

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 28 July 2011 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

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

MPA Officers:

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

MPS Officers:

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner) and Bernard Hogan-Howe (Deputy Commissioner).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It is 10am. The cameras are on. Welcome all. First of all apologies for absence. I have had apologies from Neil Johnson.

Tony Arbour (AM): Lateness from James [Cleverly].

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Declarations of interests. Anybody got any declarations? No. It has all been noted. Fine. Can we just go round the room? Kit Malthouse. Chairman of the Authority.

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

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): Reshard Auladin.

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

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

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

Chris Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Jennette Arnold.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Graham Speed (AM): Graham Speed.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Amanda Sater (AM): Amanda Sater.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Val Shawcross.

John Biggs (AM): John Biggs.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

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

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Acting Deputy Commissioner): Bernard Hogan-Howe.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Tim Godwin.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you very much. Minutes of our meeting on 30 June 2011. Members should all have a copy. Does anybody have any matters arising from the minutes? No? OK. Thank you. Can I sign them as a true record? Great. Thank you very much.

Chairman's update. Colleagues, first, I think it is appropriate, on your behalf, that I express our shock and offer our deep condolences to the people of Oslo and Norway as a whole following the unbelievable horrors that they endured over the last week. As an organisation which participates in the huge effort to keep Londoners, and indeed the country, safe from similar atrocities and a city which has similarly suffered at the hands of mad men and terrorists, we are only too aware of what the Norwegian people are going through. All of Norway is in our thoughts at the moment.

Second, I would like to extend our good wishes to one of our constables who was shot in the arm on Friday, 15 July in Croydon pursuing a fleeing suspect. He has undergone

successful surgery, I understand, to save his arm and a number of arrests have been made. We salute his courage and that of his family and wish him well for his recovery.

Next I would like to welcome Bernard Hogan-Howe here as temporary Deputy Commissioner. We will be discussing the process of his appointment shortly. We do welcome him and thank him for stepping in to assist the Metropolitan Police Service at this critical time. He is, I know, well known to some of you and did serve in London as part of his illustrious career. Some of you will know I was born in Liverpool and I have to tell you that Bernard's tenure as Chief Constable there is still seen by members of my family as a golden age in crime fighting in that city.

Members, we obviously have a number of important matters to discuss this morning and so I have consulted amongst Members on how we should handle matters to make sure we get through all the important business we have to discuss today. We have obviously had a significant couple of weeks in terms of events for the Authority and the service and what has been suggested is that we debate and discuss that matter first and then move on to the rest of the business of the meeting and that we might try to limit our discussions to possibly an hour, although that is not designed to fetter anybody. Then we could move on to some of the other matters that we have to consider, not least the day to day business and we have an important decision to make. Is that satisfactory to everybody? OK. Great.

Also, Members have, understandably, submitted a large volume of questions about recent events and so, with agreement over the last couple of days, we have clustered those under various themes in the hope that we can avoid repetition and cover the ground. Obviously there will be follow ups; this is not designed to fetter those, but to help us get through the business.

With Members' agreement we will have an opening statement from Tim [Godwin] and then move into questions, beginning particularly with Jennette [Arnold] who has invited members of the Morgan family here to witness her questions being asked. Is everybody happy with that?

First, I wanted to say a few words from my point of view. I would like to start by reiterating the apology I have given many of you about the difficulties we had in communicating and consulting with you over the last couple of weeks. Such was the speed of events that, at times, we were unable to keep up ourselves. I hope that the replies I have given to Jenny's [Jones] letters, which have been circulated to you, have filled you in on much of the detail of events. I do not propose to rehearse them again here although, of course, I am happy to take questions.

The long and the short of the last two weeks is that we have lost two fine officers in less than ideal circumstances. Sir Paul Stephenson was an effective and dignified Commissioner who stabilised the Metropolitan Police Service and put it back on its core mission of fighting crime. John Yates was a detective of rare ability who never shied from a challenge and won respect from across the policing community, especially in

counter terrorism. While they were both talented individuals the true test of their achievements is that the organisation is resilient enough to carry on without them. No doubt you will want to establish this for yourselves in questioning this morning.

The events of the last two weeks have thrown up, I think, three broad areas where we need to think how we operate. The first is the legal constraints around our meetings. I have to point out, of course, that we now have a number of Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) inquiries into this matter and a judicial inquiry. There may well be criminal proceedings that proceed in the future. All of these are a fetter on what we can say in public and I have to ask Members to bear this in mind when questioning Tim [Godwin] this morning. He will, I know, be careful not to prejudice any of those proceedings and I would ask you to be careful also to do the same.

The second is the process of the appointment of temporary Commissioner and temporary Deputy Commissioner. The truth is that, when we looked at it, there was no procedure in law so one spontaneously emerged. This is not satisfactory and I think, over the next few months, we will need to seek to codify a process for the future which, paradoxically, hopefully, we will not need again, but you never know.

Third is the urgent need for fast time secure confidential communication. It was apparent during the process that we did not have an easy way of doing that in a confidential way and we need to make sure that Members are happy that we can do so in real time and how best we can achieve that I think is a piece of work we can do over the months to come.

Two other issues just to mention. The first is to welcome the appointment of Elizabeth Filkin to look into some of the issues that have arisen around relationships with the media and how that should happen in the future. I will be arranging an early meeting with her. I know Members have questions about that - Kirsten [Hearn] in particular - so we can talk about that a bit more in the future, but that is a good step forward.

Then, finally, a word on the appointment of the new Commissioner. As you may know the advert is out with a closing date of 12 August 2011. Pleasingly, the Home Office has agreed to follow basically the same process as last time so we will be convening a panel of Members in early September to interview candidates. Those of you who are interested in playing a part please put your names forward. Obviously if we get 23 names we will have to find some way to select people to be on the panel but it is a very important job that we have to do so those of you who want to participate please put your names forward.

That is it from me in this section. Obviously I have more to say about general business when we move on to the rest of the report. Tim [Godwin], I wondered if you wanted to say anything?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Thank you, Chairman. Firstly I would like to start by paying tribute to two colleagues, Sir Paul Stephenson and John Yates. As you will know, I am personally saddened that such a great leader as Paul has left us in this

way. Paul took the decision to leave because he does not want to be 'the' story, or to detract from the fantastic work that the men and women of the Metropolitan Police Service get up to every day on behalf of Londoners. I think it is to his great credit that he has done this.

As Paul said at the time, leadership is not about popularity, it is not about the press and it is not about spinning; it is about making decisions that put your organisation, its mission and the people you lead first. He has done this to enable us to move forward and to focus on what is important; fighting crime and keeping London safe.

Similarly to Paul, John Yates has also left us for the same and very similar reasons; such that he does not, as an individual, become the story and detract from the work of the Metropolitan Police Service. John has been a valued member of the Metropolitan Police Service over many, many years and has taken on some of the most challenging jobs in this organisation that were there.

The excellent work John has done has left a legacy in our ability to respond to terrorist attack and will be continued by Cressida Dick who is a well respected Assistant Commissioner and highly experienced within this arena having previously been the Deputy Assistant Commissioner in that function. For me, there is a critical requirement to have a person in the Assistant Commissioner Specialist Operation's role due to the national responsibilities and the threat we face. Cressida seemed, and is, the obvious choice as Substantive Assistant Commissioner and this was confirmed with our key partners involved in combating terrorism.

To fill the post that Cressida has left I have asked the MPA to begin a process to appoint a full time Assistant Commissioner for the Specialist Crime Directorate and we urge that this be completed as soon as is possible. In the intervening period I have asked Assistant Commissioner Lynne Owens to take responsibility for both serious crime and for central operations (CO). Lynne is well respected and has a wealth of experience as both a uniform and a detective officer. She is well supported within central operations by DAC Rose Fitzpatrick who is a very experienced leader and a highly capable individual. We have strengthened the Serious Crime Directorate in the short term by moving Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers to focus her work on the Weeting, Elveden and **Hinton**(?) inquiries and we have appointed Alan Gibson as Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner in the interim to support Lynne.

The Chairman has already outlined the arrival of Bernard Hogan-Howe in the role of Deputy and I welcome Bernard and the support that he will give to the senior team and the increased resilience that offers.

These are very, very, very challenging times for us and sometimes I find it hard to hear some of the views that have been expressed about corruption being endemic within the Metropolitan Police Service or that we have, in some way, let our guard down and allowed corruption to infiltrate our organisation. That is something that I refute. We have a high reputation around the world and corruption is something that we do not

tolerate. In an organisation of over 50,000 people there will, undoubtedly, be a number - a very small number - of staff who are corrupted, but the vast majority of the men and women of this organisation are honest and hardworking people. The damage that corruption does to policing cannot be underestimated, not least in undermining the superb work that our officers do, and that is why we invest so heavily in our professional standards unit to seek it out where it is and deal with it through investigation, arrest and prosecution.

Let me reassure you. Corruption is, in no way, endemic within the Metropolitan Police Service and we continue all we can do to route it out, but it would be foolish if I did not acknowledge the perceptions that have been created over the past weeks.

There are a number of issues that we therefore, as an organisation, have to address. The first is our use of hospitality and the transparency around our engagement with others through hospitality means. I agree with the views of Members that we have not been entirely compliant with our own policies in recording and advertising and holding ourselves to account in the way we take and receive hospitality. I have made sure that we have reinforced our policies with all our colleagues and ensured that the recording requirements are being met. It is our intention to publish the past three years of hospitality for all of the management team.

I have also sent a member of my staff over to City Hall to meet with the GLA Monitoring Officer to see what we can learn from the GLA system of declaring gifts and hospitality and their publication. Whilst I am content that we have been complying, where practicable, I think there is lots we can learn about the perception that we have created. Previously we published redacted registers and I recognise that the public mood is for greater openness and we will be completely open and transparent from now on.

Media relations is another issue that we have to learn from. As Paul [Stephenson] said at the Home Affairs Select Committee, there is a reason why the Metropolitan Police Service Commissioner must meet with the media; to try to promote and enhance the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service and to talk about the context of policing. Paul recognised the need for cultural change before he left and that is why he asked Elizabeth Filkin to act as an adviser on our relations within the press and to conduct a review of how we conduct our meetings and arrangements with the media.

We need to do a lot more about this and we need to be a lot more open about this to maintain the confidence of the people we serve. The Management Board will now be recording all contact with newspaper editors and other senior figures including journalists. Everyone is being reminded of our media policy and that contact with journalists should be through our press team. We need to learn and we need to change and we accept that. Again quoting Paul [Stephenson], we need to be much more transparent and explain what we are doing and when we are doing it, and that we will do.

Let me turn to some other events that are still occurring. There are a number of inquiries and investigations now ongoing that are looking at various issues; from the criminal

investigations through to corruption investigations through to complaint investigations and we also have a judicial inquiry. Operation Weeting and Elveden continue under the command of DAC Sue Akers. As I have said, now Sue is totally focused on that and will be reporting to the Deputy Commissioner for the time being, Bernard Hogan-Howe.

The IPCC has determined that Elveden, which is the investigation into the corruption of a small number of officers, will be supervised by the IPCC and not, at this time, independently investigated. The IPCC is also investigating a number of conduct issues that have been referred to them by this Authority and by me.

Overarching these inquiries will be a two part public inquiry that will be led by Lord Justice Leveson. He will be considering phone hacking, police corruption and media regulation. In order to support those public inquiries we have established a team under DAC Mark Simmons which is led by Detective Chief Superintendent Matthew Horne. I welcome these inquiries and the opportunity they present to get the facts surrounding these issues examined in a methodical and measured manner and in an atmosphere that will ensure that all the right questions are asked and answered, as I referred to when we announced the Weeting investigation in this hall some months ago.

The Metropolitan Police Service has a very proud history. I, for one, am very proud to be a member of the Metropolitan Police Service. In 1829 Sir Richard Mayne wrote that the primary objective of an efficient police is the prevention of crime: the next that of detection and punishment of offenders if crime is committed. To these ends all the efforts of police must be directed. That still remains true today. We have a significant policing job to do.

We have had some good results in the last few days with the Flying Squad making interventions to stop organized criminals and arresting people for violent car jackings on the pavement only two days ago. We have, in north west London, stopped an armed robbery in progress with three arrests with a loaded handgun being taken. South west London; an organized criminal gang was taken out with nearly £500,000 of assets that they had taken. Arrests have been made and cash and firearms seized. We have had an officer, as the Chairman identified, who was shot while tackling offenders in Croydon. He is now at home after being in hospital but still in a lot of pain. He is being well supported by the family, the borough and occupational health. We had two officers in the last month injured in Southwark; one with a fractured chin and the other with stab wounds to the neck. Both are back.

That is what the Metropolitan Police Service was doing when all this was going on. I can assure this Committee that the Metropolitan Police Service carries on doing the work that the Metropolitan Police Service is here to do.

I know that the Members will have a lot of questions in connection with phone hacking and I will respond to all those that I can. I want to reiterate what the Chairman said. I am very conscious that we need to support the public inquiries, the criminal investigations and the conduct investigations and, as a result, I have to be cautious in my answers and I

will be as open as I can be here. Those that I do not feel able to answer I will try to answer at a later time. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you very much, Tim. As I said, we have grouped questions and themes but we are going to kick off with Jennette [Arnold] who has got some questions about the Morgan inquiry.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, thank you. Can I start by once again thanking Members for the support that they have given to the Morgan family and to record that, once again, the family and supporters of the Justice 4 Daniel campaign looks to this Authority to support them in their ongoing search for answers in order that they can get a sense that someone will be brought to justice for the murder of their beloved brother. Mrs Morgan could not be with us this morning but I am sure that you will all join me in wishing her well and reinforcing our commitment. Chairman, as well as the questions to the Acting Commissioner, I would like to hear from you at the end your reconfirmation of the support that you gave the last time the Morgan family were with us in terms of the MPA supporting the next stage of the work that they are doing and that is that judicial inquiry.

To the Acting Commissioner, we have had conversations and I know that a senior member of staff contacted the family but I do have to ask you, you have seen the 22 questions that I put on the paper for your answers, can you tell me are you in a position to answer the first question to confirm whether or not the leading investigator was placed under surveillance by the News of the World photographers whilst in connection with investigation of this murder as far back as 2002? Are you in a position to say anything about that?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Thank you. We have had a conversation and following receipt of these questions some things have been put into the media, as we know, in relation to a subsequent meeting between Mr Cook, Dick Fedorcio, Andy Baker and Rebekah Brooks. As a result of this I asked Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick to look into the background of those questions and where we were with the various investigations. As a result of that, it is, with regret, that I have to not be able to answer your 22 questions.

I felt that, personally, that would be unsatisfactory when you look at the journey that the family has been through and, as a result, I have appointed Simon Foy, who is the Commander in charge of the Homicide Teams within the Metropolitan Police Service to contact the family to work through what is going on around that. As you know, we do not give up in investigations, we constantly strive to look at what we can do to bring people to justice and I do not want to mess that up. As and when we have got clarity about what we can say publicly then Simon Foy will be doing that on our behalf.

Jennette Arnold (AM): I am sure you appreciate what is the family to do when they pick up a Sunday paper and read statements from people like Jonathan Rees who are

absolutely linked to this case and seem to be out there outside the remit of justice? What are they supposed to do?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Obviously whatever Mr Rees does is a matter for Mr Rees. The issue for me is to make sure that whatever the Metropolitan Police Service does does not in any way affect any future prosecution or investigation. That is why I have to be cautious and that is why I am going to be cautious. As a result of that, Simon Foy will be liaising - and I know he has already been in touch - with the family to work through all those issues.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can I ask you for clarity? If at the time there were officers clearly in receipt of money, those officers still in the system will be brought into the investigation if that line is followed, from what you are saying?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In any investigation we follow the evidence.

Jennette Arnold (AM): So you will be following that evidence. Basically, we are not able to get any response to any of these questions here today because of the offer that you are making to the family, which I am sure that the family will take up.

Can I go then to the Chairman of the MPA? I will stand back if I have your assurance that these questions will be posted and made public, because other Members here today will be able to ask their questions in full and that will become part of the public record. Can I have your assurance that these questions will be made public at the end of this meeting so that the family and others can know that these are the questions that are relevant to their search for justice?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will write your questions into the minutes. In terms of your opening question to me, you absolutely have my assurance of my commitment to the family and to ongoing support for the investigation. As you know, we have had a number of meetings with various members of the family over the last couple of years. We are in ongoing correspondence and I know officers from the Authority are in regular telephone contact with the family. What might be helpful is, once Simon Foy has got his knees under the table on the investigation, we convene a meeting along similar lines to the meetings we had with AC Yates and Dave Cook about the investigation just to review where we may have got to in the autumn. Absolutely; we will be keeping up the support for the investigation.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Have you opened correspondence yet with the Home Office regarding support for the judicial review?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. I wrote after the last meeting to the Home Secretary expressing our unanimous desire that there should be a judicial inquiry. She wrote back saying she did not see the case for that at the moment but the investigation was ongoing and there would be reviews into some of the implications of the trial not proceeding.

Once those reviews had been done, and if there were any lessons to be learned, she was happy to look at them.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you.

Toby Harris (AM): Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, Toby.

Toby Harris (AM): I have got a question which is grouped in section six however it is on the same subject. What I am not clear about from the Acting Commissioner's response is he is saying he cannot answer these at this stage. I had understood what he said as because there is clearly a continuing investigation going on into the original murder case. My question - and some of Jennette's questions - relate not so much to the core investigation but side issues, particularly in relation to the media.

What I am not clear about - for example, the specific questions that I have posed about the *Guardian* article talking about Rebekah Brooks being confronted at a social event - is are those matters that are in Jennette's question and in my question being investigated and, if so, which of the many processes that are currently in place is it being investigated under and when will we get some answers to those points?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): The answer is yes and I think that is probably the first time that we have announced that. There are a number of peripheral issues that have come out from the Weeting Elveden investigations as we have progressed and that is constantly being reviewed by the DAC Sue Akers. As a result of that some of those will end up in some form of investigation under Sue Akers. That is what we are going through at the moment which is, hence, my difficulty in answering some of the questions, even those things that have been in the media so far. I will bring that back to a Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP) to brief SOP as to exactly what the structure of those various investigations are as soon as they are finalised.

Toby Harris (AM): I think it is going to be helpful, and again for the record given that Jennette has asked 22 questions, I have asked one and I think one of Dee's [Doocey] is also on the same theme, if we could have with the minutes a schedule of which investigation is dealing with which point because otherwise it is going to be possible some of these issues get lost - not through any deliberate obfuscation but simply because of the complexities of it.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Each of them is being reviewed as we speak. We started the review process of that. I have asked Bernard [Hogan-Howe] to assist in the review of those various elements. We will bring that up. There are so many investigations and some of them are interconnecting which makes it very complicated and hence it gets a bit complicated sitting here in terms of answering some of those questions so as not to prejudice any of them. We will produce that and we will bring it to SOP.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Thank you. Any other questions on the Morgan issue? No. OK. Thank you very much. Thank you, Jennette.

OK. We move to Section 1 of the questions which were briefings of the Chair and the Mayor. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): This is about whether or not you and the Mayor had briefings in the first part of September 2010 when the questions were raised. In the letters to me - thank you for the quick response - you did say that Mr Yates called you to give you a briefing on 10 September, the same day that he offered a briefing to the Prime Minister.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. As I recall there was a scheduled telephone call that I wrote to you at 9.30am on that Friday. From memory, John [Yates] rang to say that they were looking at the New York Times allegations, that they were examining them to see if there was any new evidence, that a detective or a team of detectives was or were flying to the States to hopefully conduct interviews and they were seeking cooperation from the paper.

Jenny Jones (AM): Did you then tell the Mayor that that was happening?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I do not recall that I did, no.

Jenny Jones (AM): Presumably Mr Yates would have wanted to brief the Mayor directly as well as it had become an active investigation?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Not necessarily, no. John briefed the Mayor periodically on active investigations. The Mayor does have regular updates with the Assistant Commissioner for Specialist Operations, largely around counter terrorism. The truth is that in those periodic briefings some of them, the phone hacking investigations, would have been mentioned. The Mayor sought reassurances that the investigation was being thorough and those reassurances were given. The way the system works generally is I do take routinely phone calls from the Assistant Commissioner about various imminent issues that may happen and I tend to alert him if there is a critical incident about to occur. I would not, necessarily, alert him about an ongoing investigation of which there may be many. At that time I do not recall whether I did or not.

Jenny Jones (AM): The thing is, on 15 September, at Mayor's Question Time, the Mayor, in response to Joanne McCartney's question, that was the point at which he called the case a loads of codswallop cooked up by the Labour Party and that we do not intend to get involved with it. He said that. In the same breath, just before that, he said, "I am almost in continuous conversations with my Deputy Mayor for Policing about this and other matters. It would be fair to say that he and I have discussed this. The conclusion of our conversation will be obvious from what I have said". He is saying that you are in continuous ...

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I do not recall whether we spoke about it in the two working days between the Friday and the Wednesday Mayor's Question Time (MQT). I just do not recall. It is fair to say that during the previous 18 months we obviously had discussed it following briefings from John Yates, where we had been given reassurance there was nothing in it. You will have to ask the Mayor why he expressed his views in the way he did. I do not believe that between Friday and the Wednesday the Mayor was in any greater possession of any facts than he was prior to the last briefing that he would have had with John Yates which I suspect, I have not looked into it exactly, might have been the month before.

Jenny Jones (AM): At Mayor's Question Time the Mayor had in front of him a briefing from somebody. I do not know who writes his briefings to answer questions at Mayor's Question Time. Joanne [McCartney] had actually made it a priority question about the case. Surely you see the briefings that are given to the Mayor before MQT if they are on a policing issue?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Not necessarily always, no. Some I do, yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): He must have had a briefing about this. Do you think you would not have seen it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I cannot recall whether I did, Jenny. Part of the issue is that you are now asking me to recall matters from nearly a year ago which were not necessarily noted and, at the time, were part of a general competing series of priorities - whether that is teenage killings or rape or whatever the other issues that we were dealing with at the time.

The truth is I do not actually recall, in that split second, what was and was not said and what was and was not discussed. The critical thing is that obviously John [Yates] wrote to the Mayor once this emerged and confirmed in his letter that the Mayor had sought assurances during a number of meetings with John that the investigation was thorough. Those reassurances had been given and John has written to apologise that that now has put the Mayor in an embarrassing position. That is as far as we can go.

The other issue, frankly, is that obviously when I have had counter terrorism briefings with John you will understand, for obvious reasons, that I do not keep a note of those briefings so it is unclear precisely what and when it was talked about. But John has confirmed in his letter there were repeated assurances sought and those assurances were given. It now turns out, with hindsight, that that was not given on the basis of correct information and that is a source of embarrassment.

Jenny Jones (AM): However, in that case, the Mayor must have known it was an active investigation when he said it was a load of codswallop. If he sought confirm that it was being examined then he must have known it was active?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No. I think in the previous meetings, where it was in the media or whatever, then it would have been mentioned that the police had looked into it and there were no reasons to open the investigation, whatever those issues might be.

The critical period between the publication of the New York Times' article and then 10 September when I was informed for the first time that things were being looked at and that a team might be going out and then two working days later when the Mayor appeared at MQT, I cannot recall whether we discussed it in the two days in-between. Actually I think it is probably unlikely that we did but I cannot recall precisely and that is purely because it was one of a competing number of priorities.

It is true to say that, at the end of the month, at the MPA meeting on 30 September, Sir Paul Stephenson sat in his chair and confirmed that during that period interviews had taken place, I think on 14 September, 21 September and two others, and that there were consultations ongoing with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), so throughout that period there had been an investigation ongoing.

Jenny Jones (AM): You think the Mayor would not have known that that was an active investigation? For those people who are not bogged down in all this and do not understand the relevance of this, it is because I am trying to establish whether or not, when the Mayor made those comments, he knew that it was an ongoing investigation because, if he did know, he was attempting to pervert the course of justice.

Clive Lawton (AM): I am not sure this is relevant to this Authority. I am sure the Mayor must be questioned on these matters and I am sure that is right for the GLA but I cannot understand how this is relevant to this Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I think that is a very strong charge to make, Jenny, and I think you might be getting yourself into hot water by saying things like that. Let me reiterate; we have no records - and I have no recollection - that between 10 September and 15 September I discussed this matter with the Mayor.

Jenny Jones (AM): Are you saying that when the Mayor answers a question at Mayor's Question Time on policing you do not get a view of that briefing?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Sometimes I do. Sometimes I do not.

Jenny Jones (AM): It just seems inconceivable that you do not because it is your area - you are the Deputy Mayor for Policing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It certainly goes through my office. Whether I get to see it or not is another matter. I am happy to go back and look at the briefings that were given and see if I can remember seeing them at the time.

Jenny Jones (AM): Could we have a copy of that briefing?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No.

Jenny Jones (AM): Because it is something the Mayor reads out normally isn't it, so there is no reason for it not to be?

Clive Lawton (AM): We have limited time.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am happy to go back and look at the briefings. I am happy to see if I can remember seeing them beforehand or seeing whether they are in my email inbox and all those details and try to establish that for you --

Jenny Jones (AM): OK. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): -- but as I said to you before, I do not recall speaking to him about it at that time. Not least because, you have to remember, at that time - I know, with hindsight, this is all of critical importance now but at the time - it was competing along with lots of other priorities like teenage killings, multiple rapes, the (inaudible) and all those other issues which we were engaged in at the time. All the ongoing investigations which I am sometimes informed about, I do not pass all of them on to the Mayor.

Jenny Jones (AM): I do understand that. Can I just ask you one more question before Joanne [McCartney] comes in?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): A question was asked of the MPA and it said that you had a meeting on this topic on 15 September. It was not in your letter.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No. There was a meeting I think after Mayor's Question Time. A normal monthly update with the Commissioner on the afternoon of 15 September, after Mayor's Question Time, at which the Mayor and I were present. Catherine [Crawford] was there. Paul Stephenson was there and I think the Mayor's private secretary. Again, because it is an informal performance briefing effectively, no formal note is kept and we do not have any note that phone hacking was talked about at that meeting either. The Mayor meets the Commissioner two weekly and it was one of those standard two weekly meetings where we actually talked about knife crime and police numbers and budgets and all that kind of stuff. It was not specifically on this subject. I think Tim [Godwin] was on holiday at the time so Tim was not there. Normally it is with the Deputy Commissioner too.

Jenny Jones (AM): Off the hook. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. I had questions in a similar vein and I will try not to duplicate the ones that Jenny has asked. When I questioned the Mayor on 15 September the New York Times article had come out a couple of days beforehand. AC John Yates had appeared before the Select Committee saying that he was looking to see whether anything was new in these allegations. We then had, on 14 September, a man, believed to be Mr Horne, was interviewed under caution. At that time there was quite a lot in the public domain that this was [sound disappears] --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I do not think it was in the public domain that he had been interviewed on 14 September until 30 September.

Joanne McCartney (AM): It was released that an X year old man had been interviewed and that was in the public --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right. On 14 September?

Joanne McCartney (AM): On 14 September, the day before I questioned the Mayor. Can I ask you? You [sound disappears] presumably were aware on 15 September that this was an investigation that was being looked into?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, I was informed on 10 September.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. Can I ask then, you were quite clear that this, at that stage, was not a politically motivated put up job by the Labour Party? Was that your view as well, at the time? Given AC Yates had contacted you to tell you there was a detective --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, I knew there was an ongoing investigation into the New York Times. That is what I knew.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. Could you actually check your records to see whether you authorised the Mayor's response to me at Mayor's Question Time on 15 September?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. I will check.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You were at that meeting. When the Mayor gave those comments to me what was your view of them? I ask that - and Members may think this is not relevant - but last week at the Mayor's press conference he stated that throughout this time he was *de facto* head of the Metropolitan Police Service which is why this is extremely relevant. Can I ask what your views were of the Mayor's comments?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I think they were the Mayor's view and they were based on the briefings and reassurances that had been given in previous discussions about this issue that there was no new evidence that required the investigation to be opened again.

Joanne McCartney (AM): If the Mayor's comments were based on briefings he had been given, presumably by the police, are you now saying that the police had told him that it was codswallop, it was a politically motivated put up job --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Then they were not based on briefings that he had been given were they?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No. Joanne, let's be fair about this. The Mayor is a personality that likes to express himself in --

Joanne McCartney (AM): He said he was *de facto* head of the Metropolitan Police Service.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): He likes to express himself in particular ways. I understand the case you are trying to construct here but the truth is that the Commissioner confirmed on 30 September that there had been interviews throughout the whole of September and that there were ongoing discussions with the CPS to decide whether prosecutions could be brought forward and whether there was any evidence that could be taken.

I have to say that the implication that there was some kind of improper influence brought to bear on the investigation is factually incorrect and also unfair both to the Mayor and also to the officers concerned because obviously it points to their professionalism and their independence --

Joanne McCartney (AM): I do not make any allegations against the officer. I am saying that the Mayor's comments were clearly not based on briefings. I am assuming. That is what you said. I am not trying to construct a case here; I am trying to understand what the Mayor, who says he is *de facto* head of the Metropolitan Police Service, is saying.

After the Mayor made those comments did you have any words with him about the appropriateness of him making those comments?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I do not recall.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I ask you that because the Mayor has already had form on this. During the Damian Green arrest there was a reference to the Standards Board where he was told his actions had been extraordinary and unwise and he had to undergo some extra training. It appears that he did not learn the lessons from that extra training. Would you look at that as to whether anything further needs to be done?

One final question to you, Chairman, if I may, is that the Mayor, when I questioned him in September, said that he could remember no briefings or conversations regarding phone

hacking. Three weeks ago at Mayor's Question Time he said his memory was faulty and he now remembers occasions when it was alluded to. You have now said that you and the Mayor asked relevant and appropriate questions. You have now said that phone hacking was mentioned. Did you or the Mayor actually ask any probing questions, particularly around the civil cases that were happening around that time?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): He periodically sought assurances from a senior grade chief constable that the investigation was thorough and that he was looking properly at any evidence and claims that were coming in the newspaper and assessing them as and when. I am happy to give you a copy of his letter to the Mayor that confirms that these assurances were sought and that those assurances were given.

I understand that there is a hindsight view now that more could have been done at the time but I actually think, beyond asking a senior chief constable ranked officer that he was satisfied the investigation has been thorough and all the rest of it, I cannot see, other than go through the bin bags himself, that the Mayor could have done anything more that would not have been improper.

I am satisfied that that took place. Frankly, as I think I said in my letter to Jenny [Jones], I do believe that the proper scrutiny of that investigation should and was done in this Authority on a number of occasions. Both you and Jenny and Dee [Doocey] and other Members asked very probing and testing questions of both the Commissioner and Tim as Deputy Commissioner and, indeed, AC Yates who came here on a number of occasions to answer questions about that investigation, and you put them through the wringer. That is the right way it should be done.

On top of that, the Mayor, as I say, sought assurances, when this issue was brought up in his normal counter terrorism briefings, that all was in order from the Assistant Commissioner in charge. Those assurances were given. He has now received a letter saying that, unfortunately, those assurances were given without full possession of the information and an apology that that has put him in an embarrassing position. That is it. Pure and simple.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have another question to Tim [Godwin]. What is your view on the Mayor's comments and would you say they were helpful, given that they appear to be contradicting what senior police officers were saying at the time?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): What I would like to say on the back of that is that I am very clear who was in charge of the Metropolitan Police Service at that time and that was Sir Paul Stephenson and that the Commissioner is in charge of the Metropolitan Police Service. I am not sure what the Mayor's comments were so it is hard for me to comment on that, other than what I have read in the press.

What I would like to say is what Sir Paul Stephenson said at the Full Authority meeting on 30 September 2010. What he said is,

“We are considering the material which has recently come to light and we will be consulting with the Crown Prosecution Service. As part of that process of inquiry, (inaudible) or not, a 47 year old man was interviewed on 14 September 2010 and 21 September 2010 and then a 29 year old man was interviewed as well. We have interviewed two people further on this and we are looking at the outcome of that and deciding is there anything new or not and we will be consulting the CPS about it. That is the process at this moment in time.”

That was what was occurring at that time. The other bit I do have some difficulty in, is that some of this will be, undoubtedly, a matter of public inquiry and, additionally, some of it will certainly be part of the IPCC referral that it is considering as we speak, so anything further than that I think would be unwise for me to say.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): Two quick supplementary questions, one of which is designed to be helpful. Chairman, could you tell the Authority whether, in your experience, the Mayor sticks to the briefings that he is given?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The Mayor knows his own mind.

Toby Harris (AM): Secondly. I am trying to bring this forward. It would be useful to know how the approach that you and/or the Mayor took would have been different were we in the new legislative framework that is envisaged from some time later this year or next year? How would you have approached this issue under circumstances in which there was a Mayor’s Office of Police and Crime (MOPC) in place?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It is a good question but the truth is that where I have been, and would need to be, very careful in the future is the division between operational policing decisions and strategic decisions. While it is right for somebody in my position, or whoever is MOPC, to be informed about critical investigations, as Len Duvall and you will have experienced as previous Chairs, for anybody to be in a position where they could be accused of influencing an operational decision either way would be completely improper. The proper role of the Chair and the Mayor and indeed the MOPC will be to receive assurances from reputable senior police officers that everything that is being done could be done but, in the end, you have to abide by their operational decisions. That is the way it works.

Toby Harris (AM): So you disagree with the Prime Minister who says that if the new arrangements with a directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner are in place, the sort of thing that has happened in this instance would never have occurred?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I think this sort of thing could occur. Look, investigations go wrong. To say to somebody who is in a governance position, “That investigation went wrong because you did not ask the right question” is not a fair position to put people in. Investigations go wrong. What the person who governs the police, or even the

organisation that governs the police, has to do is make sure that you recruit, retain, train and develop the right people and that you rely on their professionalism, which is what was done.

Toby Harris (AM): I think you are agreeing with me that the Prime Minister was wrong!

Chris Boothman (AM): I am not seeking to question whether the Prime Minister is right or wrong. My question is slightly addressed to Tim [Godwin] as well. Will we get a briefing sometime in the near future about how investigations are managed and how investigations are supervised and reviewed so that we can understand the steps that should occur to ensure that this kind of thing does not happen? It seems to me that, over the last year, there have been a number of investigations where questions have been raised about how the investigations have been framed and how they have been carried out. I think we need some assistance in understanding the process more so that we can ask the right questions and have a better grip on what is going on.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): We can certainly brief you on the various review processes and policies that we have. It is obviously different for different types of crime but we can certainly arrange that.

For us, I would like to put on record that one of the things that the police service is very keen to reinforce, which has been reinforced in the current debates around changing the governance, is the operational independence of the police. With operational independence comes accountability. If you ever saw a graphic representation of that in the last week or so the Metropolitan Police Service has shown what that accountability means.

Chris Boothman (AM): Hopefully, Tim, that kind of thing should not have to happen too often.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): The obvious answer is we really hope not.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Valerie?

Valerie Brasse (AM): What we have heard a lot of up until now is the assurances that were sought. This is a question about does this trip over to what is about operational accountability. Did you also ask and how did you seek those assurances? Were you asking the Commissioner, "Give me an assurance that all is as it should be" and do you ask him how he sought those assurances?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No. I am trying to remember now. I cannot recall precisely the questions that were asked in the meeting other than we emerged from the various discussions with reassurances that everything that could be being done was being done.

In fact, in many ways, the probing questions should and were asked in public. Here. If you go back and review the transcripts you will find very comprehensive questions asked by a number of Members with comprehensive answers being given, including Paul Stephenson's confirmation of exactly the action that was taken following the New York Times' stories, that interviews were held and consultations with the CPS. Later I think it was reported there was a CPS conclusion that there was no evidence that crossed the threshold of a prosecution in the future. All of that was aired in public here. Fundamentally, that is where it should be done.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Yes, but I come back to the point; if we had perhaps been more on the how rather than the what we may have been in a different place. Maybe that is an issue that we need to think about going forward and maybe once there is a MOPC the how is as important as the what issues.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Can we move on to the next section? Everybody happy? OK. The next section was on internal resilience. Who is going to kick off with those questions? John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I am happy to. I was not anticipating leading on this. I am somewhat bewildered by the events of the last few days and I know that things have had to happen urgently. I wanted to say something to start with which was I regret very much Sir Paul Stephenson's resignation, however, I think it was forced by the *de facto* statement of no confidence from the Mayor.

Given that that has happened twice I think the Mayor needs to consider that although you say the Mayor likes to express himself in particular ways he needs to understand - because he is *de facto* the head of this police service, he told us last week - that his words have consequences. People need to understand that you cannot just make flippant comments and assume, like some sort of incontinent puppy, people will forever forgive you. It is just plain wrong. He needs to think about the consequences of his actions which, in this case I think, have precipitated the departure of a man of great integrity, to my understanding, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service.

I regret that and I think that the Mayor's actions have helped precipitate that. I am very clear in my understanding of events that that is one of the consequences. He has done it twice. I understand the reasons for getting rid of the previous one. I do not think that there were substantive reasons this time round. I do understand what he has done and he has to live with his consequences. It is not good enough to put out statements saying he was removed by innuendo which is something that you said.

I am interested in the process of appointment because we are the MPA and yet it seems to be the case that Mr Hogan-Howe, whom I hold in great regard from my understanding of his work and his knowledge and experience and leadership, was appointed by a Home Secretary who is not here and the Mayor of London who is not here. The Mayor of London appears to have certified this. He never attends this Authority. He is not a

Member of it. It is the Authority which makes a recommendation leading to the appointment.

At the end of last week I asked Ms Crawford for some legal advice on how this situation could arise and I have not had anything yet. I understand there has been copious advice, I suspect after the event, solicited from lawyers to justify the changes. I am sure you got the right advice that clarifies you can do these things but I think it is extremely discourteous and a breach of the process of accountability against an authority that we have not yet seen what that advice is. I would like to hear from you, Chairman, what you are doing to ensure that you are standing up for the Authority and that we are being allowed to exercise our still lawful responsibility in advisement on the appointment and playing a role in the appointment of the Commissioner and of substantive staff changes in the Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): As I think I have said in correspondence, following Sir Paul's sad resignation on the Sunday evening on arrival at the MPA the following morning I became aware that the Home Office was likely to move quite quickly in terms of any action it may take. I made a call pretty much first thing to Stephen Rimmer at the Home Office to underline to him in no uncertain terms that the MPA had to be consulted on any quick time appointments that were likely to be made in any short period.

Sadly, things moved faster than that.

John Biggs (AM): There has been no consultation? There has been no urgent meeting? There has been no urgency procedure? You have not convened an Extraordinary Meeting of the Chairs of Committees or anything like that? It has just sort of happened. Either it is a discourtesy or you, like the rest of us, have been treated like a doormat in this process.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The system has certainly been less than ideal but I think, as I said in my opening statement, the truth is there is no system. On looking at it there is no accept process about how it might happen. The Home Secretary recognised that there was an immediate resilience issue. She wanted to move quickly to put somebody in at Deputy Commissioner. She had a discussion with the Mayor to make sure that he was content. He then informed me that this was agreed and a short time later it was announced in the House of Commons.

John Biggs (AM): So you are the Chairman of the Authority and I think, in extraordinary circumstances, we would accept that you may have to act urgently on our behalf but you would then follow that very urgently with a consultation with Lead Members and, hopefully, the whole Authority - and that has not happened. You are now telling us that you were simply informed that this change would happen. You are the Chairman of the Authority. The Mayor has absolved himself of responsibility and yet he, like the Wizard of Oz, is exercising it behind the scenes without any accountability. I find that unacceptable, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): You will understand that this has been of concern to a number of Members and, as I think I expressed in correspondence, it was of concern to me. It was, as I say, less than ideal.

I think one of the things we need to think about for the future, given that there are lessons that need to be learned out of this situation, is that we need to examine a proper system that does consult the Authority even in the short period in which it may exist for the future, just in case. We have obviously established that, for the permanent appointments, the proper system will be in place but I do think we should be - and I am quite happy to write to the Home Office to express our concern about the way things were addressed.

As I say, on Monday morning, John, I made my views very clear to the Home Office about how it should go ahead but, sadly, there are bigger beasts out there than me, unfortunately, as I found --

John Biggs (AM): I get the impression you have only discovered that in the past week, with respect, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): As complimentary as ever.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, that there is no system does not mean that there is no authority. I accept that you say that there are bigger beasts out there. One of those bigger beasts is your own colleague the Mayor. At this point I am now going to come back. I did not think that we should be spending time investigating the Mayor and the Mayor's knowledge and so forth, but the way in which the Mayor stood away from your authority on behalf of the Authority seems to me to be at least cavalier if not directly insulting to you, if not to us. I will write in very firm terms not only to the Home Secretary but also to the Mayor.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): There is a wider point about the hybrid situation in which we find ourselves because do not forget we are not a pure police authority in the way that other police authorities are constructed; we are a hybrid. I am a direct appointment by the Mayor. I am not, as Toby [Harris] was and Len [Duvall] was, elected by you.

John Biggs (AM): Where is he today then? Where is the Mayor today? Why is he not sitting by your side to explain his actions?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Hold on. That points up some of the conflicts which I think the Government is seeking to resolve by the separation of the scrutiny and the function of the Authority from the strategic directional function. This extraordinary situation. Let's not paint this as routine. This was an extraordinary situation and an extraordinary set of events which the Metropolitan Police Service has never had to face before. That has pointed up a number of cracks in the tripartite - actually quad partite - system that we have in London and we need to learn from that and put a system in place.

I am quite happy to write to the Home Office and the Mayor saying that we need to establish a proper system from this going forward. I do not think that the Mayor or the Home Secretary acted in any way other than to attempt to move quickly to reassure the public that the resilience of the Metropolitan Police Service was being maintained by making sure that it had its leadership intact, albeit on a temporary basis. Everybody operated from a well meaning point of view but the process and the system was not sufficient to cope with the timeframe in which that announcement needed to be made.

A number of Members have expressed a view that they want some kind of statement about that state of affairs and I think one has been drafted which Catherine [Crawford] can read out to you now. If you are happy with that then we can issue that statement publicly and make our views known, albeit the process now is that we need to learn from that and try to work out a system for the future.

John Biggs (AM): Just to finish my bit, I would like to see a copy of the detailed legal advice which led to this happening. For the record, but also in the interests of Mr Hogan-Howe, there should be some clarification of what his status is.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. Val [Shawcross]?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I think the headline on this question was about internal resilience. It would be helpful to us now to have the Commissioner say something about what is the capacity and the status of the senior management within the Metropolitan Police Service? This is an organisation that was already significantly under the cosh from enormous financial cuts, from rising crime in some areas, particularly burglary and violent crime, from the Olympics, from dealing with terrorism and the events that are ongoing now and the 13 or so different types of inquiries that are underway. What I want to know, on behalf of Londoners, from the Commissioner and yourself, Chairman, is are the acting arrangements strong enough to fulfil our agenda? Do you have any support needs as the Acting Commissioner which are not being met? Are there any concerns you have about the capacity of the organisation now to deliver on what is already a really challenging agenda? We ought to be saying thank you to the Acting Commissioner for holding the ring and picking up the management of a service with so much challenge, crisis and turbulence at the moment.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Thank you for that. It is an honour to lead the Metropolitan Police Service and I am grateful that I am here.

In terms of resilience, we have a strength and depth team here. We have had some really good people come through. We have got Lynne Owens recently appointed as Assistant Commissioner. We have got Cressida Dick who has got a wealth of experience across a number of disciplines. We have got Chris Allison who has been, for many years, on public order and security planning and, as a result of that, is very well embedded in with the Olympics in terms of developing the security plan and that will continue going forward. He is supported through this Authority, through Baroness Doocey, and he has also got, in terms of support for him, Michael Johnson, Ian Quinton and a whole range of

others that are supporting him. We have also got, in terms of Lynne, a wide range of detective experience as well. For me, I am content that, with Ian McPherson who is currently on holiday but back within the next day or so, we do have a fairly robust command team.

I think it is very welcome - and it is welcomed by the Management Board of the Metropolitan Police Service - that Bernard [Hogan-Howe] has joined us to increase the resilience that we have in terms of moving forward with all the agendas that we have to deal with and so I am content that all that support is there and being met.

One of the things that we do need to do, hence being here today, is we do need now those public inquiries, those judicial reviews, those various investigations and those combat matters to be allowed to fulfil their function and to get to a logical conclusion and for the Metropolitan Police Service, once more, whilst still being held accountable through those processes, to focus on its core business - countering terrorism, reducing crime, keeping people safe and delivering a safe and secure Olympics - whilst dealing with all the issues about changes in terms and conditions of employment of our staff and, equally, the challenging budget that we have.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Just to reiterate, Reshard [Auladin], I and the Mayor had on Tuesday a very quick time briefing with Cressida Dick and Stuart Osborne just to make sure that all the risks were properly covered, that everybody's head was in the game and all the rest of it. I have got territorial policing to do exactly the same just to satisfy myself that the resilience is there.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): OK.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): A number of Members have signalled on this but we have had an hour and we are only two into six sections of questioning. What would Members like to do? I am happy to move on to talk about media and ethics and leaks and corruption? Yes, Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): A point of information. I had understood that we could not deviate from the questions that were on the piece of paper and that was all we were taking, but you have actually taken some other supplementary questions and differing views. I think we need to be clear because if we are going to continue as we are we will be here until 6pm.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I understand. Obviously Members were anxious to ask supplementary questions about --

Dee Doocey (AM): I think everyone will be at it on every section.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I understand that. There were particular questions of me and I did not want to sit, Dee, and be accused of curtailing peoples' questions of me. That is always difficult. We did agree a process. I am happy - I think there probably will

be more questions for me - now that we have done that that we start to stick to the script a bit more and get through because you are quite right, we will be here for hours --

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, one point of information. We have heard on a number of posts in acting positions - and it is not just related to the post that Bernard Hogan-Howe is holding. Are we to understand that Cressida Dick is in an acting position and Lynne Owens is in an acting position so the whole of the management team is currently in acting positions? Therefore, what we then understand is this will hold fast until the appointment of the Commissioner and then there will be a review or people will fall back to where they were? These posts, publicly paid, I imagine are somehow subject to employment law, ie you get a vacancy and you have to advertise it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Can I suggest, Tim [Godwin], what might be sensible - because there have been quite a few moves - is that you drop us a line with the exact structure now and then a proposed timetable both that takes in the Commissioner, **UA CSCD(?)**, so we are all clear about who is doing what, when and where?

Toby Harris (AM): Can we have the questions answered which have been tabled? I am not clear, if someone is acting or temporary, what the implications of the different legal positions are.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Fine. All right. The questions that are tabled for this, to be clear, are what is the current status of Bernard Hogan-Howe, Dick Fedorcio and Sir Paul Stephenson, what was the process for appointing Cressida Dick and Lynne Owens?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Sir Paul Stephenson left the Metropolitan Police Service at midnight on 26 July 2011 and at that point I became temporary Commissioner.

In relation to Bernard the Home Secretary and the Mayor asked Mr Hogan-Howe to take on the responsibilities of Deputy Commissioner and join me and my senior team in leading the Metropolitan Police Service. Those responsibilities include leading the Deputy Commissioner's command of legal services, professional standards and diversity, chairing Performance and Governance Boards and chairing the Diversity Board. Bernard has ceased all work at HMI where that relates to the Metropolitan Police Service. He will also be assuming responsibility in the Deputy role for oversight matters relating to the phone hacking investigations that are ongoing as we speak.

Dick Fedorcio is currently on annual leave and is the subject of a referral and independent investigation by the IPCC.

John Yates is currently an Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police Service but has identified his intention to resign.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The process for appointing Cressida and Lynne? That is, effectively, at your disposal is it not?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Yes. The appointment of the Assistant Commissioner Specialist Operations (ACSO). For me, as the Acting Commissioner, it is very important to have a substantive Assistant Commissioner with the right skills and experience in that role and, as a result, Cressida Dick has been appointed as the Assistant Commissioner in Specialist Operations following John Yates' intention to resign. She is the obvious choice and this was confirmed with our key partners in other agencies and the Government and conversations with the Chair of this Authority.

In terms of Lynne Owens as Assistant Commissioner Serious Crime and Assistant Commissioner Central Operations, this at the moment is a temporary arrangement until a replacement can be found. As I mentioned before, in order to support that we have Rose Fitzpatrick as Deputy Assistant Commissioner in Central Operations. We have appointed Alan Gibson as Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner in the Serious Crime Directorate and moved Sue Akers to purely focus on the various inquiries that she has underway. Alan Gibson has a wealth of experience in the Serious Crime Directorate and will provide that support. We hope that the speed with which we can appoint a new Assistant Commissioner will be swift.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. You will drop us a note on where we are?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Yes.

John Biggs (AM): Can we clarify? There were four words that you used which is you have taken on the responsibilities. Does that mean he is or does that mean he is acting in some sort of quasi role? If you were hit by the Number 15 bus would he then become appointable as the Commissioner?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Can I refer that to the Chief Executive?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Thank you. The formal position is that Mr Hogan-Howe has been temporarily seconded to the Metropolitan Police Service from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary so as to provide resilience. This arrangement will end as soon as it is clear who has the substantive position but it is not possible, under the legislation, to make an appointment formally as Deputy Commissioner. Nonetheless, with that courtesy title and under Mr Godwin's command, he will fulfil the full range of duties as was just described.

I am very happy to write. I am sorry that I did not receive definitive legal advice in time to come back before this Authority. I will write immediately afterwards to set all that out.

Toby Harris (AM): Tim has described himself as Acting Commissioner and as temporary Commissioner. I believe they have a different legal status. Presumably from what you have just said Bernard Hogan-Howe is neither acting nor temporary; he is just fulfilling a role. So what does that mean in terms of the legal obligations? I am told we

are never allowed to have both of them out of the country simultaneously. Does that mean that Tim simply is tethered to a desk in New Scotland Yard for the duration?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): He has had his holiday!

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): That is what we are looking at. Temporary Commissioner is the appointment that I have been given. I have no intention of falling under a bus and I have no intention of testing the legislation as we speak but that is a matter that we will clarify and we will pass that round to Members.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I will include that in the note that I send round.

Chris Boothman (AM): Cressida Dick is a substantive appointment is she?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): The appointments are substantive to the rank of Assistant Commissioner and Cressida Dick was appointed to Assistant Commissioner by the MPA some years ago, so she has just been transferred internally.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. That is it on internal resilience. If we can now be quick and snappy about it can we now move on to media and ethics? Kirsten [Hearn]?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): This is regarding the appointment of Dame Elizabeth Filkin to investigate and advise on relationships with the media and the police. I am asking these questions because there is a fine balance to be struck between transparency and speed really. Firstly, was there a project brief drawn up to describe the role that Dame Elizabeth would take?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): There was a specific terms of reference specification in terms of what we wanted to achieve from it and the issues to be worked at and looked at and to advise the Commissioner and the Metropolitan Police Service. It would have been made available to the MPA. That was then negotiated with Elizabeth Filkin and that is now coming over to the MPA for its information as a single tender action.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Thanks. What was the means of selecting someone to do this work?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): The decision was made to appoint an individual to examine those issues and, as a result, there were a number of conversations to identify the most appropriate person to fill that role. This raised a number of names. The people that we consulted with were members of our Management Board, the MPA Chair and the Chief Executive, the Home Office, Number 10 and the Cabinet Office for those that they felt had the gravitas and the status in order to conduct this work.

Elizabeth Filkin was the person who received support from all the key players. Many of the others who did were unable to do the work within the timeframe required and were being used for things like the public inquiry with Lord Justice Leveson.

On 20 July Dame Filkin attended a meeting with myself when I asked her whether she would consider taking up that role and, as a result, a negotiation then took place with Caroline Murdoch, the Chief of Staff, in relation to the terms of reference and contractual arrangements, which will be referred to the Authority.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Thanks. Chairman, did anyone from the MPA, either senior officers or other senior colleagues, have any involvement in this?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. We were asked if it was a good idea, to which we said yes, and then Catherine [Crawford] and I were both asked to suggest names and review some of the other names that were in the frame.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Does Sir Paul or any other senior Metropolitan Police Service officer know Dame Filkin outside this realm or have any contact or previous relationship with her?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I cannot speak for all the senior officers of the Metropolitan Police Service but I can certainly speak for myself and Paul and, I believe, the Management Board - which is no, we have not had any dealings with her and we do not know her personally.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Acting Deputy Commissioner): I should declare I have.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): The fifth question you have answered. I have just got a little googly here which is, as part of moving forward on this, did anybody do any risk assessment in relation to what you decided to do?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In terms of risk assessment, yes, we identified that, naturally, when you have these go anywhere, review it and tell us where we need to go, there are risks in terms of the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service that comes out from that.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK. Fine. I am done.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Right. We then move on to Jenny [Jones] and Toby [Harris] who had some questions under this heading.

Jenny Jones (AM): Chairman, I am happy to let my questions go in writing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Fine.

Toby Harris (AM): I wanted to know if we could be told whether the Director of Professional Standards ordered access by police officers and staff of the police national computer (PNC) and other police databases to check whether the information accessed is appropriate and relevant to the work of the person accessing the information? If this is only done in respect of a complaint about an individual officer or staff member, will this now be done more regularly to check all access to information on the PNC and other databases on a sample basis? If these wider checks are already done, what proportion of access to information are checked and will this proportion now be reviewed? Can I also ask how many police officers and police staff have been a) prosecuted, b) dismissed or asked to resign or c) disciplined for misusing police information over the last decade?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In relation to the first part the Metropolitan Police Service has always identified information misuse, including leakage, as a key risk. To reduce that risk it conferred, through the Oversight Board of the Metropolitan Police Service Security Board and the Professional Standards' Strategic Committee, the Chair by the Deputy Commissioner. It has a specific Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead for information misuse and the policies around it which is (inaudible). The Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) conducts, **with calls(?)**, audits of all databases in response to information or intelligence triggers collected from a wide range of sources. That is if we perceive that there has been a leak in certain areas we will audit those databases.

In addition, however, centrally the Metropolitan Police Service Intelligence Bureau conducts checks of high usage and/or high risk databases and there are randomly selected checks every day. That includes the impact nominal index, the police national database and the police national computer.

Locally, on borough and operational command units (OCUs), in accordance with our **PNT(?)** standard operating procedures, supervisors are required to conduct at least 140 monthly random audits of the PNT per borough.

In terms of criminal intelligence and the criminal database our operating procedures require supervisory checks to be undertaken daily by nominated gatekeepers and our crime information system has an audit facility which is able to ascertain who accessed individual pages, for how long and whether anything was printed.

In relation to how many incidences of confidential police information leaked to the press have been investigated internally, between 1 January 2011 and 30 June 2011 five conduct matters and five public complaints have been recorded in relation to allegations of information leakage to the media. All of the conduct matters have been subject to investigation and three of these are still ongoing. In both of these finalised cases there was no case to answer. In the first it proved impossible to identify the source. In the second the source was identified, however, there was no evidence of misconduct. Three of the public complaints have been subject to an investigation with two of the cases still ongoing. The third case found no case to answer. The remaining two complaints were withdrawn by complainants.

In the last decade 13 police officers and police staff have been prosecuted for misusing police information over that period of time. 29 police officers and police staff have been dismissed or asked to resign for misusing police information over that past decade. 208 police officers and police staff have been disciplined for misusing police information over that ten year period.

Toby Harris (AM): Thank you. Can I suggest that you get a report on that to a relevant Committee?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It is worth pointing out that when I suggested, whenever it was - six/eight months ago - that we do our scrutiny before the corruption and the systems that we have in place to prevent and detect it, this is precisely the kind of thing that we wanted to look at as part of that. That work is ongoing. Obviously we can include, as part of that report which will come later in the year, some of the data around how successful they have or have not been, if that is satisfactory?

Toby Harris (AM): I am slightly concerned about the timetable. Whilst I think the scrutiny work that we are doing is very important, I am very worried that that is going to run up against the closing date for the MPA and I think it would be useful if, in one of our meetings --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We can pull the data in.

Toby Harris (AM): -- and that can then feed into that scrutiny.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I think it is also worth stating that on our Professional Standards Committee Reshard [Auladin] is a member and will be aware of all the different (inaudible) and strategies. We will bring a report to the MPA.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Jenny [Jones], you are taking yours as written are you?

Jenny Jones (AM): On media protocols?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Tim answered them to some extent. Could we have a copy of the protocols that now exist?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): They are on the Metropolitan Police Service website and I will send you a copy.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Caroline [Pidgeon], you had a question on --

Dee Doocey (AM): No, I have got a question on media protocol.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am sorry, Dee. Yes, carry on.

Dee Doocey (AM): Can I ask the Acting Commissioner, in view of recent events, do you, on reflection, regret dismissing my concerns about senior Metropolitan Police Service officers being wined and dined by senior executives of News International? I am specifically referring in particular to the concerns I raised in February this year.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Dee, we have had conversations in relation to that. In terms of the response it was not so much dismissing concerns; it was answering the fact that we have always said that we should have a relationship with the media in order to get the important message across to the public about what we do, which was reinforced by Sir Paul Stephenson at the Home Affairs Select Committee. However, historically, the means by which this was achieved, including attending dinners etc, we are now changing this approach.

Do I regret the perception that this has created and the tarnishing of our worldwide reputation? Of course I do. Will we be changing? Yes, we will. I agree with not being entirely compliant with our own monitoring systems in the past and that will change. I am taking action now to rectify that with a member of my own staff coming to City Hall to meet with the GLA Monitoring Officer.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you. If I can just follow up? I have said on previous occasions that my concern is not about the police meeting with journalists - I absolutely accept that it is necessary in order to exchange information - but I did have a concern then and the concern is here now about the fact that there were so many meetings that took place over lunches and dinners which I considered at the time, and still do, to be totally inappropriate.

I am very pleased to hear you say that, with hindsight, you do regret what I still consider to be the fact that you brushed aside my concerns. You are going to set up an internet system as I understand it so that anybody can access it and I liked the idea that you are going to base this on the GLA system which is that anything over £25 has got to be declared, whether you are giving the hospitality or receiving it. I wanted to be clear that you could perhaps give us an assurance that we would see the system that you were trying to set up. I am not suggesting we design it by committee at all but before that goes live because, in previous occasions, I have often felt that the Metropolitan Police Service does not necessarily see things with the same eyes as we do and it might be helpful if we could just see it just before you decide to go live and give you comments on it.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Absolutely. One of the things that we want to do is to be very open and transparent about what we are doing and what we are going to do to address those issues. We want to get the confidence back in the Metropolitan Police Service.

In terms of the regrets, what I am saying there is the way it is perceived has been a matter of great regret for us but I have no doubt in the integrity of Sir Paul Stephenson.

Dee Doocey (AM): I have no doubt about the integrity of Sir Paul Stephenson either but I absolutely think that you should regret the fact that so many senior officers, particularly when there were ongoing investigations, had lunches and dinners with senior executives of the Murdoch Corporation. I do not think you should just be regretting the perception; I think you should be regretting the act. Thank you, Chairman.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I think if I could put the clock back I would like to do that.

Dee Doocey (AM): Sure.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Caroline [Pidgeon], you had a question about gifts and hospitality?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes. I want to do them in reverse order because my second one follows on from Dee. It is about this issue of the register of gifts and hospitality. I raised it with you, Tim, at the SOP Committee the other week and you said you were horrified it was not all up online already and that was certainly your intention. You do have something online but, as has been raised previously, it is not in any acceptable format whatsoever. The Director of Public Affairs (DPA) Department has a list of lunch, dinners and breakfasts and whether they have accepted or declined. It does not tell me how much it was worth, it does not tell me who it was with and it does not tell me where it was. Likewise, for the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner. It is up every quarter which is not timely, we have got a quarter that is missing completely - between September 2010 and December 2010 it does not exist online - and we have only got up until March 2011. We have got nothing since then. We do not actually know what gifts and hospitality officially that you and Sir Paul received.

In this era of transparency, you said you are looking at what we do in the GLA, we raised this previously and you need an online version that is updated regularly so it is in a timely manner, as we do as Assembly Members here. Within 28 days it is clearly online what gifts or hospitality we have had. When can we receive assurance that that will be up and running and in place - and going back longer than three years? I think it needs to go back a lot longer than that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): The three year review has been done and certainly I had a conversation with Dee about that only yesterday I think. In the interest of brevity, to get in on to the spreadsheet, it has changed some of them from their meanings and so, as a result of that, in order for accuracy, at the moment all members of the Management Board are going line by line to ensure that they can put down value and reason because our policy clearly states there should be a value to the Metropolitan Police

Service and to London from any hospitality. Then, as soon as that is completed, we will be publishing that for the three years.

In terms of the GLA monitoring process, we will be taking a report through the Management Board, we will be asking the MPA as to how it views any scheme and we will be implementing that as soon as we can.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Value and reason. It needs to be whom you met with, where and so on --

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): The Director of Public Affairs that I referred to earlier, the list that we have got, only goes to March 2009. How out of date is that? That is your public relations (PR) department whom I am sure are meeting a lot with the press. I think it is really important that you do that as soon as possible. We need that.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): That is a priority for us to do that, work is ongoing, I will be keeping you informed as to the progress and we will be publishing it. Likewise, we will be changing our policy very swiftly based on the learning we can get from the GLA as well and that will be implemented swiftly.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Are we talking weeks or months?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I would hope weeks.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): OK. My other question was to you, Chairman, and whether you could provide us with a list of any lunches, dinners or meetings you have had with newspaper executives and senior editorial staff since you became Chairman, and their purpose?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am happy to. I think you are over estimating the delight with which people wish to spend time in my company, to be perfectly honest! As far as I can recall there have not been any with executives, what you would call an executive. I think I am going to have to ask you to define senior editorial staff a little more closely? I once went to a lunch where, at the other end of the table, Polly Toynbee was sitting there. She did not speak to me but does that count? What I can say is that everything that needs to be declared is declared on the hospitality website. There have not been that many. I am not that popular sadly.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): You could circulate them in a list? Obviously if you have people at a table I think that is slightly different to you having a one to one dinner or lunch.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right.

Toby Harris (AM): When the Acting temporary Commissioner reports to us on these new arrangements could we also have a consideration of how far this should extend throughout the organisation? Should it go a long way further down? If so, perhaps we can talk about those arrangements.

The other thing is, perhaps in the interest of transparency, we consider what arrangements should be put in place for occasions when the Metropolitan Police Service has offered hospitality - for example, dinners in the Assistant Commissioner's mess - and perhaps indicating whether those have been paid for by Metropolitan Police Service funds or by the individual officers concerned. Again, that would perhaps be relevant in the current climate.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Absolutely.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It does point to a hole in our own MPA. It may be, for instance, we do have declarations of hospitality that have to be given, but none of us, as Members, have to declare if we have had a meeting with a senior newspaper executive. I drop that into the mix. I do not know whether any of you have. I do not think I have. I will have to go back through the diary to recall any.

Dee Doocey (AM): We should. We should look at it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): If you, John [Biggs], have had a meeting with somebody from News International none of us would know unless they had bought you lunch. Then we get into the decision about what constitutes a meeting? If I happen to shake somebody's hand at a party and we have a chat for ten minutes does that need to be declared, even though I only had a glass of orange juice? There are lots of questions there that I think we perhaps need to look at ourselves over the next few weeks and decide whether we need to revamp the MPA declarations as well.

Dee Doocey (AM): Before we abolish it or after, Chairman!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It would be a useful pointer for life after as well because the last thing anybody who might occupy that seat would want is for other people to say, "You went into a side room at a cocktail party and you did not actually declare it". There is a (inaudible) of this; which is that we have to just all publish our diaries all the time and then you get into a position where people do not put things in their diaries. At the same time, I think it is something we could usefully look at. All right?

OK. I am conscious we have had over an hour and a half now and we have still got a few sections to go so if people could keep it snappy that would be great. The next one is section four; ongoing investigations and due diligence. We might find ourselves in difficult territory here but, nevertheless, we will try. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have asked for the terms of reference for Operation Elvedon and that can be given in writing. That would be great.

My other question is can you give assurances that none of the current investigation team, Operation Weeting headed by Sue Akers, have had any links to or received hospitality from News International?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): The terms of reference of Operation Elveden are actually published on the IPCC website and we will make that copy available.

Operation Weeting personnel were asked to declare any associations they had with the media at the commencement of the operation. The team has made three such declarations that have been assessed by the senior investigating officer (SIO) as compatible with their involvement with the investigation. None of these declarations involve titles owned by News International. No member of the team has received hospitality from News International. News staff are subject to the same processes to protect the integrity of the inquiry.

The one addition to this, which occurred years before the Operation Weeting investigation started, is in respect of DAC Sue Akers who had a business meeting with Sean O'Neill of the *Times* on 4 August 2008 when she was Head of Organised Crime Directorate. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss organised crime involving firearms. The meeting took place at lunchtime and the reporter paid for lunch. That meeting was recorded in the hospitality register and is the only one that is with a News International title.

DAC Akers has reported to AC Dick since the investigation began but now, following her move into the role of Assistant Commissioner Special Operations, she will be reporting to Bernard Hogan-Howe in his capacity of performing the role of the Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service.

Joanne McCartney (AM): That answers one of my questions. My final question on this was about Operation Elveden and the status with the IPCC. I understand the IPCC is supervising the Metropolitan Police Service investigations into inappropriate payments by a small number of officers. I think it is important that we also agree with Tim's comments that the vast majority of officers out there are doing a worthwhile and excellent job and it is unfortunate that these allegations are tainting the Metropolitan Police Service as a whole.

For public confidence issues, do you not think that that investigation should be dealt with by the IPCC totally independently? We have heard from Deborah Glass before that, when those individuals who may have accepted inappropriate payments are identified, that will move over to be independent. What therefore happens if you identify two or three but not others? It is not then practical for the whole thing to go over. I want to know when the trigger is for it to go over?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Operation Elveden is, as you correctly say, an IPCC supervised investigation. That is a decision for the IPCC once we refer it.

Deborah Glass has been clear that DAC Akers is leading an ongoing complex and interconnected criminal inquiry which is looking at the actions of the media and other members of the public over whom the IPCC has no jurisdiction as well as the actions of police officers which may be criminal. It is important that the overall effectiveness of that investigation is not compromised. Deborah Glass has also been clear that she expects to be kept informed of developments and will wish to discuss lines of inquiry with DAC Akers and/or the team and to be given full access to any material obtained or generated by the inquiry as she requests.

Under Regulation 6 of the Police Complaints Misconduct Regulations 2004 the IPCC is able to impose any reasonable requirements as to the conduct of the investigation as appear to be necessary, and will undoubtedly use that power.

Following Deborah Glass' attendance at the SOP when she was questioned about why the investigation is not being conducted independently Deborah recorded a YouTube message which was why are you not doing this independently?

“This is a complex investigation looking at not only the actions of police officers but also actions of the media and members of the public. That is why DAC Akers is involved in the wider phone hacking programme which I am not involved in and the allegations involving the police. If it were practical to carve out from that that part of the inquiry that just related to the police, I would do that, but at that moment I do not believe it is. I made it clear to the Metropolitan Police Service that as and when officers are identified I would want us to independently investigate but I am also clear that the overriding objective here is to identify wrongdoers and bring them to justice. I believe that the Metropolitan Police Service shares that objective and I do not want to do anything that would compromise our ability to do that”.

It is an ongoing review and there will be a further look at it when people are actually identified.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can we be kept abreast of that when it is happening?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will give you the YouTube link, Joanne. There we are; we move into the modern age! OK. Was there anything else on this? Can we move on to the next section?

Dee Doocey (AM): I am happy for my question to be answered in writing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think mine is actually worth answering in public.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Fine. Fire away.

Jenny Jones (AM): What steps have been taken to ensure that the investigations within the Metropolitan Police Service working on Operation Weeting and Operation Elveden are themselves not compromised either through having accepted payments or gifts from the media in the past or through contact with --

Dee Doocey (AM): Hasn't Joanne just asked that?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): That was in relation to the answer that I gave to the Joanne question earlier about what checks have been done on all members of the team.

Jenny Jones (AM): So sorry.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Section five; award of contracts. Val [Shawcross]?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I think it would be helpful - the three questions are written here - to have a brief talking through of the procedure for the awarding of the contract and why it was not referred to the Metropolitan Police Authority Professional Standards Cases Sub-committee (PSCSC) earlier and what the future arrangements will be for tightening up contractual procedures. There certainly has been a lot of concern and discussion at the Finance Committee about procurement in the past but I know that Anne McMeel has been working quite diligently on trying to institute a programme and I think we should have some of that explained.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): We are talking about here the Chamy media contract awarded to Neil Wallis. In June 2011 the matter was passed to me by the Commissioner, at the beginning of June, and was subsequently referred by me to the Director of Professional Standards who then, whilst on leave, took legal advice. Following that, on my return on 12 July 2011, the matter was passed to the MPA Professional Standards Committee on 18 July 2011 which found that there were no issues on that briefing of conduct in relation to senior police officers, but was referred back to me. I then submitted that to the IPCC as a referral in terms of a conduct matter which is now subject to an independent investigation. As a result, I cannot actually talk about the process of that because that is being independently investigated by the IPCC.

In relation to what we are doing at the moment in terms of our contract winning processes, the Metropolitan Police Service has recognised historic issues with the contract award process. A programme of improvement has been introduced to address it. The first phase of this work concentrated on contract awards over £50,000 and this work was completed last year. All contracts let above this level are let in accordance with European Union (EU) procurement law. Below £50,000 a scheme of delegation provides autonomy for individual business areas and makes (inaudible) decisions in accordance with standard operating procedures.

As from 30 June 2011 we have introduced a system called Compete4. That is mandated for purchases between £500 and £50,000 to use the system. The system is used to ensure the necessary amount of quotations are received and provides an audit trail of actions by whom and when. Above £50,000 all procurement is undertaken by a dedicated procurement team. Further checks and controls are applied around invoice payment where a three way matching process is applied. As from October 2011 a no purchase order no pay process will be introduced for all inscope expenditure where an invoice will be rejected unless it carries a valid purchase order number. A new electronic source to pay system has also recently been purchased to provide greater clarity of control over all third party expenditure. This will be in place later this year and will be subject to reports to the Governance Committee.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you. Are you able to say why Sir Paul Stephenson did not tell the SOP Members about the contract with Neil Wallis when we met on 14 July 2011?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Obviously Sir Paul would answer for himself but one of the things that Sir Paul and the rest of us were very conscious of is not to in any way affect the integrity of the Weeting investigation. There were decisions about forewarning if action was to be taken against an individual.

This Authority is also investigating complaints by members of the public who have been arrested and that that has then been leaked even though no subsequent charges have been done. As a result, it is only appropriate to make those sorts of links and announcements as and when we have formally identified a person as having been arrested. That was the reason for it but I am sure that will be part of the IPCC inquiry.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. All done on that? Section six is historical issues regarding the News of the World.

Toby Harris (AM): It has been dealt with.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The first one has been dealt with.

Dee Doocey (AM): Mine can be dealt with in writing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Thank you. Toby [Harris]? You are happy? OK. Fine. Does anybody else have any other issues on this? Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I can have it in writing. Lord MacDonald, the former Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), raised some issues yesterday which seems to reopen some of the dispute between the Metropolitan Police Service and the CPS. Perhaps if we could have something in writing on that that would be very useful.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): He made some claims yesterday about certain things that had been said.

Joanne McCartney (AM): It is claims that I have raised before because they were raised in the New York Times article last September; that the Metropolitan Police Service did not show and disclose fully to the CPS at the time exactly what the evidence it had was.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am sure those allegations will be investigated.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I think that they will. We will have to look at the specific questions you ask in relation to the IPCC investigations that are ongoing and the judicial inquiry. They would sound, on the face of it, to be very specifically part of those two reviews which may mean it would be difficult to answer other than through that process, but we will look at the questions and see what we can do.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Chairman, can I ask for a point of clarification? When we do the minutes will we also put in at the same time written or are we going to do the minutes and then the answers separately? We have been told that we are going to get the written answers for this but some of them will have been covered orally and I am trying to make sure there is something afterwards that actually people can follow.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): What I was going to say at the end actually - we are coming on to the final section - was that probably what we need to do is produce a bit of a dossier to go alongside the minutes that outlines what the questions were and putting the answers, written or oral, alongside and then also, frankly, an appendix that has the pending questions that can be answered from various inquiries so we have got a working document to keep us going in the months to come.

Victoria Borwick (AM): That is extremely sensible. Otherwise, for the sake of transparency, it will be a muddle.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It would be all over the place, yes.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Infuriating if the answer starts with yes/no because you then have to search through another 65 pages to see what the yes/no was the answer to.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will produce a dossier to everybody's satisfaction and make sure that everybody is aware of what the answers are and then what is pending.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, some of the other correspondence perhaps - the timetables and so forth - which summarise these things would be very useful to have all in one place.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will do a little thing for your late summer email. OK. Then the final section. The future. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): I have to admit to not recalling putting these in in quite this form. It is a bit like the question you used to be asked at Labour Party selection meetings by Chairs of selections; is there anything that has ever happened to you in the past which might cause embarrassment were you to be selected?! Are you aware of anything you feel you ought to tell the Authority now that is still likely to come out and what are you intending to put in place that you have not already mentioned to us, because you have covered quite a lot already, that will protect the MPA and the Metropolitan Police Service from further issues in the future?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I am not aware of anything else, and I will leave it at that. I truly am not. If I was I would definitely declare it.

What do you intend to put in place? There are three key things in this for me that we have to do as a team. Firstly we have to support all the investigation, the judicial reviews and the inquiries that are ongoing, together with the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigations and combat matters that are going forward. I would like to reinforce Deborah Glass' comments that the investigations, all of them, will follow the evidence, and I believe that true of the inquiry as well. Also, that people should not rush to judgement until that work is done. We need now to allow the evidence to be looked at, evaluated and judgements and conclusions made and accountability allocated.

The second thing is the perception of the Metropolitan Police Service and the senior members of the Metropolitan Police Service must change. With the hospitality and the transparency I do not believe we have anything to hide but best we therefore expose it to pick up Dee [Doocey] and Caroline's [Pidgion] points. That will be done swiftly.

Likewise our relationships with the media and the way we interact with the media must change. We await Elizabeth Filkin's responses and equally we will be working with the Authority on that. These will be transparent and disclosed. That is what we are going to do to move forward. We will review all information misuse and our policies around information misuse and how we do that auditing and checking as you mentioned in your earlier questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Thank you very much. That is done on the prearranged questions. I presume everybody is happy for us to move on to the rest of the business of the meeting. No doubt we will come back to this. As I say, we will produce a playbook appendix in the next few weeks for people to then monitor progress of this over the months to come. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I have a quick question to the temporary Commissioner. Mr Godwin.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Tim please.

Jenny Jones (AM): About the Fortnum & Mason arrests --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Can we move on now to the business? We have got other submitted questions which, to be fair to people, we now have to move to and then we will come on to a free for all.

OK. Right. We are now reasserting the agenda. I just have a couple of things to update you from the rest of my report. The House of Lords report stage of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill ended on 14 July 2011 and a further reading took place on 20 July 2011. Both Houses are now on recess until 5 September 2011, at which point ping-pong may begin. We are working on a planned now December 2011 implementation for the new arrangements in London, although this is dependent on the Bill achieving Royal Assent in September 2011.

I attended the launch of the 101 new non emergency number in Lambeth which will make accessing the Metropolitan Police Service much more accessible and will allow us to give greater service both to emergency and non emergency numbers. Pleasingly, the publicity had gone so well that by the time I went to a crime road show that evening in Redbridge of an audience of 150 well over half put up their hands and shouted 101 at me when I asked them what the new non emergency number was. Hopefully that will percolate through the population over the next few months.

The budget process is now well underway for this year. The first of our informal budget scrutinies looking at the corporate position took place yesterday in line with the Mayor's guidance. We need to submit something to the GLA informally in September 2011. SOP and Finance and Resources Committee (F&R) will be looking at that before we do so. There will be budget workshops and presentations submitted at a joint meeting of SOP and F&R and the Full Authority all due in November 2011.

We have had the final round of the second round of joint engagement meetings (JEM) - Haringey, Redbridge and Ealing - all of which went extremely well. The process now seems to be embedding itself in the psyche of community safety amongst local authorities to the extent that a number are now asking to access the data much more frequently so they can hold their own versions of those meetings on borough and hopefully it will drive greater joint working.

We also completed the last of the third round of the MPA/GLA crime and community safety road shows at Redbridge on 11 July 2011. They all seem to have gone pretty well but we will be looking at them into the future to see how we can improve them. Not least improve attendance at some of them. Locations. Times. Looking at the evaluation. Most people who come seem to think they are a useful exercise.

I have obviously attached a schedule of a sample of my meetings since we last met. Does anybody have any questions? Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes, Chairman. I think Dee Doocey catch up suggests that we have a catch up every couple of weeks when it was, in fact, because I had just been appointed as Chair of Finance. I thought I would make that clear.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): That is right. Yes. Sorry. Dee Doocey induction it should say.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey induction would be fine.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Although hopefully we will have regular updates with the Chair of Finance as with your illustrious predecessor - whom we welcome back from his bionic operation. We will be doing that.

Thank you very much. Right we move on to the bulk of the Commissioner's report now. Tim, if you would not mind? Thank you.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In the new spirit of openness we are going to have a slight change in terms of the oral script when I will do what the Chairman does in terms of saying whom I have met which would, if I did, include members of the media but does not on this occasion.

On 14 July 2011 I attended SOP. On 14 July 2011 I met with Stephen Rimmer, a senior civil servant, then with Sir Denis O'Connor. I have had meetings with Dame Helen Ghosh, Permanent Secretary and Stephen Rimmer at the Home Office. Regular meetings with Kit Malthouse. I have met the Home Secretary and I have had further meetings with Stephen Rimmer on 21 July 2011.

We have now completed the first quarter of this new financial year and I can report to you our performance for the three month period of April, May and June 2011. Overall violent crime has fallen by 3,914 offences, or 9.8%. As did most of the components of violent crime including violence with injury, harassment, common assault and, indeed, homicide. Homicide is always small figures but at the moment (inaudible) the same period of the previous year.

Teenage homicides are still far too many but remain at a lower level than last year. So far we have had eight this calendar year compared to 13 for the previous calendar year. There has been, sadly, one more murder to report since our last Full Authority with a young 16 year old boy. Three people have been arrested for that crime.

Gun crime has fallen by 18.8% and there is some good work being conducted within SCD and territorial policing (TP) to keep that downward drive occurring. Offences where a knife is used to injure is down but only by a few offences because it is not an overly common offence but it is down by 30 offences and we continue to monitor that.

Knife crime remains a challenge - it is up by 523 offences - and serious youth violence is up by 250 offences. Some of that is linked to our issues in relation to robbery and street

crime. The area of biggest concern that we have is that of robbery which is increased by 15% and personal robbery in some locations by higher than that.

Burglary as we know was increasing as well and it is now up by 7.9%, albeit that that rise appears to be being checked. Theft from person which is snatch theft and pick pocketing has risen by 25%. That is our biggest challenge. Violence is coming down and homicide is coming down but acquisitive crime is increasing.

We are responding to this through our Operation Target which is identifying those areas that are most challenged for these crime types. That has been remarkably successful in identifying offenders, and some very serious offenders, that we have arrested since the operation began in June.

The Safer Transport Command is also working closely with boroughs to focus on key robbery routes around transport hubs and recent activity has disrupted subjects stealing phones in the West End as well as snatches from mopeds. The cycle team has been targeting those snatching mobile phones outside Tube stations.

Operation Blunt continues and has been disrupting offenders taking knives from the streets. I have asked Bernard Hogan-Howe, in his new role with performance, to review Operation Target to make sure it is hitting our core operational objective of reducing robbery.

We also have other matters going. Obviously now one year to go for the Olympics and a lot of our plans are now being well developed and being put into place.

We are also working closely with this Authority, and Chris [Boothman] in particular in relation to the Notting Hill Carnival and, as a result, as is normal, we will be commencing Operation Razorback focusing on those offenders who we believe will try to attend the carnival for criminal purposes.

Counter terrorism. It would be remiss not to touch upon the sad events that have already been mentioned by the Chairman in relation to the events in Norway. For us it has starkly highlighted that the threat we face from terrorism of all forms is very real and our officers continue to work hard to disrupt that terrorist activity, including domestic extremism. We will be joining in the work to review our processes around domestic extremism to make sure that they are robust. We have an officer in Norway who is liaising with the authorities there and keeping lines of information flowing if there are any links between the offender on that occasion and any British citizens.

We are also looking at this moment to identify the closure of the budget gap, working closely with the Authority, and that will continue. Given the level of savings required there is obviously at the moment a very large departure from our organisation of police staff. We have lost 1,200 police staff, predominantly through voluntary exit. We are working very closely with our unions and our union colleagues to do that fairly, appropriately and with great dignity. At the same time the Windsor and Hutton reviews

will be coming forward shortly and that will give us challenges in terms of how we meet that and manage that through with our staff.

We do face some significant challenges. These are not insurmountable and the Metropolitan Police Service, I can reassure you, will stand up and meet all these challenges, irrespective of what is going on around us.

I would also like to, at this point, put on record my thanks for the support that the Chairman of this Authority, Kit Malthouse, and the Chief Executive, Catherine Crawford, have given to Sir Paul and to me and to the whole of the management team through what has been an extremely difficult period. I know that you, as the Authority, are committed to maintaining an efficient and effective police force in the Metropolitan area and I have felt supported over the last few days in my contact with you, so I am grateful to each of you.

I am immensely proud of our organisation and, as I said recently to staff, we will face these challenging times together and we will be, and are, the best police service in the world.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Right. We have got some pre-submitted questions. The first one is from Val [Shawcross].

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Chairman, this is quite an important issue to me but I am quite happy to take a written response and perhaps I could be referred to a Metropolitan Police Service contact where I could have some conversations about it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): You might be interested to know I actually held a round table with various parties, not least the British Transport Police (BTP), BT and others to look at specifically this issue. There is a joint action plan that is being drawn up to try to arrest the issue because it is becoming of critical importance so you are right to identify it.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): It would be very good to see it because metal thieves attacking our infrastructure is becoming a really strategic problem so I would like to see that. Thank you, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will do. Joanne [McCartney], you had a question on knife crime.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes. It is what can you do to ensure that more young people do not become a victim of knife crime? I ask this because of recent figures we have obtained particularly around knife crime and teenagers. I was quite shocked, when the figures were broken down, that incidents of knives used to injure seems to be going up in an incredibly alarming rate. Over the last three years it has actually risen by 34%. I know you give broad figures out about the overall reduction in knife crime but actually if you look at those teenage years they are significantly rising --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Could you clarify? Are these the figures drawn from the *Guardian* website?

Joanne McCartney (AM): No, it is from the Metropolitan Police Service figures.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right. There were some figures about which chose a rather odd age group. You can slice and dice it the way you want.

Joanne McCartney (AM): It is on an Metropolitan Police Service spreadsheet that showed 13 to 19 year olds.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): You see 13 to 19 is not normally the age range that is used. Tim, I do not know if you have a reply? We can look at the figures.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Those figures are going up at the same time we have had Blunt 2. There seems, to me, to need to be some indication of why are they going up so much, is Blunt 2 actually effective if they are going up and what more can be done?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In relation to the various initiatives that we have ongoing, Operation Blunt 2 is still continuing, which is (inaudible) in specific locations and offenders. In the first year it was implemented it has some fairly significant reductions in terms of knife crime and knife injury. We constantly revisit that and refresh it and continue it. We are also doing Operation Target which is in those areas where we perceive there to be high risk. Where we are, with additional assets, focusing on those that commit those crimes in terms of enforcement.

More importantly I think for the longer term is the pressing need to tackle the attitude and behaviour from an early age in relation to knife crime and violence in particular across all facets and, as a result, we have implemented with partners Connect which is working with partners in the community to address those issues. Connect brings together diversion, education and prevention activity to ensure that resources are targeted in the appropriate places. The approach taken through Connect has helped inform borough policing partnership funding to ensure allocation is reflected and measured.

The one I would refer to, rather than going on through all the detail that I have been given here, in Waltham Forest where Operation Connect has been working intensely with partners over a period of time, especially around early years education and family intervention plans of those that are perceived at risk, we have seen a decrease in the violence portfolio of 12% plus, 14% plus in serious youth violence, 13% in knife enabled crime and 27.8% decrease in gun crime. As a result, Hackney, Haringey, Lambeth and Southwark are now joining in in terms of those initiatives in terms of developing that still further. There is a lot of partnership activity that needs to be done. We will be maintaining Operation Blunt and Target to try to kerb that.

The figures that you are referring to I do not have here so I need to have a look at the ones that you are actually relating to. The key for us is the proxy measures that the number of teenage homicides is falling again.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Obviously an injury could easily lead to a homicide.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Absolutely. Knife used to injure is down as well but we need to have a look at the figures you are referring to.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Would you mind pointing us to where they are and we will have a look obviously. Victoria [Borwick]?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you very much indeed. The question concerned the recent stabbings in Harrow, in Harrow Weald in particular. I am very conscious of Operation Target and your other projects that you have been doing in order to tackle these problems. Perhaps you could also add in some information because I gather you do some successful joint patrols with youth workers in Harrow. If you could give us a bit more of a picture about that to reassure the community please?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Yes. Two incidents that trigger this question I am sure. On 24 June 2011 a stabbing in **Wilston(?)**. Ten people have been arrested and are on bail. In relation to the second incident, 3 July 2011, a bottle was used to injure a victim.

There has been very close cooperation between Harrow and the local police led by the Borough Commander, Dal Babu, in relation to identifying those who are committing anti-social behaviour in that age range within the **Wilston(?)** area. As a result, 26 Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) have actually been obtained in the recent past to stop individuals associating with each other and creating that mix that has led to these offences.

As a result, equally, the borough of Harrow and the police in Harrow have been working closely with partners to get young people to become involved in alternatives to youth violence and gang offending and a joint approach has been put in place to target persistent offenders. Police and local youth workers have been trained in how to work effectively together and help build resilience in young people to avoid criminality. That has led to the boys in blue and the boys in denim on patrol as I think it is called locally, which is where police officers and youth workers go out on patrol together to actually engage with young people.

The Young Foundation, an organisation that looks to provide innovation in relation to social needs, has also been carrying out a scoping exercise within Harrow and other key agencies are looking to understand the local context and to identify ways forward to tackle some of the issues coming forward.

There have been some interesting lessons for us and our partners in relation to gangs and gang dismantling; how they are built and how they then fill a vacuum. Since that has been happening there has been a 20% reduction in crime within the **Wilston(?)** corridor. A lot of activity and a lot of partnership activity that we are hoping will be successful (inaudible).

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you very much indeed. Obviously there are concerns. You can try closed circuit television (CCTV) but that tends to lead to displacement. I think the important lessons to be learned are, inevitably, over the summer and we can continue to address this problem, particularly for the local community.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. One of the other things that I have asked to have a look at is how much of an apparent rise in knife crime might be down to police proactivity. We have got two significant operations ongoing - Blunt and Target - and if the police stop and search somebody and find a knife on that person that gets reported as a knife crime. Whereas, in fact, that is the sort of knife crime that we want to see on the rise - ie police generated identification of weapons - and disaggregating the two will give a clearer picture of what is happening.

OK. James [Cleverly], you are next.

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you. I would like to get your views on what seems to be a significant increase in the level of sick leave within the Metropolitan Police Service.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I am going to ask if I could possibly do this one in writing otherwise I am going to go through a stream of data, Chairman, because some of the different data sets that you have been given mean that it has been distorted in a way. I have got three tables and tabulations of data which I think might be better if I do that.

James Cleverly (AM): That tidies up actually what was going to be my next question which is making sure that data sets are consistent year on year so that comparisons can be easily made. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will circulate that to everybody. Thank you.
Councillor O'Connell?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Two questions. The question around 101 which the Chairman has already mentioned. I would be happy to see a written answer.

My other question is around the recent significant survey identifying that something like a fifth of trafficked children into the UK were used for drug related cultivation and drug related activities. I make a link with the earlier public campaign around drink and drink driving. In our lifetime we are aware that there has been a movement in public

perception from drink driving 20 or 30 years ago when some people used to be relaxed about it and almost, shockingly, boast about it, to a time now when it is completely unacceptable across the whole strata of society. That is a movement in public perception.

I wondered, Acting Commissioner, if you would see merit in a public campaign highlighting the dangers of drug taking, of drug driving and also highlighting the fact that drug use is not a harmless lifestyle choice and it does have a detrimental effect across society and, indeed, affects some of our most damaged members of society.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Thank you for that and, yes, I do see that there is a role for raising awareness. Often a number of crimes are called victimless and I, in my 30 years, have not seen many victimless crimes because somewhere there will be a victim. There have been some very successful campaigns in relation to the ethical purchasing of retail goods in relation to use of child labour etc and they have proved worthwhile, as there has been in relation to drink and driving. I think that is a good idea. Obviously there are a number of anti-drug units within the Home Office and others. That might be the best place to start that off. We would certainly support it.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): On 101?

Steve O'Connell (AM): I will take a written.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): James [Cleverly], your second question? OK. That is fine. All right. That is all the submitted questions. I have got Dee [Doocey] and then Jenny [Jones] and then Valerie [Brasse] and Graham [Speed].

Dee Doocey (AM): I wanted to ask the Acting Commissioner, under counter terrorism. I know you covered the events in Norway and the dreadful atrocities but we have read in the press all sorts of statements which may or may not have any validity. I was, in particular, keen to understand if the suggestion that the individual who was responsible - I cannot pronounce his name I am afraid - was recruited in the UK by a far right group and whether or not the Metropolitan Police Service were actually looking into any of the statements that had been made to see if there was any truth in the allegations. Obviously if there is some truth in it I think it would be very worrying.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): As I mentioned before we have our liaison officer in place in Norway and any lines of inquiry that come from that will undoubtedly be looked at over here. I would not particularly want to go into too much detail about what investigations might or might not be taking place.

In terms of where we are, we are reviewing the National Domestic Extremism Unit which is part of the Metropolitan Police Service on behalf of the UK. We will be looking at what the indications are and the learning from Norway so that we can make sure that we are prepared over here.

Dee Doocey (AM): I perhaps have not been as clear as I should have been. I recognise that you said there was somebody over there and that you would be pursuing anything that came up. I just wanted to have reassurance that you were also looking at it from this end as well.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Absolutely. Lines of inquiry that link anybody over here will be followed.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I wanted to raise the issue of the Fortnum & Mason arrests because, of the 39 people who were charged, 109 have now had the charges dropped. Given that some of those people experienced quite tough conditions after they were arrested - they were kept overnight in cells and experienced what it is like to be a real criminal. I am wondering if you think, with hindsight, that could have all been better managed?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): No on that. I think the arrests were a matter that was taken at the time and they were legitimate. The CPS has decided in all the cases, as I understand it, that have been discontinued there was sufficient evidence for those cases to provide a realistic prospect of conviction. On their public interest test they have stopped them going forward but, at that public interest test, and those details would not have occurred if they had not been arrested and those details found out.

Jenny Jones (AM): It seems that all the footage we have had from inside the store suggests that the vast majority were peaceful protestors and I think perhaps they were treated in a way that was not consistent with their being peaceful protestors.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): That is a matter for the courts for those that are still going forward. The 30 cases are still the matter of *sub judice* so I cannot comment on those. Aggravated trespass was the offence for which they were arrested.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you. In your report to us just now, Acting Commissioner, you said acquisitive crime up and violent crime down. Unless rape and serious sexual offences have just been reclassified if I read your report at paragraphs 18 to 20 that is not the picture we get in that area. We have clearly got rape and serious sexual offences still on the increase and now we seem to have sanction detections and we are moving from sanction detection rate as a key performance indicator (KPI) to sanction detections down by 16%. The explanation that seems to be given here is that there is a backlog of cases awaiting CPS advice. I wanted to be quite clear what you are saying to us about the increase in rape and serious sexual offences but what is happening on the sanction detection front and is it the case that good news, yes, we have a London rape charging

centre, the bad news is it is clearly not adequately staffed to be able to get the decisions through that centre. You refer to temporary allocation of increase of lawyers in June. I just want to know what is happening going forward.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): Yes. In relation to rape - excuse me for not highlighting that within the violence overall; I was looking at the other aspects of violence. In terms of rape, one of the things that has been mentioned many times here in the past - and obviously it is a question that has not been referred here so this is me talking from my position of knowledge - there were some concerns in relation to the fact that, with the consistency of a recording regime, was increasing the amount of recorded crime as it transferred in to the SCD. We were always concerned that that would not be purely it and that there was also an underlying increase in the offences coming forward, albeit it is very difficult with rape, because we know it is also under reported in any event by victims. It is a very complicated picture to go through.

In terms of what we are doing now there is a report coming forward to the Performance Board of the Metropolitan Police Service in relation to the increase in recording and the sanction detection fall and we will more than happily share that with you.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Are you able to say at this stage what the problem is around the sanction detections and why they are tailing off? It seems to be, the way you read this, that this is a problem with the CPS simply not being able to get the decisions through. Is that not what you are saying?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): I think that is an issue that we need to test the evidence before we blame anybody else and we need to look at what those charging standards are and whether we are matching them - whether that is because we have failed to get that necessary piece of additional information or whether it is that the charging zones(?) have got more robust.

Valerie Brasse (AM): We will see that report when?

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): It will be coming to the next Performance Board which I think is next month and then it will be coming to you.

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): Graham [Speed] next.

Graham Speed (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I would like to draw your attention to paragraph 16 on pages 32 and 33 relating to road traffic collisions. I will start with the good part which is the substantial improvement in numbers of prosecutions taken by traffic and, indeed, by a variety of other commands in terms of that work, which is good. What is obviously less good are the 52 fatalities, tragedies, that were reported at the beginning of the paragraph. I know we are looking at a downward trend which is very encouraging but it may be that this has just been a very poor three month period. We are, nevertheless, looking at an increase from 43 over last year and, indeed, as low as 27 last year. There is a big jump in there.

There is a reference to the work that is being done in conjunction with Transport for London (TfL). That may well have some bearing on this in terms of relocating speed camera sites and putting new ones in etc but I think it would be helpful if we could have some additional information around the numbers here and a bit more detail about what has happened in this batch as to whether it is just a very poor quarter or whether it is something that we need to learn about in terms of our approach to road policing.

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner): In answer to that the number of traffic fatalities for three month periods do fluctuate quite dramatically. For example, in 2009, we had totals of 52 or more once but, in 2008, there were three three month periods where that was exceeded. As a result of that, we are conscious that we must not get too dismayed by one three month period, albeit that there are 52 too many casualties.

What are we doing about that? Enforcement has been increased. Prosecutions have increased by 70% around road traffic legislation in 2010/11 compared to 2009/10 and we have been raising awareness of safety issues involving cyclists. The Cycle Task Force has now been in existence for just over a year. In that time the team has engaged with over 6,000 people through exchanging places and events. These events allow people to sit in the driver's seat of an heavy goods vehicle (HGV) or bus to get a better understanding of what the driver can and cannot see because that is one of the biggest risks that we have got on the roads at this moment in time.

We are concerned. We have seen it before. We are responding as best we can.

Graham Speed (AM): If we could have some feedback on the detail I think that would be helpful as part of that follow up.

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

Cindy Butts (AM): Yes, Chairman. As you know the Race and Faith Inquiry report strongly urged both Government and this Authority to consider multi point entry as a way forward to improve policing and diversity. As you probably are aware the Prime Minister made reference to this when he spoke at the House on phone hacking and he was supportive of the idea of multi point entry. I just wondered whether you would be willing to capitalise on his positive statements and to have discussions with him and of course the Home Office on how you could advance the introduction of multi point entry within policing, but more importantly for me, in the Metropolitan Police Service?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Absolutely. Yet again the MPA leads the way I am very pleased to see. I will be having discussions with the Policing Minister - who is currently on sick leave but will be back, hopefully, quite soon; he is well and recovering - about exactly that. He and I are both keen to progress that agenda. We had our symposium. It looks like there is a door open there for us to progress that, yes.

Cindy Butts (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Any other questions from Members? No? Thank you very much. Thank you, Tim. Right. We move on to the rest of the agenda please. We have the Treasury Management financial review, including our fourth quarter update. Always a hotly debated paper! Do we know where all the money is and is it all right?

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Yes, Chairman. We do. This report has already gone to Resources and Productivity Committee (RAP) and also to Finance and Resources. Best recommended practice is to also take an annual review to the Authority so it is there for your delectation. I am happy to take any questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Everybody happy? Obviously cash balances have been an area of risk for us in the past.

Victoria Borwick (AM): We do look at them, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am sure you do. Bob and I and Annabel talk about it all the time. OK. All right. Agreed?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you very much. Item seven; reports from Committees. Do any of the Chairs have anything they wish to flag up or can we take those as read? Happy? OK. Thank you very much.

Is there any other urgent business? Catherine [Crawford], have you been up to anything?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I think we have probably had enough urgent business for one day, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Fine. Yes, Victoria?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Briefly, Members should have received copies of the DNA report. There are additional copies here if anybody has not received one and may I thank again my colleagues who put the work in to prepare that report.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Again, very good summer reading if any of you want to take it away to the beach. OK. All happy? Right. I am afraid we now have to exclude the press and public as we go into the confidential section of the meeting so I will ask all those people to leave. Thank you for your attendance. You were all very welcome.

Toby Harris (AM): I want to explain it is nothing to do with any of the items we have been discussing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No. It is a commercially sensitive matter that is all.

Jenny Jones (AM): We are just saying we are not sure how it can be confidential in this Chamber.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): That is a technical point that occurred to me too.