would like to say that we, Paul [Stephenson] and I, were appalled if police officers were to act in that way with a victim of such a crime and, as a result, we did raise the question with the IPCC saying were they satisfied that that had actually been fully

investigated to their satisfaction and that that had been taken into close consideration. I followed that up with a letter to Deborah Glass and the feedback from Deborah [Glass] and the IPCC is that that was fully investigated at the time and puts into a bit more context - which I can brief outside - and then, as a result, they did not substantiate that particular complaint and that is the reason why the outcome was about the mistakes that were made in terms of the decision that was given by the IPCC. We will still learn from that; we are still picking those things up and, as I say, Cressida [Dick] will be leading on that.

Another issue that has come up is the Section 44 ECHR, European Court Ruling. That is a matter, obviously, for the Government to respond to and I believe the Government intends to appeal it. As a result the Section 44 power under primary legislation still exists. As you know we feel that it has a part to play in making a deterrent for a terrorist attack but it has to be used wisely. We did review the authorities that we have over the last 12 months and I know you have been briefed by John Yates and other as to how we have now identified those areas where Section 44 is in place. That is a far smaller footprint than previously when it was pan-London. The outcome of that is the use of Section 44 has decreased by 51% so the number of stop and searches on Section 44 have halved. We have also asked officers to make sure that they use good and sound judgment in terms of the use of cameras and the viewing of digital images and we await to see what the impacts of that are.

In terms of another piece which was mentioned in terms of the Race and Faith inquiry and the Metropolitan Black Police Association (MBPA) I am pleased to announce that the Metropolitan Black Police Association have lifted their boycott of supporting our efforts to recruit people from the black and minority ethnic (BME) community to join the Metropolitan Police Service. I have written to them about our intentions to pick up the themes that were articulated here by Cindy [Butts] in her update in terms of how we are moving that forward with our diversity strategy. As a result of that the BPA have told me that they are confident that this is an opportunity to address their concerns, etc, as we move forward. The one thing that came out from the debates with the BPA is we all want the same outcome, which is a representative police force that has a safe London as a result.

We had a fairly interesting day of inspection where I think it was reported that I was out on patrol which was quite good because that might have only been a small bit of it. I was actually in charging centres in most of the boroughs I was visiting to see what was happening in there with our staff. All our colleagues joined us for a day of unannounced visits. The key findings from that is a very positive feeling about morale, very positive in terms of getting stuck in in terms of making the efforts on the boroughs. Key issue for us will be single patrol and I think it would be inappropriate not to flag up that that is still an issue of concern that we need to negotiate and push through and work on confidence within our teams.

We have also - and I know there are other items coming up - won an award which is good news, should be a round of applause at that point.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Depends what it is for first! We might, we might not!

**James Cleverly (AM):** Shiniest shoes does not count!

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I actually wanted the applause before I told you what it was for, which is a blow but hopefully it is one that Jenny [Jones] will appreciate in particular. We have been awarded level five and the top possible score for a procurement which is sustainable procurement. So, the Government's Sustainable Procurement Taskforce, set up in 2006, have identified that most public sector organisations get a level one and we get a level five. I am told that as a result that puts us at the top.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think you also, did you not, make it into the top 20 employers on the Stonewall list this year as well? It is also a cause for celebration, well done on that.

Now, we had some pre-submitted questions, I do not know if you wanted to go through those first?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Dick Tracey had a question which you have alluded to on the IPCC on the report. Are you content with the answer, Dick [Tracey]?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I have not seen the answer yet.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Oh! Right, OK.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** My question is about the situation over the Kirk Reid investigation which follows on of course from the Warboys investigation about which there was an enormous amount of publicity and very worrying for the public in the area where Reid was operating, of course.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Worrying in the sense of ...?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Well, worrying because clearly there were so many gaps in the investigation of the Reid serious assault. I have brought this to you before, Tim [Godwin]; it is not unknown to you. People are still smarting from the fact that there were not warnings given that there was a rapist out on the streets and that a great deal of care need to be taken, and then of course there were the problems that arose when people did report various matters about it. So, people in Wandsworth and in Clapham area are very much waiting for the result of this investigation by the IPCC and then, indeed, what happens to the officers who were involved because that is a critical part, especially following Warboys.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think the first point to say is that we have to treat Warboys separately from Reid. Reid goes back over a number of years in 2002, 2003, 2004; Warboys was 2007. The issue in relation to the investigation into the IPCC

investigation is the IPCC have now submitted their report to us, we have to go through that report and then there is a negotiation about outcomes. It would be inappropriate as a result of that to comment further in terms of the individual cases because those decisions have to be made and we have to obviously liaise with the IPCC and then come back. I am hoping that we will do that quite swiftly and we await Deborah's [Glass] return - she is away at the moment - to complete that but I am hoping that that will be resolved within the next four to six weeks.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** All right.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Thank you. Were there any other questions on that particular issue?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I had a question.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Cindy [Butts]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Thank you very much for giving your reassurance to the public about having confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service's ability to deal with rape but I wondered whether or not there was a broader strategy in terms of trying to deal with the significant amount of confidence that would have been lost through the two cases that have already mentioned, because I think it is great for you to come here and say, "Come to us; we take rape seriously," and all the rest of it but actually I think there is a broader issue about the level of trust that people have in the police service as a result of the significant negative publicity.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, that is a very good point and I am sure it is one that Cressida [Dick] will pick up on. I can remember coming in once listening to Radio 4 when they were talking then about rape and the victim's experience and I was waiting for what the Metropolitan Police Service might or might not have done as we were driving in and one of the victims that had phoned in to that programme had actually said, "But then I went to the Metropolitan Police Service and we met the Sapphire team and The Havens," and all the rest of it. I think sometimes we do not actually explain ourselves.

When we first set up the rape Havens and Sapphire, etc, Cosmopolitan and a whole range of different periodicals put out what those services were, what the expectations were, and at the moment the emphasis is on our failures where we have failed as opposed to what the services are. I think that is an issue we need to pick up because the last thing I want out of this is that our failures that led to tragic consequences then lead to additional tragic consequences where victims do not feel they can come forward. That is a concern; that is something we have to pick up and we will be working on how we can get that message out. We have been talking to the Havens as to how they can help and reassure as well in terms of what their experience is. Equally, we have had lots from victims as well in the past and that is quite a thing to ask them to come forward and explain their experiences, but we might need to do that as well.



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** On this subject then, Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Yes, I wanted to ask in particular Cressida [Dick] about the rise in sexual offences and particularly the sanction detection (SD) rate which is worrying. Going to one of my local CDRPs suddenly that sanction/detection rate for rape is appearing in a red block which, I believe, is replicated across the city so I have a concern.

I just really want reassurance that the regionalisation of the Sapphire teams; has that been identified as one of the contributing factors that was in that transition? Some of the work has been lost or expertise has been lost. Certainly when we last looked at this issue in SOP there was certainly an issue about retaining staff, actually trying to recruit staff to the full compliment and also around the investigative intelligence functions that there were some concerns. I just have concerns as to whether you can give us some reassurance.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Just before you answer that Jenny [Jones] also had, I think, a question which she submitted on the same subject but about Croydon.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes. It was clear that Croydon had a spike and looked as if it did not have enough officers. If this is Londonwide presumably SCD2 resources were decided before this rise and so are you going to change that resourcing? The other thing is: is the Metropolitan Police Service taking on the IPCC recommendations for the disciplining of the officers involved in Warboys? Has that already happened? Is it happening? Are you going further?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Sorry, I would like to add on the volume of rapes because obviously these are very significant increases and I suppose one of my questions is: is this a London factor and what is going on in the rest of the country? So, just as a by the way. The other issue for me is what is happening here? Are we really seeing an increase in the number of serious sexual offences and rapes? Is this about people coming forward and reporting it? Is it about how it is being recorded so that we are now SCD2 compliant with the SOP whereas previously matters that should have been recorded were not? If we are dealing with real volume increase, just that question about the volumetric, the business case for setting up SCD2, was that underestimated? To what extent are boroughs being expected to support SCD2 going forward? I would like - not for now - a separate briefing note that gives me a borough-by-borough analysis of just how many cases, new and legacy, that are SCD2 labelled that are still sitting on boroughs and that perhaps should be within SCD2.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, is there anything else on Reid/Warboys that anybody wants to raise? No? OK, great.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of Warboys, as I said in the piece, when we heard the victim's account and saw the recommendations we did go back to the IPCC and we have confirmed it was an independent investigation fully investigated to their

best intents and, as a result of that, they have come up with findings where they have identified those things that they have substantiated, those things that they have not. Following those conversations we are prepared to accept the IPCC report. So, those are the outcomes.

**Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Perhaps I can try to deal with the other questions as a bundle, so forgive me for not going one by one by one but they do all interlink. In terms of what is going on nationally, it does appear that London is exceeding in terms of the rate of increase at the moment so this is not a national trend. We are having a higher rate of recording in London at the moment than we did have before and that is different from the national picture.

In terms of what is really going on here, we are due to come back to the Authority soon with our very detailed review that we have been conducting ever since the new arrangements which started in September started. It does begin to look like a trend rather than a blip but I cannot say hand on heart that we fully understand what is going on, and I hope that be the time we come back we will have a much better analysis for you. In fact I am sure we will have a much better analysis and I hope it will be a nearly complete understanding of what is happening.

Valerie [Brasse], you have put some hypothesis. You suggested that it could be that more people are coming forward and we do think that is happening; we think also that there are undoubtedly tighter recording practices so where you see this particularly big increase in rape we are having more rapes recorded than we would have done perhaps previously; we are pretty sure about that. Therefore, what is the underlying nature of the offending and you appreciate this is a hugely still under-reported offence anyway. We are not quite sure and I would rather come back and give you the proper analysis. Suffice it to say we watch it daily, we watch it weekly, we watch it monthly and we are analysing it very, very carefully.

In terms of the sanction detection rate; Tim [Godwin] already mentioned that Baroness Stern and many others are looking at whether sanction detections and sanction detection rate are useful measures by themselves and how should they be viewed. I understand entirely why people would be concerned and it is the case that the sanction detection rate has been reducing. I think that is more to do with the number of crimes going up and I have no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the change from Territorial Policing having the lead to the new arrangements as of September has resulted in a fall off in performance anywhere at all; in fact quite the reverse.

Which brings me to the resourcing issues and, Jenny [Jones], you mentioned Croydon. I can say that Croydon have been, with the exception of about six weeks, up to strength according to what we allocated for them in September and they will continue to be so and all their permanent staff are coming online. That is according to what we allocated them. Your question I think is, "Well, was Croydon out of step? What it allocated? Or, have all these units been under allocated?" Again we are doing this very thorough review and we are going

to look at that. It was a careful formula that we applied. Croydon has had increase in the previous financial year and has an increase in reported crime and recorded crime this year as well.

In the review if we decide that such and such a borough is too low in terms of resourcing and such and such an area is too high then, of course, we will flex resources, and likewise, if we come to the conclusion that actually our staff cannot cope effectively to the standards that we require of them, which are very high standards, with the resources that we have given them then we will have to look to see where within specialist crime in the first instance, and potentially I suppose going elsewhere in the Metropolitan Police Service, if we need to increase resourcing. We do have - and I do not want to hurry this - a very thorough review going on.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Sorry, can you just deal with the question about boroughs supporting work that is SCD2 properly?

**Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, I can. Sorry, Valerie [Brasse], my mistake. There are a number of crimes which were in the category that would now be dealt with by specialist crime that happened before the changeover, a few that continued to be investigated by territorial policing, because that is the best way to do it, but it is a very small number. There are then some other crimes which are still shown as open on the system and I know perhaps other colleagues have not had this but you have had a good look at the figures. There are many hundred of crimes which are still shown as open on the system but this is an administrative thing. They are actually finished investigations, they are shown to TP, they have been finished, they should have been dealt with by SCD and it is simply a matter of administration to close them down and to write the final report. That will be done, they have all been reviewed and to get to the heart of your question there are no crimes being dealt with in Territorial Policing that should be being dealt with in specialist crime. There are no very serious sexual offences or rapes being dealt with in Territorial Policing that should be being dealt with in Specialist Crime.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Thank you for that reassurance.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thanks very much. I want to favour those who have submitted their questions in advanced. So, Jenny [Jones], you had two other vehicular questions. Do you want to ask them because I do not think they have been circulated?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, I was wondering how the Metropolitan Police Service is contributing to the Mayor's drive for electric vehicles and I was also interested in heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) enforcement within CO16.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** With the electric vehicles I think actually at one point we did get some mention on Top Gear for our Smart car with its (inaudible) and all the rest of it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I have seen it.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** The answer to it is that the MPS sought and was granted permission from the MPA at a Finance & Resources Authority meeting in October 2009 to enact in the lead role for testing and evaluation of a plug-in electric hybrid and other sustainable-fuelled vehicles, such as hydrogen, on behalf of the GLA family. We feel because we have the largest fleet in the GLA family is the one to undertake this role on behalf of the GLA and that is what we have done. We have a number, therefore, going under evaluation, so identifying vehicles that are suitable for use and equally to pass that information to other GLA family members.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I remember John Stevens took me for a ride in an electric car years ago just round the block.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Can I just finish my answer?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Carry on.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Right, because I would not say if I was taking an O-level I could take an O-level in electric cars to be honest, but in terms of where we are it is important that we trial these and we are trialling them. They have to meet certain specs obviously because of their role. What we are committed to supporting the GLA family requirement to introduce 1,000 electric vehicles as described, by 2015 and, as a result, the feasibility studies that we are looking at is that we have the potential to take 800 of those within our fleet. Now, that is mainly for general purpose use. So, we are building that plan now as we go through that spec and we will bring it back to the Authority through the F&R in terms of changing that fleet mix.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, I should just also say that I hosted a meeting with the Metropolitan Police Service and others and Honda with my London Hydrogen hat on which we were trying to persuade them to bring the cars to London for the Metropolitan Police Service to use. I think that was quite successful so we might see some of those as well before 2012. CO16?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the second one, HGV enforcement 16; following your previous challenges in relation to the Transport for London (TfL) funding, etc, Traffic OCU have conducted a review and, as a result, Traffic will create a Commercial Vehicle Unit comprising of two 2 teams: 1 police sergeant, 7 police constables, a total of 16 officers dedicated to fulfil that role. The work of the Commercial Vehicle Unit will be enforcement, raising road safety awareness, full running costs yet to be determined but will be built into the final project within that OCU.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** That is great.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** No, there is just one more thing and that is that I understand though you are doing all this work now on the HGV enforcement to guarantee that that continues but you are moving the collision investigation from Euston out to some outer borough, so you are actually closing part of what makes London's road safer. It is very important for a collision investigation unit to get somewhere very quickly and if they cannot get there very quickly then they lose evidence. It seems to me that you are actually giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Not necessarily. If you actually move the collision unit away they do not actually always just sit there. They will be out and various other things but you actually secure the scene with other patrol vehicles. I think the risk, if we have a little slow response, is actually how long a road might get shut but that is for us to look at. I do not know the full facts of how they work that out. I will get into that, but the reality is that will have been taken into the decision making.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I was basically told it was my fault because I had made such a fuss about the commercial vehicles that now they are closing --

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I am happy for you to take responsibility for it, Jenny [Jones]!

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I want to take responsibility for putting the collision investigation back at Euston.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I do take the point but I will get Chris Allison to give you a call.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, if we could be snappier with questions and answers that would be great now. Victoria [Borwick], final submitted question.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Just a quick one please. This was about - rather like Waltham Forest - pushing the individual case of Brick Lane. I know there are other neighbourhood policing units there but they are particularly keen to concentrate - I know we have got two Safer Neighbourhood teams, Weaver's Ward and Spitalfields and Bangledown wards - and very, very keen to bring to your attention the actual focus of doing something in Brick Lane.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I raised it with the borough commander as to what their plans were. At the moment there are no plans to create a dedicated unit purely for Brick Lane. They have already got the Safer Neighbourhood teams that you have already

mentioned. They have also got a significant problem-solving team that operates quite a bit in there which is part of the Jet process as I understand it and actually works in partnership with the local authority. Paul Rickett, the borough commander, currently undertaking the borough planning process as we speak and is looking at his resource over the next three financial years and is consulting at the moment with the community safety element of Tower Hamlets authority. They will be looking at whether there is a need for town centre teams, but at the moment it is with the Safer Neighbourhood teams, but I am sure he will keep you informed.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you very much.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** There is a front counter on Brick Lane, isn't there? Yes, OK. Do you want to say anything, John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** I think there is quite a persuasive case for Brick Lane to have a town centre designation. I would like that to get a move on in its evaluation.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** As I say, it has got to be finished by end of February/March anyway when the plans are in so it will be a move on. As to whether it is or it is not I cannot comment.

**John Biggs (AM):** It is as much about night-time economy, I think.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, great. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I have got a couple of questions. One, in the report that you have submitted on page 32, you talk about SD targets for overall numbers of Class A drug trafficking and those with cocaine-related SDs are unlikely to be met because of a need to realign resources to cover other priorities. I was wondering what other areas have been given priority ahead of Class A drug trafficking?

Secondly, you mentioned about the increase in homophobic-reported incidents. I have been pursuing a case, and it is on the boundary of a couple of boroughs, trying to track a homophobic attack that I had heard of. We are finding it very difficult to find it accurately recorded. So, I am wondering what training is there and what confidence you have got in the accuracy of recording because this has been out in the local community and when I have tried to look into it, actually trying to pinpoint this homophobic attack has been very difficult indeed. I am wondering whether we are confident that the recording is always being done accurately and actually the figure could potentially be higher.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think equally a lot of it is not reported that could be as well and sometimes it has not actually been reported.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** This was definitely reported.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the training our SCUs and staff get trained in the whole variety from domestic violence through to hate crimes, homophobic crime, racist crime, etc, and so they do get trained in that and to make sure that the recording is done appropriately. We do inspect that and we do check that with our data accuracy team at the centre. In terms of that particular case I do not know, but if you want to have a chat with me afterwards I will have a look into why it is not recorded.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** The first question?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the other one, around the Class A drugs. Class A in the sense of our new drug strategy which I know will be coming to the Authority to go through the briefing which has only just gone to the management board. The key priority for us is to actually hit on the things that cause harm to communities in the relation to the use of Class A. So, the priorities that we have been having is where you have disturbance, antisocial behaviour and crime through overt drug markets, etc, that is a priority; where you have crack house Class A interventions, they are a priority; where you have actually got gang activity that results in harm and violence then they become a priority. Now, as a result of that has all gone through the process and that is how boroughs have been responding to those priorities as we speak in terms of asset. Something that just looks at detection for Class A that is just swooping anyone up in terms of it. What we want to do is to make sure that asset is focussed on reducing harm that comes from the use of Class A, but that, I am sure, is going to go to SOP in terms of the briefing around the new drug strategy which will pick all that up in there.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** OK, thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, next was Reshard [Auladin].

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** Yes, on Section 44 I think you have talked about guidance being issued to officers in terms of photographers and tourists and so on. Can you tell us, first of all, how do you ensure that these officers are getting the guidance? I think last week there was another incident in the South Bank. Secondly, how are you going to monitor whether your guidance has been put into practice and actually is working?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** The guidance was circulated via our intranet and it is also being circulated to all borough contact leads in terms of CT, etc, and that has been cascaded down through that, through briefings, etc. The Commissioner has actually made a statement himself about what the expectations are. Every now and again we get picked up for things that actually happen that are not actually Metropolitan Police Service officers because there are a number of other police forces, as we all know, operating in London. Equally, there will always be the odd one that does get it wrong, as I have said before. In London you have always got to be aware of the anecdote over the vast majority.

What do we do? We number that was being used. We monitor how many complaints we get on the back of it and that is all being lead through ACSO(?) in terms of John Yates. I have got here the data: 2008 in the months October, September, August, July we had 64,675 uses of Section 44; 2009 following that promotion of our guidance and pushing those changes out we are down to 31,427. So, in terms of monitoring that reduction of 51% would tend to indicate that the message in terms of the changes is getting through.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you. Anything else on Section 44? Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I want to ask about the rise in knife crime in some areas because in Islington it has dropped --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Well, hold on. We are just on Section 44 at the moment.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, no, but it is about the use of stop and search as well.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Section 60.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes. Can I bring that in now or ...?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** In a moment. Let us just deal with Section 44. Is there anybody else on Section 44 specifically?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Just a very brief one. In the note that we have got there is some information about a meeting with the Community Monitoring Network on 4 May. Can we have more information about where and what time?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I will get that circulated.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, we will circulate that after the meeting.

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Thanks.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Dick [Tracey]?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** It was performance indicators I wanted to bring up because I was a bit concerned in the Commissioner's Report that there seemed to be various cases where it says worsening, which is not the way we want to be going. Obviously we talked already about serious sexual offence/rape and that is one that is down as worsening, but also the public relations (PR) one about the number of people who say that they are not satisfied with the way they are treated when they contact the police. That sort of thing is not what we want to hear frankly, but there are others too. If you look through the columns it says worsening against too many frankly and I wondered if you could give us some explanation, Tim [Godwin].



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Well, is this about specific ones or just a general --

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Well, if you look at page 28 and page 30, really it is this trend of worsening that it says.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Have you detected a particularly negative trend on the performance indicators, Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Worsening is the fact that it is slightly down in the sense of the trajectory. In terms of confidence; we were first in our MSF in confidence in local policing; we have now slipped to second in the sense that we have not gone up the same as another force but we are still high up there. One of the key issues there is about user satisfaction as it is called, for the want of a better term - these are all APACS terms - but it is actually the way the victim feels when we actually to their concerns.

Two key things have always come out in that. One is the fact that because of our policy decisions in relation to the investigation of traffic accidents that do not result in injury often is dissatisfaction where somebody wants someone to be done for an offence even though there is no injury, and obviously we leave that often to insurance companies to resolve rather than use the courts. The second one is there are issues about expectations around the investigation of violent crime, which TP are reviewing to see what goes on in that. In terms of the other worsening pieces: with the knife crime you have got to remember that we have now had a fairly significant downward trend unlike burglary, for example, which we have already spoken about going up which is now coming down again, if we take last year out of it it is still about the lowest for about 30 years. So, in that sense it is worsening against the trend over a short period of time as opposed to the long-term trend and it is to actually say that there are still challenges here that we have to do and the flat-lining is not sufficient.

That is all discussed with performance indicators. We have that whole piece that gets done as a result and that gets reported to SOP should they need to do it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** That will be reported through Performance Subcommittee so no doubt, Reshard [Auladin] you will be drilling down into that.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Overall crime is still coming down. Most serious violence is coming down, youth homicides and homicide overall has come down significantly, the gun crime rate - the bits I have mentioned are the bits that concern us.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** There is the worrying one on page 32 where the objective, "Disrupt more criminal networks and reduce the harm caused by drugs" and underneath on the table four of the five trends indicate worsening.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** On that one there is the answer to Caroline's [Pidgeon] question. Class A is itself, in terms of a measure which we are now removing as a drug strategy piece, you can do a warrant and just go in and nick lots of different people and all the rest of it. What we are actually focusing is on harm and harm outcomes. So, that is not a bad one. The use of the term is not overly helpful because it is only a minor reduction. The value of the assets in terms of POCA is actually only about 0.9% down at the moment, but of course these come in spurts and various other bits. I take the point looking at the table. It is not exactly the correct use of terminology.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Are you saying that the indicator on that particularly table is a conscious result of a policy decision that you have taken?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** It is, yes. The bit around that is we are focusing on harm reduction and going after the ones we should go after. Sometimes they are a tad more difficult to catch, if you know what I mean, and that is why we have got to be more sophisticated on the indicators. As I said before, the drug strategy will be coming in but overall the performance gets addressed at the Performance Subcommittee.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** The new drug strategy will be coming to SOP when?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Is it the next one or the one after?

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** I think March.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. That will have attached to it, what, a new set of performance indicators that are around that?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** I shall be there.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes. Although we do not want to change the indicators to suit what we are doing, it might be good perhaps to track both and then we can see what the effect is on both. Presumably one will lag the new strategy; this one will lag but then eventually you should start see it come right.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Equally, picking up the worse thing, where we have really flat-lined, if it just goes slightly down or up the use of the term could be anything from a massive reduction in performance to a slight variation and that is the bit that we need to pick up to actually articulate what that is.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, great, thank you. Kirsten [Hearn]?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Yes, it is back to homophobic crime actually. I wrote to you and sent you some information about that via Jennette [Arnold], who helpfully actually gave me a good answer to what was going on in Hackney. The question was a wider question. Members of the community are saying there are a number of areas in which homophobic crime seems to be doing up, mostly around certain clubs. What I would like to know is can you see a trend in this and what reassurances are being put in place to actually support and reassure the community are getting increasingly alarmed about it. I will be addressing a conference tomorrow about this issue and I know that people are going to be asking me a lot of questions about it.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of that work we have identified it as an area that we are concerned about in terms of the 226 offences that have increased. We have tasked that now to our intelligence bureau to actually come up with a strategic assessment and what we can learn from that in terms of location, in terms of victim profile, etc, so that we can come up with an appropriate response. We have not had that back yet so I cannot give you that specific detail, but when is your conference?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Saturday. Kennington was another area actually it mentioned as an increase in attacks on gay men in particular around certain clubs and pubs there.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I have not got that detail with me but Cressida [Dick] is just indicating that we will push that through to see if we can get something for you before your conference.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Presumably you have completed the full rollout of LGBT liaison officers? Every borough now has named one or more individuals who are doing that.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We do have the LGBT contact officers and all the rest of it so there is a lot in there that we are trying to do, As I say, it is like all these things, when it goes up is it a recording issue, is it a reporting issue, but the bottom line is we need to understand it and that work is ongoing. We will see if we can get you some answers before you do your conference.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Two things. First of all in order to save Dick [Tracey] the responsibility I want to refer to helicopters. On page 20 of your addendum report you very nearly lost me with the Ec135 and the vectored exhaust gases but you did not shake me off completely. I noticed reference in paragraph of page 20 where you say that the helicopter is not normally used at night except for operationally essential activities. You make reference to training and that is another obviously important thing to do, but I am a little bothered by the suggestion that during the daytime the helicopter is used for operationally unnecessary activities, speculative activities? I can well recognise that police may well do tentative things, try things out and follow things up and so on. The helicopter is expensive in all kinds

of ways as to resource - environmentally, economically and so on - and I am really quite puzzled by how it would be used for operational inessential activities.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think that is just a play on the later one about the night time piece to answer Richard's [Tracey] criticisms and concerns. We do not use it for fun. They are not joy flights and all the rest of it. One of the things that we sometimes do is if we are going to take aerial photographs of somewhere where we are running public order operations, major events, or whatever then we will naturally do all those in the daytime. They are still operationally essential but at the same time they are not chasing villains and pursuing cars or whatever else it is that we are doing. So, they are operationally essential. We are aware of how much it costs to put an aircraft in the air and we actually use that for a good reason.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Valerie [Brasse]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I am sorry, there is a second matter. On page 35 of your report - and not only because we had a briefing on this - on the section C1 on Race and Equality Impact is a particularly remarkable specimen of the creature where it seems to me that it says nothing other than that there are lots of race and equality issues telling us stuff which I think we know. It is actually on the same page as paragraph 32 which makes the point that there are 9.1% BME regular police officers having said how difficult it is in the current climate to recruit more, but then there are 33% BME special constables which suggest that the police service is not a complete anathema to BME but they are not joining the service. That, I would have thought, is an implication that demands some response in the paragraph about race and equality impact, questions that must be asked, next steps that must be taken and investigations that must be done rather than a paragraph which simply says this is all very interesting and demonstrates that we really care a lot about race and equality, which frankly takes us nowhere beyond that which we know already.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Can I answer that?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We are actually doing a race and equality impact over so many issues in one report that that is always a bit challenging. It does quite rightly say in here, "Continuing to develop a workforce that reflects the diversity of London and improving the progression of women within the police service," and that is a challenge for us.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** This paragraph is a standard paragraph, Tim [Godwin] - I am sorry that could appear on every report at any time for the last year and a half that I have been on this Authority.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I hear that. Again, we can add another weighty tome in terms of it. The key bits for us is that in every one of these issues we have equalities impact about our recruitment and our diversity. We can produce them as appendices to go with it in order to satisfy your concerns if that is what you want. The bit around it for me, in terms of picking up your challenge, which I think is a very real challenge, is about the difference between special constables at 33% and 9.1% of the regular. One thing about the regular is, as we have mentioned before, that we have people for 30 years and as they progress and we go through vacancies and as a result of that you can be recruiting at 20%, but overall not have a big percentage change, and it takes a number of years for that to go through.

A number of people have joined the special constabulary to assess whether they want to be a member of the Metropolitan Police Service in terms of our history and building up that trust and confidence. One of the things that we will be bringing back to the Authority is how we use the special constables to recruit more effectively into the regular service and that is going to be coming back to the Authority in the very near future. In terms of where we are in terms of recruitment is because we are growing the number of special constables. About three years ago we had 600, we now have 2,600. Our intention is to aspire to achieve 10,000 and as a result of that we can recruit now with those jobs which we cannot do when you have already got a police service that is full of police officers. So, the impact in terms of change and recruitment is easier to see the impact of it. So, that is a good thing that is saying people still want to join the Metropolitan Police Service from the BME communities and that is what we need to build on.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think it also reflected in the PCSO situation; there is a very good recruiting ground from the BME point of view, is that not right?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Chairman, am I allowed to come just on this specific point?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I think you kind of got a bit sidetracked with the example that Clive [Lawton] was using in order to demonstrate the point. The point is that this race and equality impact statement is baseless. It is just superficial and I think there is a point about the way in which officers write reports, and particularly this section, that is increasingly becoming very, very meaningless. Actually one of the really significant equality issues that arises out of the Commissioner's Report is around rape. That is the issue. There is no reference to this within this equality impact statement and you should be saying really this issue around rape is a significant issue, these are the ways in which we are going to deal with it and you have not. I think it is really quite shabby and it really does need to get better.

In terms of special constables; I cannot wait to hear how you are going to get all of those special constables because we all know that they are leaving in droves, so I will be really interested to hear about special constables at a later stage.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** OK, well we have gone from 600 to 2,600 and I think in our first trawl we got 1,000 applications. OK, you hold us to account and you can see how we go. In terms of the equality impact assessment piece in terms of the way we use a cut and paste and all the rest of it, if anyone here today does not think that rape is a high priority for us, that it is actually of significant concern, then I would be shocked on the basis that it is not in that particular paragraph. In terms of all those equality impact assessments that we do; we do it for all those things that we have and I do take the point of how much we would put into one of these in terms of it because somebody could challenge us on anything that is in that point. I do take the criticism, we will go back and have a look at it and we can append all those equalities impact assessments we have got for each of those different issues if that is what this Authority wants.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think in the interest of full disclosure it is worth telling you that we had recently a very interesting and challenging workshop amongst Members on race and equality impact assessments and I think some of this has come out of that. I think probably what we should do is share with you some of the conclusions that have come of that so that we can work together on what our collective expectation should be about how these things should be reported in the future. The general view coming out of that was that some of the reporting of it might not be reflective of the work that had been done behind the paper and become slightly routine and so, therefore, we just wanted to have a review of that.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I can see that. I just want to assure you that underneath all these there are equality impact assessments. We did have previously some challenges around whether we are doing that appropriately and as a result we put a lot of effort into improving that. We have got a diversity strategy that does it. It is about appending those papers to this to actually show you what we are doing.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes, and I think we have seen that. On the next paper, on the human trafficking one, the impact assessments are actually very good.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Chairman, I think it is important that you do not patronise Members. We have not come up with this just as a result of having half a day of bloody training. It is an issue that has been raised over and over again. Kirsten [Hearn] in particular raises it all of the time. So, I just think shape up.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I understand that but it is in that context that I was suggesting that we work together to get those impact assessments in a position or how they are reported in a way that will be satisfactory.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** It was in that context, Chairman, that we did say committees would start asking to see and spot-checking on equality impact assessments. I think it is only fair to raise that point.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely. We will start to do that.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** That we can fully do.

**Kit Malthouse (AM):** OK. Conveniently, Valerie [Brasse], it is your turn.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** BME equality impact absolutely part of this. I did not know whether Jenny [Jones] wanted to raise this one but it was in the context of Section 60 and searches. Clearly Section 60, stop and searches are central element of Operation Blunt 2 and we have seen the figures around knife crime dropping. We know equally the numbers have soared and I am not sure Jenny [Jones] has seen the article too that was a report by criminologists which raise the issue that this is not a simple story to tell; in other words, you do not heap on the Section 60s and suddenly see the fall in knife crime.

The figures, I think, are quite revealing so we are talking about more than 80,000 stop and searches in 2008/09 but the quote, "New figures show that among the 10 boroughs with the highest knife crime figures the biggest fall is a result of Operation Blunt 2 was in Islington where knife crime dropped 25%," but Islington also saw the second fewest Section 60 searches in the top 10 knife crime boroughs with only 840. Likewise you could go to Southwark where you saw just the opposite, big fall but big number of Section 60 searches. So, the gung-ho approach to Section 60 does not necessarily deliver the drop in knife crime and yet we know the impact it has on young community, the young BME community in particular, and I just wondered what the Metropolitan Police Service's response was to that.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We launched Operation Blunt 2 which has a range of activities and one of those is the issue of Section 60, because the decision we took was to go for the weapons and to actually make carrying a weapon in a public place actually a hostile environment for anybody that would choose to do that. Section 60 was used in those occasions in locations and events and a whole range of bits that went on. Section 60 is not just used for knife crime though. Section 60s have other events and so, as a result of Marion's [Fitzgerald] work, which we have not seen her full work - we have seen *The Guardian* article - but certainly Betsy Stenko who does work on us and to monitor all that activity raised a recent Youth Violence Board that actually the decision to go for the weapons and what we are doing appear to have been working. It is always difficult with cause and effect what the impacts are.

The other bit that we have also got to be aware of as a police service is that when you put certain tactics in place then people get used to that tactic and then they do other things and, therefore, challenges and checks and revisits is actually a good thing to do and that is what is going on. So, Betsy Stenko, working with TP, will be assessing where we are doing it whether we are getting the right outcome from that particular tactical use. The one thing I can say is we have maintained that connectivity at the local monitoring regimes and talking through Safer Neighbourhoods and we have significant support from what we are doing. The

reason we do it is to try to stop young people getting killed and stabbed in London. We will constantly, and always do, revisit the tactics.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think we do actually need to have a look at the work that has been done because the connection that was made in the reported article was pretty simplistic. My reaction might have been different to yours, which is to say: how much worse would it have been, in Newham for instance, and, therefore, maybe they should be doing more; not that it had not worked.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** The point is it is not a simple story about cause and effect but it has some horrendous consequences on local communities, so we need to understand it. I think it just prompts more questions.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Absolutely, I agree. Jenny [Jones] wanted to come in on this and then Chris [Boothman].

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, Valerie [Brasse] has covered it fantastically, but in your report on page 30 in paragraph 9 it does talk about Operation Blunt 2 and saying that, for example, 240 people were arrested but how many charges actually came out of that? It just seems to me that we do get reports on it but I never feel I have really understood the situation. I also want to raise Section 44 stops, if I still may.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the number of charges, I do not have that information here but we can provide that through SOP or whatever means.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Fine, Chris [Boothman]?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** I just wanted to add to the debate about Section 60. I know it is actually quite a contentious issue but I think that Marion Fitzgerald is someone that has been doing research on stop and search for many years; she was formally a Home Office researcher. A lot of her work indicates that it is not only quality in terms of the way the stop is done but also quality in terms of the reasons behind what the stop was made for.

So, for me I will always have difficulty with this assertion in the same way we had the earlier debate about more police is not the answer; it is the quality of the work. That is my approach to stop and search as well. Blanket use of stop and search will never deliver effective law enforcement activity. It has got to be about quality in my view and people understand that. People understand where you use something not only in the way the quality of the stop is good but the reasoning behind it is good as well.

I think that if we can get a grip of that and try to move away from just more stops, more stops, more stops, because you have to look at what is the result of the stop as well. I think, as people have said, if you look at the information that arises from the stops, whether there



has been an arrest, it does leave you wondering whether just constantly increasing the number of stops is the right answer.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK. John [Biggs] wants to ask something.

**John Biggs (AM):** I broadly agree with Chris [Boothman] and I have made a point of not going onto the strategic and Operational Policing Committee because most of the rest of you seem to be on it and I assume that you do this quality in-depth discussion at that committee. The point I would make is that stopping people could happen for a range of reasons. It could be in response to a particular incident. It could be as part of a campaign, for example, on knife crime or antiterrorist activity but it has to have a temporal element to it. I worry that if it becomes an entrenched policy without very regular review and without understanding where it fits as part of something bigger.

Stopping and searching people on its own cannot really be the end game, it seems to me, it has got to be part of a wider strategy, I guess other than in very special circumstances. I guess I would like to understand - and we are not going to just do it here today - from the police how they make sure that we do not get carried away and we end up alienating public opinion and that we do not actually add value to the policing, safety and confidence of Londoners.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Graham [Speed], did you want to add something on it?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Yes, thank you, Chairman. I certainly welcome and endorse the comments from colleagues on this subject. It is one that I have had ongoing concerns with over a number of years and I think there are certain parallels with the use of Section 44 stop and search in that the use of that in its previous form was vigorously defended for a substantial period of time until it was reviewed. What I think we have now is the more mature approach to the use of Section 44 stop and search which is more focussed. I would like to see that same degree of review applied to the use of Section 60 which has hitherto been vigorously defended in its use and may indeed be beneficial but I remain of the view that it is overused in some cases.

I think it will be helpful if we were to have some more specific information about its use and it seems to me that something on a tabular form looking on a borough-by-borough basis - how many times it has been used, say, over the last 12 months; whether it was for the whole borough or part of a borough; what the broad justification for that was; what it Blunt 2 or was it something else; how that correlates with the actual numbers of stops and searches, the arrests that resulted from that and the impact that has had on knife crime - I think we need to be a little bit more scientific about it but I would like to think this is really the start of us having a little bit more of a joined-up review of the use of Section 60 rather than the denial that I think we have seen so far. I think a mature debate will help us to take a more informed route forwards with it and I am still of the view it is being --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes. Those of you who have been on Blunt 2 operations will know that it is actually not blanket, it is quite heavily targeted and in response to immediate real-time information that is coming into the control room.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Well, I am not sure I agree with you, Kit [Malthouse], on that because I think in some cases it is being used more on a blanket approach. I think that is the concern that we have got. It may well be focussed on certain targeted uses like that but I am still of the view that there are wider concerns.

**John Biggs (AM):** The perception of it may be different from the actual --

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Can I come into the perception of what it is? We do not want to use powers that are not going to achieve overly much and we do need to be intelligence-led and sometimes intelligence is imprecise so you have to deal with what you believe to be the best judgment and the motivation is not to actually harass any individuals, groups, age range - whatever it might be - but actually to prevent crime and to actually use that wisely.

So, as a result of that Section 60 as a power has got very strict rules anyway in terms of the authority of my senior officer. They have to justify the grounds, they have to provide the intelligence so it gets recorded so if anyone then wants to challenge it it is then challengeable in a court of law. We use it for public order policing, we use it for specific policing operations. We use it where we feel we need to use it.

In terms of scrutinising it the bit that we have found in London over the stop and search debate over a decade is that actually it is local people that should hold local decision making to account because they understand the context in which it is being operated. So, we have now set up all those local monitoring arrangements, we go through that process and, equally, it is about continually having that conversation.

I remember when I launched Blunt 2 in response to the homicides that had occurred in those preceding days, there was some Facebook or You Tube or one of those mediums chatter amongst Somali young men in particular who are concerned about what I was saying so we went to the Somali youth forum and actually invited them in to come and have a conversation about it and, as a result, we had a number volunteering to come out and observe, etc.

So, it is about explain, it is about perception and it is about being challenged.

Marion [Fitzgerald] has been for many years looking at this. We have evidence from Betsy [Stenko] which is as a different piece but we have a challenge and we need to revisit it and re-look at it and that is what we are doing. To share it with you through SOP is totally legitimate and we can do that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** I think that is a good way forward. I was just talking to Reshard [Auladin] about that. I think it is probably time for us to bring a review of where we

are on Blunt 2 certainly in the light of some of these other bits of research and just have a look from a reassurance point of view that everything is as it should be and that it is actually delivering what we think it should be. Although, I have to say a year ago when the numbers were so high, it came in and there has been a one-to-one correlation with its use and a fall in numbers. So, to a certain extent as far as I can see, it is cause and effect.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** To reiterate knife crime has gone down since we did it as has youth homicide - most importantly youth homicide and homicides - so we do not want to throw babies out with bath water, etc. So, this is an area that we have to make careful judgments but we look at the challenges.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Jennette [Arnold] was next.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Thanks. Following on from Graham [Speed], unlike him over the last year my experience has been much more positive about the use of Section 44 and Section 60 but I understand that he has concerns because one of the things that concerns me is: is my experience good because everything is being tick-boxed whilst myself and observers are there? I think sometimes you think, "Yes, is this a show that is being put on?" but to test that out when myself and other observers have gone back to the respective IAGs then we have had a thorough discussion there and in a sense the test for us has been as members of that community, if you like, do we feel that those powers are being used satisfactorily in that instance.

So, my concern is just how do you move that monitoring where it is the satisfaction of that community, which for me is really what is important, rather than, say, the satisfactory of any Member here, to be quite honest. How do we move that to the strategic? So, it is about looking at something that Graham [Speed] has said, how do we test that where it is being done well it has a relationship with the IAG and the monitoring bodies there and then we can then look at it strategically to identify where it is being done inappropriately, where it is being done excessively and, as I say, the mantra is then do we then need to look at training? Do we then need to look at the wider partnership and a greater understanding of the powers?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, well I think what we should do with this is Reshard [Auladin] will work up a commissioning brief which we can circulate to Members to make sure that it is covered because it is pretty critical, both in terms of crime itself but also community relations and impacts and all the rest of it. So, we will work that up over the next couple of weeks and circulate that for Members. Now, I am conscious everybody it is 11.55am; I know everybody is content to continue but just if we could bare that in mind.

We have got a few other bits and pieces to get through and I have got Jenny [Jones], Dee [Doocey] and Chris [Boothman]. Jenny [Jones], you have had quite a good go already so if we could keep it snappy that would be great. I am getting signals from others that they want to move on, but by all means carry on.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. I would like to say we did watch the stop and search figures, we had a special panel, but that was scrapped and we thought it would come under the Civil Liberties Panel but that has not happened; we have been too busy. So, actually it is an important aspect of policing. It is not only about --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** We still do monitor stop and search.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** -- politicians following popular opinion, it is also about us setting a lead and actually saying, "Actually this does disrupt civil liberties and there might be repercussions," so local people being satisfied is one thing, but us as strategic politicians we have to see it slightly differently sometimes. You threw in a figure earlier and I was so shocked at it that I did not really listen to anything else you said afterwards which was that Section 44 has fallen by ...?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** 51%

**Jenny Jones (AM):** By 51%. In what period is that? Could you just give me a few more details?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** It is since we changed the rules. I have got it here. In July, August, September and October 2008: 64,675, and obviously we have made the changes and then in July, August, September and October 2009: 31,427.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Mine is about the issues around public safety on New Year's Eve. I just wanted to comment briefly on that paragraph. I see that the superb New Year's Eve celebrations are being overly subscribed and I think my concern is that it says the safe capacity of the area remains a cause for concern and will be discussed with partners. I just get the impression that somebody will just have a general chat.

I think instead of that I would like to propose that consideration be given to having smaller events round London and particularly in the outer boroughs so that people would not feel that the only thing they had to do and I wondered if we could tie in the use of the big screens that are going to be used for the Olympics as well. Just sort of think outside the box a bit. I do not want any answers now, I just wanted to put the idea.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Yes. You are right to identify it and in fact just last night there was a meeting with the Mayor and the Commissioner and I asked Paul [Stephenson] to discuss exactly that, both New Year's Eve but also then Olympic celebrations, how we deal with it from a crowd control point of view. So, the work is in hand well in advance on that. OK, great. Thank you very much Members. Thank you, Tim [Godwin].

Right, we will move on. Our next item is on human trafficking and Cressida [Dick] is going to lead on that and I should just say at this point offer our congratulations, Cressida [Dick] on the award of your Queen's Policing Medal in the New Year's Honours; very well deserved.

**Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you very much indeed, Chairman. You have the paper in front of you and you will all remember conversations you have had with the Commissioner and other members of the Metropolitan Police Service over the last few months. Firstly, human trafficking is obviously a very serious crime. It is one which is not very well understood at the moment. We know it is definitely under reported and, as the Chairman pointed out, it is one that affects our most vulnerable people dreadfully. In particular it disproportionately affects women and children.

You will also be aware that our Home Office funding comes to an end in April and that a decision was made some 18 months ago to close the Specialist Crime Human trafficking team at that point. You will see from the papers, after a lot of consultation and a lot of thought including with many Members here, the decisions that we made at the board are shown in paragraph 9 and I think most of you are quite familiar with those. We have outlined at paragraph 12 what we regard as the benefits of the new arrangements.

The detail is still being worked on but essentially, as you know, specialist crime will take on responsibility as the lead for human trafficking from hereon in. The unit that used to come under what was called Clubs and Vice will come to Specialist Crime and we will take on responsibility for both human trafficking for sexual exploitation and for domestic servitude.

There is very detailed consultation continuing and we have met with several of you over the last weeks. If there are other Members who want more detailed briefings outside we are still very happy to do that and to take your feedback and to respond to that. The only other thing I would like to emphasise in the paper is that we do recognise we have a long way to go on this. We are developing both for the national policing community and also for the Metropolitan Police Service a training package for first-line response officers and people in station offices and other people who might actually come into first contact with somebody who has been trafficked or indeed a member of the public who wants to report that.

We are also still debating the question of whether other units which deal with organised immigration crime specifically Operation Swell(?), which some of you may know about, and Golf should come into the Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD) and I anticipate a decision on that from the board in the fairly near future.

Chairman, I am very happy to take questions at all.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thanks very much. Now, I gather you have had a couple of briefings with Members in the last week or so.

**Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Yes. Well attended as well, thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I would first like to thank you for arranging the briefings. They were extremely useful. I think from one of the people along with Jenny [Jones] that put the initial motion down, I certainly had some degree of reassurance from that meeting that the work that the human trafficking unit was doing would be continued with officers that certainly knew what they were doing and knew the whole piece. So, from that point of view I was reassured.

I was also reassured about the benefits of moving it into SCD as opposed to just leaving it with CO14, but I do have some concerns. I think these were some that we expressed. By combining the units there will be a net lose of five or six officers and we were told that this would be compensated by working smarter, but we were then told that part of the working smarter would be to put some of the burden for carrying out operations onto other boroughs' police which are already stretched. So, if you like, the specialist officers would do the planning and the control of the operations but borough resources would be brought into it. So, that was certainly a concern.

We were also told, which is a concern but also a good thing in a sense, that the Metropolitan Police Service, as like most police forces up and down the country, had not really yet understood the implications and the extent of trafficking for forced labour and that there were plans in the Metropolitan Police Service to actually undertake some research with some of the NGOs in the area. It was expected that that would then lead to further operational need and with the loss of manpower, the resources reductions, there is obviously concern about the future sustainability of the current work but also of forthcoming work in the future. I know that there is a review that is planned, I believe, in six months' time, but looking at the budgets yesterday, there did not seem any manoeuvre in those budgets for extra resources. Dee [Doocey] also raised an issue that I am sure she is going to raise today about child trafficking as well which was a concern.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Dee [Doocey], do you want to raise your point?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, I want to deal specifically on child trafficking. I do not really feel from the paper that sufficient emphasis is given to child trafficking. I have been involved for a number of years with the superb work done by the Paladin team, but of course they just work at the ports and they do not have the ability to do stuff if a child has already been trafficked into London; they have got to raise it with the boroughs. I feel very strongly that the Paladin team needs to be increased and certainly they need to get better accommodation than they have got at the moment. You have, Chairman, given an assurance that we will take this offline and look at it in more detail. I suppose my concern and the concern of those charities who work specifically with children have made to me is that they are concerned that the Metropolitan Police Service has not fully taken account of the magnitude of child

trafficking and the complex nature and the fact that you really do need very highly specialised teams dealing with it. So, if we could maybe take that as well when we are looking at Paladin offline I would be content.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, we will do. Faith [Boardman]?

**Faith Boardman (AM):** Yes, I share both the reassurance and the concerns that Dee [Doocey] and Joanne [McCartney] have said and I did find the briefing helpful. I think the only I would like to add at this stage is a concern about looking forward to the Olympics and how far the resources in particular around that period need to be (inaudible).

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Dick [Tracey]?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes, clearly you stepped into the breach at a very opportune moment in doing this work and this reorganisation but I have to put on record my absolute surprise and amazement at the fact that the Home Office choose this moment to cut resources. From the technical point of view, to what extent is this cut actually handicapping the ability of officers to respond to this clearly rising problem in this country and obviously in London?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, and then Jennette [Arnold] finally.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, I obviously share the concerns that have been voiced but it is another area that I just wanted to raise with Cressida [Dick]. That was about the communities that are being affected - and in your report you talk about Romanians and I am sure that spreads across other Eastern European countries - and clearly we know of the issues within some African communities that came out of the story of Victoria Climbié. I will not go into the Victoria Climbié inquiry at all.

I know that the foundation, who I was chair and patron of, continued to work with stakeholders and I just wanted your assurance that you are still going to stay working with those communities that already have the issue and that you have the resource to then add new communities into that work. Sometimes what can happen is that you move to work in with new communities and then move away from those areas where there is still ongoing work to be done - that is an assurance. To what degree have we got members of the new communities involved in the independent advisory group or is it the same advisory group that you had for previous communities because I think you would need to do some work there.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Cressida [Dick]?

**Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Chairman, thank you. I will first start with Jennette [Arnold] and Dee [Doocey]. We are putting a huge emphasis on working with partners with - terrible word - stakeholders and with communities. I think we already have some very, very well established links. I will give you my personal guarantee that that will continue and only get better and more diverse if it needs to. It is a huge part of our strategy

between now and April and into the future and we are very, very well aware of that. I take your point Dee [Doocey] about child trafficking; I think we do need to do some more very hard thinking about that and I would be delighted to talk with you outside as agreed.

In terms of the Olympics I think we have said before it is very unclear to us exactly what the impact of the Olympics is going to be in relation to human trafficking. We do frankly anticipate some impact both in the phase of build and leading up to and during the Olympics on the prostitution trade. We are less clear about the impact on trafficking and there is very mixed evidence about this from other big events including big sporting events in history. That said, we are investing, and you have seen we have been funded to invest, in the Olympic boroughs and we are investing in intelligence in the Olympic boroughs and both community and more technical police sources of intelligence in order to find out what on earth is going on. We will keep that under review and respond as necessary as we go.

This brings me to the funding issues and the resourcing and the lingering concerns I know that some Members had around the degree of funding. In terms of the Home Office funding I think it is important to say that this came under what was called maxim funding, which was part of the wider reflex funding - all these jargons, sorry. The Metropolitan Police Service did always know that it was time-limited. We did managed a year ago to get the Home Office to extend 50% of the human trafficking team funding and that was an added bonus, if you like, and we matched that with some under-funding - some savings we had made elsewhere.

I think the Commissioner would want me to say the funding has gone and we needed, therefore, to look to our laurels to see what on earth we were going to do about it. I honestly do believe that this change will bring greater focus and less duplication. So, for example, if you are a partner or somebody in a community who wants to access, it would be much clearer how you work with the Metropolitan Police Service on this issue. I think there will be less waste because all the units will be better coordinated and mostly sitting in one place. Yes, we have lost, as you said Joanne [McCartney], 5 posts overall but what we have done is said that the officers in Clubs and Vice, of whom there are now 39 - which is 5 more than it used to be - who were working part of the time on human trafficking but a considerable part of their time on other operations will now focus more on human trafficking.

My belief is that the degree of effort going into human trafficking today is more than it was three months ago and it will be more again in April and it will be more again in the future. Of course we will keep that under review and if we are not coping with, for example, what we discover when we begin to upturn some of the stones in relation to domestic servitude then we will have to look at whether the resourcing is sufficient.

Then finally you mentioned the impact on Territorial Policing and, yes, in turning some of the 39 officers more onto human trafficking we are taking them away from some of the street prostitution operations and those are going to be managed more in the boroughs. I think you will not get any complaint from the boroughs there. They will still have access to our



expertise, our guidance, our support and if we need to put a team out to help them we will do, but they are perfectly competent and indeed want to take on that responsibility.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Much closer contact with the local authority which is key. Just to say I have raised the trafficking issue in particular through the Olympic Security Board at the Home Office and I have to say that although they have kicked off a strand of work around that, I think some of which the funding is coming through from the budget, they are saying that they currently see no evidence that the Olympics will result in an increase in trafficking. Now, what effect that will have on the work that is done in the run up to the Olympics we are not sure but we have got a bit of a threshold to cross with them there.

OK, thank you very much. Now, it is 12.15pm, Members, if we could aim for 12.30pm that would be helpful I think to a number of people who indicated they want to move on. So, thank you very much for that Cressida [Dick]. We are going to move onto the annual audit letter. Bob [Atkins]?

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Thank you, Chairman, I will keep it short. This report marks the formal end of the 2008/09 audit process. Members will be pleased to note that it includes an unqualified opinion on the accounts and an unqualified value for money (VFM) opinion. It also includes a user resources score of two which means we perform adequately in all material respects, so an acceptable result there. It contains three recommendations and you will see the response to those recommendations at page 61 of the report. Really just to say finally that I am having an introductory meeting with the District Auditor tomorrow, obviously I will pick up any residual issues with him then.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** Super, thank you. Any questions on the audit letter? No? Thank you very much. Received.

Monitoring Officer; our Monitoring Officer [Simon Vile] is leaving and, therefore, we want to appoint an interim one which will be the Deputy Chief Executive [Jane Harwood]. Is everybody happy with that?

**Authority Members:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, Reports from Committees; do the chairs of committees have anything that they wish to flag at the Full Authority? No? OK, thank you very much.

Any other urgent business? No.

I should perhaps point out at this stage, just before we move off, that following the reorganisation of the Authority there are a number of members of staff who are leaving and in particular Martin Davies, Simon Vile and Jenny Trevillion are leaving. I am sure you would want to join me in thanking them for their service to the Authority and wish them well for the future.

Sorry, I missed Item 11. Oh yes, Action taken under Delegated Authority. What have you been up to?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** I would just remind Members, Chairman, that the complete forms are all available for inspection in the Members' room at 5.15pm (inaudible) Street and has got more details than this paper.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman):** OK, thank you very much. Right we have to move into private session now so I am afraid I have to ask members of the press and public to leave if you would not mind.