

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 30 September 2010 at 10 am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chair), Reshard Auladin (Vice Chair)
Tony Arbour, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Chris Boothman, Victoria Borwick,
Valerie Brasse, Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn,
Jenny Jones, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Valerie Shawcross and Graham
Speed.

Amanda Sater (from item 3 onwards).

MPA Officers:

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive) and
Bob Atkins (Treasurer).

MPS Officers:

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner), Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner),
Anne McMeel (Director of Resources) and Martin Tiplady (Director of Human
Resources).

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Good morning. I make that 10 am. Welcome friends. It has been a while. Lovely to see you all again. If we could take our seats please that would be great. Before we start, if we could begin by just placing ourselves in the room. I am Kit Malthouse, Chair of the Police Authority.

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

Reshard Auladin (Deputy Chair): Reshard Auladin.

Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive, MPA): Jane Harwood.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

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

Graham Speed (AM): Graham Speed.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Chris Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Toby Harris (AM): Toby Harris.

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Val Shawcross.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

James Cleverly (AM): James Cleverly.

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): Martin Tiplady.

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

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Paul Stephenson.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Welcome all. Right. As I say it has been a while. We have got a fair amount to get through today so we are going to try to keep it snappy if we can. Apologies have been received from John Biggs, Neil Johnson, Clive Lawton and Caroline Pidgeon. Any other apologies? No? OK.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I think John [Biggs] is actually coming later.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Is he? Just late probably. OK. Fine. Declarations of interests. Does anybody have any interests to declare? No? OK. Thank you very much.

Before we begin, we have an interim appointment of an Independent Member which we have to ratify to allow that Member to join us. Apparently there is some etiquette; she is not allowed to sit at the table until you have all said she can. She has obviously been through the selection process and been hanging around waiting to be approved for a while. Can I have the Authority's approval that Amanda Sater should join us as an Independent Member please? Everybody happy?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Amanda [Sater]. Welcome. Please. Come and join our merry crew. You are very welcome.

Jenny Jones (AM): You put her in the middle of the Conservative bunch. Is that a ...?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No. Just closest to the exit. We do not sit as parties. We are meant to be spread widely, Jenny [Jones].

Jenny Jones (AM): I know. I am stuck in Labour.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We all pick lots to sit next to you. Thank you very much. Amanda [Sater] has volunteered, heroically, to go on Finance and Resources Sub-Committee, Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee and Resources and Productivity Sub-Committee. That leaves one or two other casual vacancies on Committees which we will discuss between now and the next meeting and, hopefully, fill those Members from whoever wishes to serve. OK. That is that.

Minutes of the last meeting. Does anybody have any matters arising or comments on the last minutes? Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes, I just wondered if the Commissioner had looked at how the guidelines were being disseminated under 16.31?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Guidelines in terms of ...?

Dee Doocey (AM): Guidelines in terms of police stopping people taking photographs when they were legally entitled to do so.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Right. OK.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): We implemented the guidelines. I know that we have reinforced the guidelines on a number of occasions. I will happily go away and look again and speak to John Yates [Assistant Commissioner, MPS]. Is that what you are looking for, Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): It says, "The Commissioner agreed to look at how the guidelines are being disseminated". Since then I have had a lot of people come to me saying, "This is not a one off" and giving me examples. I think it is something that we do need a report back on if we could.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I will happily do one.

Dee Doocey (AM): Could we have that for the next meeting?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, I think it would be useful perhaps to have a note before the next meeting just about what steps have been taken.

Dee Doocey (AM): That would be great. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Is there anything else?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Yes, Chair. On the Race and Faith, 17.9, Members stated they would welcome details of the response to the report from the Mayor. Has there been such a response from the Mayor on the Race and Faith?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I am not sure there has been yet actually. I think it is still being chewed over.

Valerie Brasse (AM): So we will get it back here?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): There will be a response, yes.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Do not worry. It has been circulated.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): It will be circulated when we receive it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK? Happy? Right. I will sign. Thank you very much. OK.

My update. It has been a while since we last met and certainly since I was last here. Sorry I could not make the last meeting. Thank you, Reshard [Auladin], for filling in.

Since the last time I reported to you I have had literally dozens of meetings, some with everybody ranging from Secretaries of State right down to local and community groups. I do not intend to go into them but it runs in to the many, many tens, Jenny [Jones], of meetings since we last met.

A couple of items just to mention. Obviously congratulations and welcome to Amanda [Sater] for joining the Authority. Also a welcome to Fay Scott who is our new Head of Equalities and Engagement who joined the Authority last week, hopefully helping us to raise our game in relation to equality issues. Is she here? Can you wave at us so we can all know what you look like? Hello. Helping us to raise our game on these issues and helping to deliver the recommendations of the Race and Faith Inquiry. Welcome.

Obviously there have been a number of high profile incidents and events since we last met. Just a few to mention. I want to particularly - given that I have a constituency interest on the Assembly - congratulate the Commissioner and his team on the Notting

Hill Carnival which passed off very peacefully. Also congratulations to Chris Boothman for the part he played in making sure that it was an extremely successful Carnival and that crime fell, I gather, by a third compared to the previous year, which is a triumph. Over one million people came this year and had a fantastic and, largely, crime free time.

We have also had the visit of His Holiness, the Pope, which went off extremely well. Obviously there were certain tensions around particular events which, no doubt, we might hear more about later but, nevertheless, in terms of public order and management, it was extremely well managed and the Metropolitan Police Service has, quite rightly, been showered with compliments from all over, not the least Vatican, about the way the thing was handled. There is still an issue about the bill but that is separate from the policing operation and we are very grateful for that work.

I went to Peckham last week and helped to launch the latest weapons bin in London. This is a project that is being run by a charity but led by a Metropolitan police staff member which has seen 11 bins deposited across London recovering 650 knives and, as it happens, last month 3 guns were deposited in the bin in Westminster. I was particularly keen to support it because it shows that the Metropolitan Police Service not only does the work it is paid for but also its employees do a huge amount of voluntary work which benefits everything they do.

We also saw, last week, the tenth anniversary of the Week of Peace in which both the GLA and the Metropolitan Police Service participated fully. The awards were held upstairs. In particular the volunteer Police Cadets assisted at the debates and awards and generally presented the Metropolitan Police Service in an extremely good light.

In terms of two big issues for me that have been on the horizon. The first has been the prospective changes in governance and legislation. I have had meetings with Nick Herbert [Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice] and Kenneth Clarke [Secretary of State for Justice] and you have all worked on the MPA draft response which we are going to try to agree later. We are expecting the Bill to be published ...?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): End of October/November. I suspect November. End of November.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): With a timetable for going through the various Houses and implementation over the following 12 months.

The other big issue has obviously been the budget. We are about two thirds of the way through the informal budget scrutiny meetings at the MPA. We have done Deputy Commissioner, Directorate of Public Affairs (DPA), Resources, Territorial Policing (TP), Human Resources and Directorate of Information (DOI) so far. I am pleased to report that things are going better than I expected, which is good.

We have agreed with Nick Griffin, who is the Mayor's adviser on Finance at the GLA, that we will actually submit a budget and draft London Policing Plan in line with the

normal timetable, which means the end of November, in line with previous years, so that we take into account what comes out in the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) which would be at the end of October, rather than having to do the process twice. That also gives us the opportunity at the Members' Away Day on 29 October 2010 to consider the full budgetary picture as part of the day because then we will have a broad outline of what the Government is going to give us, but also a better picture about what we are able to achieve in budgetary and output terms and give that some consideration on that day.

A few other things. Yesterday the Mayor launched the London Crime Reduction Board which had its first meeting here in City Hall. This is one of the things we have supported through Met Forward and, in many ways, will be critical to success over the coming years. It is the first time that civil society - in the form of all the arms of government, probation, youth justice, social care and all the rest of it - the police and democratic politicians from the city come together in one forum to try to solve their differences, look at priorities and find a way to fight crime in a better and more efficient way. The Panel will be meeting again in the middle of December and we will have a substantive agenda there which we are happy to circulate for Members to consider also.

The Board includes three members of London Councils, the Mayor, the Commissioner and myself. We have high ambitions for it driving matters forward, not just in terms of performance but also in terms of greater joint working, shared budgets, pooled commissioning and all that kind of stuff, which is going to be critical to financial success.

We have begun the second round of joint engagement meetings (JEMS) over the summer. We have done, I think, 4 now of the 32. They seem to be going well, not least because it has become that the boroughs, having gone into the first round, I think, with an air of apprehension, are now coming with much more enthusiasm and the difference between the presentations and data from last year to this year is huge. What has become apparent is, in the interim 12 months, between boroughs there has been a massive amount of activity by all the boroughs who now have a much closer shared picture between the various parties that are borough engaged and, therefore, are making much more effort on a joint basis about some of the things that particularly alarm us as an authority from a priorities point of view.

Last time we met we talked about what scrutinies we would be doing in the forthcoming year. I suggested a second one around corruption and professional standards. A number of people said that they would like to suggest alternatives or, at least, Members wanted the opportunity to suggest alternatives. We have not had any suggestions or alternatives in the interim. We, I think, emailed twice asking for submissions and nobody submitted. Can I assume, therefore, that we are content to continue with the scrutiny on corruption and professional standards? Everybody happy with that? Forgive me if we have taken - sorry, Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): I did suggest, I think, previous to that discussion, the Territorial Support Group as a potential area that we could look at.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Good idea. Could we add that to it perhaps?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): The performance and indicators around the Territorial Support Group are monitored through ...?

Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive, MPA): Professional standards but also through the Committee that Tim [Godwin] leads on as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It is up to you really. I am happy to do either. We have, if you will forgive me, taken the slight liberty of working up some terms of reference around the scrutiny.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Might I suggest, Chair, I think we are due to bring a report back on the Territorial Support Group (TSG). I seem to recall. I think it is due at the next Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP)?

Jenny Jones (AM): Next SOP.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): You might then want to decide, at that point, as to whether you want to do a scrutiny or not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): There is also a potential overlap between the two which we could certainly have a look at.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I also think that the performance and the stuff that is coming out in terms of professional standards, the TSG over the last 18 months has done some amazingly good work and I think it would be quite good to show in a very positive light through this Authority the work of the TSG. I do not think the TSG would be, in any way, fazed by a scrutiny if that is what you desire but we will bring the report through to say what they have been doing.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Great. Thanks very much. A couple of other small things. The Mayor has launched a dangerous dogs petition which you can find on the GLA website. Please, for those of you for whom it is a concern go and sign. Numbers are mounting rapidly. We had a very good event supported by all the dog welfare charities, including the Battersea Dogs Home, in Battersea Park last month.

Earlier this week the Mayor also launched a Safer Parks award. Parks, as you know, are a talismanic issue for lots of people across London and we wanted to find a way to reward a lot of the work that is taking place around Safer Parks but also to try to give people an incentive to come together with their community and make their parks a better and safer place. That was launched in Bexley earlier this week. Those of you who are interested, who have parks, friends of parks and all that kind of thing please do have a look at the awards also on the GLA website.

Finally, Dee [Doocey], you submitted a question to me about the Civil Liberties Panel report. When is it going to be published? I think we should make it clear that when the report was brought to the Authority and ratified, it was immediately published online. I think we are talking about hard copy publishing. My understanding is it is with the printers - oh you have got one. Fantastic.

Victoria Borwick (AM): No, I have the proof.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): That is the proof. OK. So we have got a proof and there will be a print run imminently to get it out.

I should just say that we did do a hard copy run of the Race and Faith Inquiry but that is unusual and against our policy. We have generally printed inquiries, I understand, but scrutinies we have only ever done online. Now we understand the Civil Liberties Panel (CLP) report on to G20 is slightly different and so we have agreed to have a small print run. For those who were interested there is a copy.

Victoria Borwick (AM): We had agreed to send it to the respondents particularly because, inevitably, there is quite a broad range. We had agreed, when we had our open session, that they would receive it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. It is going shortly.

Dee Doocey (AM): I am pleased to hear that it has finally been done. I had not appreciated that, when it went online immediately after we had agreed it, that that was the final version. There has been a lot of miscommunication --

Victoria Borwick (AM): I do not think it was because (several inaudible words).

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It was not actually the final. That was the version then.

Dee Doocey (AM): It was not?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I think it has then been augmented with responses from the Metropolitan Police Service itself so it is a new and improved one that is up there.

Dee Doocey (AM): Right. My point is that, as I understand it, we have just got the final version this week, which is six months after the final version was agreed by this Authority ie 25 March 2010. I do think that, if the final version was agreed in March as you have just said, then that should have been sent, at that stage, to all of the people who had asked for it. I find it embarrassing, as a Member of that Committee, that we have waited six months in order to send the results of our inquiry to the people and we have done nothing about it. I just find it extraordinary that it takes six months.

I am not a great believer in producing hard copies because I think they are not necessarily the way to go but I do think, if we had produced a Word version and just sent it to people,

that would have been adequate. As I understand it, it has taken six months to get the final version ready.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes. You are right. We will learn.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Yes, Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): On the issue of Peckham, the previous Chair - and, I believe, perhaps the one before - paid an official visit to a borough they did let the Link Member know and possibly even the person who represented that area, if that was not the Link Member. I wondered if, in the remainder of our term of office, you might be prepared to do that?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Absolutely, yes. I am sorry that it was not done. I suspect it was probably because it was done through this building rather than the Police Authority. I was there in my Deputy Mayor for Policing (DMP) rather than my MPA role. Probably a combination of both. Apologies. We will make sure it is rectified.

Jenny Jones (AM): No, that makes perfect sense.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Again, we will learn.

Jenny Jones (AM): Could I raise something else as well? I have had some emails expressing concern about an investigation that was dropped in Westminster. It was about the awarding of Westminster Council's on street parking enforcement contract. I think they thought I would be interested in on street parking enforcement. It was dropped and they felt it was dropped very suddenly and I wondered if you knew anything about this?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No. News to me. They have not written to me as the Assembly Member so, no, I do not know about it.

Jenny Jones (AM): You were not involved in the investigation at all?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No. Why would I be?

Jenny Jones (AM): Well I do not know.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Do you mean a police investigation?

Jenny Jones (AM): A police investigation into alleged irregularities of Westminster --

Toby Harris (AM): Are you trying to smear him?

Jenny Jones (AM): I am trying to find out what --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It would be completely improper for me to involve myself in a police investigation.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK. Fine. Thank you.

John Biggs (AM): Does that apply to all of your jobs?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Sorry?

John Biggs (AM): In each of your capacities it would be improper?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Whatever capacity I am in, yes, absolutely.

Jenny Jones (AM): Whom should I take it forward with then? Shall I speak to Tim [Godwin]?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It is a police investigation so it is a question for the Commissioner.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Everybody happy? Valerie [Brasse], yes?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Chair, this is on a more serious note. London Crime and Reduction --

John Biggs (AM): That is pretty serious actually.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Yes, of course it is pretty serious but this is another one. London Crime and Reduction Board. You have talked about shared budgets and pooled commissioning. Is this Board - with all the partners around the table - going to be mandated by any sort of joint targets to which Londoners can hold this Board accountable to?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): This is what we are going to spend the next two or three months working out. There are a lot of sensitivities around some of the territoriality between the organisations that need to be ironed out, but there is definitely a shared objective to decide what our strategic priorities are across the city and then work out how we can best achieve that. One of the things that was raised yesterday about the Board is that it could be quite a useful forum in terms of bartering in budgets, "If I invest this money here it saves you money in your budget. Can I have a bit of the saving?" Also, critically, for us to look at shared risk, "If you cut your budget over there it presents me with this risk. How do we handle that together?"

Over the next two or three months, up until mid-December when the next meeting is, a lot of that work will be done about how we are going to solve some of those problems. It will come up with workstreams that should have targets and aspirations attached to them. More will become apparent in December. Small steps for the moment but we have got high ambitions. Thank you.

Commissioner, your report please.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Thank you, Chair. Since we last met, as you would expect for the Metropolitan Police Service it has been a demanding period. Visits. School holidays. Busy tourist period. Two major events that the Chair has already mentioned; the Carnival and the Papal visit.

Just looking at the Carnival. Firstly, I would like to endorse what the Chair has said around the work of, if I may, Chris Boothman. This has been, probably, our most successful Carnival and, without wishing to embarrass Chris Boothman, the work he has done in it has been absolutely hugely important in bringing about a much more successful Carnival than previously.

You have already mentioned crime down by 31%. There were no firearms incidents for a fourth year running. In the period leading up to the Carnival there were over 100 arrests made; frustrating criminal activity and removing weapons and drugs from circulation. Over the three day period 230 arrests were made and we deployed 300 less officers. It will always be, certainly as far as I can see, an event where we have to deploy a significant number of officers but we look to try to reduce that cost. We did that this year and the results, I think, were very, very good. Along with you, Chair, we are very, very proud of the officers who pulled that off, not just during the Carnival but the planning before and the pre-arrest phase. It is a huge event.

The state visit of the Pope to this country, the first ever state visit by the Pope, was an important national event that did require intensive and sensitive operation. Again, I would like to join with you, Chair - and I obviously already have done - in thanking all the staff involved. That was a very significant and demanding event and I do think that the Metropolitan Police Service, the officers involved and the staff involved, came out with an even more enhanced reputation for doing a big job very well.

Could I turn now, before I go on to crime figures, to some comments on the publication of Sir Denis O'Connor's [Chief Inspector of Constabulary] report on anti-social behaviour? Some of my comments have already been reported, but not all of my comments as you would expect. They stopped short of doing the full amount of what I said.

I think there are many areas of Denis' [O'Connor] report that I do agree with, and Denis [O'Connor] and I have always agreed on some of these matters. I did say publicly - and I stick by it - I do think, in years gone by, the police service has lost a sense of the importance of foot patrol, of visible uniform presence etc etc etc. I have said that on

many occasions. I have said that it is our job to provide, as best we can, that uniformed governance of the street particularly - and I think I have said it before at this Authority - as there have been less and less other uniform on the street that, by default, provided a level of uniformed governance.

We could all swing the old blue lamp and look back about how many people used to be in uniform; bus conductors, park keepers - it was many in those days - electricity man and gas man, that sort of thing that brought some governance. A lot of that has gone and a gap has been there. It is our job to do the best we can to fill that gap and do the policing role on the streets. I do think, in years gone by, we have, on occasion, perhaps, lost that sense of importance.

I did go on to say what we, in London, have been doing about it because we have not just been letting that gap grow; we have been doing something quite significant. I think the first thing to mention - and it should always be the first thing to mention - is what we have done on safer neighbourhoods over a number of years in this city, which has been a huge change in policing and it is the thing that our public has seen most often. It has been about many issues but it has been about anti-social behaviour. I will point to some of the results of that in a moment but it has been a very significant investment that has been maintained and hugely important to our public. It is directly relevant to how we are responding to some of the things that Denis O'Connor is talking about. We have been doing that for a number of years now.

In addition to that if we look at what we have done on single patrol. I have reported to this Authority before and used figures of something like an additional 2,500 foot patrol hours per week coming from just going to the default position of single patrol. It will always be single patrol but we are now operating at something well over 50% of all our patrols now being single patrols, which is vastly different than it was 12 months ago. I am told by TP - their latest workings on this - it equates to an additional 330 visible patrols on the streets of London every day. That adds to that sense of uniformed governance of the street. If we also look at does not replace 4,000 special constables has been a huge step forward, is hugely important and is part of our commitment.

If we also look at what we have done around the Special Constabulary. It does not replace police officers but actually moving many years ago from 800 to a figure - and I think we are very close now to a figure - of 4,000 Special Constables and putting them in place at the right time has been a huge step forward.

Then we look at what we have done around transport hubs. This has been a real investment.

If you put it altogether to what has it meant for London. I think it does provide some context to Denis' [O'Connor] comments. We can get better and there is much more left to do. Actually, here in this city, that investment has led to - and our own public attitude survey shows that - people's overall perceptions of anti-social behaviour in their area have almost halved over the last 12 months. It has gone down from 23% to 13%. Does

that mean we have cracked the problem? No. I am not complacent about it but we actually do need to look at the evidence to say what we have been doing and what has been the effect. That is quite a significant outcome. We need to maintain it and that is going to be challenging.

We also need to do more. Trying to put some context around what was a very significant national debate - which I agree with largely - we should be putting in there what we are doing in London to make a difference and address some of the issues that Denis [O'Connor] has raised that we can do better. We are not yet satisfied that we really have made the progress we want to make around repeat victimisation. That is key. We do it well in some parts. Some of that are recording issues that cost money, capital investment and that sort of thing. We are on that case.

I will also remind you that we are placed number one in the most similar force comparisons and a recent Home Office report Crime in England and Wales stated that London has, statistically, significantly higher levels of confidence than the rest of England and Wales. I am not saying it is good enough but it is relevant to that very, very vibrant debate that Denis [O'Connor] launched, if you will. I think the activity we have taken right the way through safer neighbourhoods and other issues has driven towards some of those results and I think we should be proud of it, but actually say there is much more left to do.

Of course, in saying all that - and I am hugely committed to the uniformed governance of public places and spaces - we have also got to remember that we need to maintain a balanced policing model. All those other things that this Authority has discussed very often, those specialist services that are often very invisible, are also about reducing risk on our streets. That balanced policing model of maintaining the homicide teams, paedophile teams, human trafficking teams, all the things that we have debated in detail, we have got to maintain that model and still maintain the progress we have made around anti-social behaviour and uniformed governance of the street where we need to get even better.

We will come back to the difficulties we are going to face around that in a moment I think.

Can I just move on to performance? Five months into the performance year. As normal you are one month behind to the figures I am now talking about so I take the opportunity to update you. Five months into the performance year. I would describe the figures as encouraging. I do not like to overstate these things. I think there are some good figures in there but still some challenging figures.

Total notifiable offences continue to fall. Down by 0.6%. That equates to 2,260 less crimes. Overall serious acquisitive crime down by 2.1%. That is about 1,700 plus less crimes. Reduction in residential burglary continues to exceed the end of year target of 4%. That is now down by 9.4%. That is 2,281 fewer crimes. I am pleased that, like total notifiable offences, this represents the lowest level of offences we have seen for this

period since 1998. Do not think I am complacent about any of this because I will always come back and say, "There is still too much and we need to do more" but I am giving you the results at this moment in time.

As you will be aware we have just kicked off the awareness campaign Lock Before You Leave reminding people to lock their homes. It is still the case, last year, that over 5,000 homes were burgled as a result of doors and windows left open. It is a simple straightforward fact; if we lock our houses it makes it a tad more difficult for the bad guys. It is that fact, trying to get that across and reduce the number of victims.

Moving on. Most serious violence combined with assault with injury showing a reduction of 4.8%. That is down by over 1,500 fewer crimes. Overall gun crime down by 12.5%. That is a lesser number this year. That is down by 184 fewer reported offences. Interestingly, the incidents where firearms have actually been discharged reported down by 4.6%. That is 17% fewer crimes. In any of this I also recognise that there is a level of under reporting. I always have done. In terms for like for like comparisons these are encouraging figures. Similarly, instances where a knife has been used to injure, that is also down by 4.7%, which is 91 fewer crimes. That is all the good news in terms of the right direction but challenges still remain.

Knife crime as a total - as opposed to knives used to injure - remains under pressure and that is still up by 1.6%. That is 83 more offences although I am pleased to say that is a significantly lower rise than the last time we met. I think the last time we met it was up by 4.1%. We seem to be getting on top of that as well.

Knife enabled robberies continue to play a part in the overall increase in robberies and that continues to trouble me. Whilst knives caused to injury is down knife enabled robberies remain up at 5.7%, marginally less than last time we reported but, give or take. It is more or less the same and I think it is proving very stubborn.

In recent years knife enabled robberies have accounted for something like one in five of all robbery offences and, as you would expect, we are focusing on that. It has been a seminal crime here in London and it remains stubbornly up at this moment in time. If you look at other knife crimes with robbery removed it will be down in total by 3.2%. That is the effect of robbery on the knife crime picture.

Robbery continues to be a key challenge and we are looking to target that quite considerably.

Robbery with firearms - with a gun - has decreased by 15.5%. Down by 115 offences. Again, we have got to keep monitoring that. The horror that anybody faces and the trauma that people face when they come upon one of those offences is very, very significant.

Other good news. Cash in transit robberies, compared to 2009, there have been 88 fewer cash in transit robberies. That is a reduction of 35% from 251 to 163. I sat with the

flying squad team to assist them with the media the other week. This is with very hard edge detectives who are doing some of the stuff that the media actually report on and programmes have been made about. The real success there is partnership. The partnership between these people and the industry has, in my opinion, been the significant factor in the success of reducing cash in transit robberies. Partnership, again, becomes the key issue.

I guess, if you turned the clock back in policing, partnership used to be the thing that we did in neighbourhood policing and that sort of thing, but less frequently in some of our other more specialised areas. I think now we look across the Metropolitan Police Service and our specialised areas are leading the way in many successful partnerships.

Of course this current performance period covers the school summer holiday months where kids were not at school. I am pleased to report we have not seen an increase in cases of serious youth violence during that period. It is always critical for us. At July's Full Authority there were 100 more victims of serious youth violence. That was an increase of 5.6%. That increase has now slowed dramatically and, in the first five months of this financial year, we now have one more offence of serious youth violence against the same period last year. I think that is really important because that has actually come down at a time when we tend to see the figures going up during the school holidays.

However, it is right that I mention it. It saddens me to say there has been one more teenage homicide since then. (inaudible) of Rio McFarlane on 6 September 2010. That takes the total number of teen homicides in this calendar year - calendar year - to 15 against 12. Even though 2009 was an extraordinary low year against the previous two years which were significantly above this year's figures, as I would always say, one is too many, that is too many and we have got to stay on the case now.

To keep young people safe we continue to maintain the tactical focus under the umbrella of Operation Verano, Blunt 2 and lots of other operations; Operation Protect, Safer Schools and Safer Transport teams. The combined effect to try to drive that number down further.

Overall, I am pleased that we are doing well on some of the things that I said we needed to do well on at the start of the performance year, but a long way away from being complacent and there is more left to do. We remain conscious that we need to avoid any sort of complacency because our figures still are not where we would all like them to be.

Can I just turn to the budget quickly? A few things about our current budget situation. I will say it now - and if we have a debate on it I will probably say it again and again - I do not, and will not, shroud wave. I do not think it benefits anyone at all. I do not think it benefits anyone to scare the public, but we do need to be aware of the difficult times ahead. The real frustration here is we do not yet know the impact of the cuts and we have just got to be honest about that. We just do not know. We do not know until the Home Office gets the results of the CSR round. Even then we need to find out what is the

division within the Home Office between police and non-police services. After that then there is the issue of how does the Mayor deal with the budget.

Alongside all of that there is the issue of specific grant. The Metropolitan Police Service is a big receiver of specific grant. The Olympics of course has a big effect on us. Then, of course, there are the partners and something like up to 10% of our total budget we get through other income; charging for various events but also other people buying additional policing services, (inaudible), Transport for London (TfL) etc.

So there are huge amounts of uncertainties of how all of those things will come together and what it will mean for us. It does not feel comfortable. Let us be honest. I live in the real world like everyone else and it is not going to be the easiest of times.

It is not good news but in terms of what is our commitment? The Metropolitan Police Service is going through the scrutiny process. Chair, you have made some comments about the way that scrutiny process is going. We are doing everything we can to maintain operational capability. That is what you would expect us to do and that is what the public expects us all to do.

Our priority is delivering the most efficient and effective support services at the lowest possible cost and getting the most out of our resources. It might no longer be about doing more for less. In the future it might be doing better for less because we might have to look at some of the things that we have traditionally done. I mentioned again in some of my comments the other day that, historically, one of the things I love about the cops is we are can do people that move into gaps in the market. Sometimes we move into gaps in the market and that, on occasion, has been to the detriment of what is our prime purpose in policing and our prime purpose is to safe life, prevent crime, detect crime and Queen's peace.

We have got to be very careful of how we move forward with this Authority and, whatever the Government structure is in the future, to make sure that we are focusing on the things that police should focus on and that Londoners want us to focus on. I have said before we should not be leading, in my opinion, social engineering but we are a key supporter to the people doing it.

In terms of the budget, we are doing what you would expect us to do; we are focusing on business support and what Tim [Godwin] delicately describes as inanimate objects - the buildings, the vehicles and all those sorts of things - where we are trying to drive down the cost because the last thing we want to do is to damage our operational capability.

Can I just remind you of one other thing if I may and then I will shut up? We are in the countdown mode to the biggest event on the planet. Again, I am not going to shroud wave but, in the modern Metropolitan Police Service, it is the biggest event we will ever have managed. I know negotiations are still continuing around the Olympics security budget and I think progress is pretty good. I am not complacent, again, but quite pleased in the way in which security is going. Still big challenges remain. However, that is not

the full deal here because the Metropolitan Police Service's base budget is equally important to how we deliver the Olympics. The Olympics budget on its own is not the only important issue here.

I would just remind you that we have discussed before the likely impact on business as usual. What we have agreed to as an Authority of how we are going to deliver the Olympics and, in delivering the Olympics, we agreed there would be an impact on business as usual. We mentioned a figure of what that impact would be on a full year in terms of the footfall on the streets of London. That was predicated on existing staffing numbers. If that changes then that adds to our difficulty and we should just be aware of that in the way in which we then look to Government and negotiate with how we get the Olympics funded.

I am absolutely convinced we will deliver Olympic security. I am convinced and confident we will do it but that issue and the base budget of the Metropolitan Police Service adds to the complexity; it is not just about the Olympic budget alone. That is not shroud waving; it is just realistically looking at our future and making sure that we all manage, to the best effect, for the people who pay us our wage.

I do think - and I will finish with this - that even more puts the spotlight, yes, on me, but on this Authority, on the Mayor and how we all work together to make sure that we maximise whatever allocation of money this Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service gets to do the best job we can. Thank you, Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Commissioner, thank you. Now I am conscious that we are going into a series of questions which are largely about Members' concerns but I think it is worth putting on record certainly my appreciation, and I hope Members' appreciation, of what is actually a very, as you say, encouraging set of crime statistics. It is a great credit to your organisation that you have got on top of some of the really critical crime types that were causing concern over the last 12 months, not least burglary which is now down 10%, having been up double digits I think this time last year, which is a huge reassurance. I know that it does not happen by accident; there is a huge amount of hard work that goes on by you and everybody in the organisation to produce some of these results. While every crime is a tragedy for the individual concerned, we do recognise that there are significantly fewer victims now of crime in London over the last couple of years and we are all very grateful for that. Going into questions which are largely about concerns, worries and issues and things that may not have gone completely to plan, it is worth us recognising that there is a lot of good work goes on as well.

John Biggs (AM): Can I just flag up a concern about timekeeping and procedure now which is there are two very substantial items later and I know Members have got about 20 questions to ask? I think we do need to do justice to those two other items on the agenda, Chair. Being selfish I would like to do it the other way round but I would like your guidance as Chair as to how you are going to manage that --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I am just about to come on to that if you will allow me to continue. I was just going to say that --

John Biggs (AM): I beg your pardon? I do not think I was being rude to you; I was asking a proper procedural question and I think that is rather unnecessary.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, I understand. OK. I was about to say that I am conscious there are a lot of questions to get through. In terms of management I am going to try to group. A lot of people have asked questions about the same things. What I am going to ask Members to do is to ask their questions en bloc so, for instance, there are a lot of questions about the News of the World story. I think, because we are being recorded on camera, Members do have to read those questions or ask them again but I am going to ask Members to ask those questions en bloc so the Commissioner is able to give a more comprehensive answer rather than prolong it and if people could keep their other questions and responses quite snappy - similarly the Commissioner has said that he is going to try to keep it snappy - so we can get through everything so we can deal with everything later on the table. Unless there are any other points of order ...? Yes, Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): I would like to agree with John [Biggs] and I would like you to consider changing the order of the agenda so that you deal with the two items that are really important. I am not suggesting Members' questions are not important but what happens is we will spend ages and ages on the questions and then we will not have sufficient time to deal with two major items.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Which are the two items you would like brought forward?

Dee Doocey (AM): I think the two items are the recruitment of Specials and the other one is the one about the response to the policing in the 21st century. Those would be my two items that I think are ...

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Would Members like those brought forward on the agenda? Happy? Yes? OK. All right. We will skip then to agenda item seven which is the recruitment paper. Martin [Tiplady], would you like to introduce?

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): Chair, I propose to say very little by way of introduction other than to update the Authority on what has happened since the last occasion in which this paper came to the Authority. To remind you in June that you noted our proposals and that you asked to be placed on record a number of concerns about the proposals and sought that we would meet with Members on a one to one basis and go through a process of trying to deal with those. We have been able to undertake that. In July there was a meeting with a number of Members present, during which we explained the proposals, we dealt with a range of questions and we also gave a detailed response to all of the issues and also handed out an information pack after that to those Members to confirm what our responses were. Since that time that same pack has

been sent to other Members on the Authority as knowledge as what had actually taken account.

The paper in front of you tries to take those proposals forward and incorporate the concerns that Members had and expressed at the previous meeting. I hope what is in front of you now is a proposal that enables the Authority to endorse what we propose to undertake as the new way of recruiting and training staff from this point on.

In sum, this is an innovative and modern way to recruit and train regular police officers. It provides due recognition for the standard and professionalism of our Special Constables and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and it enables us to develop a pool of appointment ready individuals who can be poured through the process with little lead in time and affording us, I think, a more pliable resource to allocate and respond to our operational needs.

Quite apart from anything else, it is a very significant financial benefit to the organisation insofar that it depends on the mix of recruits that we take but we are talking of somewhere around for each 100 recruits of a saving of somewhere between £1.25 million and £2 million, depending on what the mix of those recruits is.

It is a very significant financial proposal, this, but, actually, I would not be proposing it if I did not think that, professionally, we can maintain and improve upon the standard of recruits from this point on so I recommend the paper to you and to endorse the proposals.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Thanks, Martin [Tiplady]. It is worth noting that one of the concerns last time was around the quality of the equalities impact assessment that had been done by the Metropolitan Police Service. I know there has been a lot of work done on it since. I have been written to - just for Members' information - by the Metropolitan Police Service Black Police Association saying that it is content with that assessment and has been consulted on its contents whilst it has been drawn up. OK. Questions anybody? Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes, I am afraid I still have some serious reservations about this paper. Can I preface my remarks by saying I understand the pressure to reduce costs and I am very much in favour of that, but I think if our aim was to recruit from the middle classes then I think this paper is fine, but our aim is to make the Metropolitan Police Service more representative of the communities it serves and I do not really think that this is going to bring in vast numbers of future police officers from difficult to reach and disadvantaged communities. I was rather surprised that, rather than some form of affirmative action to deal with this, what we are putting in place, I believe, will act as a barrier, albeit unwittingly, against a lot of people that we really want to recruit.

As I understand it, the proposal is that most police officers in future will come through the Specials route and I do not have a problem with that in principle. If you actually look at page 49 you can see a worked example of how this will work. So if you do not have the ability to spend 16 hours a month volunteering - perhaps because you are holding

down two jobs in order to pay the bills and feed your kids or perhaps because you have got caring responsibilities - you can take a course which is 30 weeks which it says, somewhat glibly in here, you will have to pay for yourself or perhaps you might get help from the local authority. At a time when it is clear to everybody that local authorities are going to be very much strapped for cash I do not think that that is a runner. I really do not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): There are lots of jobs where you have to take a course.

Dee Doocey (AM): I know. I honestly think that if you have got to do a 30 week course and you have got the time to do a 30 week course you would have time to spend 16 hours a month as a Special. I have no problem with it if you are recruiting from the middle classes. I really do not think it is going to bring in the sort of police officers that we need in order to make the police more representative of the people they serve.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Any other comments? Toby [Harris] was next.

Toby Harris (AM): Yes. It would still be helpful to know precisely what the status of this paper is because we are asked to endorse the proposed way forward. Is that simply saying it would be nice if the Police Authority said we are right, or does this mean, if you do not endorse it, we will take it away and think again?

I have two questions; one substantive and one trivial. The substantive question is really about paragraph 14 and the balance between local regional learning centres and Hendon. As I understand the proposal, the actual intensive courses will now be quite short. Is the intention to move way from residential facilities and what does that mean for the Hendon estate and what are the implications of that as far as this is concerned? The other thing is I was intrigued by the strange phrase in paragraph 19, "The Greater London Authority was also involved though no feedback was received". Does that mean somebody came to a meeting and did not say a word? What exactly is it intended to imply? I am rather intrigued --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, I read that and wondered what that meant.

Toby Harris (AM): -- because, if you do have staff who come to meetings and do not say a word then you wonder quite why they bothered really.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I think I have given my feedback. Whether I count as both I do not know.

Toby Harris (AM): You are double!

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I like creative ideas. I think they are very, very important, particularly when we are facing such difficult times but I just think this is a creative idea

that is actually putting a burden on to people who can least afford it. You are expecting people to work for nothing and I think that is totally unfair when poverty is already probably going to be on the increase.

I can see, as Martin [Tiplady] said, some of our concerns were taken into account. For example, on the equality of access point, "Consider the introduction of a bursary scheme". Great idea but it should be more than consider.

Overall I am just really curious as to whether this is really a saving. Given that we are hardly going to recruit for the next, I do not know, four years probably, four years of non-recruitment, how is this a saving over and above any saving that we would be making by not recruiting?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes, I have a number of issues that I have expressed before and I endorse what has been said so far. I do have concerns about this. I think Sir Paul [Stephenson] earlier said that the Metropolitan Special Constabulary (MSC), despite being extremely good and needed in the city, does not replace police officers. We had a paper at our last SOP meeting about the freeze on police office recruitment at the moment and police officers are going to be lower than they were envisaged in the initial targets that were set. We have a Comprehensive Spending Review. I do not know what is going to happen but the likelihood is that we are going to be losing extra police officers and it seems likely we are going to use the Specials to replace police officers, which is a concern.

Secondly, I also have concerns - one of them was picked up by Jenny [Jones] - that there is a freeze on at the moment and, therefore, the financial savings from this are not there because there is no cost associated with training. Given that the focus at the moment on Human Resources (HR) and recruitment has been, I assume, shifted already into the Specials programme, it seems to me that that is happening anyway, whether or not we endorse it. If I look medium term, in a year to 18 months we are not going to be here. Chances are this is going to go ahead anyway but I think it is important that we do put on record our concerns about this method of recruitment.

I know that when we had the briefings we raised the issue of most entering the regular service from Specials and what most was. There were some assurances that, if you were not getting the quality of the recruits, that you would look at it again. That, in itself, is extremely vague in this paper.

The questions about people being able to afford to go on the course, let alone having the time to do it, it talks about considering a possible bursary. I want to know there is more than it is just considering you may bring one in in the future if there is a problem. It seems to me that, if you are getting the numbers of people you need, you are not going to introduce a bursary, even though there are other people out there who are equally, if not better, qualified. I have still got lots of concerns on this issue.

I also have one other question if I can and that is about the MSC programme as a whole. It is currently funded from the police service but also TfL £2.9 million and the Home Office Olympic Grant £6.1 million. I understand that Home Office Olympic Grant is up for review and, given the Comprehensive Spending Assessment is going to affect TfL as well, whether the guarantees of that funding into that pot is still going to be there in the future?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Graham [Speed]?

Graham Speed (AM): Thank you, Chair. I am broadly supportive of this as a proposal which I see as being an innovative route to recruitment. I do have one area of concern and that regards paragraph 18 on page 40. That relates to the resignation rate, or the churn rate. It would seem, from the information here, that the resignation rate, or the loss rate, seems to be at its highest where we have the greatest concentration of MSC. If we are going to improve, or increase, the numbers, on the basis of the information we have got, it would seem that we are going, potentially, to increase the rate of churn that we have got. I would, therefore, like to see what can be done to strengthen, or improve, the monitoring process that is referred to here.

There is a survey in terms of how MSC perceive its role. We are placing an awful lot of faith in this as a system and I think it is very important that we monitor how people are coming in, what their perceptions are and whether they feel valued. Otherwise I think we are going to wind up with, potentially, a higher rate of churn which is going to be an expensive recruitment cost to us. Broadly, I am supportive of this which I think is an exciting approach.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chair. Again, I am, for the most part, supportive of this proposal. A couple of points that I think we need to be aware of. I think, whilst well intentioned, there is some rather blatant classism that has been expressed around the table; the implication that only middle class people have the time and motivation to volunteer. When I was the Mayor's Youth Ambassador --

Dee Doocey (AM): Who said that?

Jenny Jones (AM): Did not say motivation. Time and money.

James Cleverly (AM): It does not cost money to volunteer. Time. OK. The point I am making is that I have seen numerous examples of people who cannot in any way be described as middle class or affluent giving huge amounts of time to various voluntary organisations so I do not think there is any automatic correlation that only the middle classes are going to be in a position to be able to volunteer their time.

I appreciate this is a really fundamental step change in how recruitment goes about but there are a number of dynamics that we have to address here. We are in a position where we are going to be squeezed financially. The Commissioner has already made reference to that. I think we have to accept that reality so we have to look at ideas which could generate this level of cost savings with a presumption to approve but make better, absolutely, but to approve.

Secondly, we have got a demographic hump that we are going to be presented with over the next couple of years where an awful lot of officers come to their natural retirement point. The combination of those two means that, in the short to medium term, we have to look at a recruitment freeze but in the foreseeable future we are going to have to recruit a significant number of officers very quickly to make good that demographic hump. The current system is not geared up to process that number of new police recruits quickly enough and this is a very good way of creating a pool of experienced officers who have had a chance to look at the Metropolitan Police Service and decide whether they really want to be part of the Metropolitan Police Service and the Metropolitan Police Service has had a chance to look at them and decide whether it wants them to be really part of the Metropolitan Police Service. It will mean that when we do come to turn the recruitment tap back on, we will be able to do so much more quickly.

This addresses not just some of the issues we have in the here and now but some of the issues that we know are going to be presented to us in two, three, four or five years' time. Absolutely we should make sure this is the best version of the proposal that it could be, but I strongly endorse this because if we are not willing to take imaginative decisions like this then we are going to find ourselves in a very difficult position moving forward.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Thank you. Tony [Arbour]?

Tony Arbour (AM): Thank you, Chair. When this matter was raised before I praised this example of lateral thinking and if only the rest of local government and, indeed, central government were willing to think out of the box in this way.

I have been particularly struck by the Commissioner's report when he said that he thought that the function of police endorsing Mr O'Connor's views on the matter. He said he did not think that we should be involved in social engineering and I am afraid that the comments I have heard from both Jenny [Jones] and Dee [Doocey] smack very much of social engineering. We are interested in providing the best possible policing service for Londoners and there is nothing I have read here and nothing I have heard from them or anyone else which suggests that this is not going to improve the service which Londoners are going to get.

The Commissioner also said that we should be thinking not of more for less but better for less. I said last time this is better for less. The holy grail of those people who have to provide services in straitened times. I would only say this to Dee [Doocey]; is she not familiar with the Big Society which we are now all signed up to? If ever there was an

example of the Big Society it is people becoming police officers through the Specials. I think this is a marvellous scheme and I endorse it entirely.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I will try to cover a bit of new ground. I have no problem at all with recruitment through Specials and Special Constables provide a very valuable service.

I think there are a number of risks that come out of this proposal which I am not satisfied on. One is that, of course, if you think about it, we are, through this proposal, going to be creating two types of Specials really; there are those who are people perfectly content and happy in their current employment who do so many hours a month of volunteer work as police officers and provide an excellent service, and there are other people who, whether they are happy or not in their current employment, or lack of employment, see it as the only way they can become a police officer. That does create two different types of Specials and I think one needs to think through quite how that works because you will have a sort of parallel service issue. I do not see that as being addressed.

I do have a concern about internship being, effectively, a way of recruitment because it does discriminate against people who have disadvantages, but that argument has been deployed extensively by other people. It will have implications in terms of who will find themselves able to apply to the police service. Inevitably it will.

I am interested, also, in what it says, corporately, about the service and the way it presents itself. Obviously what we want to provide is excellent policing for Londoners within the resources we have. I do accept that the economy and changing behaviour and so on means that the traditional ways of recruitment can always be subject to change and that when there is a shortage of people in the workforce you might have to pay more to recruit people than when there is less of a shortage in available recruits. I do not have a problem with that if one looks at it in terms of resources of the Authority; treating people with dignity but reflecting the needs of the organisation.

What I am not clear about is how this fits into the wider career development we have. Traditionally the police has been a very hierarchical sort of service where you take people in for life and you offer them almost a parental role and develop them. I am not sure how this method of recruitment interfaces with the way in which the police service is changing. I have not seen a clear statement yet from the service outwards as to how it sees that role evolving as well. Are we, at the same time, talking about people being police officers for life, as they were traditionally, or are we talking about a more flexible recruitment at both ends, in which we are seeing people moving in and out, maybe becoming police officers and then becoming Specials again afterwards?

I wonder also about how it is going to deal properly with questions of specialisms and whether we have really thought through the whole training, skills and whole organisational issues that flow from this. I am not as opposed to it as some of my

colleagues but I will tend to vote against it because I think it has not really thought through those implications properly.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman (AM): I am broadly supportive of these changes although I understand and am also sympathetic to a number of the points that have been raised. Nevertheless, I would draw from my local government experience and wider public sector experience and I think there are analogies here with a number of other public sector professions. I am thinking in particular of ones like social workers and teachers where there has long been a requirement for them to undertake study and training, both of the more academic type but also practical type, before they can take up paid employment. I do not think the experience of those professions has borne out the concerns - which are rightly raised and which we would all share - around the need to ensure that we have got a fully representative workforce.

Certainly if I look back to my days in Lambeth and I think of the social workers and the teachers that we had in our schools and that are still there, I would say that they are very highly representative of the community and, certainly, it did not, in practical terms, impose any obstacles that were not capable of being got round in that respect.

I do think that the ideas need to be further developed around a number of the issues that have been raised. I think the issue of bursaries is quite a critical one. Again, if you draw the analogies with those other professions, they do have access, subject to certain qualifying rules, which I think might provide some useful examples to be thought through. I think we should be much firmer than this paper is around that particular issue.

I also think there are a couple of other real obstacles and opportunities which this needs to take into account. One of them is that, as I understand the rules, people have to be resident in this country for, I think it is now, three years before they are eligible to be either a Special Constable or recruited as a full Constable. That is quite a lengthy period. I think it has recently been put up from two to three years. If we add to that 18 months of training for an MSC, we are, in effect, asking somebody to be resident for 4.5 years as an absolute minimum, probably nearer 5 years in practical terms, before they can become a fully fledged officer. If my maths are right - and correct me if I have got this wrong - that seems, to me, to be a big ask for people and I think that that could be sufficient to put off groups that we would actually want very much to assist to become Constables as soon as we possibly could. I think there may need to be a trade off there and I think that should be looked at.

There is no mention in this paper of how this idea fits in with the point - which was quite rightly raised and which I strongly support in the Race and Faith Inquiry - about the need to be much more innovative in thinking about multi-point entry. I think, again, in diversity and equality terms that is actually a vital issue. I would like at least a firm commitment that practical ideas along those lines are worked up and brought to us. They

may or may not wish to recommend them to us but I think we should actually get some firm input on that issue. I do remain broadly supportive.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Thank you. Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): When this came to the Communities and Engagement Committee many, many months ago it would be fair to say that the Metropolitan Police Service presented this in the following way, “This is how we recruit at the moment, this is how we would like to do it in the future and we think it will save us this amount of money”. That was, effectively, the proposal. Now what we have here, I think, represents something that is a lot more detailed in setting out what the benefits would be to the organisation, to Londoners and to policing in general, which I think has only come about as a result of the scrutiny that we did through the Communities and Engagement Committee (CEP) and the subsequent questions that we asked at this Full Authority. So I think what we have here is a much better proposal than what we had originally and at the last meeting when we discussed it.

Now I am much more comfortable with this as a principle and I am not against it, as I was before. That said, I do think that there are a number of gaps. I think a lot of Members have mentioned them. If I can just add a couple of concerns that still remain for me? Firstly, the issue of how the organisational estate will deal with this I think is still unanswered. Issues in relation to (inaudible) and provisions for Specials is a concern and has always been a concern for this Authority and I personally do not think that you have squared that off and dealt with that in a sufficient enough way.

In addition to that - I think Graham [Speed] may have mentioned this - paragraph 18 appears to be an admission that where you have more Specials in a particular location, retention is likely to be poor. If I can just extend that point, that says to me that that is either something to do with supervision and/or value of Specials that people place upon Specials and/or questions in relation to their effective use. That paragraph and what it said there worried me quite a bit if I am honest. So issues around supervision and effective utilisation are still a concern for me.

Turning to the question that Dee [Doocey] raised around equalities. Again, we as an Authority ought to be pleased that what we have seen from the Metropolitan Police Service in terms of the Equalities Impact Statement is as a result of our questioning and our scrutiny is a really good model for equalities impact. It goes through a lot of the risks and the issues related to equalities and diversity and tries to mitigate against them, but I do not think that you have not mitigated against some of those equalities issues as much as you could have. So, for instance, considering the bursary is not actually good enough. That does not give us much comfort.

I think there is a case for going back and thinking about, “These are the types of people that could well be less likely to enter into the organisation as a Special, what is it we need to do to make sure that that does not happen?” I think that is particularly around some of

the issues in relation to females and care and responsibilities. I think there is a bit more of work that could be done in relation to that. I think that is it. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Thanks. Chris [Boothman]?

Chris Boothman (AM): Can I start by saying that I agree with Cindy [Butts]; this is one of the best impact assessments I have seen. To go beyond that, can I offer a suggestion and it is this; nowadays many people are able to volunteer because their employers allow them time off work through schemes like the community involvement programmes and you find these schemes particularly in the employers who have well paid workers, if I can put it that way. Could we not examine the feasibility of having both the police service and the Mayor trying to persuade employers of low paid to adopt community involvement programmes because that could be a means by which low paid people could get some time off work to go towards the time necessary to become a Special?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We are doing exactly that. In fact, I think Sainsburys has already volunteered some of its workers as Specials. Retailers generally. OK. Is that everybody and then I will get Martin [Tiplady] to respond? OK. Martin [Tiplady], there are a number of things to pick up there.

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): Glad of that because I have run out of margins to write the questions in! If I can try and take you through, I think, and try to group things where I can.

I think I am going to kick off with the issue about the class bit. I am just simply not going to suggest that there is anything that is class driven about this proposal at all. It is not where we come from. When you look at the current mix of Specials that we have there is nothing that does not suggest only the broadest and most diverse group of communities that we can imagine.

I have to say that there is great confidence coming from the current response rates that we are getting to interest in becoming Specials in the organisation. Last month we had 1,100 applications that were received. We have been running pretty much at between 800 and 900 every month this year. The conversion rate of course will be the test of that but, as the Commissioner said earlier, we are about, with the next intake, to tip over into 4,000 Specials which is a very, very considerable increase over the last 12 months.

Of that current response that we are getting, approximately 30% of those are from females and approximately 34% of those are from black and minority ethnic (BME) communities. So, in terms of trying to get into those communities and to make the workforce more representative, I have to say, contrary to what I think will be a negative position, this will become a positive position, if those numbers can be sustained and we can convert into actual recruits into the organisation.

In terms of the bursary issue, there is nothing that is sinister in us not being able to conclude the issue of bursaries. It is just that we have not been able to conclude it yet.

We are confident that we will bring that to a satisfactory conclusion. There are various bodies that we can actually contemplate seeking bursaries from. I have to say I would not rule out the question as to whether or not we, within the organisation, may offer an internal bursary too. We have not ruled that out, but there is work to be done. Looking at the majority as to where we anticipate our recruits coming from, we are working, very broadly, on the principle of about two thirds of our recruits - it might be a bit less, it might be a bit more as the model is flexible to allow that change - coming through the Specials route and the other third being made up of both PCSOs - who cannot become Specials - a graduate scheme and also those who, perhaps, are just simply not able to participate in the Specials programme for the reasons that Dee [Doocey], Cindy [Butts] and others have mentioned.

The issue about Hendon is not that it will cease to exist because, of the five regional training centres that we are talking about, two of them, in the first instance, will be based at Hendon. The plan is that there are five different locations in London, one of which is Hendon, and we will continue to do an amount of training, including some of this, from Hendon. It is not really for me to comment on the estate other than to say it has other things on the estate. Would I anticipate that the total estate of Hendon would be sold off? No, very much doubt that. I do believe that the presence of Hendon, of that estate, could be curtailed to a lesser footprint than it is at the moment. Within the current Estate Strategy there is provision in order for that to be reviewed over the period of time in order to come up with a proposal as to whether or not Hendon should continue to exist at the size that it is in its current format. In terms of training, Hendon will continue to be one of our regional training centres.

Jenny [Jones], you suggest that there is not a saving. You are absolutely right that there is no saving if there is no recruiting but, of course, recruiting is a nine month process and, if we are recruiting, there will be a saving over the model that exists. If we are not taking people in, we cannot save the same amount of money twice. I can say that I would hope that there will be some recruiting next year. I do happen to think, professionally, it is important not to close doors completely and if we can keep some recruiting tap open, as well as some promoting tap, in a very difficult financial circumstance, then that will be the wise thing to do. Then there is a saving because this is a cheaper model of recruiting those people, however many it is, into the organisation.

If we were going with our normal recruiting period - up until last year - then I have to say the value of the saving that we would generate by this proposal is to the order of £12 million so it is a very significant contribution, if not to a 2011/12 deficit but certainly to a latter year one, given that we are talking about looking at expenditure over three, four and five years, not just one year. It cannot be double counted.

Graham [Speed], paragraph 18. We are doing pretty much all of our attrition work at the moment around the Specials. We have not got an issue of attrition for police officers or police staff. We are talking of regular police officer attrition at the moment of scoring under 3% across the organisation and we are talking about police staff attrition at the moment of round about 4.5%, 5%. They are numbers which are very, very low by any

standard. In terms of the investment we give in terms of following up the reasons by which people leave, actually we have not got much of a yardstick to compare with at the moment because those numbers are so low so those resources are being diverted into looking at Specials and what we might do to address that. I am not prepared here with all of the numbers by borough but we know exactly what the position is with boroughs. We have targeted surveys towards those that are leaving and getting information and following up on that information that is generated, and we anticipate that carrying on for the foreseeable future in terms of that resource to try to monitor what the attrition level is.

I have regular attrition information across the organisation. I report it as a matter of routine to the Authority and I would expect, in future, to be held to account for reporting on Specials attrition which is one line that we have not reported before but, if this is going to be our future model and so central to it, I would expect to report that through in the normal way, through to Remuneration Sub-Committee and, possibly, even CEP(?). I would expect to be reporting in that way. Be assured, that attrition is being followed up by the team with TP, in particular, in terms of individuals and why.

The one thing I would counter it with, however, is that volunteers have a much shorter span of service, given their voluntary nature into the organisation. That may well change in the future if the way into the organisation is go through that in order to become a regular police officer. The period of service, on average, for a volunteer Special is around about three years. That is the average length of service. There are many, many cases of people doing 30 plus years of service. The Commissioner often recognises one or two of them. It is three years, on average.

James [Cleverly], you are absolutely right; this is a much more flexible and pliable model. If we wanted to either divert the numbers of people that we are recruiting into each category or to pre-empt the pool, it is much more about creating that pool people that we can dip into and run a process in terms of drawing from a ready made pool. The current lead in period is the moment that we start recruiting, we advertise or we do the roadshows, then there is probably a nine month lead in period with all of the process. This is about trying to create the pool and keep it alive for as long as we can.

This is not in any particular order. Cindy [Butts], I do hear the issues about the estate. They are concerns. The paper does try to say that our property friends are trying to work on what those issues may be. I am not going to suggest that they are minor issues - they are major issues - but I do think there are many different ways of providing for some of the estate concerns than perhaps the traditional model of everyone has a locker, everyone has a particular type of facility and so on and so forth. I do think it would be right for you to expect, over the course of the next few months, further information about how some of those estate issues are being addressed. I do not believe that that is a reason that should suggest that we might delay the endorsement of this proposal, if that is your wish.

The issue of the residency, Faith [Boardman]. It is simply that it is not within our gift to change those rules. That is part of national guidance that is agreed. It is Home Office guidance. It is agreed by a number of bodies. If we sought to change that residency

provision we could not do so within the Metropolitan Police Service or Authority. We would have to make representations in the light of this model, perhaps, about why we thought that that was an unreasonable constraint. It is not within our gift to do that.

How the idea fits in with the Race and Faith Inquiry. I do think that is a different issue. I think the recommendation was that the MPA would organise a seminar of the parties in order to take forward and explore the ideas about how multi-point entry might be considered in the future, if appropriate. I think it is not, at the moment, for the Metropolitan Police Service to respond to a proposal about multi-point entry. I do believe it is for the Race and Faith Inquiry, for the MPA, to determine the workshop - I think symposium was the word - and for us to be one of the participants in responding to that.

I said at the time I was open to the ideas. I did have a view before but I am open and receptive to listening to what the other arguments are. I would welcome that. This proposal does not change or hinder the issue of multi-point entry in any way, shape or form.

John [Biggs], the issue of two types of Special. In the future we are going to have two types of Special; one who wants to work as a Special and not become a regular, and those that, very ambitiously, use the Specials route as a way into becoming a regular. I have to say I am not sure why that is any different from how our police officers, are regulars, work. We can take you to Constables who have got 30 years' worth of Constable experience and we can take you to those who have risen up through the ranks. There are two types of ambition; people are either very happy to carry on being a Special or are very happy to draw on their experience as a way of getting match practice, as a way of experiencing what the role is like and as a way of us testing them out as to whether or not they are suitable to become a police officer. If there are two types then I have to say I am not sure that that is any different from any other industry, or what we have got in our regular paid force at the moment.

John Biggs (AM): I think that is the fundamental flaw for me and that is why I made the point. With your indulgence, there are five year olds who dream of being a police officer and nothing else and they will go through hell and high water to become one, but there are plenty of school leavers or graduates who look at the options, "Shall I be an accountant, a lawyer, a plumber, a ballerina or a police officer?" If they see the hoops they have to jump through as being ones which do not give confidence or certainty, particularly with massive debts as a student, then we would discourage some people from coming to the service.

You are indulging me by letting me butt in when no one else has. I think there is a fundamental flaw here, Chair.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I think if they are not sure and you give them a chance to try it out first, you are helping them make a wise choice, rather than get

on to something that you end up having a mortgage and you hate it for the next 30 years. You can see it either way.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): The other things you mentioned also have much more significant barriers. I could not be a ballerina even if I tried!

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): Perhaps, on that point, I could move to the last question which is to Chris [Boothman]. Thank you for the comments about the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA). It is about persuading employers to support. We have got, courtesy of the Deputy Commissioner, the Employer Supported Programme. We have had quite a lot of success with major high street industry; Boots, Dixons, Sainsburys to name but three, but some of the banks are involved in it as well, a number of local authorities are involved in it, a number of universities are involved in it and a number of other companies. We have gone to those companies and sold being a Special as a really good management programme for those organisations. Including police staff we have got something like round about 400 of our Specials who are recruited through those current schemes at the moment. I would see no reason why we do not continue with that and develop it further, but we are already doing that.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Thank you. From my point of view, as you will all be unsurprised, I am very supportive of this proposal. In terms of my thinking, first of all, does it produce a good outcome for the organisation? Absolutely. It produces better prepared police officers at a lower cost.

The second question is has the organisation taken all reasonable steps to make sure that the scheme is as accessible as possible and I understand a lot of Members' concerns are around that accessibility? All the evidence, albeit people's intuition is that there will be barriers, of the Specials scheme is actually the reverse; the recruitment of BME and women is better than the previous method. Also, I do not think there is any evidence to show that there is a disproportionate effect on lower income level. Indeed, people from lower incomes may well be attracted to the free travel which is a bigger proportion of their remuneration and their cost base than many of us and, indeed, the Government of course has floated recently the idea that Specials may get council tax rebates which would, similarly, assist in terms of recruiting lower income levels.

In terms of those worries around accessibility, I do not think there is any evidence to say that, at the moment, in the current Specials base, that that is the case. It is definitely something that, if we pursue the scheme, we would have to monitor. In the same way that, on current recruitment practices, we carefully monitor the types and proportions of people who become police officers. I have to say we have never, as far as I can see, had any indication or any indicators around the income levels of the people that we are recruiting as current officers, so that is a new barrier that we would appear to be erecting for this particular recruitment method.

Nevertheless, I think we do have to recognise that it is not a human right to become a police officer. We do want a police service that is as reflective of London as we can

possibly get it in the better prosecution of its function which is fighting crime, not just for the sake of it. If the organisation has taken all the reasonable steps it can to make sure that that recruitment method is open and it will not have a more detrimental effect upon people than the previous one, then I think that is a good outcome. There will always be barriers to being a police officer. You have to pass a fitness test for a start and quite a lot of people get knocked out just on the fitness test. No one is proposing that we make the fitness test a bit easier so that people who are overweight are more likely to be police officers. There will always be barriers. It is whether the steps the organisation has taken are reasonable to allow that accessibility to be acceptable and achieve our objective of having a much more mixed workforce on all sorts of indicators. The current evidence on the population of Specials is that we do get better recruitment, particularly of BME and women, through that route.

Now that is not to say that, by going into this process, it is not something where we will learn as we go. With all things that we do and steps that we take like this, the organisation learns as it goes and trims the sails while we are on the journey. Some of the issues that have been raised will need to be carefully monitored and followed.

Fundamentally, underlying all of this, has to be a recognition that we are in a jam, the world is changing financially and we are in a financial jam. We are hoping, as Martin [Tiplady] said, to be able to turn the recruitment tap on. If we are unable to make these savings on recruitment, which hopefully everybody accepts as far as the organisation is concerned produces a better, cheaper recruit who is able to hit the ground running straightaway, then we will have to find that money from somewhere else. That somewhere else, in the atmosphere we are in, is likely to be somewhere fairly critical. We have to keep that at the back of all our thinking.

While we would love to be able to run all kinds of different methods of getting in and recruitment we do not have that luxury any more, and the financial imperative is just as important these days as the other imperatives that we have talked about because - and I will finish with this - we have to remember that our primary concern here is to put the organisation in the best position to prosecute its primary purpose which is fighting crime in London. It is not an organisation, as the Commissioner said, for social engineering. Its primary purpose is the prosecution of crime fighting and by having a more mixed workforce we do that better. All the evidence on the Specials, albeit we have to monitor it as we go, is that is just as good, if not a better, route than the other one that pertains.

I do not get the sense here that we are not, necessarily, going to get a lot of minds changed on this. There has been a huge effort gone in by Martin [Tiplady] over the last couple of months since this last came to the Authority to engage with people and try to address their concerns. I agree with you, Cindy [Butts], it is in much better shape than it was before. We have had reassurance from staff associations and others that they are content with some of the work that has been done around equalities. We do not often take a vote on this Authority but I am going to ask if Members would like to take a vote, albeit if you want to have more comments? I am conscious we have been on this for an hour now but carry on. Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Conscious but carry on. I would like to move an amendment to the recommendation.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Right. What is it?

Dee Doocey (AM): I would like to say that Members endorse the proposed way forward, subject to there being a bursary set up for those who cannot afford to pay for their courses or to volunteer for 16 hours a month.

Jenny Jones (AM): Point of order, Chair. We do not know yet what the status of this paper is. Toby [Harris] did ask, is it going forward anyway and are we just going for the ride as it were? We do not know whether or not endorse means that we can stop it happening or not?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): An interesting question.

Jenny Jones (AM): It is his question. I take no credit.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): This is this big grey line that lies between us all. We are hoping that we can reach agreement between us, and then we will reflect. If the Authority refuses to endorse we will have to reflect on what we then do.

Jenny Jones (AM): That means we are ratifying it; not just endorsing?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Obviously, if we are endorsing, the Commissioner and the Authority have reached agreement on a way forward and the question falls away. If the Authority fails to endorse, ratify, agree, nudge, smile or whatever it might be, then we will have to go away and think again about where we go. It is a grey legal area. As far as I can tell the Metropolitan Police Service has done a huge amount of work to try to get us towards a position where we can agree and has improved the paper significantly albeit, as I say, in all these processes there will be ongoing concerns that we, as an Authority, will need to monitor, ask for changes, adjustments and all the rest of it as we go.

On that basis, my hope is we can reach agreement to move forward because, not least, the 2,500 people who are sitting on the waiting list to become police officers, who are unlikely to get their wish, the vast majority of them, in the next couple of years, could be usefully employed by us as crime fighters in their spare time, if they so desire.

Cindy Butts (AM): Some of them have. We are not holding that up.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Exactly.

John Biggs (AM): Can we ask the Commissioner then whether he intends to go ahead with this policy regardless of what the Authority says?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We can sit here and try to decide the legal niceties of it but the point is we need to find out what the Authority (inaudible). No. I think we will just move to a vote to be honest.

Jenny Jones (AM): May I speak against the amendment?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We have got an amendment which I will talk about in a minute. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): I am seeking clarity --

John Biggs (AM): I asked a question and I would like an answer to that question. It is a fair question which I have asked.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Can we just deal with the business of the meeting?

James Cleverly (AM): The question has already been answered.

John Biggs (AM): I would like to hear an answer.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Hang on; can we have one conversation please. Toby [Harris] was speaking. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): The clarity that I was seeking was not actually on the question of the status of the paper, though I think that is actually quite an important constitutional principle, but on the question of the third route into becoming a police officer. These are the others who will be graduates - I have not picked up in any of the discussion why graduates are a special category that does not go through the other routes that are described - and others with particular requirements. Again, that is not defined. What proportion of recruitment - assuming there is any at all - is expected to be in this third category and what is going to be definition of which people are going to be channelled into that group?

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): If I can deal with that? When the paper was first presented there was no category - if you want to call it that - called other. There were three routes in, of which was MSC, one was PCSOs and the third was graduates.

Toby Harris (AM): Yes, I remember.

Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources, MPS): There is an argument about maintaining a small graduate scheme which allows entry into the organisation of very, very high potential recruits. We did not want to close that down. Proportionately we were talking of a very small nominal number, probably no more, on a normal recruiting year, Toby [Harris], of 50 to 100 at most. Please do not get too firm on the numbers they are illustrative. It was meant to be small.

In the conversation that has taken place with Members by which we wanted to respond to this group of low income people who would find the route of becoming a Special really very, very difficult, we have simply responded to that group. I really would not want to call it other because it sounds like it is an inferior group. It is not. It is just that we wanted to make provision for that other group to be able to come into the organisation and the Appendix that is attached to the report says what that route would be. The graduate is still there as well so, perhaps, in the future, there are four routes into the organisation.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I consider, Chair, my question to be a fair question and I was offended by the heckling from your party colleagues. This should not be a party political matter. If you would like to listen to my contribution you would find that it was far more measured than perhaps you might have expected.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): If you would like to pose the question I will ask the Commissioner.

John Biggs (AM): We have established this principle down the years, I believe, that the Commissioner is responsible for operational policing matters so the Police Authority cannot instruct him to arrest Person A and the boundary is a rather more fluid boundary. This is, arguably, an operational matter or a policy matter and I would like to hear from the Commissioner what his intentions are following this debate.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Thank you, John [Biggs]. It is not a dissimilar debate that you and I have had across this floor before. We might disagree on whether I think it is me or you think it is you. We have done it transparently.

Let me just say again, if you will stick with me, I think it is important that I put into my answer how we have previously dealt with such matters. I think this is a vague area. Even where I feel that the final decision lies with me I have always believed - and I think there is good evidence to support this - that the process of coming here and seeking support, the debate, the influence, the things that you have mentioned, Cindy [Butts] about the difference this time to last time, actually leads to a better product. I am here today seeking that support.

My advice is straightforward advice. I have sole responsibility for the day to day operational direction and control the force, and that includes the level of recruitment and establishing the criteria for recruitment. My view is that if today this Authority supports then I have got what I am seeking but we would carry on trying to satisfy some of the concerns around this Chamber because that is the way we should do business.

If you do not then I have got to go away and consider it. I would be very disappointed because, clearly, I support this scheme for all the reasons that have been said. I would be

very disappointed but I would then seek to try to influence and persuade because I think it is really important. I think, to use the Chair's phrase, we are in a bind here and this is a big element of our savings and we believe this will improve us and it will not make us (inaudible). We believe this is a significant opportunity for improvement. If you do not support today then I will go away and consider this position. I am not going to give you a definitive answer - it is mine or is it yours - because that is a bit of a red rag to a bull. If it eventually has to come to that then I will do it quite openly and honestly with you.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Chair, can I ask then, on the question of whether we endorse or not, I seek some understanding of the assurances about how this will come back to the Authority and how it will be scrutinised from now on in because that might help people decide as to whether they are prepared to endorse it?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): This Authority does do a job of scrutinising lots of areas around recruitment. We would just do that through the normal process. As Martin [Tiplady] indicated, if this is a change in a major part of our recruitment then, quite clearly, it would be part of the normal monitoring process as you would expect it to be so.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Having said that, obviously in the early stages we want to make sure we get it right so the monitoring in the initial stages would have to be quite close, not least around what Graham [Speed] said around these attrition rates which have the potential to cut away at some of the financial savings and, indeed, the longevity and experience and all the rest of it.

Having said that, one of the benefits of it as well - which we have not talked about - is that we will get a lower attrition rate, hopefully, amongst full time officers once they have been through the Specials, because they will know if they like it or not, if they can take it, if they enjoy the life and all the rest of it. So there may well be a saving on that later on, but we shall see.

OK. Have we exhausted ourselves in terms of the issues? We do not often go to a vote on this Authority. Hold on. Have not forgotten. We have got two votes to have a look at. The first is Dee's [Doocey] amendment which is she is happy to endorse the proposal subject to the establishment of a bursary. The only thing I would say on a bursary is we would have to work out how much it is going to cost because, obviously, there is a cost there, and what the criteria are, but there needs to be some work around that. I think there is a commitment already in the paper to look at that so I cannot see, from my point of view, there is an objection to that. Do Members inserting the establishment of a bursary for those who may need it?

Jenny Jones (AM): May I speak against the motion?

James Cleverly (AM): Is the motion seconded, Chair?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Hold on. Is anybody seconding the motion?

Dee Doocey (AM): The amendment you mean.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): The amendment. Sorry, yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): I will second it.

Tony Arbour (AM): You are against it, Jenny [Jones]!

Cindy Butts (AM): I will second it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Are you seconding it, Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Jenny [Jones], you want to speak against it?

Jenny Jones (AM): The amendment is fine as far as it goes, it just does not go far enough. Thank you to Dee [Doocey] for putting this forward. It will make a better report but it just does not go far enough and that is just because it is impossible, here in this Chamber, to scoop up all of our concerns and put them all into an amendment.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I have to say, without any finance around, that it is quite hard to give any guarantee that it will be established because it could be open ended. Who knows? That is the issue. James [Cleverly], you want to speak against it?

James Cleverly (AM): Just very briefly. I think what we have to remind ourselves here is that we are a strategic body. We have been presented with a broad policy shift. We have already said there are a number of elements within it that are going to need close and ongoing scrutiny. What I do not think we should be doing, at our level, is starting to drill down into the minutia. You may say that a bursary is not a minutia but, if the bursary fund is not of a substantial figure, then the motion is meaningless and unless we are then going to start debating the financial figure there is no point having the motion. We do not know what the CSR settlement is going to be so we cannot debate the bursary total or where it might come from. I just think we run the risk of starting to drill down into a level of detail that is inappropriate for this body at this time. Whilst I have a lot of sympathy with the amendment to the motion I just do not think it is right that we should tag it on to the decision we are making at this point in time.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Victoria [Borwick]?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Just a very quick point. We talked about the intention to set up. Maybe we could just have a verbal assurance that research will be undertaken, perhaps with local charities. I can think of several people --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): That is basically what the paper says.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I accept that. Maybe, just for the sake of the record and those watching, we could have some reassurance from you that --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Can I just make a point? The truth is that a lot of people here are working off intuition about how they think the thing is going to work. We do not actually, any of us, know really what is going to happen and what the profile of the people recruited is going to be. It is perfectly possible for us, through the monitoring that Cindy [Butts] will do through CEP, to come back in six months and say, "These have been the effects of this new recruitment process and these are the people coming through. We have detected a particular problem around low income individuals" and, at that stage, decide that we need to take some measure to address that issue and maybe look at a bursary then. Currently now projecting forward attempting to design something that may or may not be needed in the future, particularly when we may or may not be recruiting for the next few months, seems a little bit pointless.

Is there strong support for Dee's [Doocey] amendment or can I just move to a vote on the main ...?

Dee Doocey (AM): I would like you to put the amendment please if you would, Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Those in favour of Dee's [Doocey] amendment to the main motion please show? That is four votes. Those against? That is eight votes. I am afraid that falls. Right. So I will put the main thing that we are voting on which is to endorse the approach, subject to monitoring and the various bits and pieces that are put in there and accommodating some of the comments no doubt, Martin [Tiplady], that have been put through? OK. All those in favour of endorsing the approach please raise your hands? 12. All those against? Six. That is 12 to 6. Commissioner, you have your endorsement although, no doubt, you will want to work to reassure Members over the next few months that the approach is being adapted to make sure that some of the problems that have been raised today are addressed.

Jenny Jones (AM): Chair, could you please record me as having voted against by name?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Jenny Jones voted against by name. OK. Right. Thank you.

We are now moving on to agenda item eight which is our response to policing in the 21st century. Because of the timetable my understanding is that our response has actually been submitted but subject to your endorsement. I think that was made clear to the Home Office.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes, Chair, the timetable was very tight. There was an opportunity for both Members of SOP and other Members who wanted to attend SOP to discuss the second draft of the response which was then amended to take account of that discussion and sent to the Home Office for the deadline of 20 September 2010. As we said at the beginning, we expect to see the Bill published at the end of November/early December and there are ongoing discussions with officials at the Home Office about details of the drafting that is going to Parliamentary Counsel.

Since 20 September 2010 we have made available to Members a number of other responses from parties who might be interested, including the Association of Police Authorities (APA) which has caused something of a ripple.

Of course the nature of legislation is such that this response is not the only chance to influence the way in which the final Act reaches the Statute book; the Committee stages in both Houses will, undoubtedly, see amendments put down and Members will want an assurance, which I can give, that we will be scrutinising this process very carefully and bringing to Members' attention anything that we think is relevant as the Bill passes through each of the Houses. I am given to understand it will start its passage in the House of Commons.

The other thing I wanted to mention because it is relevant to the Appendix to the submission that we put in is that we are expecting the Government to announce imminently - as we have been waiting for some time - the nature of the review of the pay, terms and conditions of police officers which is extremely relevant in terms of some of the constraints and constrictions on the flexibilities that the Commissioner would be looking for in terms of managing the workforce over the next few years in the light of the austerity imperative, but that has not yet been announced. We have made some very high level suggestions about the areas that might be looked at in that Appendix not directly relevant to the consultation document but we will also be consulting Members on that as and when it takes place. I did not really want to say any more than that, Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. This is a slightly odd report because, obviously, it is your document on which you were all consulted and you all inputted so does anybody have any questions for themselves?! Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have some concerns. Can I start by saying I recognise this was an impossible job with so many different views and to try to get a coherent document in. What I am saying is not to denigrate any of the work that has been done but I do have concerns and I can say that this does not reflect my view in some important aspects.

I was going to say a couple of those things. First of all I cannot agree that the Commissioner - not the Chief of Police but the elected Commissioner - has the right to hire and fire the Chief Constable. I think that is just bringing politicisation into this police force. In that singular event so much damage and reputational damage can be done. I think that is something that I cannot sign up to at all.

Secondly, I have other concerns in this document. At the Assembly we have signed a submission to Government that is a joint response between the Mayor, the Assembly and this body. Chair, you signed that. That document does not tally 100% with this document in some --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, this is nothing to do with me. I had no input to this. I have not even read it.

Joanne McCartney (AM): OK. Fine. You have signed that other document as Chair of the MPA so it has gone in in that guise and it is at odds with this document here, which is --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes. We have made the division between the two very clear to the Home Office. It became apparent, Joanne [McCartney], to be honest with you that my view was very different to the views of Members, and Members wanted to have their views reflected, so we decided that this would very much be a Members' response, not influenced by the Chair. We have made that clear to the Home Office. My response was agreed alongside the Mayor, with the Chair of the Assembly and the other party groups and went in in that form. We have been very careful to delineate my particular personal position, which has been negotiated with you, from that of Members, many of whom have reflected their views through this document.

Joanne McCartney (AM): OK. That is an inherent problem. I think that is an inherent problem with this document as well.

There are other issues I have got and concerns, partly because we have not debated them fully as an Authority. So, for example, we talk in Annexe A about a London-wide Criminal Justice Board that brings in not only policing but criminal justice and whatever, but then it talks about replicating that at a local level. I am not sure, from this paper, whether we are advocating that we scrap Crime and Disorder Boards and put something else in their place, and you are nodding. That appears to be what this is --

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I am not sure either.

Joanne McCartney (AM): That appears, from my reading, to be what this response is suggesting. We have not had that debate. From my experience, the Crime and Disorder Boards are actually working very well. I do not want to put a paper saying scrap them and a new body should be put in its place when we have not debated it.

There is also no mention in here about community and police engagement groups (CPEGs) and the community engagement role that they play. Although there was a specific number of questions on that they are not mentioned. Under Annexe B, under the title about how we can reduce bureaucracy, there is a whole section there about what we would like to see in the terms and conditions of police officers which deals with, for example, scrapping the London weighting, scrapping allowances and special priority

payments, reducing the number of ranks and bringing terms and conditions of police officers under normal employment legislation.

There may be some merit in some of them but we have not debated it. This does not represent my views in those three major areas. There are others but I am going to stop there.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Just as a general point, obviously, although the deadline has passed, it is perfectly possible for you to make a submission as an individual to the Home Office and to write to them with your concerns.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I was content with the letter we sent from the GLA.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Does anybody else have any other comments on the paper? Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. First of all I want to say that I think it is great that a lot of the concerns that we raised were acted on and taken into account.

My only concern that I am really worried about is the timing. I think the comment that, "Whatever timings are proposed for the changes in Government must take into account the Olympics and other major events for 2012" is simply not good enough. The Commissioner told us at the beginning of this meeting what we already know; that the 2012 Olympics and Paralympic Games is going to be the most significant event we have ever put on. I think the very suggestion that there should be major change before the Olympics is barking mad. There are no other words to describe it. We should be saying that, as the MPA, loud and clear. Not wishy washy words like, "Must take account of". It must not happen.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I think the intention was probably that the change should either be well before or after.

Dee Doocey (AM): You cannot be well before if you are less than 18 months away. We have got very, very serious problems to deal with on the Olympics. Like the Commissioner and yourself I am very pleased with everything that is happening at the moment. I am very pleased with what is happening at the moment from the base we are working from. Things might change dramatically. The idea of having a reduced police force - which the Commissioner referred to in his report and I absolutely endorse everything he said - and the knock on effect that might have and, in addition, changing the entire system, is just completely off the wall. We should be saying, loud and clear, that, in our opinion, this is simply not workable.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): It is not on the paper; I am quite happy with the paper. A point of clarification. Did we ever get to see the Metropolitan Police Service's response?

Toby Harris (AM): Yes.

Cindy Butts (AM): Was it circulated to all of us?

Toby Harris (AM): The link was circulated to us all.

Cindy Butts (AM): OK.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): It was circulated to everyone and a hard copy is available in the --

Cindy Butts (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): And also the response that went from the GLA and the Mayor.

Cindy Butts (AM): No, I knew that. It was just the Metropolitan Police Service's one. OK. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): This was an incredibly difficult job. I had a few things to say but I am just thinking perhaps we are completely wasting our breath because I do support what Dee [Doocey] said and what Joanne [McCartney] has said but you have clearly had a word and so whatever you think is OK is going to go forward and what you do not think is OK is not going to go forward. Would you agree that we are probably wasting our breath in suggesting improvements?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No. I think some of the things I am sure are very valuable. I would not over estimate my position in this; I am a mere regional functionary in these matters. There are people well above my pay grade making decisions about where we go and what we do. They invited consultation responses and I am sure that they welcome ours alongside everybody else's.

I have to say we did pretty well to get the response in. There are lots of other people who missed the deadline because they were having the debates that you said but never actually reaching a conclusion. I know the police side of the consultation were very quick off the mark. The APA was incredibly slow and sluggish in terms of getting anything in and was still having seminars to discuss the implications seven days before the deadline. Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): I am with Jenny [Jones]; it is a done deal as far as I am concerned and in my response to Catherine [Crawford] I more or less said that.

I had not appreciated though that this is not then an MPA response; it is the MPA response minus its Chair.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, that is right.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I do not know if it has ever come out like that. I have never seen it and I do not know how it was expressed in the letter to the Home Office. Quite amusing really. Perhaps we need to clarify that.

I am also interested in Dee's [Doocey] comments. Do we have an agreed deadline beyond which it would absolutely not be realistic to have changed events? What are you thinking?

Dee Doocey (AM): I think I would like to discuss it with the Sub-Committee and with the Metropolitan Police Service who are heavily involved in the policing of the Olympics, and then I think, maybe, submit a separate paper about this to the Home Office because I think it really is important.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I think that is a very good idea.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I think it would be perfectly reasonable for Members of the Authority to consider the proposals as they are developed and as they roll through Parliament where it will have to be scrutinised and, hopefully, some of the more obvious problems will be addressed then.

Valerie Brasse (AM): The process for doing that would be what?

John Biggs (AM): Well I do not know.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We do, of course, have a doughty and substantial voice in the legislative process in the noble Lord who, no doubt, will be reflecting the views --

Toby Harris (AM): I do not guarantee that I will either reflect the opinions of the other Members of the Authority or, indeed, the Chair of this Authority in anything I may or may not say in Parliament. On the same basis that, as you do not feel yourself bound by the collective decision of this Authority, I clearly could not feel bound by this Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Is everybody happy to endorse what we have sent in?

Jenny Jones (AM): No. No.

John Biggs (AM): Noted.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We have sent it in. So you are saying, "We have sent it in but we would like to withdraw it?"

Joanne McCartney (AM): You are asking us to ratify it. I am not prepared to ratify this.

Tony Arbour (AM): Noted.

Joanne McCartney (AM): There is a very fundamental principle behind this.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): What happens if we do not ratify the letter we have already sent that everybody agreed to send?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): In practice, absolutely nothing I would say, Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Can we note the fact that we have sent in a misleading response?

John Biggs (AM): What do you want to do?

Toby Harris (AM): Chair, a number of people have expressed reservations about particular bits. We have not debated those reservations. For example, I disagree profoundly with Joanne's [McCartney] suggestion that it is wrong that Police and Crime Commissioners should not be able to sack their Chief Constables because, it seems to me, that if a Chief Constable does not have the confidence of their Police and Crime Commissioner their position is untenable and that is a (several inaudible words) --

James Cleverly (AM): Sacked by the famously non-political Home Secretary.

Toby Harris (AM): Therefore, we should not say that, because of the discussion where various people expressed reservations about odd lines, the whole response is not endorsed. It has gone in.

Reshard Auladin (Deputy Chair): That is fine.

Dee Doocey (AM): It looks silly.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Can we agree that we ratify the written response, subject to the recognition that there are various Members who have objections to particular parts?

All: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Happy?

All: Yes.

Toby Harris (AM): As with any other document.

Jenny Jones (AM): Not really. No.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): (inaudible) over.

Right. Can we revert back please to the questions to the Commissioner? We have had our two hours now so we are, obviously, into overtime, penalties and all that. It is triple time is it now!

As I said before, I am going to try to group the questions this time because there are a number of themes. If we could keep our questions and follow ups snappy. The Commissioner will want to do the same. The first question I had was from Joanne [McCartney] and it is about the phone hacking.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have some supplementaries. If you want to do it quickly and then go to the other - shall I just do my supplementaries all in one go? Would that be sensible?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Joanne [McCartney], if you could do your question and supplementaries and then I am going to ask Val [Shawcross] who is also --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I am happy to let Jo [McCartney] lead on that.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. We will leave you out. Then Jenny [Jones] also had some questions on this. Yes? So let us take Joanne [McCartney] and Jenny [Jones] and then I will ask the Commissioner to respond.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I asked for an update on the phone hacking allegations and I did have some supplementaries on those supplementaries.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Go ahead with your supplementaries please.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I wrote you a letter. I got the response the day before yesterday. It was setting out a number of questions arising from the *New York Times'* article. The questions were not greatly enlightening I have to say. I am aware there is an investigation going ahead again now so I am not going to touch on that.

I want to know something about the potential victims. I have asked these questions before. I asked how many people did you believe have had their phones hacked and how many were informed? The answer I had in the letter was that the investigation looked into defendants pleading guilty to the voicemails of a total of eight people who were all informed at the time. A number of other people have also been spoken to by police during the investigation and subsequently. I still do not know how many others were spoken to by the police.

There seems to be people coming forward on a regular basis saying they are writing to the police and wanting to know whether they were. That seems to be highly speculative

to me. Because, I think, they do not know what is happening, lots of people are writing - which is not good for the reputation of the police. From listening to some of the people who have given interviews - who range across party and outside party politics as well - the criticism seems to be that they do not believe there is any set criteria that is being used as to when to decide when to inform them and that, when they have got a response from the police, there has been some evidence but they are not told what that evidence is; whether it is their pin number was found, whether it was part of a number of what it was. That concerns me. I want to know that there is some set criteria that you are using to judge when people should be informed. We know that there were 91 pin numbers that were found which indicates that these people had the access codes to phone numbers. I want to know whether those 91 at least were informed of that.

I am asking you to look again and look at the criteria. I do not think it is healthy that we have everyone running to the High Court to judicially review the police because they do not know what is happening and what the evidence was, if indeed they were a potential victim.

The other question I had was the *New York Times* alleged that the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) was not given all the evidence that the police uncovered as part of this investigation. I want to ask whether that is the case or not?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I was curious why you did not contact every single victim? It seemed odd that everyone you identified at the time. I am interested as well how you are taking it forward and exactly what you are going to be doing proactively looking for further evidence and so on. I wondered if you had interviewed the reporters that had given their stories to the *New York Times* during the original investigation? Did their names come up? I am curious about why you did not interview more people at the *News of the World* when it was clear that all this went beyond just the royal correspondent and seemed to be more pervasive? That is, I think, (inaudible) with Joanne's [McCartney].

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Let me preface anything I am going to say here with we have been notified of judicial review proceedings and there are two separate Parliamentary inquiries, the Standards Committee and the Home Office Select Committee, who have indicated they are going to inquire further. Many of the issues you are raising will be gone over - have been gone over already - in forensic detail. I have come here prepared today with your questions in advance. What I am not going to extemporise is beyond that but I think it picks up some of the things you say. Anything beyond that, if it does not fully meet it, let me know. We will try to meet it but I think a lot of those issues will be gone through in the judicial review (JR) and the Parliamentary exercises. I think you understand why I want to be precise about this.

I think we need to also just establish the context here. Do not forget we did investigate and secure evidence in 2005/06 that led to two people being convicted and going to prison. In July 2009, when the issue re-emerged, we examined whether any new evidence had emerged in the media or elsewhere that justified required reopening the investigation. The clear view, which was subsequently endorsed by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) and leading counsel's advice, was, at that time, there was no new evidence so, therefore, we did not.

We have always said that position could change. John Yates said that right from the outset when he got involved in 2009; if any new evidence emerged then we could change the position.

In terms of your first question, Joanne [McCartney], which I think is about how things are going now, we are considering the material which has recently come to light and we will be consulting CPS. As part of that process of inquiring is this new or not, a 47 year old man was interviewed on 14 September 2010 and 21 September 2010 and a 29 year old man was interviewed also. We have interviewed two people on this further. We are looking at the outcome of that and deciding is there anything new or not and we will be consulting with CPS about it. That is the process at this moment in time.

Picking up your second part which is the criteria to inform - which I think crosses over something you are talking about Jenny [Jones] - there were criteria at the time. Of course this is going to be subject of judicial review proceedings in particular, but also the two Parliamentary inquiries. Where information exists to suggest some form of interception was or may have been attempted, the criteria was for the Metropolitan Police Service to take reasonable steps, in conjunction with the service providers, to inform them. That includes the eight people whose mobile phone voicemails were unlawfully intercepted by two people who were subsequently convicted and sent to prison. The other detail around that will be the subject of the JR and it will be subject to Parliamentary inquiry.

John Yates has already publicly given further and better particulars around the different nature of different people and the information held against them and the criteria that was applied. The JR proceedings will, essentially, say, "Was that criteria reasonable?" and that will be the subject of the outcome if, indeed, those JRs go ahead.

Turning to your specific question, Jenny [Jones] - I think you did ask the question in advance - did we interview the reporters that have recently been giving their stories to the *New York Times* during the original investigation? The answer is no, we did not. Prior to the recent reporting we had no cause to interview those reporters. That is just a straightforward yes/no answer and it is no.

I think that is far as I can go in the questions that you are adding to now.

Val [Shawcross], you submitted a question. I do not know whether that is still there or not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, she has withdrawn it.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I was quite happy for Jo [McCartney] to pursue that line of inquiry.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Anybody else on this?

Joanne McCartney (AM): The CPS point?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): CPS. Was all the evidence presented **disappear**(?) --

Joanne McCartney (AM): The *New York Times* stated that a prosecutor has said that he did not see all the police evidence.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Again, I am not going to try to go from memory on this. It is really important that we work specifically on the facts. Had I known you wanted to go further then I might have considered John Yates coming here today. I did not know. I was quite happy to do the specific questions but, if you want to go further, then John Yates will be dealing with those at the Parliamentary Inquiry and, undoubtedly, it will be covered in the JR.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Does anybody else have any other questions on this issue? Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): Could I ask a more general question about contacting potential victims? I pose a hypothetical case that you arrest a burglar and there is clear evidence of them having burgled in 8 properties but there is also a list of 200 other properties with little comments saying like, "This one looks interesting" or whatever else. Would you think it was appropriate to contact those home owners or would you simply limit it?

The other part of that is is it, or is it not, practice in terms of investigating crimes from, perhaps, prolific offenders that almost sample crimes are used where it is seen that those are the ones which are most likely to get a conviction and a result, rather than trying to charge for, perhaps, a much longer list of crimes which would, therefore, lead to a trial which might become very complicated in terms of pursuing all sorts of extraneous issues, rather than the ones where, perhaps, the evidence was more cut and dried?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Toby [Harris], the process would have been - and remember this is going back some time but I am pretty confident the process would have been - that we set out to investigate the allegations and we set out to actually get the right information and agree a prosecution strategy. In many, many areas of the criminal law we do not - and the prosecutor does not - charge every potential crime and nor do you, necessarily, present all the evidence for every potential victim. Of course I am speaking on behalf of the CPS here and I have not got a remit to do that. What a prosecutor's job is is to ensure they put sufficient information before the court to properly

give that information to judge and jury to properly inform their decision. That does not mean everything.

Of course that goes to the separate but linked issue; when we do any investigation we have a duty to investigate it thoroughly and impartially but also proportionately with a proportionate use of police resources. We do not chase down every potential lead on every potential occasion. We never have and we never would and you would not want us to because, frankly, we would have no resources left to deal. It has always been the case that the Chief of Police has the right and duty to use resources proportionately. The test will be whether we did that or not. That has always been the case.

I am not entirely sure that the phrase - and I think you are speaking generally - prolific offenders would apply in this case. It would depend on how you define prolific offenders in terms of one instance or an extended pattern of behaviour. You mentioned burglar. Of course we would always seek to limit victims. We would always seek to limit victims. Of course, if the burglar was in prison then those people could not be victimised but we might, through various means, seek to inform them. It might be through ourselves. In the telephone case we did use a combination of police and the service provider who also has a responsibility.

Let me extend your analogy just a tad further, Toby [Harris] which may or may not be relevant, subject to what comes out in the judicial review. If we went in to arrest a burglar and we found a list in his house of other houses he intended to burgle then, of course, that would be of much more interest to us but we would not, necessarily, go through the burglar's telephone directory and assume that everybody in his telephone directory was somebody he intended to victimise in that way. I think that may be relevant as well. To my certain knowledge there are different categories of information that were recovered from the particular person that was sent to prison. Different categories and different judgements had to be made. We need to ensure that, whatever we do, is a proportionate use of police resource.

I think the issue of the burglar - we would want to protect any future victims but we would need to be assured that they were victims and we were not wasting police resources and we would not go looking through telephone directories just on the basis of that person happened to have that name in their house. I hope that is helpful. Perhaps not.

Jenny Jones (AM): Can I just say something very briefly? I take your point completely and it is very fair. It is just that, sometimes, I feel that decisions are taken to not widen an investigation but, downstream, it costs us a lot more money to mop up afterwards because things come out. I have been on this body now for ten years and I have seen it happen again and again; that decisions are made on the basis of resources which make it more difficult downstream.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): That is an important point. Jenny [Jones], I do take that point. Of course you are a very experienced Member of the

Authority and you have seen a lot go through, but what you have seen go through is when it goes wrong. Remember 300,000 people, I think, go through our cells every year. The vast majority do not fall into that category. Quite properly, you see it where it goes wrong and it does go wrong, but the way we actually investigate offences are, overwhelmingly, successful by actually ensuring we make proportionate use of police resources. If we do not do that we will not have the resource to deal with the things you want to do. That is not an excuse; it is about making informed, experienced and balanced decisions. Our investigations do that.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Thank you. Graham [Speed], your question please?

Graham Speed (AM): Yes, thank you, Chair. It is about the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Could the Commissioner please advise whether there has been a change in the established and well understood policy that Safer Neighbourhood Team officers will be abstracted from their ward for anything other than major events such as Notting Hill or New Year's Eve?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): No. There has been Notting Hill Carnival and New Year's Eve celebration or other major incidents - and we have mentioned terrorist attacks etc. There has been no major change. It has always been the case with Borough Commanders; there is a degree of latitude around the edge of wards because if there is a common problem coming across wards then you would expect us to engage in problem solving. That latitude should be about problem solving with neighbouring wards.

For August this year the abstraction rate across the Metropolitan Police Service was running at 5% which is pretty consistent. There has been no major change. There can be occasions where people do engage in abstractions more than that. I would hope that TP is on top of that and ensure it is kept to a minimum.

Graham Speed (AM): Thank you. To follow up on that, my particular concern arises from my own Safer Neighbourhood Team where, as a Panel Member, we have been advised that the offices and PCSOs had been abstracted not in support of work for adjoining wards or for problem solving in adjoining or surrounding wards or in a cluster area, but they had been used in the town centre and in patrolling bus station, high street, outside McDonald's etc. This seemed, to me, to be a case of taking us back to the bad old days we experienced with our Home Beat officers where you would go along to a meeting and they would be saying, "I have not really been around much because I have been driving the van or I have been in the other part of the borough".

I appreciate the safer neighbourhood policing as a model needs to be looked at and there are some opportunities and there are some areas that the Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service needs to look at. My concern is that this was a surreptitious erosion of the principles of ring fencing which Tim [Godwin] has very clearly expanded on before on a number of occasions. Ring fencing is one of those strong areas that the public is now clearly understanding will happen but, perhaps, in some cases, the use of Safer

Neighbourhood Team officers and staff is being used a little bit more than we would have hoped and anticipated.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): You are right, we do have the principles there, and you are right, we do need to look at the model and have a discussion in this forum about how we are going to manage in the future, but we are absolutely committed to Safer Neighbourhood Teams who have brought huge benefits.

There has been no major change of policy. Ever since we have had Safer Neighbourhood Teams there has been the odd incident of where people have not, necessarily, fully complied with the policy. Overall - and we should not overstate this - we do comply with the policy. As I say, the abstraction across the Metropolitan Police Service for August was 5%. If you have got specific examples I will pick them up. If there were major changes to the policy we should bring it back here, where that policy was agreed in the first place.

Graham Speed (AM): We can go back to the Panel and assure those Members that this is not a policy change and we can expect those officers and PCSOs to be remaining in their ward?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Yes, subject to those exceptions and subject to a degree of latitude but the latitude should not be about wholeheartedly patrolling elsewhere. If you can give me the examples I will look at them and tell you do I agree or not agree.

Graham Speed (AM): Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chair): Val [Shawcross] is next.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Yes, I asked a question about deaths in police custody in vehicles. I do not want to raise any particular incident but it did come from my community and there was a concern that, given the high likelihood of involvement in alcohol and drugs in people being arrested, perhaps it would be in everybody's interests if what happens inside a police van was transparent and the information was clearly available.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Thanks, Val [Shawcross]. I think your question properly should be applied to wider than deaths in police vehicles. We have not had deaths in police vehicles --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Injuries and incidents.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): There is a wider application to your question. We do not use closed circuit television (CCTV) or sound recording equipment. I think it has been considered in the past. Cost issues aside, equipment could be stolen from police vans but, of course, we transport prisoners in more than police vans. The one

thing I could say is, if people did want to behave badly, then they would just take a decision to transport in a different police vehicle. So, in essence, we could not just retain it to police vans; we would have to equip the majority of police vehicles. Then it does become an extremely costly scheme. We have got to maintain it. My understanding is the cost of equipment and installation would be about £4,000 per vehicle. That would mount up to astronomical cost and we have got to do the cost benefit on that.

We have changed certain things in the way we equip our police vehicles in, not least, the ones with cages in the back. Where we do put prisoners in we now require a police officer to be there with a backward facing seat. All of that sort of thing. We have not gone to the extent of putting CCTV in there because we do not think the costs would be justified.

I do understand the nature, it has come up before and the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) once recommended it previously. The IPCC once did recommend that we should do that. It is very, very costly to do it.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Perhaps we could talk further about this outside of the meeting?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Yes.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you. I am happy, Chair, given the time, to take written replies to my next two questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. That is extremely helpful. Thank you very much. James Cleverly?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chair. Again, I submitted a number of questions but I appreciate that time is pressing so if I could, perhaps, ask that my question with regard to the single 101 number be a written response but the others if I could have a verbal response.

The first is with regard to what plans have been put in place to incorporate the abolition of the pledge and the single confidence measure and reduce the burden of measuring and reporting on those?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Thank you, James [Cleverly]. I am always grateful when there is a reduction of targets, whether those targets be centrally imposed by Government or, indeed, this Police Authority. We have had that debate before. I am always grateful with that reduction of targets.

It is a statement of public record that I was never awfully keen on the word pledge. I thought it was a bit of furniture polish. The Metropolitan Police Service prior to that was developing its promise because, actually, it is rather important. The pledge really is about confidence and confidence remains one of the three things that I think are most

important for policing in the city. The first is safety, the second is confidence and the third is value for money.

We still want to do something about public confidence. It underpins everything we do in London. We do need to measure that public confidence because, I think, it is hugely important.

There are other things in the pledge that we were already putting in our promise that we do want to retain. It is right that we should monitor the timely way in which we respond to incidents. It is right that we are committed to safer neighbourhoods. So there are a lot of things in there that the MPA wanted us to do and approved previously and that we also want to do. It is a question of disaggregating it and making sure we continue to monitor those things that we always thought were important. A lot of the stuff that was in there we had already decided was important to Londoners and was important to the MPA and was important to the Metropolitan Police Service.

You are absolutely right; everything we are doing - and hopefully it is coming through the budget scrutiny process - is about reducing cost where we do not need that cost, not least waste and bureaucracy. There are issues that we want to look further at around standard operating procedures where we have a welter of standard operating procedures that just refer to something once went wrong and eventually you have most standing operating procedures you have people to carry them out. That is a bureaucracy we need to have a look at, get a little less risk averse and actually start reducing some of those things that perhaps could save us time.

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you for that. From a personal point of view - and I imagine this is probably shared by a number of Members - and I say this without wishing to add to the bureaucracy, we have been very keen to see the progress on those reductions.

I know this is a slightly unusual way of putting this but, in light of the until very recently vacancy that we had, I was asked to put forward a question by someone who had been approached by members of the public in Haverling, which is outside my Link Borough but, as I say, because of the nature of the Link Membership vacancy. The question specifically was about should Link Members be mandated to attend CPEG meetings and, if not, what processes would be put in place to ensure full accountability for those bodies within the statutory framework?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): This is really a question to me.

James Cleverly (AM): It is probably more a question to you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): The truth is we have always left it up to Link Members. The Authority is represented at every CPEG by officers of this Authority. They are all attended and everything is recorded. The truth is different Link Members have done their job in different ways. Some do go. Some do not go. From my point of view, I go

occasionally. It depends on how well your CPEG is performing, frankly, and what use it is in terms of whether it is engaging properly or whether it is the usual suspects.

It is fair to say I have had a couple of meetings now with The London Communities Police Partnership (LCP2) which is the umbrella body of CPEGs to see how we can better improve what they do both in terms of their effectiveness and the amount of money that they absorb. They currently cost us about £1.5 million across the city and I think there is potential for quite significant efficiency there which also could be allied with a better output. We are just currently in negotiation and talks with it about how we might achieve those twin aims.

It is effectively, as I have said before, up to Link Members how they do their duties. I think mandating that you have to attend would result in more vacancies, not fewer.

Cindy Butts (AM): Chair, can you make sure you keep us, as Members, updated on that? I remember what happened last time, Joanne [McCartney], when you were lobbied and there was lots of confusion around some discussions that you had had with LCP2 that we were not privy to.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, I know. Those things are ongoing. I am alive to that. We also have to bear in mind that these particular organisations are a vast London rumour mill which quite often get hold of the wrong end of the stick. Yes, we will keep you all informed about where we are going to.

OK. Victoria [Borwick] on transport crime?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Yes, I have submitted several questions and I am happy to have some sent as written. The one I would really like to focus on, because it has come up by a number of Members in this Assembly, is what action should a member of the public who has witnessed illegal driving by rickshaw drivers take to report their concern? I think rickshaw drivers and the inability to licence or restrict them has been a problem and mentioned by lots of my colleagues.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Thanks, Victoria [Borwick]. It is very much a Westminster problem. Through the Safer Neighbourhood Team - and I understand that has been happening - informing the local council's Crime Reduction Team and the councillor and the London Pedicab Operators Association which is snappily known as the LPOA. I know it has been an issue for four years in Westminster. I know there has been a lot of work on it. The Metropolitan Police Service, along with others, has carried out six operations to target illegally operated pedicabs. A large number of pedicabs have been constructed and adapted to have an electric motor on which, above a certain weight, brings insurance. Quite a number have been seized. Obstruction of payments has led to a number of arrests.

I know it is a constant nuisance and I know there is more to be done. At this current time there are no licensing regulations for pedicabs although I understand a London Councils bill is being proposed which may regulate the industry.

In terms of reporting; Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the police.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I do not think, unfortunately, the Bill got very far and, unfortunately, the pedicabs are now going further from Westminster and now into Kensington and Chelsea, particularly around the Harrods area. It is a concern that keeps on being raised locally and I think it is just a case of making sure it continues to be discussed please.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): We will factor that back in through TP into Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We are hopeful that the licensing scheme will come in for local authorities next year which, of course, would also give them the right not to licence any pedicabs whatsoever in their area. As far as I am concerned, as a Constituency Member, they are a complete menace and I would not miss them one jot.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Quite. Do I understand that they are not allowed in the Royal Parks?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Do not know. Good question.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Probably a level of granularity that escaped (inaudible).

Victoria Borwick (AM): Absolutely. I just want to say that in all the areas covered by the Chair's constituencies I think there are concerns.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I walked past a group of tipsy guys standing in front of a pedicab driver and one of them said to the pedicab driver, "How much to Guildford?"! Tony [Arbour]?

Tony Arbour (AM): Yes. The questions I have asked. The first one increasing visible police presence and the Commissioner has, several times already today, talked about uniformed governance of the streets. Would it not, therefore, be a good idea if those police officers who are in receipt of what we have already been told are very valuable travel concessions if they wore uniform whilst they are travelling on public transport?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I have got to say that, as a linked but separate issue, there will be issues around the travel concessions coming back to this Authority in due course connected with our current budget situation.

Tony [Arbour], it is something I have considered as well. I understand it was discussed way back in 1999 when the travel concession first came in. I know the Management Board discussed this in 2005. I know it did because it is something that I keep saying, "Why shouldn't we do this? Why shouldn't we expect it?" Every time it is raised - and I think we had a brief discussion about it recently again - it is just not that easy and straightforward.

The first problem is officers out of uniform have greater options of how to deal with it because the expectation is not always to deal with it there and then. You have got various options. Officers in uniform who are travelling to and from work will not have their personal protection equipment with them that they are trained to use to defuse etc etc. That is a real issue and I can understand why it is a real issue for the Federation. Uniform without the equipment would seem rather odd and we cannot take some of that equipment home.

The second issue - which is a wider issue - is there is a need to understand the environment within which we are operating and we have spoken about this to the British Transport Police (BTP) because it would be very concerned about a wider and more general thrust to put Metropolitan Police Service officers in uniform on to the Underground because it would say that is a different environment and, if that is where you are going in terms of large numbers, that would require two days' training to operate in what is a very different environment.

It is something that we will keep we need to BTP a wider and more general thrust Underground that is where you are going in large numbers two days training. It is something that we will keep going back and looking at because we do want to increase the uniformed presence on the streets and on the transport systems. It is something I am willing to go and look at again but I am just saying it is not as straightforward as it first seems - or certainly, when I raised it, I thought it was straightforward and I am now convinced it is not straightforward but never say never.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Presumably it would be perfectly possible, through our new endorsed recruitment thing, for those Specials who are going through to do some of that training to allow them to operate on the Tube system?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I have said never say never.

Tony Arbour (AM): The principal point is that they should be invisible. Chances are there are loads of police officers travelling on buses and things in mufti. I am not suggesting that this happens but, because they are in mufti, it is not impossible I suppose they might be turning a blind eye to disorder.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): In my experience as a police officer - and it certainly would apply to me and it would apply to the vast majority of police officers -

it would not require me to get a travel concession to fulfil my duty which is there on or off duty. That is the first point.

The second point is the scheme does require someone to make themselves known to the transport operator or whatever, if there is trouble there, and go to the assistance. We have huge numbers of incidents where we have got cops in mufti, in civilian clothes, fulfilling their duty whilst availing themselves of that transport concession.

I cannot say to you there is never an incident of somebody turning a blind eye but neither can I say there is never an incident of every uniformed police officer who is out there in uniform also turning a blind eye. What we have got to do is make sure we enforce the policy and do everything we can to encourage people to do their duty.

I would come back and say the vast majority of police officers I would expect to do their duty whether they have got a travel concession or not and be comfortable that they would do it.

Tony Arbour (AM): The second question I have, Chair, relates to increasing the role of members of the police family who are on the streets. I have phrased it, “Since many councils are choosing to have more multi-tasking council employees, for example, giving street wardens the power to fine, should the GLA family not encourage multi-tasking amongst their respective staff?” I think I am really looking at the role of PCSOs here. It may be that there are other people who could take on their role, or, contrary-wise, PCSOs should have their remit widened?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): My profuse apologies, Tony [Arbour]. I thought the question, according to my brief, was going to the Chair of the Police Authority. Outrageously I was not listening and I apologise.

Tony Arbour (AM): No, no. That is fine. If the Chair has got the prepared answer we will get it from the Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Tony [Arbour], the short answer is yes.

Tony Arbour (AM): Good. Excellent.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We will have a closer look at that. Sorry. That one seems to have slipped the cracks. We will have a look. Do not worry.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I will submit a written apology for not listening.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): That is a yes, but with the caveat we will have to look at what they were going to do.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Exactly. OK. Jenny [Jones], your question about Wanstead Flats actually might be quite good addressed towards Dee [Doocey]. I think Dee [Doocey] probably knows as much about Wanstead Flats anybody do you not, Dee [Doocey]?

Jenny Jones (AM): In fact I was going to ask for the answer in writing to save some time but I was going to ask the Commissioner if anybody from the Metropolitan Police Service is going to the public meeting on 6 October 2010? There is a public meeting amongst local residents on 6 October 2010 and I wondered if anybody from the Metropolitan Police Service was going to go, or if Dee [Doocey] was going to go?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I presume somebody will be.

Jenny Jones (AM): If I could put it on to your desk. I am happy to take written answers in the hope that I will like them.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. We will come back to you on that one.

Graham Speed (AM): Chair, if it helps on that, just to avoid an overlapping between what the Estate is doing and what Dee's [Doocey] Olympics are doing, we have, in terms of Estates, asked the question as well and asked for a little bit of information. I think, between the two of us, linking with Jenny [Jones] may help.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Give her a briefing.

Graham Speed (AM): It came on our radar as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We will make sure that somebody from the Metropolitan Police Service is going to the public meeting.

Dee Doocey (AM): It has been at every other meeting so I see no reason why they would not be there.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes. It is probably highly likely it will be. OK. Then, Jenny [Jones], you had a rather complicated question about vehicles and advance stop lines?

Jenny Jones (AM): I am happy to take this as a written answer. I wrote to all the Borough Commanders asking them about their policy on this. I had some very polite replies. Thank you for that. Just one officer said it was not illegal and I thought it was illegal. If you have got a written answer I am happy to take that.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Fine. That is all the written questions. Did anybody have any other questions that they wanted to raise?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you, Chair. Just one very quickly.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Cindy [Butts] first and then Valerie [Brasse].

Cindy Butts (AM): Just a quick one. You talked about the reduction in transit robberies, which I think is great because that was a significant issue some time ago.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Cash in transit.

Cindy Butts (AM): I was just wondering whether or not, given that the profile of those perpetrators, as I understood it, was changing at the point in which the figures were rising, I just wondered whether there was a correlation between that falling and knife enabled robbery rising? I am just trying to understand what is going on here.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I do not think so, Cindy [Butts], but I will get a more confident answer. I think we have seen a reduction at the higher end and it has been about cooperation with the industry of how it protects its own vans, patrols and, particularly, how it takes certain measures with regards to the cash that is inside there.

I do not think there is a cross over because I think the reduction in cash in transit has been more recent. I think this link with knife crime and robbery has just been a little bit more enduring but it is something we are looking at and I will let you know the outcome.

Cindy Butts (AM): Thank you. The other point was you talked about addressing the rise in knife enabled robbery. In what way? What are you doing?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): It comes under Operation Verano and all the various operations that are about knife crime. Our rise in knife crime - which is now tiny to what it was - is we can see that the bulk of that rise and the link across is into robbery so, therefore, the operations to take out knife crime are also targeted on robbery.

Cindy Butts (AM): OK.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Yes. I know we are dropping targets at a rate of knots but we do still have targets around rape and serious sexual offences. There is nothing in your report this time on that or, indeed, in the figures, other than percentage of rape victims satisfied. I wondered whether you want to just let us know where we are on that? The figures have been rising astronomically. Have they started to level off? We have had (inaudible) in place now for a year almost. I just wondered where we were going with this?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Firstly, I would not agree with your assessment that we are dropping targets at a rate of knots. If we are then I have not quite notice that, Valerie [Brasse].

On rape, if you will, it is not as bad as it was but the figure is still high. It is at 25.9%. The reason I did not refer to it is I generally refer to it in every report and I know there has been significant discussion at other meetings with the Authority. What we think that is about; we think there is a significant recording issue of report to recording. Tightening that up. We can happily bring back and I will say more about it at the next Authority or do something offline with you.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I was interested in seeing whether it was levelling off or not?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): Certainly the rate of increase is reducing if you remember what it was at, at some hideous number --

Valerie Brasse (AM): I do.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): -- but it is reducing. If it was a recording issue, that is what you would expect to happen, as we start to get more to the apples and apples here.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It is worth also saying that we have now, fully commissioned and got underway, a research project around trying to find what some of the drivers of the rise have been so that we can look at some of the wider issues. The point I think we made before; although rape appears on the Metropolitan Police Service's score card, it is not actually an offence which responds very well to normal policing prevention tactics. You cannot patrol to prevent rape. So we need to look to other partners to help us drive down the absolute number, notwithstanding the improvements in detection that are going to take place.

Valerie Brasse (AM): When is the research due to report?

Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive, MPA): That is due to report back in about the next three months.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Some point before Christmas.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): It really is about unpicking it and understanding it fully so we can debate it in a more sophisticated way.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. All done. One more. Chris [Boothman]?

Chris Boothman (AM): One very brief one. Commissioner, Kirsten [Hearn] and I have a Hate Crime Panel next week and I just wonder whether you could give us any feedback on the performance in terms of sanction detection rate for racist religious crime and homophobic crime?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPA): I can speak to the sanction detection rates. Just to show that I do not just not report the things that are looking bad, actually hate crime across the piece is reducing. Domestic violence, race and religious crime and homophobic crime are significantly reducing at this moment in time, in terms of reporting. We also know these are iceberg crimes and there has always been a large amount of under reporting, but that has always been the case. I can speak to you separately about the sanction detection rates outside if you wish, if that assists.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK? All done? Thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Martin [Tiplady], Anne [McMeel] and related.

Right. We move on now to agenda item nine please which is quite an important paper. For those of you who have not twigged about half our money comes through Community and Local Government (CLG) so the local government settlement is important to us in terms of preserving our position.

We are in a slightly odd position as well because our interests are not necessarily aligned with our local authority friends in that one of the changes that is currently being proposed is to transfer money from us to them and we need to find a way to lobby effectively against that.

Bob [Atkins], I do not know if you wanted to say anything about the paper?

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Very briefly, Chair. It could be seen as something of a pointless exercise because, as Members will have detected within the paper, there is a proposal - which has certainly been lobbied for very hard - to change the whole process of financing local government, and also because of the damping mechanisms that exist currently. Actually these changes to the formula, in the main, would not impact on our funding but the risk is that, once these changes are built into the formula, damping could disappear and we might not get a review of the formula and, therefore, we could be stuck with the results of this consultation.

It is a formal consultation and, as the Chair has pointed out, because our financial interests may be slightly different from those of other police authorities and other local authorities, I think it is important that the Authority is cited on the response and also endorses that response. Happy to take any questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): OK. As I say, we sit in a slightly odd position because not only are our interests not necessarily aligned with local authorities but are also not necessarily aligned with police authorities. We sit in-between the two. While some will be pushing for flaws to disappear, others will not be, we need it but they are not necessarily the people we want to ally with on the other side in terms of the distribution, so we are slightly in opposition. Val [Shawcross]?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you very much, Chair. This is a very helpful paper and, obviously, we have to support the technical advice that we are given.

I thought, Chair, following on from what you are saying and what the Commissioner was saying earlier about the uncertainties and the complexities of the budgetary pressures being placed at the moment, I think there are probably separate representations to be made at a political level. Not that it is for me to tell you your job, Chair! This is, as you said, incredibly serious. It strikes me very much that, to carry out a funding formula review not just when there is another one booked for 2011 but when we have got the uncertainties and the doubts and the technical work around the Olympics, we have got massive turbulence with the cuts coming, the CSR and we do not quite know where all of that will land, we have just got too much instability to be having to countenance these changes being made. I think that is a very strong case that should be made. This organisation is difficult and complex enough. You need to know where we are going to be in order to manage it.

The other thing I would say. Bob [Atkins] mentioned the dampening thing. I think that is, obviously, the biggest and most difficult issue here. If we lose the safety net of dampening mechanism there could be a massive amount of sudden jolt damage done to the budget. I think the dampening mechanism is useful because - correct me if I am wrong - I think it provides a safety net in case there is any knock on financial impacts on the Authority, leakage as it were, from changes elsewhere in the local government system. I remember the changes to social care formula really had a big damaging impact on the Metropolitan Police Service.

I think the Home Secretary, in her first year, needs to know quite how much potential damage could be done by the damping formula in London and also how much gratuitous and pointless difficulties are being made for the Commissioner by doing this review at all. She obviously needs to be reminded that the Metropolitan Police Service is a huge piece of her manor too and if this Authority does not deliver on the Olympics and does not deliver in terms of crime reduction then there will be a national crisis, not just a London crisis.

Sorry, Chair, but I am trying to throw some political support for your lobbying on this one.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Val [Shawcross], it will not surprise you to know that I have got a permanent table at the Regency Café - those of you who know, it is just behind the Home Office on Regency Street - and the phones are pretty red hot in terms of making these points plain both formally and informally at a political and a formal level. Be in no doubt that we are making very clear to them both the risk that is presented by the Olympics but also the risk that is presented by London, comparative to risks elsewhere, so a cut in Lambeth exposes us, collectively, to much more risk than a cut in Hexham or Norwich --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): To massive potential change. Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): That is the point that needs to be made and we are making that point both through the Metropolitan Police Service and the Authority and a political level.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I am trying to empower you by saying you can say to them that you have to thump the table because we will all be thumping the table here. This Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service needs predictability and stability in its budgets and there are some quite unnecessary threats being thrown in the Metropolitan Police Service's way.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Thumping the table is not my style, Val [Shawcross], as you know but I am definitely doing something similar!

OK. Are you content with the approach that we are adopting?

All: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Thank you very much.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): As long as there is some table thumping going on.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I will try my best! Chest thumping!

OK. Agenda item ten. Treasury Management Financial Review. You will be pleased to hear no money has gone absence without official leave (AWOL) this year. I think we are all ship shape and we know where it all is.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): In Ireland!

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We are not in Ireland but, nevertheless, we seem to know where we are. Returns obviously on cash are very low compared to where they used to be but, nevertheless, we seem to be optimising things. Content?

All: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Thank you. Reports from Committees. Have we got a decision to make?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes, Chair. On page 117 the Professional Standards Sub-Committee has posed some amendments to the terms of reference which we ask the Authority to endorse. This is in respect of business interests and dip sampling of complaints.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): All happy? Yes? OK. That is through.

Action taken under delegated authority. Catherine [Crawford]?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): We try to avoid this as far as we can as Members know but during the summer period when there were no Members around it was necessary to take forward four separate urgency actions. As ever, full details are available to Members in the Members' Room back at Dean Borough Street.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Content? Thank you. That brings our meeting to a close. Thank you very much for your cooperation and good manners and conduct. Thank you, Commissioner. See you all in a month, if not before. Thank you. There is lunch downstairs as usual for those of you who want to stay and be social.

The meeting concluded at 12.47pm.