

MPA Race and Faith Inquiry

SIR PAUL STEPHENSON-Commissioner

30 MARCH 2009

Chair: Cindy Butts

Panel Members: Bob Purkiss, Margaret Blankson and Anthony Julius

This cassette has been proof read and names inserted only where identity is certain.

(inaudible)

CB ..Margaret, Anthony and Bob. We'll ask you a series of questions, we'll do them in blocks but we may (inaudible) directions (inaudible). Hope you feel comfortable enough to give us your honest opinions; at the end you'll get an opportunity to say anything that you haven't had the opportunity to say; we'll also ensure that you get a transcript of your (inaudible).

PS And I'm pleased to be here to help you.

(Inaudible) Can I kick off, then? In your experience, do black minority ethnic officers and staff face additional challenges in relation to their work, than their white (inaudible)?

PS Difficult question to ask, answer as a generality. But I would have to say, based on the evidence throughout my entire police career, of cour—of course there is some additional challenge. It would, it would seem to me – and you've got, we've got to judge it on the outcomes and the outcomes are, we've made real progress in some areas, not enough in other areas, so that would seem to indicate that we need to do more.

Okay. As you know, this Inquiry is very much about trying to identify

Mm

..what those challenges are and putting in place practical workable things that – that can rectify those. In your view, then, what, what, what is – what are some of the challenges that you think those individuals face?

PS Right. Well, I think if we look at where we've done well, I think we've done significant improvements round recruiting and the figures are there to sort of – support that. We've still got further to go and we've got to maintain that progress and improve on it. If we look at where there are sort of a lot – we've got a lot further to go, if we look at areas such as getting people from BME communities into specialisms, there've been improvements but at a lot slower rate than we'd like; if we look at the areas of – where I still don't think we fully understand issues of disproportionality around discipline, that's another area where we need to sort of - either make further progress or make sure that we can give people confidence and I think that's the critical issue in all of this. Its how do we give communities externally and internally confidence that we are an equal opportunities employer. So I think it's that, if you're looking at the broad indicators, it's those sort of things that indicate there must be challenges for staff in getting to those positions. Otherwise, if it was so easy, we'd achieved a, a better result by now.

Okay. You didn't include progression within the ...

PS Oh, sorry, I should have included progression, 'cause actually, that's one of the - if you will, one of the totemic issues for us. We, if you look at progression – and I'm sure we, you've had this debate in this Inquiry on a number of occasions and before, and it's the, it's the age old argument, hardly sur-- if it takes fifteen to twenty years to get to a Superintendent, whatever it is, hardly surprising without further interventions that we look something like we did fifteen, twenty years ago. The problem with that is, if we wait for time, and the volume to solve the problem, then we've got another ten years of communit—of communities not being confident, because we're not making sufficient progress, so it is the tot—if you will, the totemic issue that actually will send the signal to people, Yes, they're very, very serious about doing something about this; pleased you've made this progress but this is something we need to push on.

Right. You, you mentioned the whole issue of representation within the specialist units.

PS Yes.

Wh—wh--- why do you think there has been such slow progress?

PS Well, let's – I think first of all we've got to say there's been some progress, but if you look at just, I mean, why do I think it? Well, it's just there in the numbers. We, we're – we stand at some 8 per cent plus now of our total police population from BME communities and if we look at and I sort of, I'm not here to bandy numbers that - and I don't think that's what you, you want today. But if you look at the progress we've made, well SO is something like 5 per cent but we've got --the Serious Crime Directorate on CO are down at 4 per cent. If we'd made as much progress as we want, want to do then we would be at least the same amount as the rest of the Service, of the-- as the rest of the For--, the Met. One of the reasons why we're not, of course, is because we have come late to the game of recruiting for BME communities, a lot, our police officers are more junior in rank and they need to get that specialism, so we need to ---get that experience to get into specialisms, we need to find ways where we can give them, give them that experience quicker.

Right, okay. Can I hand over to Bob?

BP Thanks very much, thanks. First of all, I mean in terms of – you, you know, we've heard a lot here about the – the thirty years and the, the, the fact that it's a, a thirty year Service background, single point of entry and – and, and repeated what you've just said about it takes time, and yet, on the other hand, we've been meeting, you know, BME officers who've been here thirty years, so they've, th--they're saying, you know, some of the things you're saying now should have been applicable a few years ago. But I, I, I want to start off by

PS Well, j--can I just say, on that point – remember what I am saying – I'm saying as a generality, it's – it dec—you can use the numbers game, you can use the volume argument, but I'm saying it's not good enough, otherwise we will not have communities that are confident so I'm, I'm, I'm using the argument; I'm actually saying that argument isn't good enough so I guess we'd agree.

BP Oh, we, we'd agree. I just – just want to make sure that we understood what we were agreeing on, in that sense. In, in t(inaudible) I want to lead off in one sense in, in terms of what you were saying about the specialist areas to Cindy; in terms of the business case for diversity. I mean, if you look at Trident and, areas where they've clearly made a Met the business case for diversity, do you hold your Commanders and Senior Officers responsible and to account for making a business case within their own areas of command?

PS We should have moved beyond having to prove the business case – the business case is an obvious one. And what do I, I hold the whole Met to account now, because I've made it quite clear when I took over as Commissioner, I think there are two major areas driving things here in London – two areas that we've got to concentrate on, that leads to a lot of other detailed work. One is the issue of violence - and that's from perceived violence right down at the minor level where people are frightened of kids, when very often they don't need to be – right the way to the more serious level and two, the issue of confidence and the whole issue that we need all our communities to be confident that we are m—we are on their side and doing their bidding. Now that is the thing that's driving everything that I'm doing in the Met so I think we should move beyond having to prove the business case 'cause you're not going to be able to do that confidence thing, unless you got internal external quality, unless you actually respect your community internally, so you can deliver (inaudible)

BP But the

PS (inaudible) level play, it's, it's - (inaudible)

BP But the business case is – is reflected internally, not necessarily justifying to the external.

PS That's why I say, you've got to do in—you can't have external quality without internal.

BP Okay. So, just moving on – with reference to your recent public comments a—about, in relation to the term institutional racism, how did you arrive at that assessment that this term's no longer helpful, or relevant, to the MPS and the MPA?

PS Well I just, a--, as long as we are quoting accurately from what I said, and – and I think that's very helpful to what you've just said, because that is accurate, the question I got wasn't accurate until it's applied in advance. Because I did say, it is – and to quote, let me (inaudible) the question a number of commentators recently posed, Is the Met institutionally racist? Others will continue to the – the debate. Now I said – as you are saying – that I don't think it's any longer appropriate or useful.

PS The main reason being, let's – firstly, there's been huge amounts of debate around institutional racism and sometimes the debate around the definition becomes more important than the outcome. But it's actually actions that solve issues – it is not sort of – it's not definitions, so I don't want to be distracted by that – by that debate, but the other thing you'd have to say, that the application of that definition, back when Macpherson sat, became the real driver, that real thing whether people like the definition or not, that motivated change. I don't think the definition is any longer that motivator or driver in anything like the same way. And it has proved a difficult definition to properly conceptualise, over time. Now that didn't matter as much way back when, because actually there was a need to drive the debate and it was a useful driver. I think it matters more now.

AJ Well, can I just ask a couple of questions arising out of – out of that answer? Because it seems to me I've, I've – I can see the sense of saying, to get lost inside definitions can be a – fruitless, sterile exercise, but there was an aspect of the – of the consensus definition which I think caused a certain amount of resentment, and which I – I, my sense is that you were speaking to, when you made the remarks that you did and that is, the aspect of the phrase which pointed to a kind of collective guilt. The implication was that, that, that, that the, that the Met was collectively guilty of racism. Does that, does that resonate with you? I've got some questions arising out of that, but I – wanted to get your, your view, at this point.

PS No, no, a--actually, my – the driver for what I was saying is about these actions not definitions solving problems and since I've been here in the Met, the number of times I've got into debate about the definition: does it apply, does it not apply, how do we contextualise it,

AJ Yeah, no, I'm sorry,

(inaudible)

AJ Sorry, I under ---(inaudible)

PS ..so, so that as for the driver for what I've said, was about we need to get ourselves out of that debate and I'm not concerned, for the people who wish to apply it to us. We need to concentrate on the activity (inaudible)

AJ Well, you mu—you must be concerned, if people are going to say of the Met that it's institutionally racist. I mean, notwithstanding the fact that actions are important, we only understand our actions by reference to the language that we use.

PS Well -

AJ So, so language does matter

PS So--

AJ ..and if I, sorry, I too—I took your, your point to be, the phrase institutional racism is no longer, if it ever was, an appropriate way of characterising the Metropolitan Police Service.

PS Well, I, I, I would concentrate on, it is not a helpful way.

AJ Okay. And instead, it's more helpful to think about racism in terms of pockets of stupidity.

PS Well, I think sort of – I, I used the word stupidity and bigotry--

AJ Right

PS ..and, but then I was ta—when I was talking about that, I'm talking about individual culpability.

AJ Right

PS And I used, I actually, in my speech, that was a good four pages different.

AJ Of course

PS I was talking individuals there, as opposed to the organisational issue. Of course there are organisational issues, but I'm just coming to a, a balanced practical view that within the Met, is it s--, is it still a helpful definition? And I just don't think it is. My point about whether I'm concerned that other people apply it or not, other people will apply it, or not. The debate between Stone and various other people, as to whether it's there or not – frankly, if I and the Met concern ourselves around, Should it apply or not? I find it potentially a distraction.

AJ Right, so, it's not helpful, because if, if only at least in part, because it's not correct. But, but you, you would say, I mean, you must say that. I mean, you – you can, it, c—if, if, if, if it was correct then it would follow that it would be helpful. It's, it can only be unhelpful, at least in part, because it's not a correct way of understanding the issue

PS No, that--

AJ ..of race.

PS No, that's not true at all, of course. What do I think about the definition? The definition is so broad, so wide, that it could be applied to op-- most if not all organisations, continuing through time. It used to be a driver, it is no longer a driver, so I'm saying, it's not helpful. It is for others to judge whether we are, or not.

AJ Well, let's take a step back an—and look at new phrases which have come into play, like race wars and apartheid culture. These are, these are, these are new; some people find them helpful – some people find them accurately descriptive of, of the Met, or of aspects of the Met's performance and, and those phrases go deeper in characterising the Met than a phrase like pockets of stupidity.

PS Well, let me come back to that, but if, if I thought that – if we sat here today and agreed, let's apply the term institutional racism,

AJ Yeah

PS ..that would stop the – those more sensationalist descriptions, then maybe I'd consider it. But it will not. You know it won't and I know it

AJ No

PS ..wont. They were media descriptions and whether I say we're institutionally racist or not will not

AJ Yes

PS .. affect that. So I think they, they're two separate issues (inaudible)

AJ What's your take on the use of the phrase of —apartheid culture?

PS Well, I, I, I, I read the stories

AJ Yes

PS ..about what happened in that particular incident and it was deeply distressing. Apartheid culture, is it a culture or not? If that behaviour took place, on, in that area, then that is deeply distressing, no matter how you describe it. Deeply distressing. Offensive. Does that, is there an apartheid culture wider than that? I do not believe so. Are there problems? Absolutely. And neither do I recognise race wars. I recognise difficulties – I recognise places where we've succeeded and places where we need to do more. I think that's more media headlines and I do not see that being affected by the term institutional racism or not.

AJ This, this, the, the segregation in practice between black and white employees of the Met, which appears to have been a characteristic of the Belgravia station at one time, it's – it's apartheid seems an appropriate way of describing that.

PS Well, sort of let's be careful here. I don't know whether it's a characteristic of that station;

AJ Right

PS If true, it would be a characteristic of the behaviour of some people and that was disgraceful if true. Absolutely disgraceful.

AJ But people act within a culture that either permits them or, or rei—reins them in,

PS Which is one of the reasons why I think we need to introduce intrusive supervision

AJ Right

PS ..to ensure that we are aware where things like that are going on. Where there may be pockets of bigotry going on, so that the Met should (inaudible) do something about it quickly.

BP So, so what is your vision, then, for – for the Metropolitan Police Service, in relation to equality and, and diversity? Wh—what's your priorities and what resources are you now going to apply?

PS Well, I, I think I've already referred to it. My analysis is the two most important things are – are violence and people's perception and reality to be safe from that violence and second, this whole issue of confidence. And my vision for race and faith and equality matters, the same as my vision for the Met, that we have to do all within our power to ensure that all our communities have the confidence that we are on their side and doing their bidding.

BP I understand, I unders—

PS That, that's my vision for it.

BP No, I understand about the communities. I'm talking about the employees and the police officers.

PS Well, I've already said, you can't, you can't achieve that externally, unless—unless you achieve a similar amount of buy-in and (inaudible)

BP So how are you going to do it internally?

PS Well, to--

BP What are your drivers?

PS What, what are my drivers? The actions I'm taking is

BP Mm

PS I think you've already seen the report that I, I've commissioned, known as the Wolfenden Report

BP Mm hm

PS I've already moved to put sort of our Internal Diversity Board under the Dep—under the Deputy Commissioner; I've asked for an action plan that brings together the other activities we're doing, along with the activities that we should be doing, learnt out of that report, because it's – putting the foot on the ball to say, What have we done well and what haven't we done well, to ensure that we can then ensure that we have ownership by appropriate Management Board letters, with targets, with delivery dates, to (inaudible) the action, not words solve problems. That's what I'm doing. I'm also very keen to ensure that Performance Board looks at the corporate health indicators when we examine performance monthly, as opposed to just looking at the crime figures. The police service and the Met became very good at managing our performance through traditional crime figures and such-

- that sort of data. What we weren't good at, what we haven't been good at, is actually measuring our performance and corporate health indicators. And only today we've had Performance Board and I know, I wasn't—I didn't Chair it

(inaudible)

PS ..but on there, they have

Mmm

PS ... considered corporate health indicators, which is also about considered, considering our diversity figures.

BP So moving that diversity is

(inaudible)

Right, can I just intervene just there? In terms of the – is it Dialogue to Delivery report, I think – which you refer to. I just wonder, is it not slightly premature to do this in advance of the Inquiry that's been set up to have actually addressed those very issues?

PS Well, I think you've got to look at the particular circumstances. Yes, this Inquiry's coming, but also it's not just about trying to get ahead of the Inquiry. I suddenly became Com--- IPM Acting Commissioner, can't remember, but I think it is in November of last year. Is it responsible of me to sit there, waiting for this Inquiry to come out with the answers, or should I be trying to say, what i – what is the situation here? What are we doing well? Where do we need to improve? and then get on and do something about it, try and be conscious of what this Inquiry is doing, but make this Inquiry aware of where, where we are and then if you come up with additional matters, then we add to it and we don't subtract to it. But for me to sit still until this Inquiry (re)ports in June, considered by the Police Authority maybe in July, everybody's on holiday in August and then, as Commissioner I take no action, action 'til September. I think that would be irresponsible.

But given that it's likely that – possible, that we would co—we could come up with Inquir—a set of recommendations, that are in direct opposition to some of the things that you've suggested, you will have, potentially have an organisation that under your command, set out a way of working or (inaudible) a direction that is then asked to turn around, one-- once it's just got those, that new direction in place and potentially go in another direction. Doesn't that also send out a – a double message or a confusing message to the organisation, about where your leadership sits, in relation to diversity?

PS Well, there's a potential there, but I, I think it would send out a dreadful message, by sh— just sat back and said, Let the Inquiry do it all for me. I'm supposed to be leading this organisation; that's my job.

It's no suggestion; I think you should sit back and wait. I just – 'cause you could appreciate, it does appear, I'll say, for my part, that it's a – there's a degree of pre-empting or t—or for potentially trying to set the pace of where our Inquiry goes.

PS I, I've made it absolutely clear and I think it's fair to say I know (inaudible) private convers-- I've made it clear to the Chair of this Inquiry,

Mm

PS ..that in doing this, my intention is to actually pick up our responsibilities to get on with making improvements where we feel we need to make them. I find it difficult to think that we are going to do things that are diametrically opposed to this Inquiry, 'cause actually we want to do the same things. However, if this Inquiry comes up with recommendations that are better than what we're doing, would I be embarrassed about changing direction? Not a jot. I'd rather send a strong signal out that this is important – get on with doing the right things and (inaudible) something better to do, then we'll do something better, when the better thing comes along.

(Inaudible) no, that's fine, I'll come; I'll come back to that (inaudible)

BP Yeah, I just want to pick up some of the comments and thoughts that we're hearing from focus groups and other areas. We've heard evidence from BME and white officers that there's a sort of a golden circle within the MPS; where you, what do you say about that?

PS Well, sort of, I don't think there is and I'm certainly unaware of any golden circle.

BP Okay. In terms of culture,

(inaudible) I'd like to (inaudible)

Well, I think I was going to come but I knew, what (inaudible)

Be, be—because we'd – I mean, we hear that not just from

Mm

..black staff; we hear it from white staff.

Yes

Are you saying that their assessment is wrong? Are you saying that there is no --- possibly val-- validity to their experiences – I, I think it, I think it takes more than just, I don't believe that there is a golden circle, to con—not, not just to convince us, who are charged with carrying out this important work, but also the hordes of people who actually believe that there is a golden circle that operates in the Met; if you're in the camp, you're fine and you're going to fly and go to greater heights

(inaudible)

..and if you're not, you'd better get used to it.

PS Right, I think we – don't forget the question I was asked. Did I believe there was a golden circle. I said, No I don't. Do I believe that people perceive there's a golden circle? Well clearly some do – some people do, because it's been well documented. I think there are two separate questions, Cindy. And, and I'd simply say, if people perceive that to be the case, that's another reason why we've got to build further confidence internally, to get that confidence externally. It's a fact—another reason why we need to move on and make progress in the areas that are quite totemic. But I don't believe there is a golden circle. If there is, I think I would know about it. Certainly for senior levels, and I'm certainly not aware of any golden circle and I'm not part of anything to do with a golden circle. But that's a different issue, that people may have perceived it. I know people perceived it, because it's been reported on publicly.

D—okay. H—how, then, would you, would you characterise what we do hear a hell of a lot of, not, not just in terms of the evidence that we've had in our work shops, but actually it's – it's reflected within the very report that you commissioned,

(inaudible)

..which is about the informal networks that operate within the organisation. I—is that not a feature of a golden circle network?

PS Well, I, I think it's a fact—a, a fascinating area of, of, of debate and I think it's one of the areas that we need to do much more work on. The networks – the informal networks, we could turn round and say, that (inaudible) regrettable and we must stop these informal networks. Actually, informal networks are part of human nature. What we've got to do is ensure that BME staff, who do not have the same access to those networks because of numbers, because of rank, we need to take extraordinary action to ensure they get the same benefit from networking. Networking isn't a pejorative phrase. Networking is a positive in most organisations. It's the fact that BME staff - I mean, very often, are excluded because of numbers, connectivity and because there isn't the same level of seniority.

BP Is it not also because of attitude? I mean, that's what the concept of the golden circle. And what we're looking at, that it's not just because of numbers and rank, it's because of the attitude of those people who won't include them.

PS Well, sort of I think first (inaudible) we should look at, we should not be about trying to prove our sort of right, we should be out trying to get the right result here. And actually there, there are a number of reasons why some of our BME staff do not get into – t–t-- do not network or prepare in the same way that other people prepare for promotion exams. This is a confidence issue. We have to deal with that. Secondly, if – if you have people from a BME background, at a senior level in numbers, it would be easier to get the advice concurrently. That's regrettably the case. So therefore, what we've got to do, is take extraordinary action to give them the benefit of that networking, that preparation and – I, I'm informed, from a number of areas, that the Muslim Police Association, my own staff, that the networking issue is important and the best way to address this is not try and ignore and get rid of networks, because that is human nature. How do we give people the access to those networks?

(inaudible) think perhaps the focus is too much on the networks and I don't think, from my understanding, when we've spoken to both black and ethnic minority officers and civilian staff, they talk about networks. They're talking about the 'phone call that takes place. They're talk, they're talking about the 'phone call that takes place after an application has gone in, gone in that just verifies, supports, adds value or takes away value, quite often, seems to be the case, in relation to what's written on their application form. I think we're talking about the ones that I think are integrated into the culture of the organisation and not the ones, perhaps, that you can easily re-create, by putting an extra process in, or a course on, that addresses those. I think the issue around the golden circle is that it seems from what I've heard that it is embedded in the culture of how the organisation operates, which I appreciate's a far more difficult thing for the organisation to address, but I think some of the concerns is, is that's the area of, of, of attention that—it's almost because it's non tangible, people can either say they don't know it exists, or they know it exists, but they don't focus on actually trying to do work around addressing that (inaudible) and I think that's what we're, we're trying to derive from you, what, what approach the – the Senior Management Board is taking around how you address those aspects.

PS I mean, whether you call it networking (inaudible), I think it is a – it is a – I think the culture has changed significantly – but do we need to progress more? Absolutely. Either con— other contacts made, either by people who are trying to get promoted and I've got to say it does not happen at the more senior levels because (inaudible) I would know about it, but am I blind to the possibility rest of the organisation? Of course not. I actually think it is networking; I think it is when 'phone calls are made to say, That application's a good application or a bad application. How do we ensure that all our staff get the benefit of that sort of advice, instead of selective benefits? How do ensure that our BME staff actually know where to go to get the advice to prepare for various, w--various promotion systems. That's where we need to be, make further progress. We actually need to put in mentoring schemes, buddy schemes that are extraordinary, because it will not happen just because.

Because the numbers don't allow it to happen; the seniorities don't help. So, do I think that, that some 'phone calls are made, in a corrupt sense, I've got no evidence of a major corruption, but do I think that sort of network goes on? It is inevitable that some parts of the organisation, people may behave badly, but my real task is ensuring that we take action to give BME staff access to all the advice and guidance - and 'phone calls - that one would expect anybody else to get.

I'm back to this extraordinary 'cause I think there's something else and I'm going to pass you on, but I'm going to come back to that 'cause --

(inaudible)

No, no, no, that's (inaudible) I'll come back to it (inaudible) I'm going to talk (inaudible) questions around the Positive Action Programs and I'll pick up on that.

PS Can I just add one - one thing around this? I actually think it's really difficult. I think it's an area the organisation has to make real progress on and think through how would you do what I'm saying? How do you give staff the access to this? How do you make them feel this is a fair playing field? How do they get the access to people of senior level who are the assessors, how do you make sure that that is part of the routine behaviour in the organisation? And I'm not saying it's easy and I'm not saying I have, have the answers,

Mm

PS But I think it's an area that we need to make progress on.

AJ On the subject of - of these informal groups, golden circles or however one characterises them, I, I asked the Chief Executive of the MPA this morning what she thought about that and she said, in effect, there are such groups - the, the, the, the Met, unlike, I mean, sorry, like every other organisation, spontaneously throws up groups of that kind. And what happens is that people who get on conform to that culture and the people who don't conform tend to be extruded from it, so I said, Well, what are the characteristics of that culture? And she said, Well one of the chief ones is drinking. And that can be a problem for certain minorities, it can be a problem for women, because they want to get home and look after their kids and they don't want to go out to the pub at the end of the shift; could be a

problem for Muslim officers, who don't drink. Do you have a sense of the kind of indices of the culture - the organisational culture, which will need to be modified or even eliminated, in order to permit a – a level field of competition?

PS Well, it sounds like the Chief Exec's answer was not dissimilar to mine. She, she, she sort of – the organisation throws up naturally--

AJ Yes, I, I, that, that

PS And actually I'm saying it is kind of human nature. I think we've got to be careful to ensure that we, we're all aware of the impact of our behaviour from where you behave in a certain way because that's a matter of choice – be aware of that impact and if the impact is disproportionate or difficult for any other group, it could be perceived to be, perceived to be exclusionary, then I think it's a responsibility for Management to take action, to try and get rid of that perception and make sure it isn't exclusionary.

Yes

PS But we can't have is a s—This is the way you'll behave, this is when you--

AJ No, no; of course not. Of course not.

PS But we need to be aware of the impact

AJ No

PS ..of your behaviour.

AJ For she was

(inaudible)

AJ Of course. But that's a bit abstract and she was, she was helpful because she was specific and she said, drinking is an issue.

PS Well, I

AJ ..and so, sorry, so – so my question is, and that makes sense, I mean, it makes sense because certain kinds of people don't go out, don't either aren't able to for reasons of religious scruple, or don't have the time because of other commitments, or because they just don't like it, they don't go out or drink and all those opportunities to bond, network, however one characterises it, are, are, are surrendered as a result and that can lead to difficulties

Mm

AJ ..in the future. I just wondered, Sir Paul, whether – put that to one side, you may or may not agree with that. I just wondered whether you thought there were other specific characteristics of the group, like drinking, which also operated as a constraint on, on minorities.

PS I – I guess, as the Commissioner, I've got to say something about drinking in this public body, otherwise the whole of the Met is going to be characterised and set up sort of

AJ No, but if you drink,

PS ..drink problem

AJ Su--sure – but you understand

PS I, I do understand it,

AJ ..what my que—my question is (inaudible)

PS I, I understand entirely what you're saying. I think the drinking culture in policing, generally and that would apply to the Met, has significantly reduced over my service. Massively reduced. But could networks like that – however one describes the network – be the exclusionary process – for either by accident or design, yes, that could be possible on occasions.

Mm

PS Because there is a religious belief, or a social pressure, whatever, I understand that. That's why I'm saying if that sort of thing exists, then I think we've got to work out what it is, what – either change the behaviour, but if the behaviour is reasonable, then work out how do we actually change the impact of it. If you're asking what other--

Mm

PS ..sorts of behaviour. Well, I know that when Promotion Boards are coming up for - I don't know, Superintendent, Chief Superintendent - people form into study groups. And the study groups are naturally around their normal network. If their normal network actually hasn't included the person that doesn't have the confidence to be in there, then that can be exclusionary. That's when I take, we've got to take some extraordinary action, to give the people who either haven't had the access, haven't had the confidence, or don't have the seniority of service (inaudible) being fast tracked or whatever, that they do have the access to the advice and guidance that those study groups would bring. Now, on study groups that I'm aware of – and they are informal study groups – have I ever – when I've heard about them, have I ever thought that they would deliberately exclude you know race, no I don't. I think it's just a bunch of people who have got together, I mean over a period of time I've had a number of staff officers who, whilst they've been in my employ, have all taken their Promotion Board to Chief Superintendent and I'm aware that – and have been to males, females, BME, I'm aware they all taking part in study groups. Now, we need to understand the nature—the nature of those study groups, to make sure that, if it is exclusionary, how do we deal with it? And I think it's difficult. But I think we've got to do something about that, to make sure people have the access, 'cause it's that sort of advice that makes the difference, makes the difference for people (inaudible) Boards.

AJ Okay. Two, two other issues that have come up in, in the evidence that's been given by other s—senior people here. And I want; I just want to get your view on each one of them. The first one relates to the existence, the continued existence of the Diversity Directorate,

Mm

AJ And the second relates to the, the, the question of single versus multi point entry into the Service and, in each case, firstly it's obviously and secondly it's not so obviously, there's a significant race and faith aspect. I mean, plainly there, as far as the first case is concerned, it, it is the whole of it. And there the point was made that the existence of a Diversity Directorate, the – the existence, more broadly, of specific champions within the organisation for BME interest, was a bad thing,

Right

AJ ..partly because it meant that everyone else felt they could just relax and partly because it didn't address – in fact was a – was a brake on, a, a fundamental reform that was needed in the Met, which was a comprehensive career management structure, so that instead of waiting pe—for people to put themselves up for promotion, there was an active engagement with staff, senior to junior, bringing people on, developing them and you, you understand it, the, the point. I wonder what your, your, your view is of, of that proposal. Abolish the Diversity Directorate and make and main stream, or embed race and faith issues in a comprehensive career management structure instead.

PS Right. I, I, I'd be worried any answer of mine suddenly sends panic to a whole bunch of people who've currently got a jobs, but I-- the point, firstly can I deal with champions. I am not a fan of the word champion. Never have been, throughout my entire service, becau— actually because I do think it tends to suggest it's somebody else's job to do it and everybody else thinks that

Yeah

PS (inaudible) to do it. That doesn't mean to say we shouldn't have people who are leading but the word champion, I think, has become somewhat tired. Every time there is a new initiative in, in Government or anywhere else, then suddenly we have a champion or a Tsar. Frankly that is not something I'm very keen on and every time I've looked at champions being appointed, it hasn't achieved a great deal. That's my view. On t-- in terms of structure, the one thing I would say about the Met – and I do love the Met and the Met's very good at many things. But actually the Met can become obsessed with structure and as soon as you mention structure it will consume itself in (inaudible) structure and forget about the product, so I'm always nervous about structure in the Met. However, moving on to the Diversity Directorate, I think what we've tried to do – well, sort of partly successfully, but partly not successfully to be frank. We have tried to s—see so that our HR Directorate dealing with the things the HR Directorate should be doing, which is la— at the internal recruitment, promotion, and the wh-- the stuff you were talking about, this comprehensive plan,

Mm

PS The Diversity Directorate, as well as assisting (inaudible), some, some of those areas, when we attached the Citizen Focus element to it, which I was responsible to when I first came here, we were very much trying to make them externally orientated, action focussed. Now the recent review of the d—the Diversity Directorate is, is suggesting to me that it's not sufficiently action focussed. So I've been asking myself the question, Well, what is the action we want from them, because in reality, in the ideal world what I do want, I want HR driving the recruitment promotional policy issues, I want an action plan coming out of a Diversity Board that clearly identifies the Management Board leads and the accountability that everybody should have, for delivering what by when and then we need to have the requisite professional advice. Does that require a Diversity Directorate or not? For me, the jury's out at this moment in time and it is a question that I've or-- or a discussion that I've been having with the current Acting Deputy, to actually say, What is the right way forward to the future, because I think we have tried, by picking up the Diversity Directorate and putting it to TP, which is our huge area of delivery, we really did try to main stream it, to make it part of the business delivery. Has that been a huge success? And this is not a comment on individuals, 'cause that would be grossly unfair. I think, I don't think it's been a huge success.

Okay.

PS I think it's done some things, but am I happy that we have the right position, the right structure? Not at this moment in time and my real question – that I'm asking of myself – is, If I get – if I have HR doing that comprehensive piece that you're talking about, with the rest

of the Management Board and if I get the Management Board leads being directly accountable for deliver it against a very clear action plan, the things that the Wolfenden Report is talking about, what then is the role for the Diversity Directorate and how do we truly make this main stream, in a way that we've desired to do it but hasn't been 100 per cent successful?

AJ Okay. Can I, can I ask then, in relation to the other question—the other aspect, which is this single multi point entry. The – their, the point was made was that in, in some minority communities, anyway, the – the existence of a single entry point, which -- at the most junior level, is an active deterrent and that one might get greater diversity within the Met – which is a, which is an objective, if there was multi point entry and – and the Met was made a m— more attractive employer for graduates, for example. What's – what's your view on that?

PS I start my view by saying; there are huge advantages, operationally, for the single point of entry Constable. That brings real operational advantages in terms of experience which I think is fairly obvious. However, I have a clear public position why I've said, in the past, that we should explore direct entry. I, I've always said that, I've always held that view. To be fair, I haven't just said it because of the race issue, actually. I think it's a much wider issue

Mm. Yes.

.. Of course. For me, the issue is quite, i--is simply this. If we, in the Service, are confident in our abilities and the people we promote and actually I think there's good reason for confidence in many of the people we've promoted 'cause I think we've got some super people; if we're not confident, why are we so defensive in actually saying we refuse to (inaudible) to o--open ourselves up to external competition? Because, putting it bluntly, if I was trying to be an Inspector tomorrow, I think, and I was good at it and I was competent and I felt I could compete, I think I'd have a huge advantage going against anybody coming from outside, who didn't have my advantages, so, putting it bluntly and crudely, I'd be saying, Bring it on. What am I so frightened of? So I've been saying for some time, we should consider the opportunities of direct entry. I think there are some difficulties with it; the problem is, if you do it for the race and faith issue alone, you end up labelling it

No, no, no

AJ No, no-one, no-one, no-one was suggesting that, but it would certainly open the Met at every level – or – at many levels to new thinking and it would break with that strong institutional culture which is established at the – at the most junior level.

PS Well, that's a – I, I've got to be clear. I do not think many people would break in, but I think some would. And, and I think we should be flexible enough to take advantage of that opportunity, because there are some extraordinary people that could get in, at different levels and I think we should be flexible enough and open our minds to that and think, What are the opportunities. At, but that's – I've had that position for some considerable time publicly.

(inaudible)

AJ No, right, okay. So, Sir Paul, just another question in relation to – to culture, that the general, the general sense is that the culture is resistant to change and that that resistance to change is part of the problem, because racism and allow - and allow me to use the word shorn of the adjective, whether it's institutional or otherwise, but racism is, is as much or more a legacy than a current reality in the Met and one accepts that; certainly, for the, for the purposes of this argument it's something that, that it's inherited rather than actively pursued at, at perhaps with regrettable exceptions. If that's, if that's the case, two questions arise. What can you personally do, in order to break with that legacy, what kind of leadership can you exercise and what broader cultural changes can be made, independent of formal structures of promotion, that will serve to transform the character of the – of the Met?

PS Okay I think I, I do have – I, I have to say I, I've got to *caveat* my answer

Mm

PS ..by actually saying I think the culture of the Met, remember I've been here for (four?) years

Mm

PS So I'm, I'm basic on sort of outcome evidence and what I perceived the Met was like and - but also broadly the police service has moved. The culture of the Met is different than it was

ten, fifteen, twenty years ago. I'm confident of that. However, you, you make the point that the perception is that the culture is resistant to change. I think, as you know, all cultures are resistant to change; that's why they are what they are, it's the way we do things around here. So therefore it is always difficult to change a culture and it is always a long term mission. I don't know of many organisations that could ever claim it's changed—they've changed culture over short term apart from very sh—small Service related consultancy based or—organisations. And the way you do quick short term culture change is you change the people, because otherwise you don't change the culture and the police service doesn't have the opportunity to do that. We have this extraordinary slow turnover rate, because of (inaudible) reasons I'm sure you're aware of. So I think it has changed quite considerably already, but there is need for further change, as we actually achieve more and, and more we do need to achieve. What's – how do you change culture? Well, if we go back to the classic management text book it's somewhere within the analysis of that, it would say, It's how you lead, it's how you recruit, it's how you train, it's how you sanction, it's how you reward. They're the classic things you change, or you change the people and we've already been through that. I think we are doing a number-- we are trying to change a number of those issues and over time we have changed a number of those issues. But I think if, in terms of measuring, it's how you measure the organisation will have a big effect, because particularly in policing, what gets measured gets done and we are a very can-do sort of organisation, so by bringing in measures on Performance Board and on Diversity Board that actually says we are no longer just going to measure the out—the crime outcome figures and we are truly going to get into the issues of confidence and getting to the analytical piece that understands what creates in --internal external confidence and actually have corporate health indicators that every month show those to be as important as the other measures, that's actually one of the way—ways that you start to change the culture. By the – if you will, additional schemes that you put in place, sort of – sort of, a number of schemes you've put in place to promote difference, to actually fast tracking schemes, target people from BME communities within the Met, as to how we can deal with the networking issues. All of those things, that's change culture, over time. But I would not (inaudible) from the notion that it is very difficult to change culture and it is a slow process.

AJ Sorry, and, you're – also going to address the question of your own leadership, there?

PS Well, I tell (inaudible) - I guess I would come back to the debate I was having, having been here before and it might seem clumsy, but I, early in my Commissionship, I had to state what I believed in, I had to state I thought it was about violence and confidence and confidence is very much about diversity, all our (inaudible) externally internally and I actually quite clear about my five Ps, but in doing that, if I had sat back and not done something about, let's have a position statement of, how good are we and how poor are we, 'cause that's essentially what the Wolfenden report is about and where might we make progress. If I'd have not done something and sat back, I don't think that would have been a good sign of

leadership. My sign of leadership is, identify where problems are, put structures and people in place, put responsibilities to people who will be held to account and then, if this Inquiry - and I'm sure it will - comes up with matters of additionality or, indeed, something that is far better, then I am very, very open to consider and change and want to send a signal that because we don't use diversity as the single, the single line measure for the organisation, that it is and should be about our operating philosophy and not to have done something about this would have been directly against that provision. I think it's an issue of leadership, so, you ask me what would I do as a leader - exactly what I have done.

BP Yes, can I just pick up a point on the culture (inaudible)? In terms of you saying that you, you're not aware of any significant major culture change in a large organisation, I'd, I'd refer you to the Armed Forces in 1998 when the Chief of the General Staff said, Change will happen now and the culture changed but

PS I take--

BP ..you might wish to examine that

PS Well, actually, I'd like to disagree with it as well.

BP Well, you can disagree with it, but I, I believe that I could be proved right, on the examination having been an integral part of that. In terms of, of command and control, a culture, one (inaudible) within the police and another one that's become very evident over a period of time, which is defend and blame, Taylor, when he looked at the whole issue, came out with the positive culture of learning and development, which is, if it's implemented properly, in terms of the both areas you were talking about, the external and the internal, is going to have a significant change, is it not, at the operational end of

END OF CASSETTE 1 SIDE A

SIDE B

BP .. in terms of what this could mean for attitudinal change within the Met.

PS Okay. Right that I conceptualise my, my comments about the military. I think the military have made real progress, but I speak to lots of people in the military and many of them are in exactly the same position that I'm in. We've made real progress, but it's a long way off where we should be. That's where I think the military is, so – and – and I'm sure there're things we could learn from them and them from us, but I don't think we've seen rapid, revolutionary, cultural change. My view of Taylor. I think Taylor is, is very, very good development but I think there are risks around Taylor. Funnily enough, we're only now coming to terms with what those risks are. Trying to push down responsibility or managing issues before they become crises, is absolutely the right thing to do. Trying to get the right level of intervention, at the right time, is where the Service needs to be. Actually (inaudible) more, more employment law approach, as opposed to the old disciplinary system. And I have to say I, I am just a bit concerned it's (inaudible) time. We've had a full training program there and pushing it down to 32 Borough Commands (inaudible) OCU Commanders in the Met to make the, to make the decision between misconduct and gross misconduct, without having in place the rigorous ability to monitor and measure and be able to intervene very quickly, just worries me slightly that we're going to have a level of such an amazing playing field across the Met, we'll have different decisions being made by different people, as to what is misconduct and what is gross misconduct, that is beginning, I have to say, that is beginning to worry me.

AJ Hasn't, hasn't that exposed, I mean the whole point, I would agree with you, (inaudible) that, hasn't that exposed some of the total management ability in a consistent manner, across that level of management, in other words, you know, people are promoted on different competencies that they're now required to carry out.

PS I think you could say that, but I think it is a step into, a step into the obvious, even if you have 32, 64 - we have a whole bunch of these people making these decisions in the OCUs. They can be hugely competent people, but they will all come to a slightly different point on the continuum. And my worry is, whilst you can allow some flexibility, which is what Taylor is about, Taylor in the situation to meet the – the behaviour, my worry is that we have a level of disproportionality which, if we're not careful, we will not understand why and actually deal with the unfairness of it, so it's how we balance what I think is a very good advance on Taylor, with ensuring that there is consistency and ensuring that we're rapid enough and clear sighted enough to intervene if we have some behaviour and some judgements that are clearly wrong. I think we know, in the past there have been decisions by senior people in the Met around certain elements of discipline, that have been perturbing.

BP Doesn't that lead also to, to a need to review management training at that level?

PS Well, we have done a huge amount of training around Taylor. I think we've actually retracted (sic) quite a lot of credit for what we've done, but training will not sort of – training is one thing; you, we need to have con—constant monitoring, ensure that training doesn't start to morph and aberrate, based on Well, we know better for you locally, because we could end up with almost a postcode lottery around discipline and that would worry me, so I think we've got to get the balance here round Taylor, so I'm trying to be very honest about this; I think Taylor's a real advance; I think we've done a huge amount of training and I think we have some very good people. But I think we need to be aware of differences of how that might be applied and how they might move over time. So I'm trying to find a way through without undermining the quality of Taylor.

BP Can I, can I just run something by you,

PS Of course

BP ..whilst might not be directly in your area of responsibility and we'll test it out elsewhere, but there is, I, I'd welcome your observations on, on a particular point. I, I – I won't at this moment in time go in to some of the disproportionality in terms of promotion, but certainly if one looks at Inspector, Chief Inspector, Superintendent promotions over the past, three or four years or three years in particular, there, there's a disproportionate outcome, there. In terms of Promotion Boards, do you think that, in this day and age, they are still the best way, or the only way, of testing the ability and competency of people for promotion? At that level, bearing in mind that, when it gets to your level, there is a different process.

PS Mm. (inaudible) I'm sure I'd recommend the process I went through to everyone, but there we go!

BP I, I meant ACPO level (inaudible)

PS Do you know, I think we've tried and tried and tried to get systems and I think the system we've got now is the product of so much advice, so much consultation, to try and get a fair and transparent system. My worry is that what we end up with is so—where the process becomes more important than the outcome. The whole effect becomes disproportionate and this is a constant source of discussion - for me – and with the Met Management Board –

of what is the right balance, what is the right way to select people for promotion? There's a, the move towards competency based promotion was a real attempt to get beyond any sense of favouritism, golden circle, whatever you want to call it but actually that doesn't always take account of people can be very competent, but are they willing to do the job? So, so – there is no such thing as a perfect system. Promotional systems are essentially a subjective decision, informed by as much objectivity as we can bring to bear. We are bringing back huge objectivity to that process (inaudible) time but is it the perfect, is, is it a thing of beauty? To be, I've got to be honest, I just don't know. I don't know, because we keep looking but we keep adding to it, we keep listening to people, we keep taking recommendation as to how we can make it more transparent, make it fairer. At the end of the day, we're trying to get the best possible people so we can give the best service. We need people to be confident in that and it looks to me at the moment the price of that confidence is almost a, a huge process that becomes more of a rubber s – not quite a rubber stamping, (inaudible) the process which is more important than the outcome. So, I'm trying to be – I'm guess I'm agreeing, I think the jury's out as to what is the right way of doing it.

This is just a side question so it's just for my clarification. You sort of refer to confidence a lot, in terms of that being a key problem. Can you just, just succinctly, just elaborate on how you're seeing this confidence? I'm not sure where – if you were doing that, rather than me second guessing what you've been given there.

PS Well, I, I started (inaudible) two major drivers for me, I sort of, what is my job as Commissioner of the Met? I, I, I said, I think violence is a key issue here in London from perception to reality; the second key issue is, are our cu-- do our communities, are they confident that the Met is there for them and doing their bidding and they can trust the Met and they feel comfortable with the Met - all our communities. To do that, that, that's my external qualities, the total sort of service we deliver, the accurate service delivery, tailoring our services to different communities; to do that, we have to – the only way they'll have confidence, in part, at least, is to have internal confidence and to have internal systems that give people externally, 'cause that's the confidence that we're not just saying it, we mean it and that's the way we treat our own staff. (inaudible), what I want is people internally who feel they get the best and fairest shake of the dice. And whatever it is they're looking for out of the job, to get the right level of support and they don't have to just rely on their particular network, their ability, their connectivity, to actually get the best out of the job for them. Expect them being confident that they could do what I need them to do externally. That's what we're about.

Okay.

Okay. Management Board. From, for a number of years there was no lead on equalities and diversity at Management Board; that's changed in the last week, few weeks – maybe a month or so. Why was that decision made and what were the – what was the impact of that decision, (inaudible)

PS Well of course, there was a lead on Management Board up until, if you remember, 'cause we do structure in the Met, if you remember we created the Operational Services Directorate

I know there was a lead; I'm asking about the period that there wasn't, wh—why wasn't there, why was that decision made, (inaudible)

PS Yeah, well, I, I just need to clarify the dates when there wasn't. We got rid of Operational Services Directorate

Mm

PS ..on the first of April 2008.

Right

PS John **Yates** was the link. He was the lead for - and then we transferred it into TP, where it is – where it then went to a DAC leading within TP. That, that, that's when fully qualified.

Oh okay, (inaudible) no-one knew that. I, I don't think most – large swathes of the orga— well, I certainly didn't know and I've been, you know, a key - you know, involved in Equalities and Diversity these issues, sat on the – the Oversight Board for the organisation, so it wasn't – certainly wasn't known at MPA level and I, I would argue s—very strongly that it wasn't known widely within the organisation either.

PS Management board lead, but the Citizen Focus Directorate was John Yates and that's what this organ—the MPA promoted him, to do that job.

Wh—wh—what I'm s—what I'm saying to you is that - I think you know what I mean. What, what I'm saying is that there was, whether you like the term or not, in terms of champions,

(inaudible)

What I'm saying was, there was no – no single one person within Management Board who assumed responsibility for Equality and Diversity. What, what I'm saying, what I'm asking you is, recognising that you have now appointed the Acting Deputy as a lead on Management Board for Equalities and Diversity, I want you to reflect back to us what were the implications of not having a lead and to understand, therefore, whether or not y-- in understanding those implications, you now see the importance of it.

PS Right. Sort of, I stand by my comments on champions, because I just don't think they're helpful, but in terms of what I've done, I've said to the Deputy, because I, as I've already said, actually the attempt to main stream was not wholly successful (inaudible)

Mm

PS ..this Panel. I said to the Deputy, I want him to lead the Diversity Board and the Action Plan and hold people to account in the Diversity Board and Performance Board, because he chairs that.

(inaudible)

PS So it seems to me, that is the right lead and that's to hold him to account. What we tried to do, Cindy, was actually move to a position where we had plans in each Directorate and actually each member of Management Board

Mm

PS ..should've been the champion, the person leading and delivering on that.

Mm

PS Has that been wholly successful? No, I don't think so.

Mm

PS So I have now moved the Deputy back – and I've only been Commissioner (inaudible) weeks anyway, back in charge of –

Okay.

PS --that, that Board, to hold to account. I think that's the different, than an individual champion. I have to say my predecessor, Ian Blair, did huge amounts

Mm, mm

PS ..to move the Service on and this organisation on, around race and faith issues.

Okay.

PS And he was, as anybody would just have to recognise, a huge champion around these issues, but we still end up with problems

Sure

PS ..and we still end up with people

Can--

PS ..saying, it's his issue, not my issue.

Sure. No, no, I c—I completely understand that and – and I like the, the concept that you, you talked about, in terms of not just the Acting Deputy Commissioner leading on these issues, but all of Management Board. So my question is, h--, how do you ensure that the rest of Management Board take this on as a key area of work, in addition to maybe leading on SO, or whatever else there might be that, under their portfolio?

PS Well sort of – coming out of Wolfenden again, the need to know what isn't working and where our weakness is and anything you, you come out with, actually creating a co-ordinated combined action plan that names the Management Board lead, for each area of activity, what is it we're looking for them to achieve, by when,

Mm

PS I think we need to look at the structural issues of where did the advice come from again

Mm

PS ... (inaudible) Directorate or not and then being held to account in two places. Held to account in the Diversity Board, but also held to account against Metrics – where we can put Metrics there, in the Performance Board, which was the reason for introducing corporate health indicators into Performance Board. Unless we do that, then we'll end up with fine words and not enough action.

Okay. In, in terms of the, the, the practical sort of workings of Management Board, do, do you have a s—a standing item on your Agenda, Equalities and Diversity?

PS No. I, I, every paper has a standing party prepared (inaudible) to consider it, but we don't have a standing matter on the Agenda, no.

Mm

PS I think that's part and part of the argument about main stream. It is very difficult to think of many issues – the issues of confidence, wouldn't be a (inaudible) for it. And issues of confidence in London has to involve diversity. You can't do police in London without (inaudible) diversity.

Mm. And has that, has that always been the case, I mean, I take you back a year, eighteen months; has that always been the case?

PS I, we, we've always had the, if you will, the part—

Mm

PS --the sort of the part of the paper that deals with issues (inaudible) impact, of diversity. You do have to say that papers vary. They've of variable quality and sometimes there is a deep and meaningful understanding of the issues we're talking about, ar-- around race and diversity and faith;

Mm

PS ..sometimes it's more of a tick box approach. That's – that's what we've got to do – it is a journey, we've got to improve it.

Okay. Oth—other than when the Dialogue to Delivery, Paul, went to Management Board, how often are you presented with a formal audit of Diversity and Equality performance of the organisation at Senior Management Board?

PS Well, of course I'm, I'm not going to bore you by going back through it, but now we've introduced Corporate Health Indicators at the senior level and that is, Performance Board brings together everybody and I can visit it, (inaudible) the Commissioner (inaudible)

Performance Board, I think we're probably likely to change that as well, actually, that is now considered every month about sort of what are, what are

Since, since when?

PS Well, I think - Neil was looking to introduce corporate health indicating, report to the Authority going back quite a number of months, so we've been bringing those into Performance Board, I think for some months now, to actually say

Yes

PS ..we need to balance this off. So I think that's one of, that's when it happens.

Right. (inaudible)

PS But also – there's a lot of – do we have a formal audit of everything at Management Board? No, I think that – we don't do that; what we do try and do is make sure we comply with our – our legislative responsibilities, the (inaudible) policies over three years.

Right

PS (inaudible) many times.

Okay. So, whether or not it's comprehensive audit or not, or a, just a partial audit, when was the last time you had some sort of gave you a health check, in terms of equality and diversity in the Met, other than Dialogue to Delivery?

PS Dialogue to Delivery is an extraordinary

Yeah, yeah. Other than that,

PS Yes

When was the last time that you had one? An extensive discussion

PS Well, I, I guess, that it depends what you mean by a total audit. I mean if you look at our responsibilities under the Act, of having to review our policies, all our policies (inaudible) three year period, that is the extensive, on-going audit of policy. What it doesn't do, it doesn't audit outcomes in the same way and the outcomes are very much about what we're talking about, about recruitment

Mm

PS ..promotion, specialism, discipline, so I, I'm not trying to be difficult, I'm trying to know what else we could do and if there is something, then fine, let's have a look at it.

Okay.

PS Has the Board ever devoted an – an entire meeting to just talking about equalities and diversity issues? Just a yes or a no is fine.

PS No, I – no, you can't do yes or no to that, Cindy. We've had entire meetings when diversity's been the central issue

Right

PS ..but have we tabled it?

But have you, have you ever had

PS No, no. I wouldn't (inaudible)

..a meeting. That's what I'm asking you, so you can do a yes or no.

PS No.

What I'm asking is have you had – ever had a meeting where you devoted the entire meeting to equality and diversity issues?

PS I've been in meetings where we have devoted it to entire--, but it would be a particular issue on diversity, so ye—so that's

Yes, for the enti-- (inaudible) for the entire meeting is what is the issue, not -

PS ..that's why you can't do yes, or no, that's (inaudible)

... not whether or not it's extensively across equalities and diversity.

PS Well, not a sort of (inaudible) diversity type of iss—issues that are-- that's what we're discussing today and it's an equality and diversity issue, but not as a total subject.

For the entire

PS No

..meeting. Okay. Okay. Who wants to come in next? Do, do you want to come in, Paul?
Sorry – Anthony.

(inaudible)

No, you go. Go on.

AJ Well I've been, I've been looking at the - (inaudible) I'm so sorry. I'll start again. I've been looking at the, the Press cuttings on the Babar Ahmed case and the Belgravia case. And, and I'd, I'd like to ask you some questions about those two cases. Because they're - and I understand the, the, the difficulties and sensitivities of it, so I'm not going to ask you specific questions about either of them but - but one is, one is concerned with internal relations and one is concerned with relations between the Met and the, the public. And if one looks at those cuttings and reflects on them, there are certain continuities, so, if one wants certainly to take a hostile view of the Met, one would say that what's inside is also outside and that it's the same. I wonder what you would say to that? That with those ca—those cases exemplify a problem which is both internal to the organisation and external, that's to say concerned with the organisation in its relation to the public and it's the same problem.

PS Right. Firstly, I think we've got to be careful here, haven't we. Now let me give you the second part of the answer first, so I don't appear too defensive.

(inaudible)

PS Now, what do those cases say about the Met dependent upon what is the outcome of the review and the Authority had a very clear view of how they wanted independent oversight of that review and I fully accept that, ar—around the Babar Ahmed case.,

Mm

PS ..the issues that would appear to be the issue around

Yes

PS ..the **van** issue. What do they say to people externally? It is a dreadful message. It is a dreadful message, that actually make s it very, very difficult for us to actually maintain confidence, if that was the total view of the Met. But it isn't, of course. So those - those

cases, when reported like that and if true, then that is a very difficult thing to deal with. And we should be as non-defensive as possible and look at what, if anything, went wrong and do something about it. But it, it is not the total picture of the Met. Because every day in the Met, there are hundreds and hundreds and thousands of incidents going on, being dealt with extraordinary (sic) well, which actually build confidence and if you look at our own public attitude survey, which is a very significant survey, confidence has been growing in our communities, for the last three quarters, so it is a two part answer; not defensive about those issues, because when those issues come to light, that is damaging for confidence and you are right, I bang on about confidence an awful lot, because that is the measure of policing, but it is not the total - total picture; and I'd be doing a disservice to many thousands of people, if I didn't make that point.

AJ So, if, if I wanted to summarise in a sentence and do justice to what you said, would it be right to say that your view is, to the extent that those stories are, are true, they're atypical?

PS You could say that. I'd, I'd prefer to leave it at my answer. I've given you my – what my answer is.

AJ You see, the difficulty that I've got - and I don't want to return to the discussion that we had before, because in a sense I think you, you've – you've answered the questions as you want to answer them. But the difficulty is that, that – the-- these sorts of incidents don't come from a void.

PS Absolutely not.

AJ They come – they come from, from something which nurtures them, and which a--allows them to take place, to flourish and so on and that's what Macpherson was talking about when he talked about institutional racism. If we don't use that term, if we don't use it, but we want to try and understand where those sort, that kind of behaviour comes from, what language do we use? How do we – we're, were a Panel charged with investigating this, okay – we're not, we're not action men, we're words men and women. We have to write a report. So we have to use words, so, so I quite understand the point you're making about institutional racism. It probably needs to be retired as a concept but, but it's not enough to, to, so to speak, sit mute in front of the problem, either. One has to find an alternative formulation, one that does more justice to the problem. Now, given that these incidents – Belgravia, Ahmed and so on – don't come from nowhere, that they're sustained, as we

agree, by something broader than just - you know, the psychopathology of individuals, how do we characterise that nurturing context? What words do we use to describe them?

PS I'm not entirely sure what words you're going to use to describe it.

AJ No, what words would you use to describe it?

PS Well, no, I would s—I would go back - I think there's a grave, let me go back to this institutional racism bit. If we use institutional racism, let's say that the stories that have come out of those two instances -- and I do have to be careful here, for obvious reasons,

Yeah

PS ..are the accurate reflection for the facts. If that is the case, I make absolutely clear, absolutely dreadful. Nobody acting in such a bigoted form in an organisation that actually (inaudible) be proud of now, where actually has changed, significant to the way it was, nobody should be allowed to hide behind some definition and some sense that this is an organisational problem and my bigoted behaviour comes out of some wider sense of the organisation, hasn't somehow put me in a different position. I think we've got to be very careful. I think we've got to find those people who do behave in an outrageous fashion and not give them the cover for some sort of nice, comfortable, broader phraseology. Actually I think there's real danger in the comfort of broader phraseology that you might be looking for, but I do accept that it's a challenge for you in writing your report.

BP But you do accept that there is a problem with race and diversity within the Met?

PS I, I (inaudible) sort of – when you get stories like that, if true, then quite clearly that is a horrible – I'm – I'm actually saying, there will, there are people who clearly misbehave (inaudible).

BP I mean, irrespective of those two examples, do – do you - I'm, I'm just having a problem in understanding 'cause Anthony asked you a question about a problem and I, I'm - I really am having a problem in understanding if you do accept there is a problem, or you're just saying it's a perception of individuals, rather than a collective problem that exists still.

PS Well, actually, I've got a problem, if that's what you – the conclusion you're coming to, because I've made it absolutely clear – consistently, before for, before this Inquiry and during it today, that we have made great progress, but we have significant issues, so of course I'd say there's a problem. I don't understand the question.

AJ I mean I, tell me, please tell me where you feel you can't answer. I don't - obviously I don't want - and I don't want to c--create difficulty in relation to a case that may be proceeding, so I don't know, I assume it is still proceeding but, but one – one can't talk simply about – pockets of, where, where, where you know, this report is right, separate vans were in existence at this station since 2003, so we're talking about – about practices and which presumably embraced more than one person or more than one group of people at any one time, but –but in, em- embedded practices, which new people coming in to the station were expected to subscribe to.

PS I'm, I'm, I'm - absolutely shocking, I think, well, to me it's indicative of - if it went on for some period of time, it's indicative and of an absence of supervision, to ensure it stops happening and an analysis of why, why people felt that should happen in the first place. See, I realise that - and, we were talking about culture earlier

Mm

PS ..and what – let, let's look at the question and answer there. The culture has moved on, but am I saying the culture in policing or in the Met is exactly where we want it to be?

AJ No, no, I have (inaudible)

PS And I think that's your, I think that's the issue. When you are saying, What are these things being being grown from, I'm saying, Be very careful that we don't give cover to bigots,

AJ No, no I, I

PS ... in the organisation.

... (inaudible)

PS .. no, no, let, well, let me, please let me finish. I'm saying, be very careful that we don't do that, but actually, our culture is not where we want it to be, it's -- but it's a thing that will take time to change and we need to take action to change it.

AJ You used the phrase, I think, at the very beginning, of--and I, maybe I slightly misheard it, but I think it was *interventionist supervision*, is that---

PS Intrusive supervision

AJ Intrusive, forgive me. Intrusive supervision. What, please could you explain that a bit?

PS I, I've held the view for some considerable time, that when police service tried to change itself from, from pure command and control to (inaudible) using its work force to the maximum of its ability, which was about (inaudible) about empowering people and entrusting people,

Mm

PS ..empowering them, training them, positioning them and trusting them, I think the police service got itself into a habit of failing to supervise and lead, at certain levels, as it should have. My view is, every employee has a right to be asked difficult questions by their line manager, so that they can give difficult answers. If - have a right for people to intrude in their professional lives, 'cause that's the only way you find out how good they are, which is the truth on many occasions, but also find out quickly where they are going wrong or where something is going badly wrong. A—and that's what I mean by intrusive supervision, actually the art of supervision in leadership. We should not be neglectful and back off those – those difficult issues and interventionist issues, because we might be afraid that – that

(inaudible)

PS ...people think we don't trust them.

AJ Do, do you think that a system of intrusive supervision would have stopped separate bands earlier than now?

PS I, the problem is, we'll never know because we (inaudible)

AJ No, I understand

PS ..but I would like to think so. Do I think that is indicative, (inaudible) there are still people and places in the organisation that think they can behave in such a way and is that drawn from some, does it comment on us? Clearly it comments on us. Clearly it does.

(inaudible)

(inaudible)

Margaret.

MB (inaudible) Let me, right, going to move on slightly. I want to look at the issue of retention and progression and career development. It's – I, I think you've referred to it already, in terms of some (inaudible) priorities, one around the ser—violent crime, youth crime and also around, I imagine, counter-terrorism. In the contents of the work force, why does the Counter-Terrorism Command, Specialit Unit, why are there so few BME officers and particularly so few Muslim officers?

PS Ah... Well, firstly we're agreed that it, it is a problem that we need to solve, that we need to make progress on, particularly around CT, for the obvious reasons about communities trusting us. Why so few? Because, maybe there's been, over a period of time, historically, selection in own image, insufficient openness in trying to sort of attract people from different communities, but also, giving people the access that breaks in. Giving people that

access that says, Come and try it, 'cause it might be for you. Actually, there is a job here for you and I think there's a both a – an openness of access and a confidence issue from individuals from BME communities, that has led to not as much progress as we should be making. I think we need to consider different ways of doing that.

MB (inaudible) would then targets around some of those specialist units, would you be in favour in, of those? You would.

Yes. That, that's what I wanted to see in the Action Plan.

MB (inaudible) I mean, I'm quite interested in that so I've asked for sort of clarification of confidence and I'm not sure whether - I think you've just answered it, whether you, when you talk about confidence, you always, you also refer that to meaning that you've, perhaps you feel there's a lack of confidence amongst BME officers, in terms of their progression and development. Is that something that you're, you, you, you also allude to, you've alluded to?

PS I – I, I think we've got to make sure that people do have the confidence, but is that the only answer? Absolutely not. We've got to work on individuals, but the organisation, the system and the unit itself. I, I think you've got to take as, as, as broad an approach as possible to ensure we crack the problem.

Mm

PS Sort of – to – either, either sufficient day—taster days; are people given the opportunity to make them see what it's like? Do we, do we give people the opportunity and the encouragement and do we then look at the internal cultures in different parts of the organisation, because there are different levels of recruitment in different specialisms.

Mm

PS Why is it we might have a greater problem in one area than another area? And I think that's what I would want to do in the Action Plan, target those areas to make the improvements.

MB (inaudible). To sort of – further reinforce that, are, I mean this really (inaudible) sort of a yes or no. Are you in, are you in favour of managers, PDRs, reflecting their support, the work that they do in terms of the management and development of their staff, being included in the PDR, so, for example, in yours we could fit one in there around the overall progression rates of Chief Sup—Chief Superintendents and above. Are you in favour of that?

PS (inaudible) huge amount, number of things in my PDR, (inaudible) but nevertheless I, I am in favour of PDIs reflecting what the organisation expects them to (inaudible), so the general point (inaudible)

MB Okay. Thank you. Just want to move on and talk about the Equip to Achieve program. And we've ha—heard, I think, a great deal from - both in the focus groups and from individuals who've (inaudible) come for the Inquiry, as to the expectations around the Equip to Achieve program. Can you just give me your views on what your expectations is, of what Equip to Achieve are, are going to deliver for the Met?

PS Well, on its own, it will achieve too little. It, I thi—it looks to me like a good program that, along with other, other programs, may well assist us to get sort of high potential people through, particularly from BME communities, to a place where they can be of greater influence and do something (inaudible). It looks like a good addition but is it, is it the gold bullet? Will it do it on its own? No, I don't (inaudible)

MB What, what do you – what's (inaudible) what is some of the – problems or the issues, around recruitment and retention that you expect that program to deliver? Or, or do you – not have a working knowledge of what the make-up of the program is?

PS I've go—I've got a – I've got a broad knowledge of what

Okay

PS .. the make-up of the program is but, if you asked me, could I give you now a detailed analysis, (inaudible) probably not.

MB Okay. (inaudible) I thank you. Perhaps just to m—m--- move slightly. What do you think are the, the causes of disproportionality between black and white officers? (inaudible) officers, both civilian staff and police officers, in relation to recruitment and retention?

PS What do I think of the causes (inaudible)

MB What do you think the causes of disprop—portionality. We, we've met with long serviced officers, we've met with groups of staff that have been on several Positive Action programs, we've met with staff from a bro—Borough Commanders, have all talked about this disproportionality of - and what I've trying to gauge from you is what you feel the causes are, of why that still appears to be in the Met despite a significant number of existing and ongoing Positive Action programs and initiatives.

PS I, I think the—the—there clearly are a number of causes.

Mm

PS I won't (inaudible) again but there is the issue we can't - and I've already said, we can't wait for the volume issue,

Mm, yeah?

PS ..the time issue, to solve the problem. But that in itself is, how much experience do people have, to actually get through to the senior ranks. That is, that is a problem and we've got to overcome it. That's why we need programs to break through that. We, I think we've already talked about the networking issue, the informal networking – recognising that's going to happen and give people access to it. So I think there's a whole host of issues,

(inaudible)

PS I th—I think it's an issue arou--, sorry, I think there's issue around promotion systems. What parts of the promotion system, particularly when you do it in sittings, because we've got

such (inaudible), is likely to leak? What part – so, so if you’ve got a partial promotion system that is very much about a particular basket exercise, where people have to go through a certain exercise, changes with the promotion systems, or a different presentation, because of the networking issues and because you do it over various sittings, are people going to keep com—com--- completely secret, or is it going to leak? We’ve g—they’re all issues that you’ve got to address, both in terms of preparing people for the system and then looking, is the system as incorruptible as possible. So I think it’s a whole host of issues.

Could you elaborate on what the other host are and I wonder if – and if you could also, ca-- you’ve talked, if you could relate this to whether this includes part of the extraordinary activity you referred to, on a number of occasions. This is where this extraordinary activity would take place.

PS Yeah, no, I – the extraordinary activity, I think we’ve got to find ways that give people the opportunity for networking, in terms of advice and guidance, buddying, senior people actually having a clear responsibility and I mean at the very senior level Management Board as well, a clear responsibility, to give people the advice and guidance that, because of the le—less in number, actually gives them the opportunity get some assistance. I think it’s (inaudible)

Out, outside of the things that is about the individual, so, I think you’ve talked quite extensively about networking.

PS Right.

You’ve talked about the confidence issue, you’ve talked about, I think we’re aware that the Met has a number of programs. Outside of the individual, the person who wants to be, wants to be the beneficiary of a promotion, what are the organisational things that contribute to that, that you ..

PS Sorry, I think I’ve given you one already; making sure our systems are as incorruptible as possible. That’s nothing to do with the individual. Secondly, actually the organisation putting the networking opportunities in place and the preparation in place. That’s actually not just for

Mm

PS ..the individual. That's for the organisation to give them access. So I think there's a whole host, we've got to continue to make the systems as fair and transparent as possible. I'm – what are we looking for, to get people through? Identification of talent in the first place, are we good at identifying the talented people early enough? I think that's an issue for the organisation. Are we then good at preparing people and making sure that preparation is even and fair and gives people the opportunity to actually overcome some of the, some of their disadvantages they might have, because (inaudible) less, it might be less experience, do we give them the opportunity for the preparation? When I take (inaudible) extraordinary action, if you're part of that larger group of people, you easily network and get the advice and there's a smaller group of people who don't, the extraordinary action is, how do we give them that extra opportunity, to get that advice and then, lastly, make sure the systems are as fair and incorruptible as possible.

(inaudible) Thank you. Paul, be-- before I hand over to Bob, can, can, can I just test out something with you? And it, and it really does relate back to the issue that you raised in response to Anthony's question, which was around organisul—organisations, culture and how you might change that culture. And you very much talked about, you can tinker with and radically change systems, process, all the rest of it, but it's the people. One, one of the things that, that we've picked up from various quarters, is around the whole sort of Thirty Plus scheme. Two, two things in relation to that, I think. The first is, you know, the – the organisation kind of regurgitates (inaudible) and people just sort of come back in, in a different guise. But also the fact that they can sometimes act as barriers to other people within the organisation, learning key skills, getting key exposure to particular posts and the like. What's your view? Do, do you think it's, do you think they help? Does that help or hinder the organisation, by and large?

PS I think it could be a problem.

Mm

PS I think it could be a problem, Cindy. We, I mean, we use the Thirty Plus scheme because it's a skills issue and we have (inaudible) delivering

Mm

PS ..particularly around certain expertise and of course the Olympics is going to present us with a real challenge,

Mm

PS ..but could the issues you raise act i—act in the way that you outlined? Yeah, (inaudible) potentially

Mm, mm

PS ..they could. Do I have an easy answer? No, that would be (inaudible) to try and pretend I do.

Mm

PS We've got to somehow make sure that we can – make sure we don't haemorrhage skills, but actually, I take the point you raise. I don't have an easy answer for it.

Mm, mm

PS Maybe that's something we need to look at.

Cause, 'cause the other aspect, of course, is that it allows the organisation to do what even the organisation accepts it doesn't do well, which is succession planning.

PS I don't, I, I – I entirely agree with that; and i--in a kind of way, th--that creates a blockage,

Mm

PS ..but, sort of – there are other blockages: the temporary promotion system and the sort of the absence of complete transparency across the organisation for temporary promotion. These are all opportunities for people to progress and, unless there is, unless we can unblock those things, but still keep the opportunity—the advantage they bring, temporary promotions, Thirty Plus, then the blockage remains. I don't have the easy answer to this; in fact, think I've got, I think we can come up with answers for temporary promotion; I think we need greater transparency around that and the way in which we go about some of the

Mmm

PS ..filling those sort of positions. But the Thirty Plus one, I haven't thought about it, got to be honest about it, but it could operate in the way you're talking about (inaudible).

Bob.

BP Yeah, Paul, you, you've spoken quite a bit about confidence, areas of confidence. How, how at this moment in time would you characterise the relationship between the staff support associations and – and, and yourself? Including the BPA and ..

PS Well, broadly, the relationships are pretty good, we work the Samurai group, I meet the Samurai group and most of the staff, staff associations, staff support associations have access and very easy access, to Management Board and to myself. I think (inaudible) it's plainly obvious – and we're idiots if we try and deny there hasn't been a problem with the MBPA. And there's been clearly a problem there. I have maintained a position to be open and have access to them and we have had meetings, we've most recent meeting, which actually has moved it on. I want to move, I want to work productively with all staff support associations, including the Met Black Police Association. It is our interest to do so and it's in their interest to do so and I think we all see that. It's how we see I think our (inaudible) way through what has been a very difficult problem. I want to be positive around that and ensure that they are able to deliver on what their originating mission was - and still is. We are at this moment in time re-negotiation (inaudible) I call it a Memorandum of Understanding, with all of our staff support associations, 'cause I do have to say there has been a problem. There has been a problem in the way in which, for the best of all possible reasons have allowed these associations to develop, actually doing some really good work, but it's been a bit of a pick and mix approach, we haven't been clear on what are the good governance and constitutional issues and we haven't been clear on how public monies

should be properly used and accounted for. Now, we need to get all of that sort of thing on a very firm basis, so that those sort of tensions can be removed in future.

BP And did you see that – you know, the-- implementing some of these Dialogue to Delivery, some of those areas that we've raised today, in – in engagement, in going forward? Do you think they'd be more effective in the future - a, a more effective way of staff associations engaging at various levels of the MPS?

PS I mean, they do engage, quite fairly heavily,

BP Yeah, (inaudible) more effectively.

PS (inaudible) Do, do, do I want, do I want to make it more effective, yes; but on the basis of good governance. Governance has been an, an issue for the MPS as a whole, let alone just staff support associations. So we need to have clarity on what the role is, how they govern themselves, how we use public money and of course I want them engaged with me, because that's the best way to build confidence in the Met and that's the, within (inaudible) within to, within, within the Met and the best way to improve confidence externally to our communities (inaudible) decent Service.

BP Just, just a (inaudible) question for myself. The Metropolitan Police Authorities and police authorities as you've worked with before in other areas, have that responsibility for the oversight of the effective and efficiency of police service. Given that your relationship with other authorities, different than the way that the Met and – the Metropolitan Police Authority work, do you think that there is a – an effective and a – a, a good relationship between yourself and the MPA in terms of the way they challenge? Or effectively set you the policies, and then operationally you put them into place and are accountable? Do you feel that there's that similarity between the way other police authorities operate and the way this Authority operates?

PS Goodness, I'm tempted to look round now to see who's in the room and which (inaudible)

BP Well we're (inaudible). Part of our investigation is not just the Met. It is the police authority and that's why I bring it, raising those questions.

PS An-- anybody who doesn't think that London is different, is just living

Yep?

PS ..in a different world. London is massively different; this Police Authority's hugely different than any other police authority I've worked with. It's bigger, it has different pressures and we live in, in, in a kind of different sort of place than the, the other (inaudible) I've worked with. Do I have a good relationship with them? Yes, I think so. I've always maintained a good relationship with them – they recently appointed me in this job so that was the opportunity to tell me if they didn't have a good relationship with me. Is it an easy relationship? Absolutely not; is it meant to be? No. Do I, do they hold me to account? I guess (inaudible) get, get hold of the – a tape recording of last Thursday's (inaudible) police authority meeting, it felt to me like I was being held fairly rigorously to account.

BP But do you think that they have the corresponding effective structures that you're talking about in the future within the MPS, to robustly ensure that, on this particular issue of race and faith, there is a collective way forward?

PS Do you know, I don't – to be perfectly hon-- I don't know the internal structure of the MPA (inaudible) I really don't know what capability and capacity they've got. Are there – are we held robustly to account across a range of issues including this? Yes, we have been. On a whole host of issues and related issues, including (inaudible) the work that we've done on stop search; the work we've done by the authorities. Changed the way in which we relate to (inaudible) stop search. Huge - I'm not being patronising here, hugely effective work, that changed the way in which we did things, quite significantly. That is different than other police authorities, in terms of the amount of that effect they bring to bear. Again, if you look at the work that was done out of the – the review around counter-terrorism. Very, very different than other police authorities, bringing real changes to the way we do our job. So I guess I would say, comparing two authorities, more effective (inaudible) those things. What the internal structures of the MPA are, to support members (inaudible) doing that - probably I'm not the right person to comment on that, I don't know.

(inaudible) Just (inaudible) one last thing. Just want to talk to you just briefly about IAGs, as a former

Mm

..member and one of the Met's IAGs, we – and we've also met a number of members of IAGs. Can you tell me, do you have plans to improve the quality and effectiveness of those IAGs and what are they?

PS Okay. Well, sort of – I, I don't know whether this goes to your question of quality and effectiveness. I suppose it goes to effectiveness in terms of the relationship with the Metropolitan (inaudible) Management Board. They have a standing invitation to come to Management Board on any occasion, but I have to be honest and say, I don't – can't remember when they did. So I've recently had discussions with the Chair of the Race IAG, to actually say, maybe we do need to move towards. And I suppose it might go towards your question about standing -- sort of a Standing Board meeting about race and faith matters and sort of equality matters. I have said, we might, it might be useful to reach a position where the IAG come to (inaudible) Management Board maybe once or twice a year, to have m-- a more effective formal engagement, where maybe we could, we could engage in advice on that audit issue we're talking about. So I think that goes to effectiveness. As to the quality of their work individually, I've, I've got huge support for people on the IAG. I know they're heavily used on gold groups. I don't think I could qualitatively comment beyond that. I don't know. (inaudible)

They, clearly they, they potentially have a key role.

(inaudible)

They do, they can have a key role to play and --you know, using this opportunity. I sat on Operation Blunt as an IAG member and I think it was one of the most frustrating, ineffective, poorly managed, advisory group I've ever sat on, given we were potentially, supposedly dealing with the issue of knife crime and I think that lots of very good people round the table from a broad range of backgrounds and experiences and I think gave up their time on a number of occasions to come to meetings, where things weren't followed through by the Met, Senior Officers, I think, rarely came and therefore little came out of them and ultimately

END OF SIDE B CASSETTE 1

Cassette 2, Side A

..just wanted to hear your comments.

PS Okay. Well, now is not the time to sort of go on about (inaudible) but, Cindy, your comments are new to me; I, I, I didn't know that – you, you have me at a disadvantage there. You were there, I weren't and that's your views. That disturbs me, hearing it and I will go away and actually look further into why is it that you feel that you have to make those comments. I'm not criticising them, if there is something there that's not working,

Mm

PS ..then I need to know about it. I didn't know that was the case.

CB Paul - Sir Paul, I say that in the context not just of my experience,

Mm

CB ..but as, I think, also listening to the IAG members who sat in front of us, their experience wasn't dissimilar.

PS Right.

CB And while I'm not aware of all the IAGs that exist, their, their experience rang true and I wonder whether the Met is missing an opportunity. So while it has an IAG, either and it, it's fully not --understanding they're not working at some level of the organisation and so my, my, my comments aren't purely around my experience;

PS Right.

CB As I've said, the – the IAG has, you know, is disbanded.

ps Well, in the speech referred to earlier, when I referred to institutional racism, I did say it was my ambition to revitalise, can't remember y-- whether I said revitalise or re-energise our relationship with IAGs. Are we bored with them and don't want to play any more? Absolutely not. I think they bring a real advantage to us. So I need to go away and think about that.

Could- could- could- could the same be applied to staff associations?

PS St--staff associations or staff support associations?

Sorry, staff support associations.

PS Well, (inaudible) with one association we have, we have had to fundamentally re-think our relationship to try and move that on, which we, we are, slowly, doing., I, I think so - ignoring certain individual issues, which we, that we can't talk about here, I think we are slowly doing that. How - and I think you are right, in saying is it revitalising, re-energising? I think it's properly repositioning, getting a common understanding, which is the work we're currently doing with them on the new Memorandum of Understanding to say, What is your role? How should, should you engage with the Met? How should you bid for resources? What's the business case, what are the benefits we're getting out of this? So, I think it's a slightly different (inaudible) but we are looking at what our relationship should be with staff support associations. So, that work is already ongoing and there's already a draft MOU in place and that's been negotiating (inaudible) moment in time. The re—the, the IAGs, I think it's a different (inaudible) and I need to think about your comments. I really do.

Is there anything else? No more questions? Okay. Is there any question that we haven't asked you, for which you've prepared the most amazing response? 'Cause if there is, we'd like to hear it.

PS I, if there's anything I think of, I'll drop you a note after (inaudible)

(inaudible) Fantastic. Lovely. Thanks for your time.