

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 24 February 2011 at 10 am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chairman), Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
Tony Arbour, Jennette Arnold, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Victoria Borwick,
Valerie Brasse, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn, Neil Johnson,
Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Caroline Pidgeon,
Amanda Sater and Valerie Shawcross.

MPA Officers:

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

MPS Officers:

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner) and Anne McMeel (Director of Resources).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Good morning ladies and gentlemen. The cameras are on and we are being watched by the world. Welcome. Apologies for absence. I have had apologies from Chris Boothman, Graham Speed and the Commissioner. I am pleased to say, incidentally, that the Commissioner's recovery seems to be going well. I have spoken to him and he is on good form. He has been in to senior management team meetings a couple of times now, at the Yard, so we look forward to seeing him back in due course. Any other apologies? No.

We should just go round the room first. Sorry. Kit Malthouse.

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

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

Clive Lawton (AM): Clive Lawton.

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Toby Harris (AM): Toby Harris.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

John Biggs (AM): John Biggs.

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Jennette Arnold.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Val Shawcross.

Neil Johnson (AM): Neil Johnson.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

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

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): Reshard Auladin.

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

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Great. Any declarations of interests? There is advice on declarations of interests outlined at agenda item two. Anybody got anything to 'fess up? No? Thank you. We will take them as noted.

Minutes of the meeting on 27 January 2011. If anybody needs the transcript of the meeting that is on the MPA website. Is everybody content that I can sign them as a true record?

Dee Doocey (AM): Are you doing matters arising after the minutes?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I can do, yes. Fire away.

Dee Doocey (AM): I have a concern. It is not the accuracy of the minutes; it is a matter arising out of the minutes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Fine. Matters arising?

Dee Doocey (AM): Have you signed them?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. I will do in a minute. Go on.

Dee Doocey (AM): It is page 19. The Police and Social Responsibility Bill. I am happy that what is written in the minutes reflects what actually happened. I have a concern though about the item under discussion. This was a late paper which I certainly did not read because I was concentrating on the budget papers that had arrived at the same time. I notice that it says that the implementation of the new scheme is going to be dealt with by the Business Management Group (BMG). I had not appreciated that at the time and I am not sure that I understand the reasoning behind it. I would have thought that the implementation should be a Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP) issue, rather than done by a very small group of people. It is going to SOP as a regular item, we have been told. It seems to me more sensible that the implementation would be dealt with by SOP, rather than by a small group.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): On that same page, 63.3, it says that. They are a standing item on the agenda of SOP.

Dee Doocey (AM): The report does not say that. The report which the minutes are referring to says, "The MPA Business Management Group (BMG) chaired by the MPA Chairman will act as the Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPC) implementation programme board and then formal updates will be provided by that group on a monthly basis which will go to SOP". I am querying and suggesting that it would be more logical for SOP to be leading on this, rather than an unelected number of people - unelected by this Committee.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I raised a very similar issue at the last meeting. When I raised whether other Members would have an input into this or whether it would just be left to the BMG, you did reassure me that we would not only be --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It says, "The Chairman agreed to also seek other Members' advice in addition to the membership of the Business Management Group on developing and implementing the proposals of MOPC". So, yes, everybody can chip in.

Dee Doocey (AM): Does that mean that everybody can come to your meetings when you are discussing it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We could certainly have updates. It is quite difficult to design these things in a large Committee --

Dee Doocey (AM): If we can come to the meetings when you are discussing it, I am content. That is fine. It is just that I cannot see how we can chip in if we do not know what you are discussing and when you are discussing it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That was the whole point of bringing updates to the SOP Committee.

Dee Doocey (AM): That is an update, by definition. It is telling you what has already happened.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Not necessarily. It is telling you what the plans are that might be going to happen for you to then comment and input. We can have weekly meetings to talk about it if you like. BMG is the Chairs of the Committees.

Dee Doocey (AM): I have raised the point and I have made my point.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We circulate the minutes of BMG. There is nothing to hide. You can have a look at everything you want to. As I said last time, I am more than happy to sit down and talk to anybody at any time about their views, and implement it.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You can give us an assurance that can be recorded today that, before any decisions are made, you will seek the views of all Members?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is what was recorded last time but I am happy to record that again. As usual, when I volunteer to take views of Members I look forward to the flood of emails which never then appear. By all means --

Jennette Arnold (AM): With respect, we hardly know what is going on at BMG. You would have to be informed about something in adequate time for you then to respond. If you are saying, before you put this matter on your agenda, we will be given adequate notice - like a fortnight - then that is fine. Work with us here.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is a standing item on the agenda and it is a standing item on the agenda of the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee. I give you formal notice that it will be discussed at every single meeting of BMG and SOP over the next six months.

Jennette Arnold (AM): OK. We can come if we want to?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman (AM): Chairman, I was consulting with my colleague here and neither of us can remember getting copied into minutes of the BMG. I have seen them once or twice and I have come along once or twice, at your invitation - for which I am grateful - on human resource (HR) matters.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): They are on the intranet and available. We do not routinely circulate the minutes of all Committee meetings to all Members. If people would like them to be given to them in hard copy, printed out and posted, we can

certainly do that. I am more than happy to do that. They have been available on the intranet right from the start so you can log in on your intranet account and get them.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): We do not have access to the intranet. Assembly Members do not use the MPA intranet because we have an email account here, so I would not have access to that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You do have access to it. The fact that you do not use it is a different thing. You absolutely have access to the intranet.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Would it help, Chairman, if I offered to rationalise what is and is not available and remind particularly Assembly Members and support researchers how to access this and also to undertake to email out the minutes of BMG, every meeting?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, I do not think we should email them out. We need to print them and post them.

Dee Doocey (AM): I do not want to spend money printing and posting.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We have had this whole, "It's never printed. We cannot get it. I did not see the email". That kind of stuff. It happens all the time.

Dee Doocey (AM): At a time of such financial constraint, for the Chairman to suggest that, rather than emailing, which is what Members want, he is going to print it out and post it, is too far.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Perhaps we can have a named vote!

Jennette Arnold (AM): He is being silly.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I get the story. I get it.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Can I take away an action to rationalise all this and try to do the best we can to ensure everybody is informed?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Any other matters arising from the minutes? All happy? Good.

We are now on to item four, Chairman's update, which has been circulated. I will not take too long. It has obviously been a good start to the year in terms of public protests. Some of the demonstrations were --

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I have not finished yet.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): I know but I want to say something at the very beginning. This was emailed out last night. I am afraid I had gone to bed by the time it arrived. It is not accessible to me. I am getting really fed up with this.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We will correct that. Apologies.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Thank you.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): You are going to read it out, Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. I will read it out for your benefit.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): First, I would like to congratulate the Commissioner and his team on a number of recent successes.

Significant protest policing demands continue to be placed on the service. The student protests at the end of January 2011 were successfully managed, despite an escalation to a political protest outside an embassy and a march through the West End.

I know that a huge amount of excellent work undertaken by the Metropolitan Police Service is recognised through awards and commendations. I wanted to highlight a couple of recent examples. I am pleased to note that Newham was presented with a partnership award for work between the local police officers and the **Al-Madina(?)** Mosque. A team from Operation Rise, the investigation into the use of safety deposit boxes to hide criminal assets - most of which were apprehended in my constituency - won the Keith Hughes team award for excellence in financial investigation earlier this month. Operation Rise has, to date, resulted in over 130 arrests and the return of £13 million of criminal assets to the public purse, which is a huge result. Well done.

The House of Commons Committee stage of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill concluded last week. A team of MPA officers attended the sessions on a rota basis to track the progress of the Bill. Senior MPA officers continue to meet with Home Office officials to explain potential consequences of the Bill.

The internal MOPC implementation programme continues to progress. A London working group has been set up, chaired by the MPA Chief Executive, which will report to the next Ministerial Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) Transition Board in March 2011.

An amendment was tabled during the Committee stage of the Policing and Social Responsibility (PRSR) Bill to allow compulsory alcohol sobriety to be given as a court order during sentencing. We will talk about that later on the agenda.

Discussions to finalise the budget have been ongoing and the budget and business plan are included in as an agenda item today. As part of that, the MPA is contributing to the shared service agenda. One positive outcome to note to date is that the MPA is about to enter an agreement to provide internal audit services for the GLA on the basis that we are generally leading in internal audit across the whole of the GLA family, so it should result in some savings across the piece.

Attended a number of events including the successful launch of a knife bin in Victoria which will presage more knife bins being placed across the city. The one we attend in Victoria had been in receipt of a couple of firearms in the two months before. All good stuff.

Went on patrol in Bexley with some Specials just a couple of weeks ago. Pleased to note that the Bexley Specials are the most productive Specials in the Metropolitan Police Service, some of whom, it seems, do more hours per month than regular officers, showing the benefit of our Specials programme across the piece. So I am told.

The work of the London Crime Reduction Board continues to progress well and the Board is working with the GLA to ensure effective dispersal of the Community Safety Fund - this is money that was previously given to local authorities but has now been put through the GLA for dispersal to local authorities - and other funding that has been received from the Home Office in the last couple of weeks around youth and knife crime.

That is it from me. Any questions?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Could you remind me what happens to the money?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Local authorities receive a series of small grants depending on their size and need --

Victoria Borwick (AM): No, sorry, I meant your £13 million. The proceeds of crime. I am so sorry. Sorry. I should have said.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The proceeds of crime are split between us and the Home Office.

Victoria Borwick (AM): This way we are putting George Osborne [Chancellor of the Exchequer] out of business.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): One sixth of that comes back as part of the incentivisation scheme around the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA). The rest; 50% goes to the Home Office. Then the other two sixths; one goes to the Ministry of Justice and one goes to the Crown Prosecution Service. We get the final third. That goes into the disbursement group which reports to the MPA. Some of that goes to people like the Safer London Foundation and other community programmes and investing in some of the assets we have to go and **collect properly**(?).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The overall split of where the money goes is not particularly advantageous to us, given that most of the cost of recovery falls to us. Both Tim [Godwin] and I have had conversations in the past with the Government about rejigging the split so it becomes worth our while to invest more in recovery of criminal assets. That conversation is ongoing.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am glad we have noted it. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Tony [Arbour]?

Tony Arbour (AM): Referring to item 11 of the money which you are now handing out, rather than monies which have been going to the boroughs, is this not completely contrary to localism? It might seem like small bits of money in the overall Metropolitan Police Service budget but to boroughs, as a contribution to community safety, it is quite a substantial chunk. The boroughs would like to have control of that.

I would like to know two things. Firstly whether or not you agree with me that it is against the overall policy of localism? Secondly, is the overall pot reduced? If the overall pot has been reduced, is the money which is going to be distributed back to the boroughs going to be altered pro rata or are you going to discriminate between deserving and undeserving boroughs?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The pot has been reduced. We have received £10.9 million, which represents an overall cut of about 20% on the money that it was previously handing out direct. I have written to all Borough Leaders saying that it has come so late in the budget process that it is our intention to passport the money through but, from a governance point of view, we need to have a note of what they are going to spend it on. I anticipate that we will send it through with a pro rata cut across the piece to boroughs.

Tony Arbour (AM): Localism?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I agree with you to a certain extent although, of course, we are local too. More local than the Home Office is. Given the significant savings that are having to be made out of that budget, one of the things that I will be talking to local authorities about over the next year or so, before the next round of that spending, is how we can better spend that money together more strategically, albeit spent by them, to try to deliver some of our joint outcomes. It may be that we are able to augment some of the money ourselves.

The current financial climate means we all have to work together to maximise the output for that money. Where you have got two boroughs who have a common problem, it might be that they can spend that money better together, more strategically, than they can alone. We will be doing that over the next year.

Tony Arbour (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): A couple of things on your report. Item two. Of course it is absolutely right to mention the fact that there are significant policing demands on protests but I do hope you will not only focus on the protests; there are all sorts of other things that make demands on police time that we do not get paid for. I do hope that you will put in football matches, film premieres, Royal weddings and that sort of thing when they make demands on police time, as well as protests.

On item four. You said that you have attended a number of meetings. I always read your updates with huge interest and I am curious about the meetings that you do attend, in the interests of transparency that we all care about. Is there a list of those meetings that you go to on the intranet?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Not on the intranet, no.

Jenny Jones (AM): No. How do we find out about those? What senior Conservatives? What senior press barons?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Nice try, Jenny [Jones]. Nice try. I have not met any press barons. Is that some kind of attempted amateur smear? I do not know what that is supposed to mean. I do not know what that is intended to imply.

Jenny Jones (AM): It was just a joke. Like your joke about sending everything out by mail. It is just a joke, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. OK.

Jenny Jones (AM): If you dish it, you have to take it. Where do we find this list of meetings that you have been to because that is of interest to us as an Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): If you have got particular meetings that you would like to know about or particular activities I am more than happy to let you know what meetings I have had. I do not routinely open my diary for everybody to see. Neither do you. I am happy to give you a list of police and crime related meetings that I have been to.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Just attach it to the minutes routinely.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): More than happy to do that.

John Biggs (AM): You would be happy to disclose all meetings, whether they are in your eighth floor capacity or your Westminster capacity?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No.

John Biggs (AM): No. You are not?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Unless you will as well.

John Biggs (AM): I am very happy to, yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Disclose every meeting that you do in your capacity as an Assembly Member?

John Biggs (AM): Yes, I am very happy to do that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is kiddy stuff. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Picking up the point raised earlier about the Community Safety Fund, I have received your letter and a copy of the allocations to each borough but I was concerned that one of my boroughs received nil.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Which borough is that?

Joanne McCartney (AM): It was Enfield.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Received nothing?

Joanne McCartney (AM): There was a list, on the front page, of certain boroughs that had nought next to them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I do not think that is the case. I do not think there is a single borough in London that receives nothing. No. Definitely not.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I will check. I will get back to you if I need to.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am happy to look again but, as I remember, every single borough got money. It ranged from, at the top end, about £600,000, down to £100,000 for lower crime areas. I am happy to look at that again.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you.

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

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, I am missing the sunny collegiality of bygone years but no doubt it will return.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There is an election looming.

James Cleverly (AM): After the election.

Clive Lawton (AM): I note a trend which has been happening for a while to accentuate the frontline - whatever that is - and crime fighting and feeling collars and stuff like that as the primary function. There is no doubt about it that catching criminals is important. I just wanted to applaud and note that in your item three you talked about huge amounts of excellent work and you particularly chose to highlight a partnership award for work between local police officers and the **Al-Madina(?)** Mosque. I assume this is not directly about catching criminals or feeling collars or whatever; it is about the preventative work of community engagement. Looking through documentations and articulations at the moment, it is really important that we accentuate - and I think somewhere else somebody quotes Robert Peel about preventing crime - this engagement with the community. In many ways it is easily as important as the business of crime fighting and a lot of macho posturing in these matters.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I completely agree with that. I am at the moment in the process of donating my free booking of the London's Living Room as a Member here for a Southwark inter faith forum sponsored by the Metropolitan Police Service that it wants to hold in the building. Lots of that work goes on that is absolutely vital. You are right. Any other questions? Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): A couple of questions, Chairman. Can I go back to your visits? We are invited to attend meetings in committee rooms when you are visiting boroughs, doing the reviews, but I have yet to receive an invitation from you when you are in the borough opening something or launching something that I would have been party to whilst sitting on a partnership board. Will you look to see whether, in future when you are in boroughs, you could invite Members of this Metropolitan Police Authority who are sitting here like you, as a Member of the Authority committed to that work?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We should be routinely informing Link Members --

Jennette Arnold (AM): You are not.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): In those cases that is you.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Never.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Happy to look at that.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Never happens. It just seems really weird because previous Chairs had a record of doing that so it would be good if you could --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes, more than happy to. You were all invited to the crime roadshows that we did.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Let's be clear; I am sure that every Member attended, as available.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Also you have been invited, hopefully, to all the Joint Engagement Meetings (JEMs) that take place in your particular area.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Right. I am sure that Members attended when they could. We have had some really good meetings at my boroughs. I have been attending. I hope you were not inferring anything there, but I am sure you were not.

My second question. Going back to your note 11. I want to pick up from where Tony Arbour started. It is very rare, sitting round this table, that I agree with Tony Arbour formally but it seems strange to me that something that was well managed by boroughs and was specific to boroughs has now been taken away from boroughs and is landing here to be passported out again from your Board. When you talk about the pro rata means of division, will this be based on the criteria that would have been used by the Home Office previously? I would imagine that some boroughs with greater indicators had more funds than others. Have you thought through that yet?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. I recognise that many local authorities will have budgeted for having that money and many of them will have contracted to spend that money so it will cause problems. That is exactly what we have said. We have said we are more than happy. From a governance point of view we cannot just send the money; we have to know what they are going to spend it on. Absent there being any howlers in there, being spent on fact finding missions to Cuba or anything, we will passport it through with a pro rata slice in the same way that it has been passported through to us.

Jennette Arnold (AM): The difficulty I have is I do not understand the oversight of all this. This is now with the Mayor's Crime Reduction Board, which you deputise for him on. Can I request a full briefing through the Chief Executive so that I can be fully informed so that when I go to my partnership meetings I am aware of the criteria that are going to be used, the timing and the work around this? It seems to me it is in a void somewhere with you and others making this decision. Those of us who are fully involved with our partnerships will be arriving at partnerships with people looking at us saying, "What's going on?" because they think it is the MPA but, in fact, it is not the MPA, as you say here it is the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB). Again, I have not got a clue where the LCRB reports are, where its minutes are or how I can make representation to the Board on behalf of the boroughs that I represent as a Member and am linked to as a Member of the Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We were all taken slightly by surprise by the money coming to us if truth be told. It has only happened in the last couple of weeks.

Jennette Arnold (AM): You did not ask for it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. The Government's thinking is that, in advance of the arrival of police and crime commissioners in the rest of the country, it will be giving that money to them. On the basis that we would be going early into the new structure it would give that money to us this year. As I say, I have written to all Leaders outlining a very simple process. I had the Leader of Islington in yesterday to talk about exactly that --

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes, I know. I had a meeting with him as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- issue. We should be able to send the money out quickly before the beginning of the financial year.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, an extensive note came round about this whole process. I cannot understand why we are going round it again.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Excuse me. Clive [Lawton], can I have a follow up question before you come in?

Clive Lawton (AM): By all means.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Is it possible for us to see that letter so we can get an idea of what you said to Leaders, given that we will be meeting with them --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You have got the letter. It should have been sent to all. All Assembly Members got a copy of the letter. Joanne [McCartney] has had it.

Jennette Arnold (AM): You have had it? Assembly Members? You sent it to all Members or Assembly Members?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It would be a City Hall issue. This is not an MPA issue. The money is not coming through the MPA.

Valerie Brasse (AM): We do have Link Membership into our partnerships locally. We need to know what you said.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): City Hall would have sent, I presume, the letter to all Assembly Members with constituencies.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Then I would ask for it to go to all Members because we do have to deal with our partnerships.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am more than happy. It is not a secret letter. More than happy to circulate it to Members.

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is not a matter of secrecy; it is about transparency and openness and everybody being on the same page.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): A note has gone round about this.

Valerie Brasse (AM): We got the note but we did not get the letter. It is a matter of common courtesy. We arrive at our partnerships looking a little bit blank and people will assume we know what is going on. We just need to know what you sent out. That is all.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We will circulate the letter to everybody.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can I move from you then and ask the Chief Executive for a full briefing about how you can update us in our role as Link Members when we go to partnership meetings and this item is on the agenda? Can we have a full briefing about the role of the LCRB, the criteria and all of it so that we can share that information and appear informed?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): Just a quickie, Chairman. Hopefully. Can you update us on your understanding of the proposed date for abolition of the Authority because people have read it in various places and, as a second part of that question, the role that this Authority will play in managing that transition?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The pencilled in date is 1 October 2011. One of the groups that both Catherine [Crawford] and I, **Andy** (?) in his national role, and Tim [Godwin] are involved in is the Transition Board at the Home Office which is looking at exactly this question. One of the things we have raised is there will be some legacy issues that mean there is an overlap period - half heard disciplinary proceedings and that kind of thing - that we need to look at. It is fair to say the first meeting was a bit of a scoping one around what the work programmes might be to look at transition, but we have not yet come up with any of the ...

John Biggs (AM): Are you the only Police Authority representative on the --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. The Chairman of the Association of Police Authorities sits on it, as does the Chief Executive.

John Biggs (AM): Of this Police Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. The Chairman of the Association of Police Authorities sits on the Transition Board as well, representing all other police authorities.

John Biggs (AM): Right. Of this Authority? You are the only representative of this Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The Chief Executive is there and the Treasurer is there.

John Biggs (AM): I am not suggesting you are doing anything secretly but, given that you are a two headed beast - which is a term I often use, not about you but often about myself - in that you are the putative Mayoral Commissioner and you are currently the Chairman of the Authority. Do you think that the role of the Authority in managing its demise would be facilitated by having another representative from the Authority who was not potentially conflicted by that?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is not my Board. If the Minister chooses to invite another Member of the Authority that is up to him.

John Biggs (AM): I will return to my earlier question then. Ministers are free to set up whatever they like. That is the way it works. Fine. If they want to invite you we are delighted on your behalf in whatever role you are invited. What role is the Police Authority - we discussed this at the Corporate Affairs Committee - playing in managing the closure of the Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I guess there are two routes. First of all I have said, as you heard me say earlier, I am more than happy to convene whatever working parties, meetings, SOP, whatever, to talk about the transition. Other Members of the Authority play prominent roles in the Association of Police Authorities and the Chair of the Association of Police Authorities is there, effectively, representing them and others. I can put it to the Minister that he might like to invite somebody else from the Police Authority to come and put the opposing view but I suspect it will get a negative answer.

John Biggs (AM): I sense that you are mesmerised by the aura of power around the Ministers' working party. I am talking about the more mundane issue of the Police Authority overseeing its closure. There are things that the Authority might want to consider to ensure that there are issues of trailing wires and proper handover. It might want to talk to the working group that the Assembly is about to set up.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is what Dee [Doocey] was referring to I assumed earlier. The system at the moment; we had assumed - if Members are not happy then that is fine - that the Chairs of the Committees who are on BMG - that is me, Reshard [Auladin], Cindy [Butts], Steve [O'Connell] and Toby [Arbour] - will look initially at the work programme and talk about transition. That then gets reported regularly to SOP in terms of what the plans are recommended from BMG. SOP can then make comment and amend because, of course, Reshard [Auladin] sits on one and chairs the other. That would come regularly for update. It is a standing item now at every meeting. Members would be fully aware of what is going on.

In-between then and now it may be worth us having an away day to talk about some of the details as the picture emerges from the national Transition Board so we get an idea of what the rest of it is going to be and we can see what is going to happen. The transition is not particularly well advanced at the moment, largely because the Bill is still changing here and there. We will wait and see.

John Biggs (AM): I give up, Chairman. You clearly do not understand my question. Perhaps other Members can ask it differently. Or answer it differently.

Dee Doocey (AM): I understand what you are saying and the assurance that you are going to make recommendations that SOP will then look at and amend is fine, as far as I am concerned.

I have a little concern about how you answered John's [Biggs] question though when you said, "Well maybe I could ask the Minister to invite somebody from the MPA to put an opposing view". I do not think we have necessarily at any stage got an opposing view. We might have a contrasting view. It is not you versus us; it is us surely.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I understand. Maybe I misspoke. Contrasting then.

Dee Doocey (AM): If you decide, for whatever reason, you are going to ask for somebody else to come on, you must not make us all out to be rabid rebels. We are not. We are all here not for the good of our health but in order to do something that we actually believe in. I get very, very upset when people misunderstood scrutiny for criticism. We are being paid to scrutinise and part of that is to look at what is happening and say, "In our view [and we all have our own views] that is right or wrong". You must not think of it as criticism. It is not.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I do not. I do not think of it as --

Dee Doocey (AM): We have not got the opposite view to you on everything.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- criticism. I understood the implication to be that I was not in a position to represent the views of the Authority. Therefore somebody else may be required.

Dee Doocey (AM): I do not think John [Biggs] was saying that. He can speak for himself. I did not pick it up like that at all.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I thought he said I was conflicted and therefore could not --

Jenny Jones (AM): He said some quite rude other things, but you did not pick up on those!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am just used to it by now.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Out of that conversation can we agree that we will have an away day or a session at an appropriate time, presumably once the Bill is progressed and we know what it is going to say?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): More than happy. It will be important for everybody to understand how it is going to operate. Once things become clearer it will be very important to understand how it is going to operate.

John Biggs (AM): I tend to ferret around and find out these things but our Independent Members would benefit from a regular briefing on progress with this stuff, rather than reading it in the papers, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Is that everything? Can we move on? Thanks for that.

Item five. Acting Commissioner?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. That made me a little nervous; that earlier piece. It has been three weeks since we met so, as a result of that, in performance, there is only a little bit of reassertion of what I probably mentioned then.

Total crime, in performance at the moment, is slightly down. Violence with injury is down nearly 6%, which is an important one and one of our core priorities. Knife crime where a knife has been used to injure is down by nearly 3%, so 103 fewer stabbings so far during this performance year, which is good news but still too many. Overall gun crime continues to go down, nearly 18%. 514 fewer offences. Discharges themselves, where actual shots have been fired, are down by 8.3%. Again, good news. Lots of good work going on with Operation Verano and other initiatives.

Domestic violence shows a reduction of 5.2%. Lots of work going on there. Multi agency teams on boroughs. Again, it is one of those that we can lose confidence and, therefore, do not get the reports.

Hate crime overall is also going down in racist and religious crime and homophobic crime. Again, I put the caveat in terms of confidence and under reporting.

We have reinforced the commitment to maintaining our community safety units. We currently have 569 specialist hate crime investigators across the 32 boroughs. We are also horrified by the recent account of the manslaughter of Ian Baynham which has touched many and, as a result, we are redoubling our efforts to make contact with various groups to ensure that they do have the confidence to come forward and report crime to us so that we can prevent those horrific incidents occurring.

Burglary. The challenges for us at the moment rest within serious acquisitive crime where we have seen some increases. Burglary is still down but only by 1.5% and, as a result, Bumblebee has been given an added uplift in order to go and tackle some of those that are committing that crime.

Overall serious acquisitive crime, which includes vehicle crime and robbery, is slightly up. It is up by 2.5%. The main reasons for that are robberies and motor vehicle crime

which, for the first time in a long time, has seen an increase in theft from motor vehicles, which had been going down continuously prior to that. That has things to do with scrap metal values and a whole range of other pieces and territorial policing (TP) is on the case.

Robbery. We are revisiting our Blunt 2 initiatives and we are making sure that we maintain our commitment towards taking the weapons off the street. That is now being chaired by Maxime de Brunner as the Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC) in driving that forward.

Homicide. Since we met there has been another murder, Daniel Graham, on 29 January 2011, and for that we are deeply saddened. It does mean that we are now up to four homicides since the start of this year for young victims and it is one of those issues that we are continually focused on and endeavour to prevent.

The budget process. I will be brief because there are lots of questions later in the substantive items on the agenda. It is our intention to commence recruitment as of 14 March 2011 and we will start taking in Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) who have previously been selected on that date. We had 210 Police Community Support Officers who had passed the selection process and have been waiting for us to start recruiting again and we will now be bringing them into the service. Then we will be encouraging others from the Police Community Support Officers to apply. After that we will be looking at our new scheme involving Specials as well as PCSOs.

We have launched a counter terrorism campaign which is to raise awareness and vigilance and to re-publicise our anti terror hotline. We have had a 40% increase in calls for March 2011, compared to March 2010 when we launched it previously.

Public order. We have been busy as you all know. Protests at the Egyptian and Libyan Embassies have required us to deploy police support units (PSUs) into central London in order to respond. We have also had sporadic events involving UK Uncut and also now planning for the large Trades Union Congress (TUC) march on 26 March 2011. We are very heavily in planning with the Royal household in relation to the wedding on 29 April 2011. We have also been given an indication that we may have to also maintain a presence around a State Visit by the President of the United States.

Lots going on. Lots of good work. Pretty much the same as it was three weeks ago in performance.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you very much. We have got some written questions that have been notified, taken in order of notification. James Cleverly?

James Cleverly (AM): Are we reading our questions out?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): If you would not mind, for the camera.

James Cleverly (AM): Alongside looking into rebalancing a proportion of managerial positions to front line policing and Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs), what else can be done to reduce the amount of bureaucracy and efficiency in the Metropolitan Police Service?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): In response to that that is a large question and we have discussed it at previous Metropolitan Police Authority meetings along similar lines. We are now very imminent in starting the live link process whereby police officers will be giving evidence by video conference link to Croydon Court. Officers being at court waiting to be called and not being called, which many of them are, should free up somewhere in the region on 1,200 police days a week that can be redeployed. We are also working closely with the Crown Prosecution Service and the Court Service in streamlining forensic processes.

I could go on and on about some of this but, because this is of significant interest to you, James [Cleverly], we might put something together to give you a full briefing of all those efficiencies, all that process re-engineering and the reductions of bureaucracy that are going on. A lot of them are not our gift to give because it does rest with the Director of Public Prosecutions, for example, around case files, but we work closely with him.

James Cleverly (AM): I am pleased to see there have been moves in that direction. I have got anecdotal feedback of some of those things cutting in and I do appreciate that. The 1,200 police days additional a week will be very, very useful. If that could be quantified into the equivalent in human capital that would be a very useful metric for us to have so we can see how much these innovations equate to policing time.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That is the prize that we have to do. The test is to make sure that the interest of justice is served for that particular initiative. We have got very strong support from a senior Presiding Judge and the Judiciary and, as a result of that, within the London Criminal Justice Board arrangements, we have been asking for them to set efficiency targets around these initiatives and we can bring those back to the Authority.

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Victoria [Borwick]?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you. This concerns Sergeant Meeke. For several years there have been calls for the police to tackle the high crime on Arnos West Estate in Southgate, Green Ward, Enfield. This request was largely ignored until recently when, thanks to the work of Sergeant Meeke and her emphasis on local policing, crime has now significantly reduced in the area. Will the Acting Commissioner join me in congratulating Sergeant Kyra Meeke, who has demonstrated what can be achieved when you have a committed individual and an emphasis on local policing and responding to residents' concerns?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): With great pleasure we will join you in congratulating Sergeant Meeke. We will make sure that the Enfield Borough Commander is also aware of this being raised in this forum and passes those comments on to her. It is always pleasing to receive positive messages about Safer Neighbourhood Teams doing what they are there to do, which is to respond to the challenges that are confronting citizens in neighbourhoods, and the leadership of the sergeant in this case has assisted in reducing anti social behaviour, using some of the toolkits that are there, in dispersal orders, and other engagement that has been done. I am grateful for that and we will certainly pass that through.

Victoria Borwick (AM): It was a letter that was sent in by some residents out of the blue so that was very nice and we were very pleased to congratulate them.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you. Joanne [McCartney], you wanted to say something because it is Enfield?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I did. I wanted to offer my congratulations. She has been wonderful. Can I also say that the issues down there have been very longstanding and the new council has invested in a new youth centre in the area? I know the sergeant was very persistent in lobbying for that as well. It is a combination of local authority listening and the police as well. It is evidence of very good partnership working.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thanks. Caroline [Pidgeon], you have asked a question that involves a lot of figures. Go ahead. Do you want them read out?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): What is the total budget for Safer Neighbourhood Teams for 2010/11, 2011/12, and 2012/13 broken down into various things, particularly total staff? It would be useful if that were circulated. I hoped that would have been lying before us today. I do not know if you are able to give us some of that information now?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I can. We will circulate it and I am sorry that we did not do it in advance. 2010/11 the Territorial Policing costs for Safer Neighbourhood Teams was £203 million, broken down into £193 million worth of pay, which covers both police and police community support officers, and £10 million in non-pay, which are premises' costs etc. That was ICT costs and other matters. In addition to this there are also property related revenue costs of £8.3 million and other revenue costs of £2.2 million.

The budget for 2011/12, which is still currently under construction and is yet to be confirmed, on the current assumptions that we are making, the overall budget will reduce by £4.5 million to £198.5 million, of which £189 million will be pay and £9.5 million will be non-pay.

Budgets for 2012/13. Much to be done in relation to building those budgets, as I am sure you are aware. In our current projections we see that the overall budget for Safer Neighbourhoods will reduce by a further £4.5 million to £194 million. That is very much an issue of debate that will be with either this Authority or whatever replaces this Authority.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Those reductions in pay, are those your current budgeting proposals to reduce the number of sergeants and Safer Neighbourhood Teams or were there other staffing reductions in there?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): It is the 100 sergeants for 2011/12 and the 200 sergeants in 2012/13 which are in the current medium term financial plan.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I look forward to getting that all in writing. I have scribbled down a bit.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I will make sure is circulated, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Next question?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My next question is on the Diamond Districts initiative. What are your future plans for the work currently being carried out as part of the Diamond Districts initiative? What provision is there within the budget for the next two years for this work?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): As you know, Diamond was an initiative that we established in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and, for us, is a very high priority in trying to break the cycle of the revolving door of crime for those who are short sentence prisoners predominantly with chaotic lifestyles.

The Diamond initiative, which has now been running for nearly two years, has been evaluated by a panel of experts and criminologists as we still await the comprehensive evaluation that has come out. As a result it ceases on 31 March 2011 in the work that has been undertaken and a lot of learning has come out through that process. A lot of the integrated offender management, which will be a core issue for us as the Metropolitan Police Service going forward over the next few years, will be built into the operating model of some of the Safer Neighbourhood programmes where there is a lot that can be done locally from that learning.

Equally, we have now had an approach from the Ministry of Justice, literally last week, about having another debate about the future of the Diamond Districts and whether that can be maintained going forward into the next financial year. The meeting, as I

understand it, by the senior officials from the Ministry of Justice, is now taking place with us today and I await the outcome.

What I will do is let you know what that is. It is my hope that it will be part of the pay by results in some of the financial incentive models that the Ministry of Justice is currently proposing. The previous financial incentive models were very complex and complicated and, as a result of that, high risk for local authorities, this Authority or the Mayor, depending upon future governance arrangements, to take. As a result of that we have asked it to rethink it, which is why it is coming back to talk to us again.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I look forward to getting the full evaluation around Diamond Districts. I have heard, anecdotally, that, in terms of the cost of how you have implemented it, there may be other providers that could have done similar things that are cheaper. I recently went to visit a project in the Oval area where they do a lot of work with reoffending and the cost of it was very, very cheap. Indeed, I sent the information about this particular charity to the Chairman as well so he was aware of it. It struck me that, if we cannot do it as it is, and the money is going to run out, can we use voluntary sector and other bodies to help us with that at a reduced cost but still trying to pick off the best bits that have, hopefully, proven to have worked.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I agree with that. Equally, one size often does not fit all and there are different things in different locations. That is all part of the ongoing debate that we have. The Safer Neighbourhood programme roll out was about engagement with communities where you would work with communities to resolve problems. We have already heard about working with local authorities.

Additionally, there are some where some communities feel a little bit afeared of becoming too closely associated with police officers because of the nature of some of the other people that live there. One of the biggest benefits we have had in the Diamond initiative significantly contributed by police officers has been changing the relationship within those communities with the police as a result. It is not that they are there just to nick people and lock them up all the time; it is to try to resolve some of the underpinning problems that involve individuals. There are other paybacks and value that we need to assess as well. That will be part of the evaluation that we will bring back here.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Your final question?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My final question. I have got another one but I will do that at the end because I did not submit it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. I will put you on the list.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Are decisions about the structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, the levels of supervision and the numbers of officers and PCSOs, an operational matter?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I want to follow up on this question.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We are doing follow ups at the end. We have not got many written questions to get through so we will get through them and then we will have a free for all.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Chairman, I have got a very similar question from Joanne [McCartney] and it would be helpful if I could answer the two together. Will the directly elected Police Commissioner be able to direct the police numbers? That is very similar.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Was that a written question?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I sent it in late. It was past the deadline. I did, out of courtesy, send it to Tim [Godwin] so that he could have sight of it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right. If it is the same question.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): If I can try to answer them both together. Much debate has happened here on many occasions about what does constabulary independence mean. One of the key things that is going to be coming up in the Transition Forum, that was mentioned previously by the Chairman in the Bill going through Parliament and setting up new governance arrangements, is what is meant by operational independence, which is being enshrined within that Bill and, hopefully, at some point, Act. Again, how do you then define it?

The issue for us is that the direction and control of the men and women of the Metropolitan Police Service rests with the Commissioner of the police and the conduct, use and deployment of those officers and police staff is a matter for a Commissioner.

In terms of something like the PCSOs, there are no clear demarcations on some of this. As you know, we invented Safer Neighbourhoods here in London. We were passionate about it, as the Police Service and the Metropolitan Police Service. In order to facilitate that it was a negotiation with the Mayor and the Home Office in order to deliver it. Something as important as that which needs the funding for that you do have to go through that process and, as a result, the Metropolitan Police Authority was an integral part of the delivery of Safer Neighbourhoods and the empowerment to do so.

Paul [Stephenson] [Commissioner] has mentioned this on many occasions. Something like this is something that would naturally have to be negotiated with the Police Authority or whomever replaces it, either to do away with it, to change it or to increase it. It is very hard to answer who owns what bit. We collectively own it. The one thing categorically though is the direction and control, the conduct and use, and the deployment is a matter for the Commissioner. Something like Safer Neighbourhoods would be something that is negotiated here and whatever replaces this.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): It sounds like you are saying the numbers of officers you would put out in a certain area you see as a matter for the Metropolitan Police Service in direction and control, rather than a matter for the MPA or the Mayor in what follows.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): What I am saying is, in terms of decisions like that, it would be a foolish Commissioner or a foolish Acting Commissioner not to go through the process of engaging the Authority about those and coming to joint conclusions, as has been done about Safer Neighbourhoods. Safer Neighbourhoods is an example of where those negotiations take place and then the decisions are taken as a collective because, without the support of the Police Authority and without the support of whatever replaces the Police Authority in the Mayor as Police Crime Commissioner, then it would not take place. We do need that investment, we do need that commitment and I see that as part of the relationship between a governance scrutiny strategy priority meets direct control. Often these areas will be grey areas as opposed to hard and fast boundary lines. That is where the maturity of us as organisations is the key for moving forward in the future.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. The Diamond Districts looks to be a fantastic project and I hope you get the funding. It is very important to try to quantify all the unquantifiable things about the lowered stress of the victims that will not happen. I am sure you are up on all that.

I have a question on the CS spray that was used. Are you satisfied that the use of CS spray against a protestor in Oxford Street on 30 January 2011 was both necessary and proportionate and are you concerned that this may set a precedent?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Thank you for that. I know we had a conversation about CS spray. That particular incident was part of an officer's training in use of personal protection equipment. It is very clear that an individual is accountable for their use and it has to be used on the basis of an officer's honestly held belief that the force used would be proportionate to the perceived threat against the officer or another person. That is why the officer, as I understand it, used their spray; because they felt that threat. I do not see that it sets any precedent other than that is why they have it, which is if they feel threatened and they feel the need to use it they have to account for it later. That is what was done.

Jenny Jones (AM): It was quite a rare event and I would not like there to be any feeling that it is an acceptable to do except in extreme - for example, in the briefing that you sent, it does describe the officer seemed to be under attack and kicked and so on. I am curious about why there were not more arrests because that is out of order.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): It was as a result of going to make an arrest and then getting separated. There may be a complaint pending at some point. An

officer has got personal protection equipment. When they feel threatened and it is necessary to use it, then they will use it, and that is what was done on this occasion.

Jenny Jones (AM): This briefing that you sent to us, is that something we can use publicly or not? I am never quite sure. It says N on it. I do not know what that stands for.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That is a restricted briefing for you. It may well be that there are still outstanding matters in relation to *sub judice* process and, equally, a later complaint.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I went to try to use that Boots about 15 minutes after it happened, because it is my local Boots. When I walked past I just thought everybody had got a bit upset! I should not laugh really but there were people crying --

Jenny Jones (AM): You thought they were emotional.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- and it did not seem to be quite the tumultuous event that everybody then portrayed in the press 15 minutes later. Anyway, I had to go to another Boots!

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): To suggest we are going to use CS as a means of controlling protests? No. They are personal protection equipment that is being used to protect an officer. Of course it is a decision you take not lightly because you do get it as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The officer sprayed himself didn't he?

Toby Harris (AM): Chairman, there is a request in to provide us with a list of the items you were buying --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Of the items I was attempting to purchase! I thought that might open that particular Pandora's box!

Jenny Jones (AM): Only in your capacity as Chairman of this body!

James Cleverly (AM): Only if they were subsequently used on police business!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): What was I doing there?! Had I notified the Link Member?! Jenny [Jones], next question?

Jenny Jones (AM): My second question is about the PCSOs and traffic wardens that we are losing. Can you explain what the replacement of PCSOs and traffic wardens with officers in the Safer Transport Command will mean for roads policing and enforcement? When I say enforcement it is about the red routes. This third question was part of the second question. Police officers cannot do enforcement on the red routes but, as far as I

know, you are contracted to Transport for London (TfL) for 210 personnel to keep the red routes clear. Does that contract still stand and do you still have to do it, because it is going to be difficult without traffic wardens and PCSOs?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): We will still have traffic PCSOs within the Safer Transport Command. The 2010/11 contract with TfL to provide the Safer Transport Command includes 210 traffic warden posts. Those 210 traffic warden posts will be going but will be replaced by traffic PCSOs and by police officers. Traffic warden PCSOs have the same powers as a traffic warden and more besides, which means that they can tackle things such as cycling on the pavement, bylaw offences and other nuisance and anti-social behaviour offences and therefore they have a wider range of powers that they can deploy to enforce red routes and, at the same time, protection.

We are currently reviewing the service delivery model for roads policing and enforcement activity with our TfL colleagues. They are very content with the revised model. The traffic PCSOs can do the same as traffic wardens in enforcement on red routes.

Jenny Jones (AM): At more cost. You are still contracted to put 210 personnel in, some of whom will be police officers because the PCSOs will need supervision?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): No. The numbers in total feet will fall but they will be getting people with more powers than the traffic wardens have at present. That is the negotiation with TfL that we have been having, which it is content with and is agreeing to. That will mean that it will be able to enforce other things such as safety and nuisance and it will be able to intervene in disputes. One of the key objectives that was set for us by this Authority was about safety on the transport network, which is what these individuals will be doing, and the Safer Transport Command is safe and will continue.

Jenny Jones (AM): Sorry, Chairman, I have two more questions on this. This is going to cost more isn't it?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): No.

Jenny Jones (AM): It is not going to cost more? So that is a commitment; it will not cost more?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): The amount of money that is being paid by TfL will be slightly less than previous years in terms of the deal with TfL. It will be for police and traffic Police Community Support Officers.

The point you are making is will there be the same number of pairs of feet, ie people, in the Safer Transport Command at the end of that process? The answer to that is, no, there will not. There will be - I have not got all the data here - about 89 fewer in numbers of people. The people that will be deployed, such as police officers and traffic PCSOs, have

a range of powers that they can bring which is felt worthwhile by Transport for London and ourselves.

Jenny Jones (AM): If you have 89 fewer people that are doing more jobs then keeping the red routes open will have less activity. You need to keep those red routes open for TfL. That is the whole point of that command. How are you going to do that if you have got a third fewer and, at the same time, they are doing lots of different things?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Do not forget the traffic PCSOs have already been there as well. It is more in the Safer Transport Command than the 210 traffic wardens. That is a matter of negotiation between us and TfL. The requirements for keeping the red routes open which makes it a Section 90 whatever it is agreement still exist. We will still have accountability against the service provision and we are satisfied that the assets that we have will enable us to do that.

Jenny Jones (AM): Anne [McMeel] has just given you a note. It is very difficult to defend traffic wardens because they are not very well liked generally but, at the same time, they have been doing a lot more than just ticketing cars. They have been incredibly valuable. I am very concerned that TfL is not going to ...

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): The traffic warden service has been here for 50 years and has often been, in the history of London, the unsung heroes of road safety by stopping people parking on zebra crossings, by stopping people clogging up route networks so that people then do silly things in cars and motorbikes, and yet get much maligned. That is wrong because they are doing a service to London.

The traffic warden service itself, when the Police Community Support Officers came along as a new entity within the policing family, then became less effective in that traffic warden Police Community Support Officers had these additional powers to do other things whilst they are patrolling those routes as well. As a result the transition was from traffic warden to TP (Territorial Policing) CSO. Many of the good people that are in the traffic warden service, we hope, will be able, through the budget settlement that we have, to join the TP CSOs and so will gain those additional powers and still be part of the team.

Jenny Jones (AM): Will they need extra training? They will, obviously.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes. I have another question which is about youth services. I am happy to take a written answer on that if it can be a fairly full written answer. I am very concerned that we are perhaps not putting enough into this. Thanks.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We will do that. Right. That is all the written questions done. I have got a list of Members that signalled. Valerie Shawcross?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you very much. I can appreciate, Acting Commissioner, that there is a lot of very positive news in your report but I hope you will forgive me if I highlight the thing that is of real concern, certainly in my area, which is the rise in knife crime, up by 4.9%, 454 more offences compared to the same period last year. Can we talk about that for a minute because it is serious and significant? In particular I would be quite interested to hear what you have to say about detection and how that is going and if there is a similar upward shift. I noticed elsewhere in the report you do say something along the lines of the key to tackling serious youth violence is prevention. That refers back to Jenny's [Jones] point that all the other partners involved in youth work are really important. One of the key issues of prevention is detection and the key deterrent is that people think they will be caught. I would like to know how those figures are matching up and what the challenges are?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): One of the key challenges which is linked to the knife crime increase is the increase in robbery. Robbery is up 7.4%. If you run through that it is looking as though it will rise to about 9%. One of the things that we know from our history here is once that takes hold it is very hard then to bring it back.

We have the Blunt 2 operation. The reductions that we were seeing in weaponry on the streets had relaxed in the sense of fewer operations in relation to Blunt 2 deployment for the Section 60s in those high hot spot areas. That is now being put back in.

Territorial Policing has had a look at the offender make up in those robberies which are often intimidated knives. "I have got a knife". That is a knife crime. It does not actually have to be seen to be recorded as a knife crime. We do know that somewhere in the region of 130 individuals are probably responsible for about 960 robberies. Often they are very, very young. There is an issue there for us that we need to address, with partners, as to how do we tackle that particular event.

Detection rates and arrest rates are now increasing because TP is alive to this threat and has responded to it. The key question I am still waiting the answer for - because that is the real nub of an issue; using detection as a deterrent - is what happened to them in the process? It is all well and good us charging them but what happened? Were they convicted? Did it get discontinued? Because that relies on court results I am still waiting for that but we can make that available to you as and when I get those results.

For us it is about relearning those lessons. It is about having the deployment in those locations. It is knowing who the offenders are. Often Safer Neighbourhood Teams do know who the offenders are.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Absolutely.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): It is then about working a) to disrupt them and b) to capture them and hold them to account for their activity. The main emphasis will be on those prolific offenders that we need to deal with.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Generally speaking, broadly, what is the proportion of these crimes that do get detected? The clear up rate.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): At the moment, in the detection rate, it is about 20%. One of the things that you do find, especially with young people, is the reluctance to stand the test of the process in terms of the fear as a witness and taking it forward. There are issues there about maintaining the system to keep them going through it. One of the keys is making the arrest very quickly, catching it very quickly and making it go to court very quickly, which is what we are working with our criminal justice partners to try to deliver. That was the learning from the street crime initiative many moons ago that and the lessons are still true today; to make sure that we put those things in place and not have to relearn them again. That is what we are working within TP to do.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The delay is now a very major issue, particularly at this level. As an example, I witnessed an incident at Christmas and I got a letter yesterday saying it is not coming to trial until 22 April 2011 which has serious consequences in maintaining witnesses and time involved right through to coming to some kind of conclusion.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Do you think the rise in robberies is just simply the recession?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I would not like to say. If we put our assets against other priorities and move off and we vacate space then people will occupy it. We have to take that space back. That is the tension --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): A constant dynamic.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): -- that is always going on in London, which is why you have got to have eyes in the back of your head and to react.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you. Thank you, Acting Commissioner, for your report. It is related to a series of questions raised by Caroline [Pidgeon] on Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Yesterday, in answer to questions regarding what the Mayor called the new geometry of Safer Neighbourhood Teams - but what I would call the cuts of 100 sergeants from 2011/12 and the 200 the following year - I wrote it at the time, the Mayor said, "Only experienced sergeants would be tasked with the leadership or supervision of two or more Safer Neighbourhood Teams". Can you tell me whether there is an agreed definition that would cover the roles and responsibilities, competencies, training and time spent in the service that would constitute an experienced sergeant? If you have not got it with you today I would be happy to get it in writing. If there is such a group of people

then how many do you have working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams? Again, I am happy to get a written response.

The other thing that arose last night was a discussion about this possible reorganisation of Safer Neighbourhood Teams that you are planning was people felt that the consistency that they had had was from the sergeants. I cannot say all the sergeants are the same as Sergeant Meeke because she is fabulous but a majority of them would be in that mould. They felt they had consistency from that sergeant who had stayed with them over their tenure and they had consistency from PCSOs. They felt that police constables (PCs) had stayed, on average, about a year because of their training. There is no criticism. They knew where they wanted to go. I want some information about the tenure that you will information on; how long sergeants have stayed in teams and PCs and PCSOs? Again, you will not have that today so I could receive that in writing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thanks for that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): A very long list that I have not come prepared for other than to say that there is a set of criteria which we judge Safer Neighbourhood sergeants against and the training requirements that they then have in order to fulfil that role.

In terms of experience, that is not something that has cropped up in that sense before. Naturally there will be a selection process in which ones are going to take on the bigger teams in the future. I will make sure that TP inform you of what those criteria will be as to how it is going to make that selection. We have currently got 636 sergeants in Safer Neighbourhood Teams. To do the breakdown of what backgrounds they have got would be a bit tricky for me here and now.

In terms of consistency, we did try to make it a two year tenure for officers. One of the reasons we created the role of Police Community Support Officers was - I remember writing the job description so I know we did that - to have a police family member who was going to be there and not be driven to do all the other things that police officers have to do. To be present. Police Community Support Officers will be staying within the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and there are no plans to reduce those.

In terms of every neighbourhood having a sergeant, they still will have. It is just that that sergeant might have more citizens than they had before in their area. I am hoping that those sergeants will still have that availability and accessibility. This is about reducing management on costs which, in the current fiscal climate, is something that we are all having to do.

Jennette Arnold (AM): A follow up. From your answer then it is a done deal. You are not waiting for the outcome of the review? You have already started planning and developing criteria about this reorganisation?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): You called it a reorganisation. This is a management on cost reduction. As I mentioned earlier about the budgets, the 2012/13 budget is still very much at the moment work in progress. Assumptions. If the review were to come back with something totally different then we would have to go back and rethink what the gap is.

We are committed to Safer Neighbourhood Teams. As Sir Paul Stephenson said before, - and I would echo - it will take some significant convincing to move away from the models that we have put in place. If that is what the review does we will look at what the review says. The only thing that we have got at the moment is the 100 reduction in police sergeants for the next financial year as part of the management reductions which are perceived to be - and I believe - in line with what is coming out of the review in any event.

Jennette Arnold (AM): In your guidance to boroughs, as you move forward, will you be using this term experience? There is a difference, surely, between an experienced sergeant and a sergeant who is newly promoted and newly appointed? If the Mayor is using it and it has a specific meaning - experience - have you agreed with him that this is what will happen; an experienced sergeant will have two or more teams? This gives a different feel to this whole debate and it may well be something that we can move on.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): In terms of criteria I will come back to you on what TP is thinking about.

Have I had, personally, any debate about what those sergeants look like in those decisions with the Mayor? No, I have not.

In terms of what experience means, it can mean a whole range of different things. If you have got someone who is newly promoted but has been a police constable on a Safer Neighbourhood Team, is very well liked and knows what is going on, why can't they be the sergeant? They are newly promoted but they are very experienced. Rather than have the debate here, what I need to do is go away and ask TP to brief you on what the criteria will be as to how it select the sergeants and, out of the 636, which ones will have the bigger teams.

As I said in answer to Caroline's [Pidgeon] question, it is absolutely vitally important with this one that we maintain our communication with the Authority as to what we are doing. It is one of our key success stories in London, in my view; building confidence. To think we have got the highest confidence rate in any of the urban areas in the police from our citizens is definitely coming through the Safer Neighbourhood Team programme. We would be very foolish to mess about with that too much.

Jennette Arnold (AM): How do we bring transparency to our citizens about any development? That is as important.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That is through SOP and various others. We will make sure we comply with that and keep everyone informed of what we are doing.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you. Steve [O'Connell]?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you very much. Coming back to add to Caroline's [Pidgeon] question around Diamond Districts that we were talking about earlier. It would be useful to hear your thoughts, Acting Commissioner, around a good initiative which is the recent initiative coming out of the Ministry of Justice (MOJ). There are two national pilots - one pilot is Greater Manchester and another pilot is Lewisham with Croydon - around a payment by results scheme. The partnership, be it the MOJ, probation, police, council - and in our instance High Down Prison - work together to reduce reoffending and acknowledge that offending does produce a significant cost across society and across boroughs. We all know a reduction in reoffending does have good social results and good monetary results.

Would you not agree with me that this new scheme - which I was delighted to launch at Cabinet on Monday night - will reduce, hopefully, reoffending and also significantly give a share of the financial reductions in reoffending back to those pilot councils and those other councils that will join in the scheme?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Without knowing exactly what the pay by results piece is with Lewisham and Croydon - and that is my fault; I should know. We have been making the case in London, with the support of the Authority, for quite some time about the term justice reinvestment. We have got somewhere in the region of 14,000 to 16,000 - and it varies as to the numbers of course - being released every year from a short sentence in prison. Somewhere in the region of 60% to 72% of them will reoffend in the first year and then go back to prison. That is a revolving door of about £120 million worth of spend. Anything that we can do to break that cycle must be a) economic good sense and b) the right thing to do. Hence we invested in the Diamond initiative.

One of the issues, as budgets are being cut, is it is quite difficult to get that financial incentive model up because they have to get guarantees not just about the number of people going back to prison, which is where we got our figure from, but how many people go to court etc etc. You have got to take those costs out.

One of the challenges for Diamond was that, because the contact between these offenders on release was with the police, a lot were being arrested for possession of Class A drugs. Whilst there were fewer victim crimes they were still being arrested. The costs are still in the system. That is the reason for the debate today about how do you get that investment out? I know that, as a result of that debate, hopefully your incentivisation model is being restructured. I know the Ministry of Justice is very alive to it. Equally, it does not want

to create any perverse incentives whereby, to achieve the money, you do not arrest the offender. There are other risks that are in here. That is why we are still negotiating with the Ministry of Justice what it looks like.

We do support your ambition. I, personally, support your ambition in tackling that revolving door to try to take the money out of the system and reduce crime.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thanks. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have three issues I want to raise if I may. The first is related to the question of what is operational policing or not. Tim [Godwin], the police have been very consistent in this; you have always maintained that you take control of the direction, control and deployment of officers. We had a chance to question the Mayor yesterday about this issue and some recent statements that had been made about the make up of Safer Neighbourhood Teams. The Mayor, although not saying that he had operational control, said that he had a political imperative. Is that something that you recognised in policing terms as affecting your judgements?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): There are certain things. Whether they are political imperatives or Mayoral priorities. As we have experienced here within the Police Authority, the responsibility for the policing plan is the Police Authority's in setting what the priorities are for the Metropolitan Police Service to deliver. We have a very full and active dialogue in what those priorities might be and what we perceive the threat and risk to London is from crime and disorder and harm. We have that negotiation and that debate and then the targets are set.

Likewise, as I mentioned in answer to Caroline [Pidgeon], if you are asking for a specific investment to maintain a specific piece of policing, that must be a negotiation with either the Police Authority or the Mayor in gaining that funding, which is why when the strategic priority meets operational deployment there is this grey area that goes within it, which has to be a negotiation.

Picking up the point. It is an issue of concern for us if we are going to tackle the change in governance through the Bill that is going to be passed. Whatever Parliament decides is it. Parliament will make those decisions. There does need to be clarity so that we constantly do not have debilitating conversations about whose decision is it. We need to clear up as best we can. A lot of people have tried to define operation independence which includes **Patten(?)** in relation to Northern Ireland. It was very difficult for them to define what it was because there is lots of *jurisprudence*. It is often about interpretation of specific events.

What we do know is that, within the Transition Board, there is a requirement to set up a Memorandum of Understanding about the tripartite role. What is the role of the Home Office? What is the role of the Police Chief? What is the role of the **Press Complaints Commission (PCC)(?)**? That is for national empowerment and change as we go forward. Within that we are making the case - that is the Chief Police Officers and us as

the Metropolitan Police Service - that if you cannot define something you can define when it is not. For example, the Theft Act found it very difficult to define dishonesty so it said when it would not be, ie when the person believes they have a right in law to it, where they honestly believe the other person would have consented to them taking it or where they took reasonable steps to find the owner. As a result of that, we are making a draft clarifying what we understand it to be using that same principle, which we will take to the Transition Board. We will share it with whatever forum is here in the transitional arrangements. This is going to be an ongoing long term debate, rather than one purely for (inaudible). That would not do it justice.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I look forward to hearing some clarity throughout that process.

This relates to an interview that the Chairman gave to the Politics Show on 10 February 2011. Chairman, if you feel that you want to comment please do. The Chairman was asked in that interview, "How can you and the Mayor guarantee Safer Neighbourhood Teams will remain in every ward?" and the Chairman replied that it was not an operational policing matter. Our Chairman was asked, "Are you giving the guarantee that in each of the 630 wards there will remain two uniformed police officers and three Police Community Support Officers?" to which our Chairman replied, "Yes". Our Chairman went on to say, "In some wards there are six PCSOs and they are protected too".

We questioned the Mayor on this yesterday and the Mayor said this was what your scrutiny was finding as well. If they are guaranteed, and our Chairman has said that they are guaranteed, then is that a decision you have come to and the finding have not been shared with us yet?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the review we await the final outcome of that and then we will do it.

On where we sit on this the real issue will be when we violently disagree about something and it is about the rules of operation independence and what that means in directional control. When you find yourself very supportive of the Safer Neighbourhood programme, because we did invent it, we are passionately committed to it, as I said to Caroline [Pidgeon], we did have to negotiate very closely with the then Mayor in order to secure the funding to establish it. Life is a negotiation in securing the funding to make it happen.

Things like extraction, deployments on May Days, protests and all those things are operational deployment issues which are matters for the Commissioner of the police. The other piece around it is the directional control, the combat and use of those officers is definitely a matter for us. In finding ourselves violently agreeing that we want to retain the neighbourhood policing footprint that we have, unless there is compelling evidence - and it would have to be compelling evidence - that may come from the review, then that

is where we are at at this moment in time. Picking up Jennette's [Arnold] point, we await any counter evidence to that effect.

Sometimes in the debate we forget that it is not about the amount of crime; it is about the perception of risk. That is the key thing that I am waiting to see myself what the review finds about that.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I agree with the Chairman on this one. Our Chairman has given a guarantee that each ward is going to have two uniformed police officers and three Police Community Support Officers. That is before the review has come back. Are you giving that guarantee now too, or not?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): You can never say never. As we stand at the moment, as the person who implements the Safer Neighbourhoods, was the lead for the national reassurance project with the Government of the day to win the assets to do it, I am passionately committed to the neighbourhood policing piece. I am also alive to the fact that things might have to change based on evidence. We await the review and we await those findings. Anything that does come out will be negotiated through this body or whatever replaces it. That is certainly the Chairman's guarantee and it is probably best that we ask him. For me, we are, as the Metropolitan Police Service, committed to Safer Neighbourhoods.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Did you want to comment, Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The Mayor has told me that is what he wants to happen and that is what he is willing to pay for. He has now agreed to pay for that. That is what is in the budget and that is what has been negotiated.

Joanne McCartney (AM): When you went on the Politics Show and you gave the guarantee that there would be two police constables (PCs) and three PCSOs in every ward, that is a guarantee you expect the police to honour?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is what is in the budget. Yes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): What happens if the review comes up with something different?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): They would have to come and talk to the Mayor about that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): For us, as we have said all along, and certainly checking out where it is at from the **Assistant Commissioner (AC)(?)** TP, it would have to be very compelling things which change, which are locally agreed, and flexible. For that we need to see that compelling evidence in order to do it.

Do we think the directional control of police officers is an operational matter? Yes, it is. That is one for us.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have two other issues but if you want to put questioning on this I am more than happy to come back in a minute.

Clive Lawton (AM): I did not know that such a guarantee had been given. I have spent considerable hours in a scrutiny group considering Safer Neighbourhoods. One of the things that became clear, to me anyway, and we are producing a report, was that, while the general model seemed pretty robust and should be maintained, there may be situations in which those things may be locally negotiated and discussed and resolved.

I am totally astonished that anybody would deliver a guarantee on numbers across London. I understand what you say about it is in the budget. That is a neat piece of planning and contingency. That is quite different to guaranteeing specific numbers ward by ward. I am amazed. If that had been known and had been in the mind of the Mayor from the beginning it would have saved us all a huge amount of time and bother and money not to go through a scrutiny, let alone a TP review, and we could all pack up and go home on this.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, because the findings of the scrutiny were emerging at the time and I was aware of them but, at the same time, that is what the Mayor said and my job, as his appointee, is to negotiate the outcome that he wants. That is what we have done in the budget. It does not necessarily mean he should not look at it or that will not inform the Mayor's decisions next year or the year after or whatever it may be. That was the wish and that is what we delivered through the budget.

I understand Members want to press on this operational versus non-operational but, as I said at SOP, there are some decisions that are both. It is not black and white. The style about policing and the resources that policing gets is a negotiation with the Mayor. It was to put in, as the Acting Commissioner said, Safer Neighbourhoods and it would be to make any amendment to it as well. His voice and money dictates, to a certain extent, what we do.

Clive Lawton (AM): I am sorry, Chairman. Articulating an enthusiastic commitment to. Being passionately determined to ensure that. All of those kinds of things I would recognise and I would applaud and I would agree with. To guarantee specific numbers - two uniformed officers, three PCSOs, where there are six there will be six and so on - simply makes a nonsense of any scrutiny process. I do not know how closely the Mayor has followed through the process of scrutiny, how carefully he has read the papers and whether he has looked at the evidence and so on, but to have a scrutiny team discussing this at every level with everybody involved and attempt to come up with measured conclusions and the Mayor simply to say, "That's all very well and I don't know what they know but I'm guaranteeing".

There is a huge difference between guaranteeing and wanting to maintain the things that Tim [Godwin] has much more carefully said about being passionately committed to, which I am pleased to hear. I find such a guarantee, especially at a time of budget constraints, to be bizarre.

Tony Arbour (AM): That is the Mayor's risk.

Clive Lawton (AM): A view is one thing. A guarantee is something else.

Victoria Borwick (AM): The problem is one is a political decision.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I note your view. John [Biggs]? Sorry, have you finished, Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I had two other issues but if it is on this issue.

John Biggs (AM): I am tempted not to. It seems to me that the guarantee then, if there is a guarantee, is that the cut will not exceed in the next year 16%. That is a very interesting guarantee from the Mayor. Joanne [McCartney] had two other questions.

Joanne McCartney (AM): My second question was about the reduction in the total headcount of Safer Transport teams because you are proposing to cut all PCSO posts but invest in PCs, but there will be headcount loss of 32. I want to know how that will affect the service to schools. Will some have to share officers? Will there be a reduced service to some schools?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Safer Schools came out of London. It came out on the back of the tragedy of the murder of Damilola Taylor. As a result of that the Safer Schools programme was something we committed to and we have invested in. One of the things that has become very apparent is that the neighbourhood teams and their linkages with schools is equally as important as the dedicated individual. As a result TP has been conducting within its overall review as to how those schools partnerships will be continued. That work has yet to be finished, albeit that a number of police officers will be going back into schools. We will increase the number of police officers in schools but reduce PCSOs. There is, as you say, a small difference in numbers. That will be picked up through the neighbourhood programme and we can make sure that we bring that back here as to what the plans are for TP in Safer Schools partnerships.

Joanne McCartney (AM): That would be useful. When you are negotiating with schools, or if there are reductions, could you let Link Members know as well, with regard to their areas?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I will ensure that is done. We have gained a lot of benefit out of the Safer Schools partnerships and the programmes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): My third question is on the *New of the World* issue. Thank you for your list of meetings that you sent through early last week. Can I clarify? The list of meetings you sent was for senior officers whose purpose was specifically to meet the News of the World but at the meeting you agreed that you would hand over details of formal or informal meetings with officers on the investigating team. Can we expect some further details to come forward when they are available?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): We were talking to the Chairman about that. Some of the stuff is easier than others in diaries --

Joanne McCartney (AM): I appreciate that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Senior officers' diaries. We are going back quite a long time here in being able to access that data. There are levels below which we do not have that stuff available. I will look at that, as to what we can provide. The key point that we picked up here was the openness and transparency about whom we are meeting and who we are talking to which is for the senior officer end of the market, which we have done. That was a specific request purely for the *News of the World*. Senior officers such as the Commissioner speak to a whole breadth of individuals, opinion formers, Ministers etc. It is a bit dangerous to take it purely in isolation.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Looking at the list, one of the things is it looks like senior officers dining with the *News of the World's* Deputy Editor, for example, in the same month that one of the paper's reporters had been arrested and there was an ongoing investigation. The police were still trying to investigate whether journalist executives were involved in the phone hacking issues at the time. Looking at that, are you going to review whether this is an appropriate practice and whether there are any lessons to be learned from this in the future? It does seem to be extraordinary that officers were dealing with executives when junior reporters had been arrested just days prior.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I am not going to go into the individual meetings because I was not there so I cannot answer that. What I can say is that if you are the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service one of the significant constitutional freedoms that we enjoy as citizens of the United Kingdom is a free press, and a free press does need some information in order to fulfil its function and it does need to have conversations about matters that are often taken out of context. There will be meetings between the Commissioner and editors of all media outlets as well as there are for Ministers of the Crown and a whole range of other people.

The one thing I can guarantee is that Sir Paul Stephenson is very alive to the needs of *sub judice* and for confidentiality and I have no doubt that there would have been no conversation about that and, equally, the other individuals there would have been not party to it. There are very strict rules about that and Sir Paul [Stephenson] would not, in any way, have breached them.

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

Dee Doocey (AM): It is on the same topic. I was wondering if you could perhaps explain the thinking behind these meetings, which are actually dinners rather than meetings according to the list we have got, and whether they had been discussed at Management Board or whether they had been discussed with the officers who were investigating? I totally accept that the police will need to have discussions with a range of people, of course, in order to do its job.

What I find quite extraordinary is the fact that, during a time when this newspaper was being investigated, the Commissioner of Police had so many dinners with the newspaper. I cannot imagine a situation where a member of the public who was being investigated by the Metropolitan Police Service wrote to Sir Paul [Stephenson] and said, "I would like to meet with you. Will you come to dinner?" and he would say yes. His instinct would be, "I do not think it would be appropriate". I think it is, at the very least, a serious error of judgement.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Sometimes when we in the Metropolitan Police Service have people who are under investigation for crimes people will still come and talk to me. Likewise - I do not want to be provocative - Members of Parliament recently. Some of them have stood trial having been arrested for various offences. That would not stop us meeting with politicians and meeting with senior members of various parties even though people are being arrested. It does not naturally follow that you cannot talk to a hierarchy if someone within an organisation has committed an offence.

I hear what you say but, equally, you have still got to keep the business going in connectivity and contact. The Commissioner does have to make sure that the police views are heard and put into context. Often we do suffer from taken out of context pieces of information that we can clear up when having a debate. The Commissioner has regular meetings with a whole range of editors but, importantly, Chief Executives of local authorities, Leaders of local authorities, Ministers, faith leaders, various forum groups and all the rest of it. That is part of the Commissioner's role; being there, being accessible, being accountable and explaining what we do.

Dee Doocey (AM): I am assuming from that you are saying it was not discussed at either Management Board or with the investigating officers before the Commissioner decided to

--

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I cannot comment on that at that point.

Dee Doocey (AM): You do not know. OK. Fine. You could perhaps let me know.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I am not sure why it would be. As I say, the issue in terms of the investigation certainly would not have been discussed.

Dee Doocey (AM): Just for the avoidance of doubt, I do not think that anyone who is under investigation by the police should be meeting the Chief of Police for dinners. I think it is wrong, fundamentally.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I have got to confirm that but I cannot imagine that anybody that was at that dinner was under investigation.

Dee Doocey (AM): I still think if an organisation is under - we have a difference of opinion.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): If a person was under investigation and suspected of committing a crime, then we would not be having dinners. The bit around that is you are --

Dee Doocey (AM): If the organisation is under investigation?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): It is very rare that an organisation is under investigation as an organisation. It is about individual acts. As I said before, I have police officers who are under investigation. It does not mean that the Metropolitan Police Service itself is under investigation; those officers are under investigation.

Dee Doocey (AM): Indeed. I think it is totally wrong for you to be meeting with politicians who are under investigation. To me, this issue is black and white.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I did not say that we would be meeting with politicians who are under investigation --

Dee Doocey (AM): You said you had done.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): We would be meeting with their leadership and their management structure. We would be meeting with both opposition Ministers and current Ministers, even though Members of their party were under investigation. Do not forget the two individuals that were prosecuted were not at those dinners.

Dee Doocey (AM): No, I understand that. I still have a real reservation. I do think it is an astonishing lack of judgement.

Could I ask, finally, if it would be possible also to have a list of any senior executives that the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner, or indeed any of the senior team, had with News International? I do not want it now. I wonder if you could send it to me?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Again, with the caveat that this is going back quite some time, diaries etc --

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. Between 2006 and 2011 would be very helpful.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): We have absolutely - and I certainly can speak for Paul [Stephenson] - nothing to hide.

Dee Doocey (AM): Good. Excellent. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): John [Biggs]? Sorry, I thought you had had your question.

John Biggs (AM): No, Chairman. There are a couple of substantive questions I wanted to ask. One of them, hopefully, can be disposed with in writing. On the back of Dee's [Doocey] questions I would like to, firstly, agree with her but, secondly, suggest that although this may involve quite a lot of work, transparency would be helped by disclosure of more information about who has met who. One could perhaps help establish whether the *News of the World* had been given favourable treatment by seeing which other editors of which other Sunday newspapers have been met on which occasions. This is an issue that is not going to go away and we will realise that. I am planting that thought.

Two questions. The first one is about traffic wardens. I was very grateful for Jenny Jones' detailed question. I have been written to by someone on behalf of traffic wardens - maybe other Members have as well - a summary of which is, "We have done good work for many years, why are we being thrown away?" One does understand that you get letters like that at a time like this but I would like to understand - and I hope this can be dealt with in writing. I do not know whether a report has gone to SOP on this matter - the thinking that lies behind the change.

I am motivated in this because the number of PCSOs and police officers is a very political issue at the moment. We understand that. The number of traffic wardens is not a particularly political issue, yet we all know that every borough council in London employs traffic wardens who have the skills which are very similar to those of police traffic wardens. I have not identified across London boroughs a need to raise the skills of those traffic wardens to turn them into *de facto* PCSOs. I am also aware that in TfL's business plan for next year it is talking about introducing parking charges on the TfL road network, which has never happened before. That will require, in my simple mind, traffic wardens to be even more like traffic wardens than they are at present because they will be checking tickets and so on.

I would like to understand the thinking that went behind that decision. That is a reasonable question and I am sure other Members might be interested in hearing that as well. We can deal with that in writing, Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. We can give you that in writing.

John Biggs (AM): The other question is about recruitment of police officers. We are all very pleased that the Mayor's budget is allowing the freeze on recruitment to be

unfrozen. The question in my mind is the pool from which that unfreezing will take place. My understanding from comments in conversations is that this will primarily be by allowing PCSOs who are on the waiting list to go through the process of becoming police constables. Of course there are many other people who went through the pre-selection and selection processes and were then told, "Sorry, mate, you can't come to Hendon. Not least because Hendon's closing but because we're not recruiting officers anymore".

The question would be whether we have got the balance right. It may be that some of those people have skills which will be very useful to the police service. Can you comment on the decisions you have taken in deciding how you are going to go ahead unfreezing recruitment? Again, from a politician's point of view - and I confess to being one of those animals - it would be very convenient for me to manage the internal workforce by converting PCSOs into police constables but, when you look at it operationally, there may be other considerations which point towards a different blend of recruitment.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): The PCSOs come from a very diverse background so they are not all the same individuals and are probably the most representative workforce we have of London itself. In recruiting from PCSOs a) we know them and b) they have lots of skills already when they come in. They are excluded from becoming Special Constables because of the difference in role; walking round with the warrant card. They cannot be part of the Special Constabulary recruitment process which we now have.

In running an organisation and getting the best public return on the investment that we have it is far better that we recruit the Police Community Support Officers that we would erstwhile be losing that are suitable to join the service, rather than pay out any redundancies in relation to PCSO number reductions.

It was agreed at this Authority we have the three routes in. One is through the PCSOs, one is through the Special Constabulary and the third is a high potential graduate entry type process. We have got 210 of our own staff waiting to come into PCSOs. They will be taken first. We will then be recruiting for PCSOs but we will also be kicking off the Special Constable recruitment process that we mentioned before.

John Biggs (AM): Someone has written to me about the 1,200 recruits who were made job offers which were then withdrawn and what their status is; whether you will be writing to them saying, "Sorry, mate, it is never going to happen", whether you are taking legal advice on this and whether there is any obligation? Many people would say they had been through their school career, decided they wanted to join the police, they had been through the panels and had an expectation to be treated reasonably fairly. What is going to happen to those people?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Most of the ones that were in the pot, I am told, were not made actual offers. That was a debate at the time. I cannot recall exactly when those letters went out in terms of the numbers that were there.

What we have done is we have encouraged a lot of those to become Special Constables and to enjoy the new recruitment process which we will be kicking off and we hope that they will be applying for that process. Part of that is that they will be accredited as capable of independent patrol and they will have the policing skills requirement which we in London provide the training for through the Special Constabulary and we will be doing it with the PCSOs. Other forces require an individual to do that before they apply, through further education establishments. They will be coming through that route.

The ones that are not in the Special Constables pot or who are not PCSOs I would suggest they apply to become a Special.

John Biggs (AM): Right. Given that I have a feeling - mistakenly or otherwise in their minds - that there are people out there who think they are on a waiting list, perhaps we should let them know that we have abolished it through Mayoral (inaudible) or whatever it is.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I am assuming they have been written to but you have raised something that concerns me so I will find out. The piece around that was invited to join the Special Constabulary. That is the new system of entry into the service, together with the PCSOs. I will find out and come back to you on that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I, too, have had some correspondence from various people about this. It might be worth us having a general note about who has been written to, what their status may be and, therefore, what the paths are that might be open to them now to come into the force.

It is worth pointing out that when recruitment is turned on there will be a rise now in actual numbers of officers. There is also the rotation retirement numbers that we will be required to maintain. That runs at anywhere from 900 to 1,000 a year on top of the 200 or 300 to get up to strength. That gives some opportunities. It would be good, particularly for Assembly Members who are getting correspondence, as I am, to have that note.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That will be done. We will also put copies of the letters that we sent out to those that were in there in terms of the standard letter --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The various categories of people who got the letters.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Anne [McMeel] keeps a watching brief on human resources (HR) will do that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Great. Thank you very much. Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you. On the follow up of the discussion about PCSOs and traffic wardens and the contracts with TfL. It is useful to look at the contracts performance compliance measurements that are in place to see whether, having said they may be less or the quality of what is actually doing that job, if the contract compliance measure has changed, the performance measure, that will be an indicator that Jenny [Jones] is looking for, and to see how we deliver against that. That is just a pointer for Jenny [Jones].

I was interested in the debate about the Diamond Districts. I am slightly bothered that we have yet to see the full evaluation and that decisions are being made, potentially to suspend this, ahead of whatever that evaluation has been set. I do not know when it is due to come back to us. Maybe someone knows the answer to that?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There is, on 10 March 2011, a briefing for Members on Diamond Districts at the Police Authority for anybody who is interested in that.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Right. That is when we get the full evaluation?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is when --

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That is when you will get - sorry, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, carry on.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): One of the things that comes out from it is the point I was raising about the types of offences that are occurring and the fact that if somebody is walking round with rocks of crack cocaine they get arrested. It is a dynamic that has not been in any of these recidivism studies in the past. As a result it needs unpicking still further. It is the only study that we are aware of that has gone into such depth with comparable offenders who are not within a Diamond who are a control sample. Normally most of these recidivism rates are tested against a national average figure, whereas we put control samples in. They are understanding the differences and the uniqueness of the individuals in another bit that they are going through. You will get the headline stuff. You will get all that but our criminologist colleagues are unpicking that still further.

Valerie Brasse (AM): The issue, for me, is, when you remove the wrap around services, is there an impact on recidivism? If the evaluation is not continuing beyond, even if the service is stopped, we are not getting a true value of the benefits of what this scheme could or could not have done.

The other issue, for me, is the lynchpin around the value of a police officer holding the ring for this. Caroline [Pidgeon] was talking about other projects that potentially could deliver and one of the benefits has always been it is because there is a police officer there that is bringing them to where they need to be. That is why it works. We need to test that out, clearly. The future of those other services, given that we have the cuts, the capacity of these organisations to exist and survive beyond, if indeed there are others that could step in to the breach here, is really quite critical. We do need to understand the relative values of the police officers that are holding the ring or others.

I would say this is exactly the sort of area that should fall, for example, within the London Crime Reduction Board in its role in making sure that it can deliver something that would pick that up. We really do need to understand the evaluation.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): If I can very briefly try to answer that one. The point that you make about what happens when you do not do it is why it is the only study that does have a control sample. The others have not, which is why you do need to see and carry on the evaluation post event to see what happened then.

Valerie Brasse (AM): It is having had it and then stopping it and then seeing what happens going on.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): If I can try to chop through it I might answer your next questions. As a result of that there is quite a lot of data there. With the Ministry of Justice it is one of the planks and key elements of reform within its Green Paper. There is a range of models, as you say, with different pieces. The problem that it has is that it has not invested in the past in terms of the evaluation processes. That is one of the debates we are going to be having with it.

In it being a matter for the London Crime Reduction Board, it was taken to the London Crime Reduction Board as a core item - because I agree with you; it is definitely something for a body like that - and a presentation was given at that point. The financial incentive model that was being offered at that time by the Ministry of Justice for a range of different models was not something that that body felt able to sign up to because it was too high risk in getting your investment back. As a result it has gone back which is why there is that ongoing negotiation.

Integrated offender management is wider than Diamond, as you quite rightly say. 10 March 2011 is where we might need to say what we are doing about the whole integrated offender management (IOM) agenda in relation to where we are at with the MOJ.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Fine. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Just to say we are coming up to the two hour mark. I have got Faith [Boardman], Jenny [Jones], from an earlier notification, and Caroline [Pidgeon], then we might move on. Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman (AM): Thank you, Chairman. To bring us back to your performance report, as usual, it gives us a very impressive record of genuine reductions in crime. I want to congratulate you very much on that because it is not an easy climate and to get drops across the board is a damn good thing. I am sure that that has contributed to what you rightly point out is your pole position amongst most similar forces, other urban forces, for the confidence that local people have in what you do at the local level.

When I come to look though at the column on page 61 of the comparisons with those most similar forces, the other three big urban forces, that is the only one in which we are number one. Out of 18 indicators on which the comparison is given, we also have 1 where we are number 2. We have 5 where we are number 3 and we have 11 where we are number 4. In my arithmetic that means that 16 out of 18 we are in the lowest half. I know that that has been the position for many years under all administrations. Speaking as an ordinary Londoner I would like to feel that we were moving towards being at least at the average position for urban forces.

When I come to look ahead to the business plan and the key performance indicators that we are being offered here, I would rather like to add to them a key performance indicator which is based on, by the end of the three years, we would like you to have at least half in the top half. Is that a reasonable approach?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That would be a reasonable approach if they were reasonable measures! I make no apology for this; we are having a very robust discussion at the moment with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary as to how these things are measured because what it actually does is it measures against resident populations. As I have said to a student who is shadowing at the moment around politics, a person in London could say that, as a resident of London, you have the lowest risk of being subject to violent crime.

To say that would be true because you are using the British Crime Survey, and that is what the British Crime Survey says; which is the biggest longitudinal study of victims' experience based on a resident population. If you were to use our recorded crime data, so what we believe the level of violent crime in London against a resident population, you would have the highest risk of being a victim of violent crime if you were in London - not lived in London.

One of the things around it is, when you do crimes per resident population, places that have big commuter populations and big centres for late night etc - I can remember having a long debate with the previous regime and the Prime Minister's delivery unit about could you square for me that particular circle in we are either the safest or the highest risk from two data sets that people say are accurate? Equally, the reverse is true if you lived in the south east area where one would say you are the safest, which would be on recorded crime, but on the other you would say you were the highest risk. The answer to that was because they are coming into London and thumping each other. That is the general answer you get. As a result, that is the difference.

Resident populations against crime figures are not fair for London. London should be judged on how it has performed against London before.

The other thing it does is assume that the resident population figures for the country are accurate. We have a census that is starting now. The census is ten years out of date. We are bumping into newcomers into London every other week in the boroughs. A number of boroughs at the time of the original census took the census to court because money decisions were being taken against it that they did not feel were accurate.

If you take two sets of data; one that has a plus or minus error rate of something like 10% - ie census data - and that is just off the top of my head, and an error rate in recorded crime data and put the two together you could be anywhere plus or minus 50%. We could appear anywhere on that list. It would not be logical for me to accept, under those sorts of rules, something that is statistically questionable as a target for us to achieve, when I do not know how London could achieve it based on that current reality of statistics.

Faith Boardman (AM): Chairman, I can well understand that. I was anticipating that you would not be happy with the approach! It is genuinely complicated. I do genuinely have a concern that the table that we are being offered in the business plan is pretty simplistic. Having worked with large organisations and been involved as a Chief Executive in negotiating my own targets I know they are something you really need to pay a lot of attention to because they need to be not crude and really suited to the business. I am not convinced this list is. I am not saying that is your fault or the Metropolitan Police Service's fault. There are genuine issues, some of which you have just outlined. We should be having a lot more scrutiny and thinking about this over the next year. I am raising the question because I want to flag that up as an issue. It needs some hard technical thinking about.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, Chairman, I know we are running out of time but can I welcome that? At the moment we are trying to make the narrative for London in this rather silly use of statistics that we sometimes see. That support from the Police Authority and then whatever comes next in developing a different way of looking at it would be greatly appreciated, certainly by me and the Metropolitan Police Service, and additionally help us to make that narrative with opinion from stakeholders.

The one we are higher on is per residents and the per residents is more accurate than resident population. On that one we do all right. There is a clue there, I think. Any support in making that narrative for London would be gratefully received.

Faith Boardman (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I have three quick things I hope. I am glad my colleagues John [Biggs] and Valerie [Shawcross] brought up the traffic wardens thing again. I am really concerned. You made the point earlier, Tim [Godwin], about how the PCSOs were designed to do a limited number of things and do them well. This is exactly what traffic wardens do; an even more limited number of things and do them well. I am worried that we are exchanging a lot of good value staff for more highly paid staff. It is as if you are taking a dress, cutting it down to a bikini and saying, "It's fine. It will have just as much impact". It does not cover the same area. Do you have a business plan? Can we look at the business case for taking away the traffic wardens? I cannot see that it adds up. I just cannot. I have looked at these figures quite a lot now.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): PCSOs do not cost more than traffic wardens.

Jenny Jones (AM): They do not?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): No. Police officers do but PCSOs do not. Powers. They have the same powers and more, as I say, which is the business case because they can do other things as they are patrolling the red routes. If you are good at enforcement you do not have much to enforce because nobody parks there because they know they are going to get a ticket. We can provide you, as has been requested anyway, the productivity data in ticketing and all the rest of it.

Jenny Jones (AM): I would be very grateful.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): The one thing I do want to reiterate here is that we have got some very superb people who perform the role of traffic wardens in the Metropolitan Police Service. They have done a good job. Seven years ago, when the PCSOs were developed, there was a transition to go to that, rather than the traffic warden as was currently then. The change in the borough enforcement activities and all that meant that the traffic warden service as part of the Metropolitan Police Service was on its way out. The individuals - and many of those individuals we hope will stay - will be using those new powers as TP SOs.

I do sense your concern. It is something we are negotiating with TfL as well. At some point we will do the written response. Equally, if you want a briefing, we will give you a briefing.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think I would. Redundancy. There are so many factors.

My second thing is can you clarify for me? You say you are opening recruitment and this is amongst PCSOs and so on but you are not sure if you are opening recruitment amongst the people who were partially trained before. I am looking for clarity here.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): They are not partially trained. We had a number of people that were waiting for **Day 2s(?)** and various others and waiting for offers, who may have felt they were given an offer, which is the point that John [Biggs] and the Chairman made.

Jenny Jones (AM): You are not sure about that?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): That I need to look at. What we are doing at the moment is our first port of call - it would be illogical not to - would be the PCSOs that we currently have in service plus recruiting from the PCSOs and the Special Constabulary that we currently have, which is our recruitment model that we brought through the Authority.

Jenny Jones (AM): There are absolutely no new people being brought in at the moment?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Unless they become Specials.

Jenny Jones (AM): Oh I see. If they become Specials.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): There are. We are having 800 a month joining the Specials. Somewhere in that region. 800 applicants a month. We are nearly at 5,000 Specials. That is the route through now. We have got lots of new people coming into the Metropolitan Police Service, which we welcome and we are encouraging more and more.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Do not forget the rotation. Whilst some PCSOs will transfer to being PCs, to maintain the number of PCSOs just because people retire or move on, there will still be recruitment through that route too.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. I am clearer now.

My final point. Tim [Godwin], you do not know about this probably but we had a very, very fractious meeting yesterday at Mayor's Question Time.

James Cleverly (AM): Everyone knows about that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I had heard.

Jenny Jones (AM): Perhaps this is a question for Anne [McMeel]. One of the problems was the figures being used. Anne [McMeel], could you please clarify for me the figures for the number of police officers in the budget last year at this time were more than in the budget this time? For example, last year, the 2010/11 budget had 33,091 police officers. It also had figures on staff, PCSOs and traffic wardens. The figures this year for police officers are 32,510. My point yesterday was that the Mayor of London is claiming that there are more police officers this year in the budget than there were last year but,

actually, he is using a set of figures from not this same time last year but at a different point. I think that is misleading and I would like some clarity on this.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There are two different sets of figures. There is the establishment figure and then there is the strength figure. The strength figure is the real PCs that are being paid on the payroll to do work. The establishment figure is the figure that goes in the budget. To use James' [Cleverly] analogy, the establishment figure is the number of seats in the car and the strength figure is the number of people sitting in those seats. Over the last year we never got to - I do not think - the establishment figure because we held recruitment back.

What the Mayor has been saying is that, yes, numbers were falling because of the agreed hold on recruitment because we did not know where we would be on budget. Now those numbers can start to rise again back up to what will be 32,500 we hope. We are, currently, at 32,300 or something like that. It changes every day of course. That is the number he is using, not the establishment figure. The establishment figure could be anything. It is just the number of seats in the car.

Jenny Jones (AM): I know. Yet he is using the establishment figure now to say he is going to have more, but there is no guarantee, just as you have said, that he will fill those seats in the car. He is actually comparing apples with pears.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, not necessarily. We know, because of budget certainty and because of the extra £42 million, that we can now advance that figure by taking off the recruitment freeze, which is why, as the target for the end year and for the figure that we will maintain, it can be used because that is where we are going to get to because we know we have got the money to do it now.

Jenny Jones (AM): My point is that he is using sets of figures from two different places which is misleading --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is not.

Jenny Jones (AM): -- because he did not fulfil his budget commitment last year and you cannot be sure you can do the same this year.

James Cleverly (AM): Hold him to account next year then.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am holding him to account on what he is saying. I wish you would too.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The figures may be confusing. I do not think it is fair to say it is misleading.

Jenny Jones (AM): They have been very confusing for the members of the public. We are trying now to explain it so that they can understand that the figures being used were not the same. It is not like for like.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): As I have just explained, there are two different figures. There is the theoretical and then there is the actual people being paid to be police officers. The Mayor has used the actual people being paid to be police officers at the moment, rather than --

Jenny Jones (AM): Against another theoretical figure. He is using a theoretical figure against an actual figure, which I --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Only because we now know that we can get to that figure because he has given us the £42 million to allow us to do it.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think he is being very misleading. He did not even try to explain it yesterday. He just rubbished us all and showed contempt for the Assembly.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You will have to take that matter up with him. Finally, Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I had a couple of questions. One is linking to these numbers because I think it is very, very confusing and it would be helpful to get some clarity around them. What I do not understand is every other year we have looked at the establishment and that is the figures we have used. This year you have decided to use strength. You are saying that the strength you want to go to is 32,510. Is that correct? That is still down on November 2009. The strength was 33,404. You are still seeing a reduction in actual police officers from the strength. That is an actual number from the strength. It seems to me that it is very confusing. You are trying to say you are increasing police officers but it is going to be a fall from where we were in November 2009.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The reduction in police officer numbers is well known. It was because we all agreed to hold recruitment. We held recruitment pending the result of the budget. That reduction has now been reversed and it will rise to 32,500.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): It would be really helpful to get Tim [Godwin] or someone to give us a full briefing that really clarifies all these extra officers; who is paying for them and what is going on? I am quite curious about the Safer Transport Teams. Yes, it will be in the budget but I would like it spelt out really, really simply so we can all fully understand and be able to communicate it. Safer Transport Teams. The Mayor is putting over 400 more warranted police officers in the Safer Transport Teams. Is it Transport for London who is paying completely for the Safer Transport Teams or is it coming out of the extra £42 million coming in from the precept? I am not clear on that. Is it TfL paying for it or the Metropolitan Police Service?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): TfL. It is all the Mayor's money but, yes, it is TfL.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): TfL is paying completely for the Safer Transport Teams. That was not clear either. It would be very helpful, Tim [Godwin], if you could provide a note.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am not just saying this. One of the negotiating achievements that the Mayor managed to swing was to maintain the funding through the Department of Transport through to TfL so that it could maintain the funding through for the Safer Transport Teams. That was something won personally by the Mayor through his negotiations with the Secretary of State.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): You can get my nervousness about entering into a debate around statistics and use of various figures and the obvious differences in opinion.

The Safer Transport command is a TfL fund. There are some hub teams that are funded through the MPA budget which is something that we set up some time ago. The vast majority of the Safer Transport command is direct funded through TfL.

On the numbers of establishment and strength we will make sure that we can circulate that through the Authority and getting great clarity in the various bits. The strength figures vary even by a month on this --

Jenny Jones (AM): We know.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): As a result of that and because we do not particularly want to get involved in that particular debate in those levels, we will make sure that we put something out to clarify the strength and the establishment.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): That would be very helpful. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There seems to be some general view that there is some kind of card trick going on. It is not the case. What the Mayor is doing is putting in extra money to allow us to maintain numbers. He has always said between 32,000 and 33,000 is the right amount but it fluctuates daily. The question is - and I have always said this although you will all accuse me of not - what are they doing? It has to be as much about quality as quantity. Hopefully we can move on to that.

Jenny Jones (AM): We do agree that it is not about numbers - or I do. It is about the Mayor of London putting out misleading figures and suggesting a direction of travel which is simply not true.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): I hear the debate and we will put the numbers out. In what is a very tight fiscal envelope we do want to say thank you for

£42 million. It would be wrong of us to not acknowledge the £42 million has certainly made a difference for us. On the actual numbers debate, I will definitely leave that to you guys.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you. Thank you very much for that. Thank you for your report.

We will move on now, if you do not mind, to item six which is the updated budget. In-between the last report and this report it has been to SOP and Finance and Resources (F&R) for a bit of that detailed scrutiny. The most notable change is the approval of the Mayor's budget. It was only yesterday. It anticipated and confirmed in this paper going up from a £30 million extra contribution to just under £42 million. Beyond that the detailed work is ongoing to build the budget up still. There are one or two uncertain areas, not least our counter terrorism grant which is still to be agreed.

The plan is that this budget now goes from here and will be finally approved, we hope, at the next meeting, which is 31 March 2011. That is our last chance to approve it before the financial year. Bob [Atkins], do you or Anne [McMeel] want to add anything to that?

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): No, that covers it, Chairman. We are expecting the letters on the counter terrorism (CT) grant to be signed today or tomorrow. Hopefully early next week.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good. We should have an early picture quite soon about where we are going to be on that as well. Anne [McMeel], did you want to add anything or is that OK? Does anybody have any questions on the paper, the budget? Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): It is not a question. I would like to express disappointment that, despite the fact that the Liberal Democrat group, along with other groups, put forward an amendment to the budget that was fully costed and in our case - I cannot speak for other groups - used figures from the Metropolitan Police Service itself so that the figures were not in question - whether you agreed with it or not - you have not made any attempt whatsoever to give us a response and say, "We accept Point A, we don't accept Point B" or, "I don't accept any of it" and to explain why. I really think, as Chairman of the Police Authority, you really ought to have done that as a matter of courtesy. This nonsense that you came out with last week about you could not do it because individual business cases needed to be made is simply not acceptable. We gave you figures, we gave you suggestions and it is incumbent on you to say, "I don't agree with it or I do agree with it or I've got reservations" or something.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): As I said, Dee [Doocey], at the time, there is a time and capacity constraint around us doing the detailed work around the business case for things that you have put forward. A budget is a series of interlocking jigsaw pieces and moving one bit has an effect throughout the organisation. As I said at the GLA meeting I am more than happy to look at those things but I did say then that we would not have the

time or capacity to do that before the budget came to approval but I would be happy to look at them in year and consider whether any of them could be taken forward from a business case point of view. Anne [McMeel], Bob [Atkins], Annabel Adams [Deputy Treasurer, MPA] and the team, because of the compressed budget timetable, are flat out at the moment trying to get this thing done by 31 March 2011.

As you have already heard, negotiations on our grant elsewhere are not yet complete. Once that is done then there is still a hell of a lot of detailed work to build it up to present something to you for 31 March 2011 or in time for 31 March 2011 for you to have a look. There just simply is not the space and capacity to look at some quite significant proposals that groups put through. I am not ruling them in or out at the moment but just have not got time to look at. You have my undertaking that I am going to look at them but that will have to be in year.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you. I have the deepest sympathy for Anne [McMeel] and her team. I know how difficult it is to get all this sort of thing done in a very short space of time. I think I am correct in saying that you made similar comments last year but, to the best of my knowledge, you certainly never came back to us on any of the proposals we had put through, including potential savings, to say what you thought of them. I wanted to be clear. You never came back and said, "I'm not doing this because" or, "I'm doing that because". Nothing. We got no feedback from you whatsoever. Other groups might have done. I wanted to be entirely clear that this year you are going to come back and give us your response to all of the proposals and, hopefully, take on board at least some of them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I will.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I ask that when the final policing plan comes back to us it comes back to us in plenty of time and not be one or two days prior to the meeting like last time and that we will also have the underlying figures? I know Anne [McMeel] last time said that, if she provided anything, it would be with so many caveats it would not make sense. We need something more certain and some more detail next time.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is our ambition.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Again, with quite a few days to be able to read it and to ask questions.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): The aim is to bring it back to the joint SOP and F&R Committee in the middle of the month - I cannot quite remember the date of it - so there is an opportunity between that and the Full Authority. We will, no doubt,

still have some health warnings on the figures but we will give you absolutely the detail around the best information we have at that time.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): To be honest, it would be quite good to tease out as many issues as we can at that F&R because it is the last day we can approve it so it needs to go through on 31 March 2011 for us to comply with our legal obligations.
John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I had an interesting conversation with the Mayor yesterday about police numbers and I was not planning to repeat that today and I am not going to, but I do agree with my colleagues about the need to have clear and authoritative and independent - insofar as we are able within our convoluted organisation to be independent - account of police numbers. The fog of war is lifting because the budget debate has ended although we have a one year fog of pre-election war. We do need to have some clearly understood figures.

My working hypothesis is we froze recruitment which means, roughly, 1,100 officers disappear each year we freeze recruitment. We have now unfrozen recruitment for roughly half of that which means we are still on a reducing trend yet, when you listen to the various claims and counter claims, including the stuff that comes from my party as well, you can almost reach any conclusion you like if you are not careful. I am pretty clear the trend continues downwards. It is not for me to dispute what the Mayor has said here because he is no longer part of the Police Authority. We need to have some transparency about numbers so that Londoners can understand what is going on and so they can hold their politicians to account for better or worse. Whether people can win or lose arguments about resources and numbers is a debate for another place.

I had a second question which is about the buy one get one free offer and where that sits in the budget strategy and whether those officers are additional or replacements or redeployments and how that features in it? I was at one of my council annual budget meetings yesterday where they were talking about this tantalising offer and wanted to understand crisply where it sits.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): On the buy one get one free there are negotiations underway with a number of local authorities but nothing has yet been agreed. As the budget states there are 54 officers made available for deployment in that. If the buy one get one free demand comes in above that, then those officers that apply to that would be additional to what is currently in the budget.

John Biggs (AM): Are they newly recruited officers? Are they above the current number?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): They may well be.

John Biggs (AM): But they may well not be?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It depends. We do not know what the demand level is going to be yet.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Would you like me to come in?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Basically there are negotiations ongoing and nothing is concluded yet. We currently get about £19 million from local authorities. If we can advance beyond that on buy one get one free then that might give us more scope for recruitment above the figure that we currently have, yes.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): There would be additional numbers to the ones that are currently here. It is not outside of our remit because we have done it before. This is not new. It is a natural progression of the next new contract with local authorities and we have yet to work that one through.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Chairman, can I check that the next iteration of the key performance indicators (KPIs) and performance monitoring will also come to the Finance and joint SOP meeting?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes.

Valerie Brasse (AM): There have been some helpful direction of travel changes here; that we move away from the rather simplistic approach that we have got as it currently stands.

I did also want an assurance that, when we look at individual crime types - and I know we are talking **volt**(?) at the moment and things move away from that but you are talking about a monitoring framework that will be by exception. It is all very well for you to determine what that exception is. I hope we get an assurance that the data will routinely be shared with MPA officers so that we all agree what is exception reporting. Yes?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS): Absolutely.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK? Grand. Thank you. Can we note the recommendations then? We are noting and commenting. That is it. Great. Thank you very much.

Item seven is the draft borrowing and capital spending plan for the next periods up to 2017/18. Fantastic. Long term planning. Anne [McMeel] or Bob [Atkins], did you want to say anything?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): No, Chairman. This is really reflected in the business plan. It is the detail to allow us to build it into the business plan as part of the process.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. All content with that? Thank you very much.

Item eight is the proposed alcohol sobriety scheme which we said we would bring back. Toby [Harris], I think it was you that asked, prior to Christmas, for us to bring back some detail. Progress is being made. There have been a number of meetings with senior Ministers and others who may be involved in the establishment of a pilot scheme. As it says in the paper, amendments were laid to the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill and then withdrawn for consideration by the Government for working up into something. I am in conversation with Ministers and others about what that might look like if it were to reappear as Government amendments elsewhere.

We have had meetings with a number of interested parties - the Metropolitan Police Service, probation, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), Director of Public Health and others - to talk about the possibility of designing a pilot for implementation in the city. Those conversations are ongoing. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have some questions. It says the Mayor wishes to trial a compulsory scheme. I take it that is dependent on the amendments being accepted. Is that right or not?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is, to a certain extent. There is research underway at the moment as to whether we could put something together without legislation under existing powers. What we would like to do is to have some amendments to the legislation to give us some specific powers, not least the charge the person is being tested for their own testing which is one of the key planks so that it is self-financing.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Irrespective of whether amendments get passed, the Mayor may still wish to proceed in any event?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Depends upon the outcome of the research into what alternative routes there might be, yes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): That will come back, if we are still here, to this body for approval if the police have got to be partners in that. Is that right?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. More than happy to bring it back for you to look at. Yes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): The other thing that I noticed looking at this is it refers to the scheme in South Dakota and states that the breach rate is very low. That raises the question, if the breach rate is that low, is it tackling the right people? Secondly, on page 69 one of the benefits is it reduces recidivism but there are no figures there to say

how much does it reduce reoffending or not? From this we cannot see whether the scheme, as it works in America, is valid or whatever --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There has been quite a lot of academic research into the scheme and similar approaches. I am happy to circulate that if you would like to see it. The basic rule is that 66% of people are completely compliant and 17% of people fail once and then pass.

I met a Stamford professor who came over a couple of weeks ago and gave a presentation to a drug and alcohol policy thing in the City. He has done quite significant research into it; running control groups and non-control groups to see what the difference is. He confirmed that it makes a significant difference and that the claims around the scheme are accurate. I can circulate that for you.

There is a very good book that I would recommend to you which is called When Brute Force Fails which is about reversing the current criminal justice thinking around some of these offences. There is a lot of academic research into this kind of programme in there as well. Caroline [Pidgeon] and then Jennette [Arnold]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): A couple of things. One. It sounds very interesting, this whole scheme. I am nervous about the individuals paying for the testing and if there is more evidence on why you need that or not. The sort of vulnerable people who may well be wanting to put through this may not be able to afford it. That I am concerned about.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): They could afford the booze. It is not for addicted people.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I am just flagging that. The other issue I wanted to flag is the accuracy of the report. It says the Mayor is tabling an amendment. The Mayor has no ability to table an amendment. It says it both in your report and the covering report the MPA then did. He is trying to get a Member to or has persuaded Members of the Committee to table. Our accuracy should be in these reports. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): Presumably a business case has been done for this?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is being worked up at the moment.

Jenny Jones (AM): It is being worked up. It will take into account all the factors we talked about before about less crime means less cost but, at the same time, there is an aspect of police resources being used for it. Are we going to see that business case?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I do not see why not. Yes. The business case will be presented as part of the legislative process in the House of Commons so it will be available. Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Right. Are we talking about a pilot here?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The initial plan would be to start it on a pilot basis somewhere small. Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK. It seems, all of a sudden, there is going to be Parliamentary legislation about it and we are not even sure it will work yet. I have not got any particular problem with it; if it works that is fantastic. I am concerned about bringing something in full blown that works in South Dakota but does not work in Brixton.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Absolutely. It would be a disaster to bring in a huge scheme across London. You want to start with a pilot, possibly two, in discrete areas where you can judge the outcome and results and then trim the scheme to see if it can be improved and if, indeed, it does then work. That would be the plan.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, thank you. The principle around this is great. Many years I spent as a Sister in casualty and saw the impact on young people's lives with alcohol and, throughout nursing, in intensive therapy units (ITU) when they are looking for liver transplants. I would welcome anything that would reduce alcohol consumption. This seems to be a good idea.

From a personal view it is good to see sinners repent. The Mayor was quite a public drinker in his time so he clearly knows what he is talking about and he has some restraint on some aspects of personal behaviour. That has got to be good.

The question though for me here is there is no mention about the age range. Given that so many of our young people - we see them in the partnership work that is being done - are drunk on the streets at 12, unfortunately. I am sure we can find them younger than that. I am concerned if we are not clear here about the rights of our young people. For instance, if you got this through, a PC or whoever could approach that young person. Written into this would have to be some parental permission.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The scheme is designed for people who are convicted of a crime. They have to be convicted first. It is not a, "Right, you've just got to go on this" like an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO). They have to be convicted of a crime in which alcohol played a part.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Police officers will have to go and arrest that person believing them to be drunk and disorderly.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is not necessarily going to be used for drunk and disorderly unless it is very persistent and is violence related. The area of most interest, where all partners seem to be most excited, to start with is around domestic violence. Probably what we do is start with one offence type like that and see how it works. You have to design it differently, possibly, for other offence types.

In terms of the young people. Some of the amendments that were laid did deal specifically with applying it to young people but we would not want to start that because, as you quite rightly say, there are particular obstacles and difficulties around young people and the cause of why they are involved in drinking too much alcohol.

Part of the business case we are working up at the moment is about offence types and where we would start.

Jennette Arnold (AM): I go back to the point Caroline [Pidgeon] made, this is an MPA piece of work, not the Mayor, and this would have been --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, it is not.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Is it not?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. It is a Mayoral initiative. It is just the MPA asked me about it and so I said I would bring a report to you. It is nothing to do with the MPA.

Jennette Arnold (AM): But you are leading on it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is a GLA community safety initiative.

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is a GLA linked to policing and crime and disorder and all that sort of stuff. Is the MPA supportive of the amendment? Are the police supportive of the amendment? I will maybe move from you, as I did before, to the Chief Executive. Can you provide any briefing of any position that the MPA has taken regarding this work?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I would regard the discussion that is happening now as an attempt to get the MPA to formulate a collective view or independent views. I do not think it is the MPA's place to be putting forward any such - individual Members may want to. The paper is an MPA paper. I apologise for the mistake. The summary box has been cut and pasted from somewhere else. Only statutory officers of the MPA can place papers before a meeting of the Full Authority and the statutory officers, of course, include the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service.

Jennette Arnold (AM): This is something of interest at borough partnership level. It would be good if you could produce a note. Something that can be shared. At the level

of the boroughs a lot of this work is being done in terms of how you can help reduce the level of alcoholism because it is so linked with the level of domestic violence and all sorts of things.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We have had conversations with London Councils about it. There are a lot of local authorities that are quite excited and want to join in. It is just a question of us now building that coalition of the willing to get the legislation so that we can start somewhere.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): If I may suggest, the paper that is attached to the MPA paper here, does give a clear account as possible. That is available for Members to use in any bilateral conversations with partners throughout London.

Jennette Arnold (AM): There is nothing else then? Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Clive [Lawton] next.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, if you need my support you have it. I do not think you do but, anyway, you have got it. It is a commendable suggestion. I also do not have any discomfort about people paying for the treatment. Fines are means tested and quite possibly that could too, resolve some of that issue if there is some sliding scale or whatever according to means.

I did note though that, in the report, it says the Mayor appreciates that crime types are different to those in South Dakota and our legal system is based on different principles. What I am more interested in though are cultural differences. Clearly this has a lot to do with people's feelings about the use of alcohol. Later on in the paper it says this is a long term process of changing attitudes. Assumptions that because it is so hugely successful in South Dakota - which is comparatively mono-cultural and still has a large number of communities where people can feel embarrassed and ashamed and paid attention to - might feel quite different in London, according to different groups. I do not think we ought to assume, or indeed condemn, the initiative if it does not produce the same levels of success and the same levels of compliance in the first instance. I suspect we will be quite surprised by levels of compliance initially.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is the thing. We have got some advantages and some disadvantages over them. They have a disadvantage in terms of geography. It is a vast state with nobody around. People coming to be tested often have to drive a long way to be tested. That has proven to be an obstacle with them. We do not have that. We have geography on our side --

Clive Lawton (AM): They probably need a drink before they set out.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- and we have community on our side. On the other hand, you are quite right, we have a different cultural attitude towards it. Even if it

is half as successful it will be much better than what we are currently doing. That is why we need to start small, in a discrete area, see how it goes, trim it, design it, and try to --

Clive Lawton (AM): What I was hoping for is that there is a deliberate intent to look at the cultural issues. As I say, it was not formally mentioned in the paper. When you are doing your scoping or assessing or whatever you take those things into account because, if you do not, then a slower start or a longer run in may feel like frustration or failure. That would be a shame.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is right. Wise words. Valerie [Brasse] was next and then John [Biggs].

Valerie Brasse (AM): I wanted to say that we have had the opportunity to discuss this through the Violence Against Women and Girls Group on the Mayor's Panel which was very helpful. The caveat that this is very clearly centred around, if you are going to apply this to domestic violence, is that the relationships between alcohol, power abuse and domestic violence are very, very complex and this can never be instead of the range of other things that have to be in place, for the obvious reason you could end up leaving the person in the home where the violence has taken place and now the alcohol has been removed from him and he is really happy about that. It is the complexities of the relationships and this can never be an instead of; it has to be the add on to other things you would expect. If you do not do it that way it is inevitably going to fail. That point has been very carefully made. Let us try it and see.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is right. One of the curses of our binary culture is that everything is assumed as replacing everything else. It is not. This is just an additional tool. John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I think it is an attractive scheme of the sort that you could very easily invent down the pub actually. The reason I say that is because the more I think about it the more monstrously complicated it becomes. There is a whole range of people for whom it might work and there is a whole range of people for whom it might not work. It says very little about treatment.

The way to test it - I am giving you advice although I am pretty sure you do not particularly want my advice - would be to run it very firmly past people who think it is a bad idea; people in the treatment business, people who understand alcohol, people who look at the relationship between alcohol and behavioural issues and so on. One example crosses my mind. I drove through a speed camera which, embarrassingly, I played a role in having put there. As an alternative to having three points on my licence I paid £95 and went on a course. It was full of people who were little old ladies like me who had done exactly the same thing. It was a voluntary thing, as an alternative. That might work, for example.

You have to look at the whole animal really. It is a nice idea but I suspect, the more you look at it, the more complicated it will become, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. Kirsten [Hearn]?

John Biggs (AM): It could be your version of dangerous dogs.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Some of these things will be teased out when you get round to doing the equality impact assessment, which I hope will be soon.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): I have no objection to this at all but I am an unreconstructed supporter of the nanny state and the Government. I supported all sorts of things which would no doubt fall foul of Nick Clegg's [Deputy Prime Minister] restoration of freedom bill or whatever it is being called. This all fits in as part of that. It is a very New Labour project actually, so I congratulate you on your adoption of New Labour ideology and we wish it well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you. On that note shall we move on! Noted.

Reports from Committees. Anything of any note? All had an exciting time?

Calendar of meetings. Does it all stop on 30 September 2011? It takes us through to July 2011.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, can I say that I do appreciate the sensitivity of the proposal to move the date because of Rosh Hashanah, Jewish New Year, for the September 2011 meeting? I hope that is agreeable to people.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No problem. There is an issue I might just raise here about the meeting of the Authority in April 2011 where an email has been circulated. The current slated day for the Authority meeting is the day before the Royal Wedding, which is in a week with four bank holidays on either side of it. There was a suggestion that we could possibly shift the date of the Authority to the week before, ie the Thursday before Easter, which happens to be in the school holidays - we are damned if we do and damned if we don't - or leave it where it is. My worry about leaving it where it is we might find a lot of people are absent or we might find that there are issues that pull our senior police officers away on the eve of a significant public event.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Chairman, is it possible to just cancel that one?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We will have had one at the end of March, on 31 March 2011. The following one then would be towards the end of May 2011. We would have about a six or seven week gap between the two. We might have exhausted ourselves on the budget in March 2011.

Jennette Arnold (AM): This week is half term week and we are meeting. I do not understand the objections for the April 2011 one when it is school holidays.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The reason for the April 2011 one is I know from my own staff that quite a lot of people have put in to take those three days as holiday because you then get a ten day break. There will be a kind of skeleton service. It is up to Members as to whether they want to do that date. My worry is that we will end up with four of us.

Dee Doocey (AM): To have it the day before the Royal wedding is absolutely not acceptable. First of all the Metropolitan Police Service ought to be concentrating on other issues and not coming to the Authority. It is a waste of its time at that particular time. Whatever the alternative is - I do not feel strongly personally. I would cancel one meeting. Other people will feel differently. I cannot go if it is the week before but, even having said that, I think it is more important that we do not have it on the day before the Royal wedding.

Toby Harris (AM): It would be deeply inappropriate to have it on Maundy Thursday!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There is that. Are Members content that we cancel the April 2011 meeting and proceed to May 2011?

Jenny Jones (AM): I am not particularly happy about it because we have very few opportunities left as an Authority to hold the Metropolitan Police Service to account. Leaving an eight week gap is not a very good idea.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Chairman, to be helpful, I agree with Dee [Doocey] that it is absolute madness to detain senior police for an hour and a half before the day of the Royal wedding. Madness. I agree completely with the sentiments.

Jenny Jones (AM): Absolutely.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Can we have a show of hands for those who would like to cancel April 2011?

Jennette Arnold (AM): I think we should look for an alternate date.

Tony Arbour (AM): It is the cruellest month.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I think that is a majority.

Jenny Jones (AM): A show of hands.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Can we have a show of hands of those who want to maintain April 2011?

Jenny Jones (AM): I do not particularly want it the day before the Royal wedding but I am happy to move it. I can manage all the dates. I am sure you will be delighted to hear.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Four. I will assume the others are abstaining.

Jennette Arnold (AM): An alternate day is what we are asking for. You can seek an alternate date.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We did circulate an email around people coming the Thursday before but we have not had a very enthusiastic response because of school holidays.

Jennette Arnold (AM): If you have got a quorum for the alternative date then the meeting should go ahead.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We are agreed that there will not be a meeting on the day before the Royal wedding. We will now email to find availability for the previous Thursday and, depending on how many people respond to that, you will have to leave it to me to take a decision about whether we proceed or not. Thank you.

Action taken under delegated authority. There is only one item. Agreed? That is it. Thank you very much team. See you next time.

The meeting finished at 12.43pm.