

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 12 January 2012 at 10am at 10 Dean Farrar Street, SW1 0NY

Present:

Members:

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

MPA Officers:

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

MPS Officers:

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner), Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner) and Anne McMeel (Director of Resources)

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Members, I make that just slightly after 10am so if we could start. Welcome all to our historic, and slightly sad therefore, final meeting for some of you I am sure. For others not so sad. If we could, just before we start, go round the room and say who we are.

(inaudible)

Toby Harris (Member): Toby Harris.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

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

Chris Boothman (Member): Chris Boothman.

Faith Boardman (Member): Faith Boardman.

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

Cindy Butts (Member): Cindy Butts.

Valerie Brasse (Member): Valerie Brasse.

Graham Speed (Member): Graham Speed.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): Anne McMeel.

Cressida Dick (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Cressida Dick.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Bernard Hogan-Howe.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Kit Malthouse.

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

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

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

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

Amanda Sater (Member): Amanda Sater.

Kirsten Hearn (Member): Kirsten Hearn.

(inaudible)

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you. Right this meeting was initially proposed to be a short wrap up meeting dealing with various administrative matters but, as has been our habit over the last eleven and a half years, things have expanded somewhat so there are a number of items that we need to consider. Questions have been submitted by various Members to the Commissioner which I propose to take under item four, matters arising from the previous meeting, if everybody is happy with that. There is no report from me and there is no report from the Commissioner but obviously we can take those questions as they come and there will be a chance for people to ask questions as well.

Apologies for absence I have had from Jennette Arnold and Clive Lawton. Are there any other apologies?

John Biggs (AM): Val Shawcross.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Can I have any declarations of interests? Does anybody have anything to declare? No? Everybody is sure? OK. Thank you.

The minutes of the last meeting held on 24 November 2011. Does anybody have any matters of accuracy in the minutes? No? Can I sign them as a true record of our meeting? Thank you.

OK. We are moving on to item four which is matters arising. We have had a number of questions submitted by Members which, as was the practice, I am going to group into themes, not least because there have been some significant events since we last met. I think we are going to kick off. Commissioner, did you want to make some comments before we kick off?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The only thing, just for the Authority to bring you up to date on a couple of things. One is the new Deputy Commissioner has been appointed. I would like to thank the Authority for its support in the process by which to help the Home Secretary make a fair decision in the end, together with the Mayor. Craig Mackey has been selected, who is presently Chief Constable from Cumbria. He will start with us on 23 January 2012 so a fairly quick time getting in which we appreciate.

Finally just to mention that Assistant Commissioner Lynne Owens has been selected as Chief Constable Surrey. She will take up her new post on 1 February 2012 so she has replaced Mark Rowley who joins us the previous month so there has been a bit of a transfer there. That obviously will lead to a change in the Management Board.

Secondly I was just going to mention the terrible murder that we saw in Oxford Street. It was awful. Any murder is terrible but it was a fatal stabbing of an 18 year old young man, Seydou Diarrassouba, in Oxford Street on Boxing Day. A number of arrests have been made, we have got an ongoing inquiry and we are optimistic that we will have a successful outcome. Obviously for all the people who were there at the time it was a terrible shock in the middle of the day.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you very much. Right we are going to take your questions in themes. The first set of questions was about the outcome of the Stephen Lawrence trial for which, Cressida [Dick], we offer our thanks and congratulations to your team which worked so hard on that investigation. Kirsten [Hearn], you had some questions?

Kirsten Hearn: OK. Could you identify what the (several inaudible words) McPherson inquiry. That's the first question. I have got three on it. The second question is, at a time of cuts, what will the Commissioner do to protect such significant institutional changes that have been made, and how will total policing support this?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. I think it might be sensible for us to take all the questions on this at the same time and then the Commissioner can make a more considered statement. Caroline [Pidgeon], you had a question.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes. My question was, following the convictions of Gary Dobson and David Norris for the murder of Stephen Lawrence do you expect further arrests to be made and, following a lot of concern that we saw in the media, will the investigation team continue in its current form?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thanks. Jennette [Arnold], who is not here, has submitted a question which I will just read out.

“Let me congratulate the MPS on its role in bringing to justice two of the men accused of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. In his summation at the trial Mr Justice Treacey said, “On the evidence before the court, there are still three or four other killers of Stephen Lawrence at large”. Can the Commissioner set out how the investigation into the remaining suspects will continue from this point on?”

Joanne [McCartney], I think you had a question.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes, on a similar vein. What ongoing investigations are continuing to bring others to justice for the murder of Stephen Lawrence?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Commissioner?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Two men have been found guilty and sentenced for the murder of Stephen Lawrence. I believe this is a significant moment for policing in London. The questions that have been raised I am now going to address individually.

First of all in terms of Kirsten’s questions which are really related to the improvements that the MPS has seen since that time, now 18 years ago. First of all I want to pay tribute to the leadership of now Lord John Stephens and also John Grieve who carried out an awful lot of those improvements and instigated them over the last 18 years. I do not think we should forget that.

The first thing that I think was a benefit was that we had the new 24 hour operating of homicide teams. Previously that had not been there. We had the pan-London homicide teams. We have got advances in forensic science and accredited crime scene managers. We have improved generally the way that we investigate crime, particularly I think around hate crime in a way that previously was just never acknowledged.

We have also responded better I think actually being more open-minded to the needs of people and understanding that, in fact, hate crime is a different crime altogether and is an aggravating feature in any crime. I think that, therefore, has helped the people of London to have more confidence in us.

In terms of the other developments we have also seen the developments around Trident which has also been a major support, particularly for the black community, and we have improved our senior investigating officer (SIO) training. We have critical incident training for SIOs and for borough commanders. We have improved on decisions logs.

There are many bits of detail but all very, very important detail in the way that we have improved our investigation and the way that the police have worked with the community since that time.

Kirsten asked a second question which is, at a time of cuts, what will the Commissioner do to protect such significant institutional practices from being negatively affected? For me race and diversity are vital to the successful delivery of policing services in London. The MPS has made huge progress in recent years but my assurance is that we will continue having these issues as an Authority. Even if we end up with less resources we will still invest hugely in this area and we are committed to ensuring that the service continues with its recent success to become more diverse in its recruitment. It is a real challenge at the moment and I think there's a question later, when we are potentially slimming down and certainly not growing, how we maintain the success of the past in making sure that we represent London. I think there are some things that we can still do.

The third question Kirsten asked, which is how will total policing support the initiative to tackle hate crime, well we have talked about total care for victims. That is vital for me, particularly in areas where we cannot help the victim by putting the suspect through the criminal justice system. I am absolutely committed to tackling all forms of hate crime and that is exactly what we will do in the coming years.

From an operational perspective that means continuing with the initiatives which were started by John Gieves such as the Athena days which sees coordinated action at all levels all over London to tackle perpetrators of hate crime. From a prevention perspective that means continuing to support victims of crime by providing the most professional service we can and working closely with partners. I can only say this clearly again; it remains one of our highest priorities and it will remain so in terms of any new arrangements I am sure in terms of the objectives we set and certainly the objectives that we set internally.

In terms of Caroline's question which is about the conviction last week of Gary Dobson and David Norris for the murder of Stephen Lawrence do I expect

further arrests to be made and whether or not the investigation team will continue in its present form? First of all, we are reviewing, under Cressida's leadership, the outcome of that case. Obviously the convictions are significant in changing the dynamics of the suspects who we believe were involved in that initial offence. We are reviewing what that means for us and we are looking at all legal opportunities that may be prevented.

That review will take some time because the reason we got to this stage is because of careful, patient and methodical work - not because we raced off to take immediate action. So we will carefully consider what our options are for the future.

In terms of the team, the team remains together and it will do for the foreseeable future until we finish that review. One other thing is I saw the team a couple of days ago to thank them for their work. One of the issues they brought out is obviously what they have done is built up trusting relationships with both the family, Mr & Mrs Lawrence, but also with witnesses. It is vital that we maintain that link so whatever the future holds - I don't know is the size of the team - will depend on the outcome of the review but if it means that we need to keep that team together or enhance it, then that is what we will do. I think best considered properly when we have had the outcome of the review and see what opportunities still are available for us. There are other significant things that we are looking at at the moment.

In terms of Jennette's question, which is about, again, on the evidence before the court, there are still three or four killers of Stephen Lawrence at large, can the Commissioner set out how the investigation into the remaining suspects will continue from this point on? It is difficult to be specific on that point at this moment, other than to reassure you that a serious review is taking place.

Finally, Joanne's question, what ongoing investigations will continue to bring others to justice for the murder of Stephen Lawrence? I think all I can reiterate is that we are reviewing all the evidence available to us - and I just take this opportunity, again, to say that if there are any witnesses out there who can help, even 18 years on, if you know anything now that you have not yet revealed, if they tell us we will take action on it. You may have seen in the press that we have had some calls. Our initial assessment is that they have not taken us too much further forward but the request is still there; is somebody knows something please tell us. Even 18 years on it is still possible to make a difference.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Did anybody have any other questions on this matter? Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris: I was just going to make the point that when you congratulated, quite properly, Cressida and the team on all of this, it is also worth just recording that there was sustained pressured and desire from this Authority in earlier years

that this matter be looked at and it is quite important just to recognise that, whilst it is inappropriate for a Police Authority or presumably for the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) in future to exercise any sort of direction over operational matters, it is appropriate on occasions, where there is real public interest, to continue to highlight the importance of certain investigations being pursued and carried forward.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes, I would agree with that. Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): My point is slightly different. I absolutely agree with what has been said previously and I think it is essential that everything like this is not just investigation but is seen to be investigated thoroughly because the public really does need to have confidence in the police.

I was in South Africa over New Year and I was very upset to see that there were a number of programmes talking about the institutional racism in the police and it really bothers me because I have been on this Authority for over seven years and I have never seen institutional racism in the police. I just think that, at times, there needs to be somehow - and I am not quite sure how this happens - a more robust response to some of the totally stupid newspaper stories that come out and that are just peddled time and time and time again. There is no doubt that there were problems in the past but a lot of those problems have been addressed and I think it is an insult to the officers, both men and women, in the police to just blankly say there is institutional racism because, in my view, I have not seen anything that would suggest this is the case.

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

Cindy Butts: As someone who has led on Equalities and Diversity for this Authority for 11 years I cannot not respond to that comment. I think we have to acknowledge that, yes, the force was found to be institutionally racist when the McPherson report was published and since then there has been a great deal of work that has taken place. I think it is really important that we do not forget that there are still some very serious problems that still need to be tackled. It would be wrong of us to suggest that racism does not exist within the MPS; it exists in society and the organisation is made up of members of society.

I think we need to understand the complexities that are associated with this issue and the Race and Faith Inquiry tried to go some way in suggesting two things. Firstly, that it is simply very difficult to label the organisation institutionally racist because good practice and racist and negative behaviours and policies co-exist at the same time. On the one hand you have got things that happen in the MPS that most public services ought to be very envious of but, at the same time, you have got bad practices that exist and, yes, racism too - so the two co-exist at the same time. It is not one or the other. To somehow lurch from the organisation

being perfect and the organisation being institutionally racist is actually really quite naive.

The other point is that we know that the term institutional racism is a very loaded term and the inquiry suggested that the term had actually become a barrier to improvement. Whether it is or it isn't, the term itself has become a barrier to improvement. Surely all of us around this table and beyond are in this game and want to see policing and policing in London improve so if that term is a barrier to improvement then we need to be thinking about whether it is still useful to use the term, much less whether or not it is an accurate one.

I really wanted to just bring out the complexities and the nuances that exist within this debate and there are those out there who seek to label the organisation institutionally racist because they are in an industry that needs to support that always being the case and there are those that seek to deny it for whatever reason. I think it is important that we recognise that the issue is a lot more complex than one might first assume.

Sorry for that lengthy response but I just think, 11 years on, we need to really understand what we are dealing with.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you. Anybody else want to comment? Kirsten?

Kirsten Hearn: I just wanted to say that disproportionality still exists within the organisation where it operates its services to different communities for various different reasons and I think we cannot let go of that. It is very important to ensure that we try to iron out negative disproportionality towards particular communities - and obviously stop and search is an issue which somebody is going to talk about later anyway. We need to be mindful of those things. A lot has happened and I am very pleased to hear the commitment of the Commissioner in relation to dealing with these issues but there is still a lot more to be done and I do not think we should be afraid of the criticism; we should be able to point at the positive things that have happened and to openly heartedly accepted that there may still need to be changes made.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you. On that note, Kirsten, you also had some questions about independent advice to the MPS?

Kirsten Hearn: It is my last opportunity to say a few things. The MPS has a sophisticated structure of independent advice providing by local and London-wide advisory group and individuals. What have been some of the most useful pieces of advice that these advisors have offered the police and how will the Commissioner seek further independent advice, particularly from those who are hardest to hit communities? Are there any communities that he feels we are not hearing from and need to?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the first question, what has been the most useful advice, the Independent advisory groups (IAGs) have become an integral part of how we respond to critical incidents, which I think is a direct benefit from the McPherson inquiry and the subsequent work. Across London members of the AIGs are likely to be providing advice and support in investigations on a daily basis - so it is not an ad hoc thing; it is something that happens all the time. We value the diversity of the advice that we receive and the contribution that advisers make to a range of critical incidents and policing operations.

I suppose it is not easy to single out specific pieces of advice but probably what we can say is that, in terms of the AIGs, what they do is, for example, they help an awful lot, including Members of this Authority in terms of the Trident AIG, enhancing community support for Trident's work and building relationships with the affected communities. Members of the Race AIG worked closely with us in response to the public disorder during the summer. The work of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) groups, in reviewing LGBT related murders, has led to changes in how these are investigated, and improved guidance for investigating officers. We are currently working with the Disability Advisory Group to improve how we respond to disability related harassment. Those are four major areas that we have seen benefits from.

How will we seek further independent advice particularly from the hardest to hear communities in the future? As with all our community engagement activities we're constantly working to improve the representation to ensure that the voices of all our communities are heard. Representation of our community engagement groups is a recommendation arising from the strategic review of Operation Kirkin, in response to the riots in the summer. We are taking forward work to identify where we have gaps in representation because one of the conclusions is that, at times, we were not always talking to the right people. **However, we turn right(?)**, but people who are probably most representative of the voices we need to hear.

One area we certainly need to do some work on is our engagement with young people. We are taking forward a number of initiatives in this area including work in partnership with the Safer London Foundation to establish youth panels in three wards, three particular wards, in London.

Are there any communities that we feel that we are not hearing from? This is always a bit of a difficult question to answer because obviously sometimes if you are not aware of a group or a particular interest it may be that we are not hearing from either. I think I have done my best in this area to try to help but certainly it is an area that we are not complacent in.

One of the fundamentals of policing that really is helpful, without having a system or a process, are the Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs). They are great opportunities to talk to the community and hear individuals as well as groups. Both always matter. In that way hopefully we notice those people who need most help and might have a unique need.

At a pan-London level we also have the Communities Together Strategic Engagement Team which monitors community tensions and has access to many community representatives across London and can be called upon as and when incidents arise.

So I think we can show quite a comprehensive concern for hearing from different groups but I think we should never be complacent than we are hearing for everyone, although we have got a comprehensive scheme, because there are always challenges when new needs arise.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you. Yes, Kirsten?

Kirsten Hearn: What are you doing around connecting with new migrants and new communities arriving because London is changing quite rapidly with different communities arriving?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Many boroughs of London, if not all, are affected by new migration. We see in the boroughs in the east particular concentrations of migrants and there you see the boroughs actually have got some very good relationships. For different communities it can mean using different engagement mechanisms so sometimes it can be religion for certain groups, sometimes it can be that they have got really good organisations and sometimes they fix into the political processes quite well too. We try to work that essentially through the borough mechanisms to make sure that we know there are groups there. Also we work with the UK Border Authority (UKBA) because clearly the UKBA is aware of legal migration and sometimes it is aware of illegal migration. That provides intelligence for us to, first of all, understand which groups are present and do it for each borough and, number two, how we might relate to them.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Does anybody have anything else on this? No? OK. Jenny [Jones], you are next. You had some questions on stop and search.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you, Chair. Commissioner, could you please update us on where you are with your new targeted approach to stop and search and what will this new approach look like? The second question is are you satisfied with the way in which stop and search is currently carried out by officers? Thirdly, are you concerned that the racial disproportionality in stop and search has increased since 1999? How do you plan to address this?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Chair, if you don't mind I would like to address those in reverse order. Certainly I am concerned that disproportionality has increased since 1999. Secondly, I would say that the work that we are going to take forward we should get an announcement - I do not want to commit too much today but hopefully by the end of January but no later than the end of February - about how we will progress our stop search. One of the benefits we have got in the new Deputy Commissioner is that he has (inaudible) national work in terms of stop search.

The three principles you might remember I have talked about here. First of all I want it to be smarter, ie we want to target only people who should be stopped. Number two I want the interaction with the member of the public to be better because I think there is clear evidence that sometimes we do not get that right. So first of all are we targeting the right people and, number two, are we dealing with the interaction right? In terms of smarter I want us to push a knife stopping approach. If you know someone who carries a knife or is carrying something they should not be carrying then tell us and we will take action. Number two is to target those people who have previously carried weapons, so far as the Police and Criminal Evidence Act will allow. Number three is to have better communication around the Section 60 searches and also to see whether or not we could manage with less of those searches and those other searches that are based where there has been violence in an area or there is a real problem in the area and then we put that search in. There is some evidence we may have too many of those and we probably could manage better with less. We are developing some new performance indicators but they will be intended to make it smarter, not do more of them, if that makes sense.

The most important piece of work for me is the training that we are going to do to make sure that the stop search interaction is better. That will take time. What I do not want the training to be is an email. To train lots of people - and most of our people who are involved in stop and search - the territorial policing, our Territorial Support Group (TSG), our traffic officers - it will take time. I want to make sure we have got a quality product that we can train them with. Number two is that we take time to do that and we do not just preach at them because I think it is about attitudes and beliefs as well as it is about how they do it. I do not blame them when they get it wrong - and sometimes it is a very difficult thing to manage if it is late at night and everybody is getting a bit afraid, but we have got to put an awful lot of work into it and I think, starting where you were, which is disproportionality, is just one of the issues that we have got to get right.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think the disproportionality is a real problem in view of all the unrest that we have experienced. Could you expand on how you think you can actually address that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The first thing is, by being smarter in our application of stop and search, that is for me the critical thing because if we act on our intelligence and we are looking for a particular person, rather than what can be seen as random searching, I think people understand. Number two is that if we tell everyone in an area that we are stop and searching in this geographical area for a particular reason for a limited time, it seems to me that that will help. Really by training and by education it is the best way that we will have of dealing with that.

There is always potentially some disproportionality in one sense in that the street population and the young people often are differently represented compared to the general population. I was at a meeting last night in Brent where we had people from Brent, Harrow and Barnet and people in the audience were talking about disproportionality. What was agreed is that the majority of the people in the evening - which is when a lot of stop searches happen - who are adult are at home or in places, so the street population is quite different. We have to bear that in mind - and of course the demographics of young people can be quite different to the general population.

I think it is a complex area but I think, by training and education, we can help our officers to deal with it. One to target searches properly. Number two, when we do deal with it, even if we end up with a resistance or a misunderstanding, we come out of that better if we remain professional and cool and calm and sometimes we are not always able to manage that.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Joanne, you submitted a question but it was broadly similar. I did not know if you wanted to ask a follow up?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes. I share some of the concerns that Jenny has, in particular about the interaction. One of the ways of addressing this - and I hope you will do this in your new approach - is to actually try to get feedback from those that are stopped and searched. Victims of crime we do victim satisfaction, call backs and surveys. One way to find out how people react to stop and search is to try to do relatively soon call backs to them and to see what their experience of it was. That way you get some quality feedback as well. I'm just wondering whether you will look at building that into any new approach.

I was also going to ask about the ability of officers to text details of stop and search straight in to somewhere central so that that feedback can be done straightaway. Most people have mobile phones now. There is no reason why we should not have a random sample of people who have been stopped and searched that day being called up within a few hours and asked what their experience was of it.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the first point I think it is a good point which is about are we doing enough to ask people what their experience of stop and search is so I think we can do far more about that.

In terms of the last point about texting one of the things we have found two young men apparently who have developed an App. This App allows them to very quickly feed in what their experience of a stop search is and then they will share that with each other. We are working to see whether or not there is something we can do to do exactly what you said. It could be texting or it could be an App. What it means is it can happen quickly and we can collect it together. We think there is something there that both young people will find useful and interesting and hopefully we will get better information. Whatever the principle is, as you say, it has to be quick and for us to care that we want to know what happened in that interaction.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): I am a member of a Blackberry messenger grouping in Lewisham. I happened to see a number on a poster one day. They are always sending me messages saying there is a Section 60 in place in New Cross. Please make yourself available. This is why - X, Y, Z. I think it is incredibly useful. Whether they get any feedback the other way I do not know but it is that kind of thing we need to do. Cindy?

Cindy Butts: We have had reassurances over the years - many, many years - whenever we talk and discuss and we have had scrutinies on stop and search. We have been told and reassured over that very period that stop and searches are carried out in an intelligence-led way. We also know that over the years we have had various initiatives, key and counter training, lots of training, around officers carrying out their role in a respectful manner. We have had the establishment of stop and search monitoring boards across the capital which the Authority has led on. I am still struggling to see what is new in what you have talked about in your response to both Jenny and Joanne which will make things any better.

Given all that we know about the corrosive nature of stop and search and how it really does detract from building positive relationships, particularly with young black and Asian men, and given that less than 6% of stops and searches result in an arrest, my question to you is whether or not you really think the pain is worth it, given the gain is so slight?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of your first point about things have been tried before, will this work this time, I think it is a very fair question but I think there are only a limited number of things that are available. What I would argue is that the things that you have mentioned have seen improvements. The question is whether it has seen improvements enough. The evidence is it has not yet. We will go back and we have got to be determined

and resolute and just keep trying new ways. We will find a way through it. I am convinced of that.

In terms of the point about if you look at stop and search and 90% odd of the time it is ineffective clearly it therefore appears to be an inefficient tactic. Again, we had a discussion in Harrow High School with a group of young people yesterday. I would have to acknowledge that. I suppose the other way of looking at it is that if you take 200 knives off the street in 6% of the searches that still means there are less knives. If there isn't a better way of doing it, other than stop search, I suppose we have to find an alternative to find the 200 knives or the 500 drugs or whatever else we find in the stop and searches.

I acknowledge that it could be better. It is the best in the country - sometimes it is about a 12% success rate which, again, remains a very small percentage but where it has been effective it has been a useful thing. What we do want to do is make it more and more effective.

I do not think we can say therefore, just because it is 6%, it means it is not worthwhile. It is worthwhile to stop people carrying weapons. It is worthwhile to prevent people and hopefully deter them from doing some things if they think there is a risk of being stop searched. I think that has a value.

I would be lying if I said that I had not thought about whether or not you could think, "Let's just stop stop search". You can think about it. I think the public might be worse off as a result.

It is not an easy thing to manage but I am determined that we can get better at it. I would prefer to try to get better at it than I would to stop it at the moment.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Does anybody else have anything on stop and search? No? OK. Tony [Arbour] and Steve [O'Connell] both had something about gang culture. Steve, you are happy with a written. Tony?

Tony Arbour (AM): I am concerned, Commissioner, about the apparent dissonance between the rank and file as represented by the Federation and, if you like, by you on the way gangs are being treated. One of you is wrong. Who is wrong?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I am not sure you expect me to accept the way that it is put, Tony. The Federation has made a point in its report on the summer riots that it believes that the neighbourhood teams could have been more challenging and more confrontational with some of the gangs. I am not sure that is fair actually. There are two things. One is the SNTs are vital for getting intelligence and they get that by knowing people. The fact that they are not making arrests every two seconds does not mean to say they're not playing a vital part in our work against gangs.

We will make announcements at the end of the month in the week starting 30 January 2012 about how we intend to take forward our gang work and I hope you will be able to support that. It will be a pretty massive piece of work. Although that will have elements about specialists it will be built on the work of the neighbourhood teams because all the specialists in the world do not meet people, often. They are not the ones who wander round these communities. They are not the ones who tell people who is driving their car or who has seen who. That is the sort of work that really is vital. Everybody needs to play their part and if the total policing logo means anything it is about the whole team and the specialist plays a part but so do the SNTs. I do not accept that SNTs are a soft option. They can make arrests, they play a vital part in serious crime investigations and they will be embedded in the work that we do against gangs.

Tony Arbour (AM): Isn't there a chance that with the SNTs wanting to live side by side peaceably with gangs that you get a Stockholm syndrome whereby the SNT says, "There's so much the gangs can do and we'll turn a blind eye to it"? Isn't there a risk of that with this very close contact between the SNT and gangs?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I don't think so. They are not living with them!

Jenny Jones (AM): You don't know that!

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry. I withdraw my comment! There are various ways you gain intelligence aren't there? We gain intelligence by people telling us stuff and sometimes they do it for different motives. They often do it to protect their own families because they want their kids to stop being involved in a gang. They sometimes do it for money. The starting point of the relationship is you have to have a relationship. They have to trust someone to tell someone something. The SNTs and our local detectives are the people who gain the most information but you have to walk around the area, you have to talk to people and you have to show that when they tell you stuff you do something about it.

For me, I think talking to people is good. I think having a relationship, a trusting relationship, is good. I would never argue that SNTs or any police officer should ignore an offence. That is their job. They have a very difficult jobs. I met a sergeant who is working in Barnet at the moment on quite a difficult estate. He has been walking round this estate and the surrounding areas for seven years. It is clear that people in the area know him. It is not that easy a job actually; night after night going down the same streets with a uniform on where you have got crowds of kids or other people who actually do not want you there. Sometimes you have got to build a relationship to make sure that you do not end up with an argument every night. It is a great challenge. I celebrate the work that the SNTs do - and they do one of the hardest jobs. While some of the specialists go in and

go out again they are the ones who, night after night, have to deal with this. I do not think it is a soft option at all. I think they are vital.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): Quickly, two little questions. The first is I took this question to be a reaffirmation that within the London Federation there are under currents of unease continuing about neighbourhood policing and so this is an opportunity, at our last meeting, for you to confirm that you are totally committed to this model as one of the pillars of policing in London. The second that falls off the back of the question as well from me is whether total policing,- every Commissioner has a catchphrase, total policing is yours- whether that implies a different approach to gangs to that which you have inherited.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the first one I hope the feeling that was given in response to Tony was, yes, I am committed to neighbourhood policing. If that means that we can invest more in it in the future then we will look to see what we can do. There is no withdrawal of that support and, in fact, if we can, we will enhance it.

Secondly, in terms of approach, we always need a new approach. We will bring the approaches forward at the end of January 2012. I think there has been some good work in the past but I think there is a need to make it more expansive, it needs to be deeper and it has to be wider across London. It was started in so many boroughs but it was doing it incrementally over the years. For me something has to happen now across many boroughs, not across one per month per year. That is a vital change.

The second thing is that we need to do our enforcement in a well managed way. We need to performance manage it. I think we have got agreement from the relevant boroughs that they are going to manage the support for those people who do not want to be in gangs, instead of just enforcing the law, but support for them to encourage them away from a life of gang, in a similar performance managed way. If we can work together with a good grip we will get some good effort. This is not, for me, a partnership just talking about it; it is about what are you going to do. We are going to do something on the enforcement side I think our partners in the local authorities and in the other agencies need to grip it in a similar way. I think we have got that sign up at a political and chief exec level to make sure that is going to happen.

John Biggs (AM): I welcome that, Chair. Just quickly, what is the significance of the end of January 2012? Maybe I have not read something.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): What I was alluding to was the week commencing 30 January we are going to make announcements about how we are going to take gang work forward. We have taken the first four or five

months of me being here to make sure, one, we talk to the boroughs affected. Were they accepting there was an issue? We have had the political leaders together and they have. Otherwise I am imposing a solution. Number two is we are getting our plans together and we are working with them on how we can work together clearly. We have taken about 16 weeks to do that. We will make that announcement at the beginning of February 2012. I know the Authority will not be here but I hope you find you can support it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. We will move on to Kirsten again. You have got some questions about workforce diversity. Kirsten?

Kirsten Hearn: Don't say again like that! Reasons to be cheerful. Well I was cheerful about this for five seconds but it has now changed. According to my maths 50% of the Management Board are women. I think they might have been for five minutes. Wasn't that great! Now of course it has changed since you just appointed various other people. Statistically women now have a better rate of promotion than men do in the MPS. That is good actually. Reasons to be doleful. Although there is now 25% female officers strength it still does not reflect the number of women in the community. Barely more than 3% of inspectors are women. There are less than 3% chief inspectors from black and ethnic minority communities. I could not find statistics (stats) about LGBT and disabled staff.

So, given the lack of critical mass of women, black and minority ethnic officers and the apparent reluctance of LGBT and disabled staff to declare themselves how does the MPS compensate for its lack of diversity? Second question, what impact does this lack of representation and the confidence to declare status have on the MPS' ability to provide a high quality service to all Londoners? What does the Commissioner feel needs to happen to get the MPS more like London at all levels?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Chair, it is quite a broad question but I thought I would start where Kirsten started; reasons to be cheerful. I thought we ought to recognise some of the great achievements during the last few years and some of it during the existence of this Authority. Of the nearly 6,000 police officers we have recruited since 2001, well over half, that is 58%, so well over half, nearer to two thirds were female. In March 2001 we had just over 1,000 officers from a black and minority ethnic (BME) background and today we have 3,000, so three times as many. We remain unrepresentative I accept but I think the change has been very significant. We have put programmes in place to support target groups within the organisation in progressing up the ranks. Of course what we need to do is make sure that we provide a high quality service to the public. I think we can celebrate some great achievements but there is far more than we need to do.

What impact does this lack of representation and confidence to declare status have on the MPS' ability to provide a high quality service to all Londoners? Well

some of the groups are not always prepared to declare and that is still an issue for society, as Cindy was saying earlier, as relative as it is for us. Certainly in the LGBT community that is a significant issue and I think, as Kirsten has alluded to in her question, she struggled to get all the data that we might like to because not all our staff will declare. Many other organisations have more success in that but we do have a challenge there. Clearly if we do represent society then we will have a better relationship with the public so it is vital to make sure that we do have a high quality service and that we do represent Londoners better.

In terms of representation in middle ranks we have been running our Promoting a Difference programme for a number of years. Since 2009 it has supported an average of 1,500 people from under-represented groups each year. The two most successful elements of the programme are the Positive Action Leadership programmes and the Promotion of Study groups, and we have seen increasingly positive results from these initiatives. For example, in 2011 ten out of the 11 study group participants passed the superintendent promotion process. Those applying for sergeant and inspector processes who took part in the study groups were twice as likely to succeed. Over 50 candidates for the recent inspector process were part of a study group, including 34 BME, 12 disabled and four LGBT applicants. I think we can show some progress has been made and certainly some attempts to improve representation at the middle ranks.

What do I think needs to happen to get the MPS to look more like London at all levels? Well I have already alluded to - and it is not lost on this Authority - that obviously if we are not growing then it is rather difficult to get more people in who will be more representative. One of the things I think is an opportunity from the Windsor Report - we will get Windsor 2 shortly; we have had Windsor 1 already and Windsor 2 is coming along. Certainly I am a supporter of lateral entry. I think the point about lateral entry for me is that if we target able groups we will find a disproportionate representation of BME groups, for example graduates, and women are disproportionately represented in a positive way in graduates and universities. I think there is something there that if we can target those groups and if we look at lateral entry we will get a quicker representation at a more senior level. We will have to wait and see what Windsor is prepared to do to accommodate that but we are talking to them about certainly I would be interested in piloting such a scheme should they think that it is favourable.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Anyone else? Kirsten, we also have a question from you on domestic violence.

Kirsten Hearn: Yes. This is my last question at the moment. Given the high no crime rate for domestic violence (DV) offences, more than double that of sexual offences, what is the MPS doing to address the part that you play in the continued lack of justice experienced by domestic violence survivors? I have asked this question because a friend has recently supported another friend of

hers through a domestic violence court case and was remarkably shocked by the lack of support from the police.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly I just want to talk briefly about the no crime aspect because sometimes this gets a little confusing and I thought I would just reiterate what a no crime is. No crime means that there is no evidence to substantiate that a crime has taken place. It is quite a harsh barrier. No evidence. Territorial Police Performance Unit has identified that there were 3,503 domestic violence allegations that were subsequently classified as no crime during the period 1 April 2011 to 31 December 2011 and that represents a no crime rate during that period of 8%. During the same period, for all crime, no crime was 3% and in sexual offences it was 9% and rape 12%, which is down from a significant 20% the previous year.

What we do to make sure that those no crimes are accurate is that a data accuracy team scrutinises the classification of allegations of offences ensuring that only appropriate cases are classified as no crime and all domestic violence incidents are allocated for further investigation intervention irrespective of the initial classification. What we can show is that our community safety units, which now have 500 specialist investigators working in each of the boroughs, respond to every incident of abuse. We do check carefully to make sure that the no crime is not an excuse for not investigating.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Tony, you had a question about metal theft.

Tony Arbour (AM): I have asked about this before but week on week the problem does not seem to be abating; it seems to be getting worse. I have asked specifically what you are doing. I note that in today's papers the industry is suggesting that one way of tackling the thing is to ensure that scrap metal merchants, by and large I guess, who have reasonably large sites should be monitored by cameras. I wonder if that is one of the weapons in your armoury?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The first point is that we have recently started our task force against scrap metal although I think at the moment we have probably got too few resources on it. Over time we need to put more in it. What I would like that initial team to do is to assess the scale of the problem before we put any more people into it.

The other thing, clearly, is we need to follow the intelligence because it is very clear it is a market and markets work by selling things through the most profitable route. It is not as though it is being sold on the street; there is a market place and we need to understand that and then do something about it.

There have been proposals to actually stop or reduce the amount of cash that is used in the industry and I think that is certainly a wise precaution if we can manage to get a statutory change.

In terms of CCTV I have not got a strong view. It seems a sensible proposal. Of course the police would have to have certain authorities in place should we decide to use it but if the operators had a licensing condition to put it on then that is something that the police could enforce. I can see why that would have some attraction, certainly in terms of how is coming to the sites and in terms of what is being brought there. One of the big challenges with scrap metal is it is not always identifiable and by the time it has been moved through the system often it has changed in its appearance from the place where it was stolen.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Victoria [Borwick], you had some questions about protest police numbers.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you. I will read the questions out. Can you give us a picture of the police numbers used to cover the student and other protest events between 1 September and 31 December last year and the ones in comparison for the previous year? What was the cost of policing public order events during this period please? I know this will come out in due course; it is just that we have not been able to find it yet.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I think, as Victoria points out, the final amounts of money will come out in July 2012 in the final out turn budget. For last year in the order of £30 million was the overall cost. It was actually £34.8 million. We have had slight difficulty getting hold of numbers you needed for the time but I am quite happy to write later with the full detail. Broadly, in 2010 - if you would accept, Victoria, that one of the challenges we have had is it is a pretty broad definition in terms of protest and also in terms of students. We do not always classify protests or marches in that way. What we have tried to do is answer as much as we can in terms of --

Victoria Borwick (AM): I was using just a general term as the general protests. I was trying to make sure that we differentiated from all the additional costs that you had during the riots.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I understand. It is just that sometimes, on the same day, similar events can be coordinated but not always be a protest - if that makes sense. We have tried to be generous in our definition but we want to make sure that we give you an accurate answer.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I tried to cover that loosely by saying used to cover the student and other protest events.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): There is still a possibility we are coming from different angles so that is why I am putting some caution on my figures. In 2010 there were a total of 23 events which we had which we policed during this period which had more than 200 officers and then we had 1,000 officers per event in 2010, giving a total of 24,682. You can tell that this has been put together fairly quickly.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am so sorry. The original figure you gave us of the £34.8 million was for which period?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): That is for the period of 2010 into 2011. What we have not got yet is the period for 2011 into 2012.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Because we have not come to the end --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Which is the point you made at the beginning.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Absolutely. Sorry. I was trying to have a vague comparison with the figures. You spoke previously at the previous Full Authority that the numbers had risen considerably so therefore --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Understand. I have got some numbers.

Victoria Borwick (AM): OK. Fine.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): During 2010 the total, bottom line, was 24,862 as the total number of officers who were used on the events that I have described. In the same period in 2011 into 2012 it was 34,788.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): So 10,000 more.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): OK. I was just trying to choose the definitions as to which ones we have included. I am quite happy to write. In the time we had we had a little difficulty in giving you all the information you need but I am quite happy to write with it. Anyway, the bottom line is there were more by a significant number.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Yes. I will wait for a fuller written answer. I am sure those will be clarified.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Steve [O'Connell], you had a question about police academies. I presume you mean training?

Steve O'Connell (AM): I am very happy with a written answer on that one.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. James [Cleverly], you had a question about crime rates since 2000 --

James Cleverly (AM): I am happy for a written.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you.

Toby Harris: Can I just check about the written responses. Are they going to be placed on which website?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Will they be circulated to us, Chair?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): They will be circulated to you, yes.

Toby Harris: Including former Members.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes. Everybody who is currently on the Authority will get a copy and we will stick it on the new website as a final whiff of smoke.

OK. Relations between the media and the police. Dee, you had a question.

Dee Doocey (AM): Shall I read it out?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes please.

Dee Doocey (AM): Will you be adopting all the recommendations in Elizabeth Filkin's report on the relationship between the MPS and the media?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Toby, you also had a question --

Toby Harris: Has (inaudible) the recommendations of the Filkin report and, in particular, who the Commissioner intends to appoint as public information champion and his integrity and ethics champion within his senior team? If not the name, where they would fit into the organisation?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Yes. First of all I do accept all the findings of the Filkin report and I accept in principle all the recommendations. The only reason I hesitate a little about the recommendations is not because I disagree with the thrust of them; I just think some of the detail we are going to need to work out for ourselves. The principle of them I think, for me, is really not that arguable.

In terms of the person who is going to take the lead on our response it will be the new Deputy Commissioner and in terms of that particular role that Elizabeth Filkin suggests, the champion, he will also, I believe, be the person. I

am just going to give him a little time before we give him that role but that would be my suggestion.

Dee Doocey (AM): My follow ups were going to be similar to Toby's question so I will leave him to do all of those. Can I just mention one issue? 4.2. Leadership and trust within the MPS. I am quoting from the report. It says, "I'm concerned by the extent to which police officers and staff feel that some of their senior leaders abide by a different set of rules". What are you going to do to address that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): First of all I accept it. I said at the press conference about leadership from the top. In fact, the criticism that is there could be argued strongly to be at the top and not about the others so it would be bizarre if we asked the whole organisation to change if we had not sorted something out ourselves. I accept that is my job and it is the Management Board's job to lead in this area.

Number two. I have said I want us to have a principle of openness and particularly in this area about relationships with the press. It is not about stopping relationships with the press; it is about being open about whatever relationships exist. Like I said at the press conference and repeat here, if someone is talking to someone or meeting someone and they are prepared for someone else to know about it, either a line manager or the whole organisation, presumably there is nothing to hide. There was some challenge at the press conference, does this mean creating a bureaucracy of notes etc? My response was, one, we are a note taking culture so that should not be a great burden but I do not think anybody is asking for a verbatim account. It is the fact the event happened, broadly the reason for it and therefore somebody could go back and be accountable for it. For me the openness and accountability are the principal things because, at the end of the day, we need to work with the press. So, for me, it is the openness. I hope already we have started - I think we started with the Authority - making our expenses at a senior level and meetings with the press open and we will continue that either through the website or to enter into whatever governance arrangements are being developed in the coming months.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you. I am taking from that that what you are saying is that in future there is going to be one rule for everyone and not one rule for top officers and another rule for officers at the bottom. That is fine. Thank you very much.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I agree. One thing I did say and I will repeat here of course is what we have got to be aware of is whistle blowers. If someone, for a public interest reason, wants to talk to the press, in law they have got a protection and I would always support them in that. I hope they would be able to sort it out within the organisation but the whistle blower would remain a public interest benefit.

Toby Harris: Can I just pick up on the question of the public information champion and integrity and ethics champion? I had taken Elizabeth Filkin's report to imply that, for a variety of reasons, she saw those as separate roles which were slightly distinct in the sense that if somebody is promoting openness and the desire to have more information in the public domain that is slightly different from the role which is about ensuring that people behave ethically and appropriately and with integrity. Whilst the new Deputy Commissioner is of course going to be super human because all senior officers of the MPS have to be in that bracket, I wonder whether it is worth discussing further with Elizabeth Filkin whether she had strong reasons for feeling those should be separate roles before making final decisions.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I think it is a good point. I did talk to Elizabeth about her report to try to understand. I had not picked up as sharply that distinction as you have made it and therefore I just may have missed that nuance. I am quite happy to talk to her about that. As I have tried to indicate in my response, as Craig arrives, it may be that he suggests actually this is not compatible as well. My mind is not closed to that opportunity but it seems to me, to give him the task of presenting the recommendations and then to have that discussion, was wise after he arrived but I am not blind to that opportunity.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Jenny?

Jenny Jones (AM): Commissioner, for clarity, do we have your assurances here that police officers who speak to the press as whistle blowers exposing police corruption will be protected? Operation Elveden - obviously it has ramifications for that.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): They do. In short they do. It is unequivocal for me. The only thing we have all got to be clear about is that there are systems that officers and staff can use which I hope they can feel trust in. Sometimes there are those people who use this as an opportunity for selfish motives and then paint it with a public interest motive. That is the only caution I would put on that but the short answer to your question is yes.

[audio silence]

Joanne McCartney (AM): The first one is a budget question. The second two are about the Riot Damages Act. Perhaps I could start with the first one separately. How close are you to fully closing the budget gap for the forthcoming year? I ask this because I think the Mayor came before the Budget Committee this week and suggested there is a deal with Government where it is going to

give further money so I would like your clarification on that and the timing of it and also the scale of it and is it a one year deal or more than that?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): We have been in negotiation with the Home Office about recognising the special difficulties that London faces with the Games and various other public order and related issues. We expect to have resolution on that probably next week when we will know exactly where we are. That will be in advance of the London Assembly budget meeting which is, I think, in two weeks time. It will be ready then.

The indications are that that will be a one off settlement now to recognise the extra pressures that we are going to face as we run up to the Games, effectively, and the combined. My anticipation is that, although it will be a payment by the Home Office, it is designed to last us for a bit if you see what I mean, so the fact that it is one payment means it is meant to get us through some years.

Having said that, we are obviously having to justify on the other side that the MPS is going through the wringer in terms of savings and control. We still have to do our bit in terms of making sure the budget is in shape before we actually get there. I will not know the full detail until probably middle to end of next week but it will be there for scrutiny at the London Assembly.

Joanne McCartney (AM): The Mayor indicated that it may be the full £85 million budget gap. Is that your understanding?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): The quantum is going to be there or thereabouts. The fact that the two are similar is coincidental because obviously there are movements in our own budget which will reduce the gap from £85 million anyway but we still have remaining gaps in the following two years to which anything that is over and above will contribute so that we can maintain through what we think might be possibly a tricky period. OK?

Do you want me to address your other two questions? Yes?

Jenny Jones (AM): It is sort of a budget question but it is also a diversity question to the Commissioner. I know that, because of budgetary constraints, there are all sorts of re-negotiations about working patterns, particularly for civilian staff, and I am concerned that there is a consistent child friendly policy to any changes in working practices because of course this is a diversity issue that it is quite often women who have to look after children still and we will actually decrease further the number of women working in the MPS if that sort of child friendly policy is not followed through.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I agree. Perhaps I am missing it but I have not sensed, in a bid to try to save money, that we are therefore trying to be less flexible in our terms and conditions. I do not think there is any need to.

In fact, probably the pressure is the exact opposite; you need more flexibility. I have certainly not felt that but perhaps I am missing it. Certainly in terms of police staff, even if there is a need to reduce the amount of spending, it should not mean that we should have less flexibility.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Go on. Yes.

John Biggs (AM): I am sure we all welcome a bail out from the Government and that the minutes will note Mr Malthouse's wry smile at that suggestion. The discomfort that you might have had, Mr Hogan-Howe, was that, in return for £30 million, you were expected to commit yourself to roughly £200 million worth of expenditure over the next three years. Is your understanding that you will no longer be embarrassed by that demand?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): There is a lot of loading in that question so I will try my best to avoid it! The only thing I can say is we wait to see what the final budget is going to deliver and then we will do our best to achieve whatever we need to achieve over the coming year. It has been a bit difficult, as you know, for the last few months because we have had two budgets to think about; one is the initial grant allocations that we were told about and then this latest opportunity perhaps to make sure we did not have such a big gap.

We talked before at these meetings about can we sustain the police numbers if we have less support? I think we can but we do need to see the final cash limits. Until we have got that it is really hard to give you a straight answer to all the questions and obviously the nearer we get to the end of March 2011 the harder it gets because we have got less planning time, which is a bit of a concern but the advice is that we will hear fairly quickly.

John Biggs (AM): While I have the floor can I record my appreciation of the superb work that Anne McMeel has done on this budget, given that she has announced that she is going to go off and whatever - breed ponies or something.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. I was going to say something at the end about that but that is fine.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Just to add my own support - we were going to mention it at the end - but first of all to say thank you for the kind comments on behalf of Anne. Number two is to add my own. I can't speak about previous years but this year has certainly been complex to say the least. I would suggest for two reasons. One because of the general confusion around the management team and the people going in and people going out and Anne has been the constant factor on this side. Number two is, over the years, it has been a great challenge just getting the MPS' finances to a position where everybody could get a confidence in them. She should take great credit in that and the future will look good because of that investment. So we wish you well for

the future but we should all celebrate the great achievement she has brought to this organisation.

All: Hear hear.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): We all endorse those comments. Thank you. Joanne, your other two questions?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes. They were about the Riot Damages Act. I understand that there are approximately £300 million worth of claims so far lodged with the MPS. Can you give us an update as to how negotiations with Government are progressing to recoup that and has it agreed to meet the cost of our claims - I understand from evidence from the Budget Committee that approximately £100 million has been agreed but that leaves a potential risk of £200 million. I want to know what approach the Home Office has taken.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): You are right; we have had £100 million of underwritten costs so far. Effectively it is a three way negotiation so on the uninsured claims we have 100% coverage. That is not a problem and those are being processed well. Quite a lot of those claims are now in payment. There are quite a few waiting for their forms to be agreed that this is what we are going to pay and then they are coming back. There are some still in process in terms of documentation evidence. That side is fine.

On the insured there is obviously a three way negotiation between the insurance industry, the Home Office and us. The Home Office is basically saying that it will underwrite as we go along the way with those negotiations. As you said we have had £100 million of underwriting thus far. We have yet to see what the final total may be. It may not be the amount that you said, it may be somewhat less than that, but I have no reason to believe that, as we get towards it, we will not get a full payout from the Home Office. I think it just wants to keep a hand in so, for some of the particularly large claims, it is part of the direct negotiation with the insurance industry and because obviously it is recognising that it is its exposure.

In terms of the process and our accounting I think Bob [Atkins] will correct me if I am wrong but I think we have enough assurance now to say that any liability we are accepting on our book is covered for this year. We did have a risk at one stage where if we had accepted liability without having some underwriting from the Home Office we could in theory have had a bigger budget gap. That has now been covered. As we move into next year when those negotiations are ongoing and possibly litigation - I hope not but possibly - then we will be able to turn to them again year after year. So so far it is going all right.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I make a comment?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes, sure.

Joanne McCartney (AM): (inaudible). I was disturbed a couple of weeks ago to find that residents in Tottenham had started receiving some feedback from the MPS with regard to their claims under the Riot Damages Act and people were disturbed to find that emergency payments they got from charities and from local authorities that had set up assistance funds were being deducted from their payouts. There are obviously cases where that is going to be suitable to do but in many of the cases they were emergency sums given out to pay for items of immediate need such as clothing, toys for children and emergency food and toiletries. It appears that they are also being deducted off their claims - which seems totally inappropriate. The charities and the local authorities who raised the money are dismayed by this. It appears that, initially, there were some suggestions that they might want to recoup them off those they had given donations to who could then apply for the sums again.

Part of the concern was that it was not made clear when people filled out these forms to start with that that would take place and therefore the way people filled in their forms may have done them a disservice. I want to know has a solution been found to this?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): We think we have a solution to this. You are absolutely right. For those who do not know the Riot Damages Act is very clear that where somebody making a claim has received compensation from another source for the same claim that that has to be deducted from money that is given under the Riot Damages Act. The problem comes in that people, as you say, Joanne, have said on their forms that the money is for the same claim whereas in fact it is not.

What we have done is made the form clearer but also this relates in particularly, largely, to the Mayor's High Street Fund which has been paying out quite a lot of money to businesses and we are arranging for the High Street Fund itself to liaise with the DLS who are dealing with the claims here to make it very clear that any payments they are making are not in respect of any claims for loss under the Riot Damages Act (RDA); they are for paying the wages, business continuity and all those matters that do not fall under the Riot Damages Act because they do not want to recoup their money and they certainly do not want it to be deducted from those people who are making a claim so hopefully we can get round it that way.

If there are individual cases where there have been errors made on filling in the form in those cases, the numbers, certainly on the uninsured basis, are small enough that we can go back and review them individually.

Joanne McCartney (AM): That puts the onus on people who have had a very traumatic experience, many for example in Tottenham whose first language is not English, and to suggest that they then have to go through a process I think is

totally unfair. You may be able to do that with regards to the Mayor's Fund but to suggest that the various charities or the various voluntary organisations that were set up to raise funds should be doing that I think is totally inappropriate so I am asking you to look at it again.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): We are happy to. If we can get blanket letters from the charities and local authorities who have given money clearing it then we will. Obviously we are in a situation where we may have to go back to individuals and explain to them what has happened. Fortunately the numbers are not so huge at that level that we cannot do that and we will try to do that carefully. We recognise this problem with the Act and we are trying to address it.

OK. Thank you. Finally, Graham, you had two questions beyond the deadline. I am in generous mood so fire away ...

Graham Speed: I am indebted to you, Chair, for your generosity. Final two. The first one is a question about breathalysers. It seems that there still appears to be a shortage of functional roadside breathalysers available to borough officers and what can be done to improve this. First question.

The second question relates to Safer Neighbourhood Teams. From the briefings and discussions we had at Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP) and Full Authority last year I believe that it was agreed that we would receive regular reports on Safer Neighbourhood Team abstractions. I do not, however, recall seeing this and would therefore be obliged if we could be updated on a borough by borough basis over the last six months - this is not including the normal New Year's Eve/Notting Hill type events - a report on the levels of abstraction for anything other than adjoining ward work.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): OK. First of all in terms of the breathalysers. I am told that we have sufficient. Whether or not they are all available might be a deeper question. We have got about 1,350 electronic screening devices at the moment and all our traffic vehicles are equipped with them at all times but then within the boroughs we find that officers sometimes have to ask for one to be delivered in a vehicle. Apparently there are enough for our use but it does look as though there have been some local problems. I think Croydon had a problem previously in the year. Graham, I think you raised an issue. I was told that it had been resolved but it sounds like it might not have been.

Graham Speed: Thank you, Commissioner. Looking at the wider context there is an ongoing drive to cut road deaths and serious injuries and this is where we had the origins of this. Reducing drink driving is key to that aim and objective. I, as you acknowledge, have raised this previously and been assured, in similar situation, that we have got hundreds, if not thousands, of these bits of kit and that they are all out there and it is all working.

Empirical evidence would seem to suggest that when you go to a borough and you talk to officers that there is actually a shortage of these available and working for them to use. As a result, it is actually making their lives much more difficult to go out and detect drink driving offences. I have certainly seen at first hand an increasing number of occasions when they are saying, "We've stopped somebody. We haven't got the kit. Who's got one?" and they are standing at the roadside for three quarters of an hour while a traffic vehicle brings it from the other side of south London. That to me is totally unacceptable.

Now what I think we need to do is say we have got enough of these but we need to identify where they are. TP has probably got to do a bit of work around managing this because I think there is a management issue in this.

It really ends with a challenge to you, Commissioner, that when you go out and about and you visit the boroughs ask to see them and ask how many are actually there and available because this is the difference - we are being told one thing but the evidence on the ground seems to suggest something else. What I think officers want and what I think we want, particularly from a road safety perspective, is the devices out there, people being tested, hopefully they pass, if they do not they are arrested quickly and they are brought in and they are processed, and it contributes towards the objective to reduce road deaths and casualties. That would be my plea to you for that one.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): First of all I agree with you; the more available they are the more tests are done. That is the bottom line. If people are having to wait then there is a danger that they think, "Well they might be under" and therefore they allow them to travel on which is not good.

My experience in the past in other organisations has been the best way to manage this is that you allocate a breathalyser kit to a vehicle and then you book it in and out with the keys to the car. It is getting down to a really tedious level of detail but, frankly, unless you get that sort of management they get lost.

Graham Speed: Commissioner, with keys, and I think that is the key to success.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I am with you. I do not know enough about the vehicle fleet to know whether 1,350 of these are enough for every vehicle that goes out at any one time. It looks a little low to me so it looks like we have assumed we are going to share anyway, which is what led to the problem. I am with you. I will ask first of all about the supply and then, when I go out, I will ask to see if I can see one there.

Graham Speed: Thank you.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the SNT it looks like we might owe you an apology. (inaudible) ... I apologise it has not made its way to you yet but we will do that and, as we can, the full Members of the Authority.

Moving forward, the report coming through for December is due later this month. Now I have got some numbers here, which obviously I am not going to share in this meeting, but I am quite happy to share. I have to say, having had a look at it, I was surprised by the disparity of abstractions which I do not think can be totally accounted for by aid, which is one of the usual reasons why - people give aid to central London and that is often why they are abstracted. I am not going to go right through the numbers but you are talking about the odd percentage point up to well over 10%. I cannot understand that difference yet. I think the information is useful but we will make sure that we share it with you.

Graham Speed: Thank you, Commissioner. Chair, this was almost something that really needs to come back to you. It is not something that we are going to be able to look at but I remain concerned that there are instances out there where Safer Neighbourhood Teams are being looked at as a local resource for additional things above and beyond the very clear undertaking that we were given about cross-border working plus the team working etc. I think that the temptation is there and I think it is being used. I think it would be important for you to see those reports coming back and to perhaps dig into a few examples as to what is actually going on and is it being done with local support because certainly the evidence that I have seen is that it is not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you. I will note that on my work programme/list of things to do. OK. Does anybody else have any questions for the Commissioner?

Valerie Brasse: Yes, I have one question.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes, Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse: If I can vie on your generosity just a bit further. Shortly after you arrived, Commissioner, I made the observation to you in Full Authority that, in relation to serious sexual offences and the MPS' performance, the MPS' performance was worse and worsening and had been for quite some time. I know you went away and said to me, "Well it's going to be one of our major priorities going forward". That is both in relation to your own measure of performance in sanctions and detections and now, notwithstanding the fact that of course we have a centralised Sapphire command unit in SCD2. I really wanted to ask you what have you done since then and what has changed?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The two things we have been done. First of all, as usual, we have carried out a review. Number two is that Lynne Owens sat down with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to work out

what were the reasons where there was a backlog and there were also some concerns about the charging decisions. We have gone through some individual cases to work out why we believe they could have been charged and the CPS sometimes did not. Whatever the result of that it has meant that both the charge and detection rate has risen over the last two months.

Now because I did not have notice of your question I am afraid I do not have the numbers with me but we were only talking about it at the Management Board last week so there has clearly been a change in direction to what had been for a long time, approaching two years, a huge decrease in the number of detections and charges. First of all it bottomed out but then it is actually starting to go back up. We think it is to do with that conversation that Lynne Owens had, together with CPS at a very high level, and that seems to have transmitted itself into, we would say, a different charging approach. I think we are starting to see evidence of that. I do not have the numbers but we could always share them.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): A final question to the Commissioner. OK. Thank you very much. We will move on to item five which is the report of the Civil Liberties Panel which is a **notey(?)** one. Victoria, did you want to say anything? Yes? Go ahead.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Please, if I may, Chair, again because it is our last meeting. I would first of all like to thank my colleagues on the Panel - Valerie Brasse, Joanne McCartney, Kirsten Hearn, Clive who is not with us today and of course Dee Doocey - for not only their work on this report of course but the extensive and detailed work that they did on DNA. I would like to obviously publicly thank the officers at the MPS - Siobhan, **Sharanee(?)** and Simon when he was with us - and thank you please to your team, Commissioner - to Lynne Owens and all the other officers - who facilitated our persistent questions on the various visits we made not only to London but down to Gravesend and to some of the other operations that you facilitated our visits.

From a civil liberties viewpoint I am obviously concerned that the gains that have been made in enabling peaceful protest are not lost or confused, more importantly, with the criminal behaviour that we all saw this summer. The two are separate and should remain so from a civil liberties point of view. In compiling our report we invited the media and public who previously had been critical of the policing of events to let us know what they had seen and what changes they had seen in their experience on the ground and, frankly, they were positive in summary. I think, for the sake of today, I will leave it in that sense. Inevitably there were still concerns raised but there were positive responses given back to us about your team.

Obviously it is our job now, as we finish today, to ensure that our successors continue to monitor to the effects and the adherence to civil liberties by the MPS.

As I say, thank you again to our team and I look forward to your assurance that civil liberties will remain part of your agenda as you move forward. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you very much. Thanks, Victoria. Does anybody have any comments? No? Noting the report. Thank you.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Victoria would like an assurance.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): By all means give her that assurance.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I am quite happy to give an assurance about protecting civil liberties and the balance of rights really; the right to protest and the right to carry on in a peaceful life.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): OK. Thank you. Item six. Treasury management half year report. Bob. Bob is also going to explain to us that in this report we are approving an increase in the prudential code limit on variable rate borrowing from 30% to 50%. Jenny, I know this is a matter close to your heart. You wrote to me asking for information so I know you will have a detailed question. Bob, fire away.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Thank you, Chair. This is the routine six-monthly update report on treasury management for Members. I am happy to take any questions on that part of the report. A few key things to mention in addition I think. The first one is some good news that on the Icelandic investment we have seen the first repayment made. Unfortunately it looks like the timescale for the final repayments could run through to 2018 so it is quite a long term process but it is really positive that we have won the court case in Iceland and therefore there is no appeal against that so we now are certain to be treated as priority creditors and get repayments back.

It is a question now of the assets being realised, which is not without complication and not without difficulty, and quite important from our perspective that there is not a fire sale so actually we do get good value out of these assets and get the maximum repayment that we possibly can get. I think that is some very positive news. It is as a result of an awful lot of effort on the part of both the claiming bodies and also the Local Government Association (LGA) and the solicitors that were appointed by the LGA to support us in this process. It has been a really good combined effort across the public sector really to get this result so it is a very positive result.

Another important thing to say is that the whole treasury management activity really is being limited and constrained and influenced by the events in Europe which are still very uncertain, and Members I am sure have been reading press reports on that. Really the situation is still unresolved and it is very difficult to

quite see how that will actually turn out in the event. So, as a result, we continue to operate a very cautious policy. Where we do have money to lend, which the disturbances in August 2011 have constrained to some extent which might be an upside I suppose to that, we are lending it very short term and only to the very best counter parties and basically UK banks and we are following our treasury manager's advice on that.

Turning to the prudential indicator limit which we want to vary, which is the variable rate limit from 30% to 50%, we are in the position that because of the impact of the costs from the August 2011 disturbances and although we have a commitment on the grant payment, we have not actually received the cash from the bank yet. I have been in correspondence with the Home Office this morning to ask where it is and we are trying to get that finalised. Because of that we are having to make short term borrowing in order to balance our cash flow from day to day. Usually it is at the month end that we have got get some cash in to cover our salaries' bill and what have you.

The way the market is working at the moment is that there can be advantage in taking out at a variable rate. As a Treasurer I tend to be a bit wary of variable rates because you are actually taking the interest rate risk rather than passing it on to somebody else. So normally we do not use variable rate very much but actually the rates were considerably lower at variable rate. We want to have the maximum amount of flexibility around that to respond to the market conditions as they vary.

As it happens at the moment the fixed rate for short term borrowing has actually dipped below the variable rate so, in fact, we are slightly changing our approach to it but we just need to have the maximum flexibility we can to make sure we are reducing the burden on the revenue account in terms of the cost of borrowing. That is the rationale behind that which is set out within the report.

I am happy to take questions, Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman: This treasury management area is one which obviously in the past has given quite a lot of concern to the Authority and it has been one of the roles of the Resources and Productivity Sub-Committee to monitor and scrutinise and challenge it so normally this would have come to that Sub-Committee for a detailed scrutiny.

I think I would like to say that that overall situation has improved very markedly and I think thanks are due to both MPA and MPS officers, including Anne, for that improvement. I would have been wary for the same sort of reasons about increasing the rate, the potential up to 50%, if there had not been that

improvement, but I think what I have seen reassures me that that will be used sensibly and that it is indeed necessary given the current situation.

So I would just like to give a) my thanks for that improvement and b) my personal recommendation that we accept this recommendation.

[audio silence]

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Just very briefly, Chair, because the annual letter is the very formal conclusion of the audit process and it has been to the (inaudible) Governance Committee, whose Chair might want to comment. Basically, as the Chair of the Authority says, it is a very positive letter. We got a clean audit opinion on the accounts, which obviously we are very grateful for, and we also got an unconditional value for money opinion as well which is extremely good news, so really very positive. There are four recommendations within the letter and all of those are agreed and accepted, so no issues there, and we continue to meet with the District Auditor to iron out any problems there might be as we go forward.

[three minutes of audio silence]

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): ... brought a welcome transparency internally and externally which I certainly hope to continue in the future.

To reassure you in terms of the various agendas and the projects and the spirit in which the MPA has driven the MPS forward I am very hopeful that we will continue in exactly the same vein under the new structure and that will be my job and my successor's job to do that. Those of you who are on the London Assembly who will then be continuing on the Police Committee will be able to watch and scrutinise and push and cajole just the way you did before, and I do hope that those of you who will not be, those of you who are independents, will stay interested and involved. You have all got my email address. By all means offer your views. It will always be very welcome.

From my point of view the last three years has been a particularly difficult period for one reason or another and I am extremely grateful to you all for your support. I know we have all had our moments but I think we have been, notwithstanding the political differences and the ideological differences and what have you, a pretty cohesive group. I am particularly grateful to those people who have taken on the burden of being Chairs of Committees. I have learned, in chairing the overall Authority, that it can be a bit of a thankless task and you do become a focus for discontent but, nevertheless, we seem to have managed it reasonably

well and, ultimately, in the end, we are a partner in what we hope is an improving product which is a safer capital. I think over the last ten years or so all the indicators are that the capital is appreciably safer. The vast majority of that achievement is down to the work of the brave men and women of the MPS, but I think we can all allow ourselves a little bit of the credit in the Authority for the part we and others have played over the last few years in driving that forward.

We are having a small event after this at which words will be said but I just wanted to publicly thank one particular person for her, frankly incredible and herculean, efforts over the last dozen years. Catherine [Crawford] is the focus of a lot of public and private pressure from Members and from some extremely intimidating senior officers. She has been in the thick of the fray for a very long time. The fact that she almost 100% of the time maintains her calm and affable approach towards dealing with people is a fantastic quality and the Authority would not have achieved much of what it has achieved, or indeed we would not be in the shape we are, without her. So she leaves being Chief Executive of the Police Authority with our hearty congratulations and, from my point of view, admiration for doing what must be one of the most difficult jobs in the civil service in the UK, and on Monday we will be welcoming her as the new Chief Executive of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime with similar enthusiasm. Catherine, thank you.

[applause]

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Chair, thank you very much for those words about me personally. I am of course the first and last Chief Executive of this Authority, showing stamina and sustainability that others might perhaps envy or think is very imprudent.

I would like to say that this has been an unmitigated pleasure right from the very beginning but of course it has not. It has, however, been challenging and it is a matter of personal pride to me that the Authority has achieved as much as it has. I know that there has been some concern that this retrospective paper focuses very much on the last four years. It seems to me that that is appropriate because that is the current administration and it is right that this particular group of Members should be reflecting on what has been achieved since the chairmanship changed. If you do look further back - and I will confess that some examples that the Chair has mentioned I cannot add to because I probably supplied them in the first place - is a remarkable achievement and those of us who were around in the beginning, whether we have been on the Authority continuously since or not, I think unanimously will recognise the extraordinary distance that the Members have taken this. It is not just Members of course. I have been supported by a remarkable staff who have shown loyalty and commitment and determination, sometimes in some very difficult circumstances, and I have had cooperation right from the very beginning from colleagues in the MPS, officers and staff, for which I am very grateful as well.

I think that the idea of doing a retrospective paper links actually through to the next agenda item because I know that Members - all Members but Chairs particularly - were very keen to identify work in progress, if you like, and to seek assurances from you as the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime in waiting, shortly to be confirmed on Monday, on how those work streams might be progressed and a commitment that the good work of the Authority will not disappear just because the Authority itself has done so.

[audio silence]

Toby Harris: ... say something on both items, eight and nine, but can I just first of all say something on item eight which is, as the first Chair of the Authority, to welcome the comments that you made recognising that the work of the Authority did not start in 2008, but I wanted to echo your thanks to Catherine Crawford and also to all of the staff of the Authority on whom Members no doubt placed completely unreasonable requests on occasions, but also for their dedication in trying to support the work of delivering public accountability for the police service in London.

I also want to thank the MPS for, despite on occasions behind closed doors and occasionally publicly, disagreements about provision of information, the direction of travel and all sorts of things, it has almost universally worked extremely hard with the Authority to try to deliver the improvements that we would all want to see happen. I think that is, again, extremely positive.

I wanted to draw a distinction both between something I have been banging on about and how important it is to retain this in the future; the visible answerability of the MPS and the visible work the police service does. I take all of that as read because I have said it so many times before but there is also the behind the scenes work that the Police Authority has done over the years which does not always get public recognition. I want to couple that with certainly my thanks to the Members I have worked with over that time.

If I can give one example which I think demonstrates it, partly because the former Member is in the audience today, which is that there was an occasion right at the beginning of this Authority's life when, with some considerable expenditure of political capital, the then Mayor of London agreed that the precept should rise to finance an extra 1,000 MPS officers. It seems small numbers by modern comparisons. This was at a time of considerable doubts about how well the MPS used money and everything else. Spending that political capital persuading the boroughs to increase the precept was agreed; there was to be a thousand extra officers. I remember at one of those private discussions that you, Chair, will be familiar with, when you sit down with the Commissioner - I think it is on a Friday

morning. I think you meet even earlier on a Friday morning than I used to - maybe a difference of approach. The Commissioner then just dropped casually into the conversation, "Of course nobody really expects us to achieve 1,000 officers do they?" I said, "Well actually I think the Mayor does, I think the London Assembly, having finally voted for that budget, expect that and certainly the Police Authority does". "But it's just not possible. Hendon couldn't cope. The capacity simply isn't there".

What the Authority did was we fired Rachel Whittaker, who was then a Member of the Authority, at the problem. She ended up working out that the key problem with that deliverable was the capacity of the kitchen to serve enough lunches - and I think Bernard Hogan-Howe will remember some of those discussions in his previous incarnation - at the time and the issue was that there needed to be a third serving hatch created in the catering facilities to provide that. That required the detailed work of individual Members going down there, I think with a measuring tape, to establish that this was possible. I think it is that dedication and that degree of detail and the degree of detail which the MPS has been happy for us to work with over the years that has enabled the Authority, not only in terms of the public things it has done but also in terms of the private things that it has done, to make policing better for the people of London. I want to pay tribute both to officers but also to former Members.

[audio silence]

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. On item nine I just wanted to draw Members' attention to the fact that there is also a tabled Finance and Resources final report and an Olympics report, because both Committees had asked for it specifically to be done. Largely because there are some very specific recommendations to MOPC and I would like those written into the minutes.

On the finance one I would just draw Members' attention to the recommendations on paragraph 29 and I think it would be helpful if they went into our final minutes.

On the Olympics one I have some comments which I think would be more appropriate to be made in a Part 2 but I just wondered if you were planning to go into Part 2?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): I was not going to. (inaudible)?

Dee Doocey (AM): I think my comments would be more appropriate in a Part 2 so if we could come back to that. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): (inaudible)

Joanne McCartney (AM): I wanted to formally echo my thanks to Catherine. For the years that I have been on here I have always found, whenever I have needed clarification, you have always given it extremely quickly and extremely fairly. Also to other officers of this Authority. I think we have had a very good service so thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you.

[audio silence]

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Just on behalf of the MPS, as the most recent Commissioner, I would just say thank you. Thank you. Many of the Members, including one in the audience, I have worked with over many years. Some more recently. I have always enjoyed it. I have to say, although it has been challenging for all parties involved, I think it has been approached generally with a sense of openness and honourability, even when it has not been easy to agree things. That has certainly been my experience.

I suppose the big change for the MPS in 2000 was not only did the Police Authority arrive but a receiver receded and of course the Home Secretary was no longer the Police Authority but had not quite realised it and did not for many years. I am still not sure they have! That dynamic has played a part I suppose in all our lives for quite a long time.

From my experience while I have been here, and from what I have seen when I have been away, it seems to me that the strength the Authority brings is it challenges and I think anybody in any organisation needs challenge, particularly in public service when you have no competition. The public of London has to come to the MPS to get their policing so you need someone to challenge you constantly and say, "Actually, you could do this differently. You could do it better". It is not always easy to understand that challenge but it is always easy to accept it. It is vital.

The accountability. The point about if you have got an explanation then let's hear it and we may be persuaded is a vital part of public service.

There has been an openness it has encouraged in the MPS which I think the MPS would have to acknowledge that, prior to 2000, was not there. Public meetings actually bring openness. They bring the press. They bring the questions. They bring the answers. Others will look at that dialogue and they may learn something from it. I think it is absolutely vital.

There has been an expertise and it is not only the hatches, important as the hatches were. There have been many other things in which individuals have

brought specialist knowledge and that has been really helpful in terms of the Board level.

The final thing I would say is it seems to me it has brought a friendship over the years as well. Friends do not always agree. Friendships wax and wane a bit. It can be that you actually fall out at times as well but there is an underpinning trust there that joins you that I think can take you forward into the future. I think we ought to celebrate that friendship. It has been a critical friendship at times but it is vital to be there. The sole aim, as I think the Chair started out with, is to help the MPS improve but, most importantly, to keep the people of London safe, and everybody who comes here. I think that joint ambition is something that we have worked on really well together and it is something this Authority, in its various guises, should be proud of.

Finally, to reiterate my support and comments regarding Catherine. Her role and her staff. I think for those who know privately some of the pressures she and her staff have gone through only those can realise just what difficulties she has been placed in. She has invariably been professional and come up with some wise solution which has not always been that blindingly obvious at the beginning. So we would add our support to that of other Members.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you very much. Members, we are going to move on to item ten if that is all right. Urgent action taking any under delegated authority. I think it is just to note for the last time.

Item 11 and then we will move - Dee has something to say in confidential. Any other urgent business? You should all have some documents to sign that are in an envelope which are various discharges and what have you. You should all have them. If you could sign them and leave them with us before you go - just leave them at the end of the table there - that would be great. Yes, Jenny, you have a question?

Jenny Jones (AM): Any other business?

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): I would like to propose a vote of thanks for your time as Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair, MPA): Thank you very much. There may not be a seconder, Jenny! That is very kind. Thank you very much indeed. Thank you. Thank you very much. That is very kind.

OK. Well on that note, at Dee's request, we are going in to private session if that is all right so I am going to ask the press and public to leave. You have been very welcome over the last 12 years, those of you who have been in for the long

haul, and we will see you over at the London Assembly in the not too distant future. Thank you.

If you could just take a moment to sign the various documents as well. We just have a brief hiatus while people clear.