

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on 28 May 2009 at 10 a.m. in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1 2AA.**

**Authority Members present:**

Boris Johnson (Chairman), Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman), Jennette Arnold, Reshard Auladin, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Christopher Boothman, Victoria Borwick, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Caroline Pidgeon, Deborah Regal and Richard Tracey.

**MPA and MPS Officers present:**

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA), Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive, MPA), Ken Hunt (Treasurer, MPA)

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, MPS), Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS)

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Good morning, Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA). I think we should crack on since I think we are now quorate. Can I begin, of course, as usual by asking Members to identify themselves starting with Catherine [Crawford] on my left?

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

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

**Ken Hunt (Treasurer, MPA):** Ken Hunt.

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

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** Reshard Auladin.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Victoria Borwick.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Richard Tracey.

**James Cleverly (AM):** James Cleverly.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Caroline Pidgeon.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Dee Doocey.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Jenny Jones.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Kirsten Hearn.

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Chris Boothman.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Joanne McCartney.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Jennette Arnold.

**Deborah Regal (AM):** Deborah Regal.

**Faith Boardman (AM):** Faith Boardman.

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):**  
Chris Allison.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, MPS):**  
Paul Stephenson, Metropolitan Police Service.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Kit Malthouse.

## **112. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Boris Johnson. Asking whether Members have any interests to declare in relation to the business? Chris [Boothman]?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** I think I better disclose an interest as one of the people in the organisation of Notting Hill Carnival.

## **113. MINUTES**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Of course. I am sure that is noted. Can I ask for the approval by Members of the minutes of the last meeting, whether Members have any matters they wish to raise on those minutes?

**Authority Members:** Agreed.

## **114. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you so much. I have just very briefly to say that this is our first opportunity to congratulate Chris Allison, who we welcome today along with the Commissioner, on his appointment as Assistant Commissioner for Olympics and also to announce that Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC) Stuart Osborne has been appointment as Senior National Coordinator Counterterrorism.

We are going to, in a short while, hear from the Commissioner. I think there are some very good elements in his report. I think Members will have seen that there

are some very, very encouraging signs there but also, of course, some causes for concern and I am sure we are going to have a discussion about that. This is also, I think, the first opportunity Members will have had to discuss the protests in Parliament Square and I am sure that everybody will agree that the police are doing an extremely good job of balancing some very difficult competing concerns and competing interests.

Everybody accepts that there is a right to protest but we also accept, and we also must understand that that right has to be balanced with the freedom of people in London to go about their business in a normal way without being interrupted and without being inconvenienced. Of course, there are serious issues about policing a long-running protest such as we have been seeing in Parliament Square without abstracting so much by way of resources from the outer boroughs that we start to have a serious worry about the effects on policing across London. I am sure that Members will want to discuss that issue today.

#### **115. QUESTIONS TO THE AUTHORITY**

Since we last met there have been questions put to the Authority by members of the public and I am going to ask Catherine [Crawford], the Chief Executive, to relay those questions and to give us the answers.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Thank you, Chairman. The first question is asked by Ms Julie Lawrence [member of the public]. I believe Ms Lawrence is not here today. Her question is,

*“Does the MPA have responsibility for the policy on the use of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) helicopters, and if so, does this policy require operational staff to take into account the impact on the public in terms of noise when deciding whether to deploy a helicopter?”*

The response is, and I believe Members have a copy of this but I will read it out,

*“I am sure that anyone living or working in London, will understand the sentiments expressed by Ms Lawrence. But the balance that she is looking for is a difficult one to achieve. Effective policing is necessarily intrusive in various ways, be it as part of major policing operations, public order policing, helicopter noise or indeed the use of police sirens which can also figure as a source of public concern.*

*At both the policy level, which ultimately is the responsibility of the MPA, and the operational level the key question must be whether the deployment of a helicopter will lead to the better (and safer) prevention or detection of crime. The MPS uses its helicopter fleet in a variety of ways, including searches for missing people or suspects, monitoring public order events, and following vehicles involved in crime. All of these are conducted more effectively, and in the case of following vehicles more safely, from the air.*

*I know that the MPS are only too aware of the noise caused by helicopters and they are therefore only deployed when necessary. I understand that the pilots try to adopt a flying position that causes the least intrusion and that this is reflected in operational procedures. The MPA was responsible for the procurement of these helicopters in 2005 and a "reduced noise signature" was one of the factors taken into account in the assessment of suitable models, with the result that the current helicopters are indeed quieter than those they replaced.*

*It is of course for Members to decide whether this is a policy issue that the MPA should look at further, though I would suggest that it is through operational procedures - the responsibility of the MPS - that the balance I referred to earlier is struck."*

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Catherine [Crawford]. Could I ask whether Members have any comments or questions they wish to raise on the matter of helicopters? Dick [Tracey]?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** One thing, Chairman. I actually live close by Wandsworth Prison and from time to time the police helicopter seems to be going round and round and round in circles for an interminable length of time. I do know from personal experience, and certainly from comments of a whole lot of my constituents and neighbours, that they are pretty annoyed by it. We understand the operational reasons but sometimes it just seems that it is going round and round in circles and actually probably it is not all that much quieter than its predecessor.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure your point will have been registered by the police insofar as it is possible to ameliorate the noise over Wandsworth Prison. I am sure they will do their best, but obviously there are operational reasons why they have to do that. Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I do not know if Catherine [Crawford] inadvertently let a separate hare run on this but it relates to the whole business of noise; you mentioned car sirens as well. Clearly and obviously the police have a responsibility to carry on with their operational needs and none of us can second guess that exactly. From what you said about the choice of helicopters partly being to do with reduced noise and so on, is there in fact a policy about reducing noise or having regard to that as far as possible? Are police sirens just let run as people choose or do they have to think about that? Similarly, if there are situations where helicopters do indeed circle areas for a long time, do the police make any attempt to explain this to local people? I mean put out a press release to the local press so everybody knows that it was a wonderful thing rather than an infuriating thing.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am told that there is certainly a policy, Clive [Lawton], to minimise the use of sirens wherever possible, but perhaps the Commissioner would like to address it.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Three things, if I may. I actually do accept that noise in London as a city could actually add to the whole perception of this is a violent and dangerous place. It is something I discussed with Chris [Allison] a couple of months ago. The policy is we use sirens only where absolutely necessary and in relation to what we call I-calls, the obvious calls. They should only be used when absolutely necessary and at all other times they should be turned off. I have nothing to tell me that that is not complied with but we constantly go back and check and brief officers accordingly. That is the first point.

The second point is quite simply that we are not the only people that use sirens in London. The total noise that goes on in London is a combination of factors. I am not blaming anyone else but the reality is lots of other people use sirens. All we can do is put the controls on our own, and we do put the controls on our own.

The third issue is - I raised this with Chris [Allison] only several months ago - is there something we can do to reduce our contribution to the cacophony of noise in London because I too live in London and hear the noise throughout the night with all the sirens. He has revisited our instructions around that to make sure that it is absolutely clear that we only use it where necessary and in relation to I-calls.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much. Victoria [Borwick]?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Quick question. Perhaps you could let us know whether or not the use of helicopters has been increasing because obviously here we have had a number of demonstrations but I personally feel I am much more conscious of the number of helicopters around. Obviously we all want you to do your job, but I just wonder again if there was ever a balance for how long they were actually used for on a particular operation.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I guess my response would be that we have three helicopters and actually we see them massively as a valuable operational tool and we will want to maximise their use for the reason that they are bought for. So I guess you would say I almost want them to be used to the maximum, but I want them to be used to the maximum on the things that will bring most benefits to Londoners and - I am not just being dismissive of this - the noise is a price we pay around it. If you turn the clock back 10 years or 20 years - I guess we did not have helicopters - not to police a city like London without that helicopter support I think would be unacceptable in 2009.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** So, just to get to Victoria's [Borwick] question, it would be possible to show that the use of helicopters was increasing over time?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Well, it must do. We now have three helicopters where historically we did not have, so it will be.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you so much. John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** Very briefly. First of all I apologise for being late. Unlike you I am sufficiently close to the people that I still make my own tea and that was my reason for being late.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That was a needless crack! I think that wins a prize for the most gratuitous piece of political insult.

**John Biggs (AM):** I think if we start with one then maybe we can move to a more civilised setting. Two tiny points; the first is as an elected representative I do get a lot of representation from people who are annoyed by helicopter noise and they cannot understand what these things are up there for. I think without delaying us now, a bit more public information about what they are they for - are they spotting drug dealers, are they just clocking up hours so they can get overtime or whatever - would be very welcome.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I tend to agree.

**John Biggs (AM):** The other point, which again I would be failing in duty to one particular constituent, but it is something that comes up from other people as well, is siren noise at night. I have a persistent complainant who does not understand why, when the roads are empty, these things whirl past his house and wake him up every single night. He has been to noise abatement and he thinks there is a conspiracy against him and that with modern technology and other means of alerting people that in hours of darkness you should be able to conduct this service without making such a racket. Now, I do appreciate it is not just you, fire engines are even worse, but it is an issue, for the record, Chairman.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, John [Biggs]. Can I just stress to Members that we have quite a lot to get through and we are still on the first question from the public, so I think we can really have a very long discussion on noise but I think it might be in the interests of the Authority and time if we went onto the second question from the public which was in relation to the G20 [Group of 20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors established in 1999] protests. I wonder whether Mr Andrew May who was here last time; do you want to ask your questions in person?

**Andrew May (Defend Peaceful Protest):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Oh, he does. Welcome.

**Andrew May (Defend Peaceful Protest):** Would you like me to read them out or do you want me to just point them across?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think the Members will have had the advantage of reading your questions. Perhaps it would be best if Catherine [Crawford] replied and then you can come back if you wish.

**Andrew May (Defend Peaceful Protest):** That would be fine, thanks.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Chairman,

*“These questions follow on from those Mr May asked at the Authority meeting in April. I hope he will agree that the discussion and questioning at that meeting covered a lot of ground in relation both to the general and specific issues in connection with G20 policing.*

*Starting with Mr May’s fourth question, there is no formal mechanism for co-ordinating the work of the different bodies and they are of course carrying out investigations for different purposes and to different timescales. From the MPA’s perspective, however, I would expect the new Civil Liberties Panel to be able to make a significant contribution, amongst other things, in taking an overview of and learning from the outcomes of those other investigations and reviews.*

*Following on from that, my answer to Mr May’s other three questions is that these really relate to ‘work in progress’ and it would not be appropriate or useful to give an answer at this stage. The tactics used during the G20 protests, including the way in which the Climate Camp demonstrators were dispersed, are under review by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). The issue of deliberate or accidental concealment of ID was discussed at some length at the last Authority meeting. The MPS have recognised that there are improvements that need to be made in the ways in which ID numbers are attached to police uniforms, providing practical and financially viable ways of doing this can be found. This will be reported back to the Authority.*

*Finally, I anticipate that what Mr May refers to as ‘inconsistencies in police statements’ will be addressed by the HMIC review in particular as part of its terms of reference to look at MPS liaison with the media.”*

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thanks, Catherine [Crawford]. Mr May, do you want to come back on any of that?

**Andrew May (Defend Peaceful Protest):** Yes, if I can follow up on a couple of points. So, first of all I am glad to see the Civil Liberties Panel has been now agreed. I would welcome this as a way of having additional oversight over some of the issues around public order policing. What I would like to know really is in terms of obviously there is going to be oversight and scrutiny of public order policing and they are going to be following up on some of the investigations but will there be any specific powers given to the panel to ensure that the Metropolitan Police Service’s

actions, proposed changes to policy and tactics around policing because this is really the key thing that there is actually going to be long-term change implemented after these reviews have happened. So if I could hear an answer on that. Do you want me to go onto another point?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think what you are technically permitted to do now, as I understand it, Mr May, is really to make a three-minute response to the answer you have been given rather than going into a sort of ping-pong session.

**Andrew May (Defend Peaceful Protest):** OK, in that case I would just like to finish really with a response. I do not feel yet that the questions have obviously been adequately addressed. I understand that there are ongoing inquiries happening but as question four pointed out there are some issues around effective communication between the inquiries. Obviously now that some of them are at an advanced stage: there are inquiries going on at the House of Commons, there are inquiries going on internally with the police, there are inquiries with the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) on individual aspects of cases and if there is not effective communication and there is different evidence going to different committees and it is now two months on from the G20 and I just do not feel really that how can there be an effective investigation if there are all these different aspects being investigated separately. Obviously what we have called for as a group, Defend Peaceful Protest, is a fully independent effective inquiry and this is the very reason for doing so. We do not feel that there is a catch-all approach and that we are really getting the effective oversight. Without that I do not think a lot of the protesters and members of the public will really feel that they have regained their confidence in some of the public order policing and associated issues with civil liberties.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, thank you very much, Mr May. I think you have made a very interesting point which I think a lot of people will understand. You are particularly concerned about coordination between the various inquiries and I am sure that Members will now want to discuss your questions further, but I am afraid I am under the sad obligation of having to ask you now to leave our proceedings to enable us to get on with it with our thanks. Thank you very much Mr May for coming along.

Can I ask Members whether they have any questions relating to Andrew May's question? Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is very exciting that this huge chunk of work of oversight is being given to a Civil Liberties Panel, I think that is great. It is a very good point, isn't it, about oversight and coordination. I am not sure we are capable of it. I am not sure we have the resources so might it be something the Home Office should be doing, if not in this case in future cases, because it does seem that there is an issue here about all these different bodies tackling things in a different way. Is this something that you could consider and perhaps the Civil Liberties Panel might want to make a recommendation along those lines?



**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes, Catherine [Crawford], do you want to say something?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** I would want to see how things pan out. I can see that it is really quite a complex field out here, a lot of different people doing different things. I would also hope that the Authority was in fact uniquely placed at the centre of this with its formal statutory responsibilities for oversight of the Metropolitan Police Service. In that context I refer to Mr May's first question about will the Civil Liberties Panel has specific powers. I do not believe they need specific powers because the Authority already has a significant statutory role. I would have thought that we were the best placed body to ensure that there is cohesion between the outcomes of the various inquiries. I would like to reassure Jenny [Jones] that I am confident that we can be resourced to do that adequately and competently.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** I am not sure I would recommend the Home Office as a body that is legendary for its powers of coordination or organisation.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No. Point well made. Jennette [Arnold] and then James [Cleverly].

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It is related to the question. It seems to me it is a question about openness and transparency as we move on. I just wanted to ask will Members have a transcript of the matters discussed at the last meeting? Are they posted on the MPA site?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** It is in the minutes.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It should be in your --

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, no. I know. I said we had them. I wanted to know if they are posted on the site so that the public could actually read the transcript - that is my first question. Then will you try to get as much information out as soon as possible about the Civil Liberties Panel in terms of not just its remit but expected timescale and, if you like, some markers so that summaries can be made. If it is going to go on for three months or something like that that some sort of summary position about evidence taken because, unless we are as open as possible, then people will just be repeating the same questions, because James' [Cleverly] questions are similar to the ones I have had and I am sure other Members have had.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Two things. Yes, the transcript is posted on the website and, as you know, Jennette [Arnold], we are coming to a full discussion of the Civil Liberties Panel in a paper that we will talk about.

**James Cleverly (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I think as a body we have to be very robust in defending our position as the independent scrutiny body for the

Metropolitan Police Service. I appreciate what Mr May said in terms of that desire, but I think that we need to be very clear that, whilst other bodies may wish to investigate things and obviously they have their remit to do that, that this is the body which is independent of the Metropolitan Police Service and is tasked with scrutiny of their actions. I think we absolutely have to make that clear and not concede any ground on that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure that Members will completely agree with that and it is our prime function - it is the prime function of this body - to scrutinise and invigilate the Metropolitan Police Service. Yes, Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I do not disagree with anything that has been said, Chairman, but I do think that when we have finished our inquiry, and perhaps at a slightly later stage, we should also look at a summary of what all of the other inquiries have found because I think otherwise the police are going to get a dozen different suggestions from various quarters.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That is exactly right. Can I suggest what we should be doing, once all these inquiries have reached their term, is I think it should be the function of this body to draw the net conclusions of all the individual investigations. Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, just very quickly. That is why I am a little bit nervous about forcing too many timescales on this particular process because it would be very silly for us to try to draw conclusions at a point at which others have not. I believe that whatever is our final conclusion should be or seek to be the last word on the overview of all of this.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** I would like to make a slight counter-comment in terms of the transparency which is that I do not fundamentally disagree with what James Cleverly has said, although in a free society we should respect that there will be civil organisations and people out there who would want to scrutinise as well and they do not have the same legal rights that we have and statutory role but they have a perfectly legitimate right to ask questions and to investigate in their own particular ways. I think that if our panel was to scurry off and do its work in private for a year or something and come back with a report which was definitive I do not think that would satisfy in any way public opinion, which would want us to be transparent and clear insofar as that is compatible with collecting evidence and a trail of what has happened.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure we can do it in a way that is transparent and clear. Dick [Tracey]?

**John Biggs (AM):** I am not sure that we can do it.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes, I agree, Chairman. Just one question; from various of the requests that we have heard just now, does the MPA honestly have the level of staff to be able to cope with all this or do we have to look at actually recruiting some new staff in addition to what we have got because it sounds to me like a very large task that confronts us.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Dick [Tracey], I am slightly nervous to hear you say we should recruit more staff. My instinct is that that would not be necessary but, Kit [Malthouse], do you have anything you want to add on that?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** We have the resources.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think we felt that we are adequately resourced to do the job that I think all Members would like us to do.

#### **116. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

Can I suggest that we move on from the questions to the next item on the agenda which is the Commissioner's report? Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Thank you, Chairman. I think the timescales of this are the report largely is historic and the report is largely relating to last year's crime figures which ended on 1 April. I think we have discussed those before actually in terms of if you are going to call them business results, which always feels a bit odd when you are talking about crime, but if you are going to talk about the crime figures largely a successful year for the Metropolitan Police Service. They are there and you have discussed them before. I am not entirely sure it would be useful for me to trail through what we have already frequently discussed.

It seems to me that I ought to take the opportunity to say, "Well, that's last year, that's all well and good, but actually we're several months almost into this year and I ought to be talking about how we're doing this year." I want to just touch on where I see us at the end of our first full month of crime reporting for this year, the April crime figures. In doing so I have to say to both to the Authority and for any media, one month's figures - you have got to look at them very, very cautiously in making claims of success or indeed saying, "We're in deep trouble," because it is one month's figures and it is liable to change, but we are comparing April with April.

With that very careful caveat, where are we in the start of this performance year after one month's crime figures? Well, the good news is - and I think it is balanced - total crime is down by a small amount, but it is down. Serious acquisitive crime overall is down and serious acquisitive crime includes a number of crimes such as burglary would be included, motor-vehicle theft, etc. Motor-vehicle theft is one that actually is coming down. Homicides are down by a huge percentage but actually we are talking small numbers so percentages are irrelevant. The numbers are small but there are seven less over that month than there was the same month in the

previous year. Again, I always feel very uncomfortable talking about success when we are talking about, "Well, there are less people being murdered," but nevertheless homicide is down.

Serious youth violence overall continued, through the month of April, to fall. So, again, that trend is continuing. It might be useful to reference Operation Blunt here, and I am going to come back to some of these issues where my real concerns are. Operation Blunt, we feel, has continued to make a contribution to that reduction, a significant contribution, but, as I have said before, we are very much engaged in the suppression end of activity of youth crime. I think we do agree that the causation factor is much longer, much more difficult and actually involve a lot more people and that is not what I do on my own. I contribute to that.

Of course, sadly since the last Authority meeting, which I was not present at, there have been two further murders of young people in London. Whilst, again, the number of youth murders has dropped over April compared to April in the previous year, nevertheless, the very fact that we have had two further since the last Authority meeting just tells us we have still got far too many. Any idea that we are over the hill on youth crime and youth murders I think would be a big, big mistake. That is why we have to keep revisiting the tactics we are using because I have said before the tactics are intrusive and capable of causing disbenefits as well as benefits. We have got to keep redoubling our effort to maintain community support for those intrusive tactics. I still believe we have to do it because we are engaged in that suppression activity. I would still turn round and say it is up to many agencies and this Authority, the Greater London Authority (GLA) and lots of other people to ask "What are we doing about the causation factors that start the problem in the first place?"

Well, let me turn to what I think - and I have just mentioned some challenges there - the figures are looking good April on April but actually the numbers are still too high on youth crime. Challenges: burglary is a very real challenge. I think I have spoken about this offence a number of occasions since I have been Commissioner and I think I was telling you if we look at the normal economic crime models and all economic crime models will tell you that burglary comes under pressure when there is an economic downturn. It is our job to learn from history and try to avoid that happening, but it is a challenge.

Throughout the last six months of last year we have put a considerable effort into combating burglary which is till think is often an offence that we underestimate its effect on the public. That considerable effort resulted in the end of last year's performance year of a small reduction in burglary, which was against the trend nationally. So for that we actually got a result and I think I was very pleased with that, but I have to say in the first month of this year burglary is up, the numbers of burglary are up. There are some 300-odd more burglaries in the month of April than there were in the same month last year. Again, small numbers, but it does worry me because I think that is actually a priority trend, a real pressure that we were seeing last year and we are combating but we are combating with a lot of effort and a lot of

police activity. That is our job but I think we are under real pressure on the burglary figures and we might want to come back to that. I want to talk about why we think that might be in a moment but the economic model would automatically put under pressure and that seems to be the case this moment in time.

In particular an increase in the burglary figures particularly in some of our outer London boroughs. It actually looks like it has been replicating some very significant rises, even beyond what we are seeing, in surrounding forces - one in particular I know about - but I think that is the case in a number of surrounding forces. They are seeing a very significant rise in burglary. We are seeing it slightly less so at this moment in time, but I think it is a very worrying trend for us. Of course we are putting operations into those boroughs. I want to come back to the number of cops available to put into those operations in a moment. That is an area of real concern for me.

I would also want to turn to violence. It looks to us as though there has been an increase in more serious violence and assault with injuries over the month of April. Again, you have got to be even more careful with this figure because the figures are showing an increase in violence but actually it shows one month you cannot make a judgment on because of course the position of Easter critically affects April. We end up having more violent crime because people are off, available and going to various clubs, etc. Easter fell in this performance year this year and it did not last year, so I cannot hand on heart say at this moment in time is the increase in violence, and violence with injuries, down to a change in the Easter being in the year as opposed to last year or is it down to a real trend? Certainly there is no trend at the moment because last year we saw a reduction in violence but again you would have to be concerned just by the fact we have an increased figure and that is something that concerns me.

Why? Well, I have talked about the impact of the economic downturn, but I have to turn to the abstraction of officers from boroughs to deal with some extraordinary events. Now, I am not going to sit here and say, "All the problems we face are because of those abstractions," I think that would be wholly wrong of me. I think we are seeing a small rise in domestic violence which again I have talked about before, which again you can almost predict that pressure will come on with economic downturn. I do not think that small rise in domestic violence is being affected at all by an abstraction of officers from the boroughs in any real sense. So I am not saying everything is down to that but the rise in abstractions from boroughs of officers is very significant for us at this moment in time.

If we look at the abstraction for the G20 and we look at the abstraction for the Tamil protest, the increase in aid to the centre has been enormous. That has had a big impact on our borough commanders, their ability with whatever, if you will, discretionary asset they have to proactively move to target operations, that must have an impact. If it does not have an impact we should not have that asset in the first place. It has had a significant impact. My worry would be if we continue in that vein with that level of abstraction - we do not think we will - in particular the

availability of our asset for the classic Friday nights, the times when we are trying to increase our patrols on the street and we have had some success around that, then that is going to have a long-term effect on the Metropolitan Police Service's performance. Actually forget Metropolitan Police Service's performance, on Londoners' experience of crime. It is just inevitable that is going to be the case. It worries me.

G20, which we have discussed for a whole lot of reasons at great length, but the realities as you know G20 was not quite sprung on us but we had about three months in which to do this enormous thing. That is actually not a lot of time to plan for the impact of a huge abstraction from boroughs. The Tamil protest has been very significant for us. That has been a major abstraction from boroughs and rose to a crescendo, which I think was the responsible thing to do, when we had to put a huge amount of cops together because of what we were seeing abroad. Not to have done that would have been hugely irresponsible had something gone terribly wrong.

Our problem with policing the Tamil protest, and Chris [Allison] will probably give more chapter and verse on this, is quite simply that this is a protest where there is, very often, no central controlling mind other than the 50 that were originally agreed, the people who have been demonstrating there have an ability to put lots of people into that place very, very quickly and we have a simple decision to make. We either have a standing army ready to deal with what might happen all the time, which means we never have any cops available in the boroughs, or we wait until it happens and then respond and we are going to be several hours behind and eventually we will have to do something about something that might be peaceful but it is unlawful. So has been our problem.

We have seen a massive increase in aid. We are seeing at the moment a significant reduction in the demands we are making on boroughs as of today, I think is the case, so we are hoping that we are going to be able to get back to a more steady state where we can see the police officers that we have got actually doing the jobs that we all want them to do back there on the boroughs policing the streets, increasing foot patrol and targeting burglary and targeting violence. It has been a real problem.

I do not claim all the challenges in our crime figures are down to that, that would be wrong, but it has had an effect and I am deeply concerned about it. The overall cost of the Tamil protest up until last Friday was £9.3 million, of which £4.3 million was opportunity costs and £4.7 million was overtime, because when we significantly increase the aid because of what may have happened because of what we are seeing internationally, we did it using an enormous amount of overtime to try to keep some cops in the boroughs to keep policing going, but we cannot afford to do that for very long. I know a full report is being taken, I think, to the Finance Committee.

I do not intend to say any more about my report because actually what I have been talking about is not in my report but I want to talk about current matters because I think what is in my report you already largely know about.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, I am sure Members would want to come back on a lot of that, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** On the Tamils in Parliament Square, I think we are all aware of what a difficult situation it is and I think the policing has been very good. I accept between leaders on the ground, as it were, for the protest but have you spoken to the Tamil leaders in London generally with a view to actually trying to perhaps bring it under control in the sense of reduce the numbers and that thing?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I do know that we have tried to speak to everybody because, of course, we do not have the solution to this issue. The solution, if there is a solution, lies elsewhere. It is certainly not in the Metropolitan Police Service's gift. All we can do is respond. Chris [Allison], if I could ask you to respond?

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, Jenny [Jones], we have been liaising with everybody through Counter Terrorism (CT) sets, through all the contacts we have got with the Tamil community, with the groups that have been running the protest by putting officers out there. Obviously you were aware earlier on in the protest there was a hunger striker there so we were doing lots of work with the hunger striker and others, so we have been speaking to everybody we possibly can. As the Commissioner says, this is beyond our capability to resolve.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Chris [Allison]. Why don't we take all questions on the Tamils and related matters now if there are any? Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I do not have a question on the Tamils, it is about something else.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Dick [Tracey], is it on the Tamils?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes, it is.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Good.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Chairman, can I ask the Commissioner: is there any knowledge or intelligence how long this protest is going to go on for and what support are we getting from the Home Office, from the Home Secretary [Jacqui Smith]? Because from my local end I know that the Chair of the Crime Prevention Panel has written to the Home Secretary, copying his letter to the Chair and to myself, about this matter because the evidence in Wandsworth is that they

have been cancelling various proactive policing operations in Wandsworth because of the abstraction of officers. It has cost them, I think, £60,000 at least in overtime already. Meanwhile, and this is what of course concerns the people locally, burglary has gone up and so has robbery gone up, they believe, as a direct result of the abstraction of our local officers. So what are we getting from the Home Office in the way of support and how long is this likely to go on for?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Because you mentioned robbery; iconic offence in London more or less flat-lining across the Metropolitan Police Service on the month of April, but I am not disagreeing the figures regarding your local borough. I want to be clear and blunt about it. Actually, for Wandsworth, read across the Metropolitan Police Service, operations have been cancelled or altered significantly because of this protest, including Operation Blunt. We have not been able to mount what we feel we need to mount to maintain the progress we are making around suppression of the activity of youth crime. It has affected Operation Blunt and it deeply concerns me.

What are we getting from the Home Office? Well, I would welcome any support from anywhere that encourages whoever is the funder for the MPA and Metropolitan Police Service to make sure our funding is adequate. I would never refuse any support like that but the reality is I am guessing the Home Office will turn round, and probably with some justification - and I am not here to bring apologies for the Home Office but to be honest about the whole thing - and say they feel they give us a settlement that takes account of our capital city responsibilities.

As this Authority is aware that is a matter that has been in some dispute for a period of time and the Authority keep pressing that cause and so do I about do we get sufficient funding for our capital city responsibilities. We would say not; they would say yes. I think it is an ongoing debate and I encourage that debate. The reality of it is that element of policing on the streets does fall within our legal responsibilities to police. There are certain formulas that come into effect where an extraordinary operation takes up so much of the Police Authority budget but I think it is something like 4% or 6% - and I am looking for assistance and Ken [Hunt] will be able to say that- but I think it is an extraordinary amount that I do not think we would ever get near.

**Ken Hunt (Treasurer, MPA):** The figure is about £30 million.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Yes. So, we are not close to that where we could automatically claim by the rules that we should get some extra money, but I would encourage anybody who does manage to get extra money because this is having an effect on the operation performance more importantly the experience of Londoners regarding crime. If it goes on, it will.

You ask me what intelligence have I got. Well, I have got to be honest, I do not have any intelligence that tells me whether this is going to continue or not. I can have a professional opinion, I can have a citizen's opinion, I can look at the



international situation and do like other people do and make some predictions around it. We are reducing the amount of cover massively, but could I say from my intelligence that this is not going to come back? No, I could not. I fervently hope not, but if it does we will have to respond appropriately. I am hoping there will be a reduction, but I am hoping my words are not very clumsy words that encourage the opposite.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. I am sure everybody will appreciate the delicacy of the situation but it seems to me there are signs for hope that the tactics that you have employed are working. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes. I think, like most people, I have great sympathy with the Tamils but I think there does come a time where groups will have to move on and I am concerned about the bigger picture. Basically the fact that one group really should not be allowed to hog what is probably one of the most iconic sites in London because what about if we wanted to go down and protest about something else tomorrow? We cannot because the site has already been taken. I think there are big issues here that need to be addressed and I think they need to be addressed at a high level.

I wondered what, wearing your hat as Mayor and Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, discussions you have had perhaps with Government about this, because I do think that rather than saying, "It's not fair," and obviously the abstractions in boroughs are a major concern to everyone here, but I just wondered if you have had any discussions and, if not, if you would have some discussions and would like to come back to us. I do not think we can just leave it up in the air, but we have got sympathy for somebody who has got a great cause but at the same time they can takeover Parliament Square for the rest of their lives.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Absolutely right. Obviously, Dee [Doocey], there have been discussions going on for quite some time now about exactly what to do with Parliament Square and whether further legislative regulatory change is required. Because, as you know, sovereignty is divided, as it were, in the square between the GLA and Westminster Council and there are different rules pertaining to the two different segments. We have a duty to allow people to protest reasonably and that is what Parliament has decreed and that is what the police will enforce quite rightly. What we cannot have is systematic disruption of the square, disruption of people's lives and, as Sir Paul [Stephenson] has said, an abstraction of serious quantities of police resource from the outer boroughs. It is certainly something Londoners will not tolerate.

We have to reach, I think, a decision about how to proceed and the difficulty is that if we were to make a legislative or regulatory change to prevent, for instance, protesters such as Mr Haw [Brian Haw] from encamping there then the risk is that you would create a situation in which protesters would seek martyrdom, as it were, by seeking the occasion to be moved off in a violent, physical and confrontational

way. They would get the headlines that they want in that way. So that is the difficulty that we face.

Kit [Malthouse] actually, I think, went to a meeting with ministers and representatives of Parliament to discuss it a couple of weeks ago. Do you want to say anything about that?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Yes, Chris [Allison] and I both attended a meeting with the Speaker [Michael Martin], the Minister of State at the Home Office [Vernon Coaker] and the Deputy Leader of the House [Chris Bryant] to talk about the issue. They interestingly were quite keen for us obviously to bring the protest to an end as swiftly as we could and we explained to them the legal situation that we actually could not do that.

There are also some difficulties around the type of crowd; there are lots of children in the crowd and women. It becomes a very difficult arena. What we said, both of us, at the meeting is that fundamentally it is for Parliament to decide what happens in Parliament Square and then the police will enforce accordingly. The problem is, and the Mayor is quite right, you could put as many laws as you want in there, people will still protest and may still invade the road. It is a question of how you get protesters to behave responsibly and also to realise, as Jenny [Jones] said, that Parliament Square is not for hogging by one particular group.

It is interesting to note that while the Tamil protest was going on the Ghurkhas were unable to protest in Parliament Square and had to be moved further down the road because the square was being monopolised by one particular group. It is an extremely difficult position. I am not sure actually, to be honest, that it is a situation that is soluble. I am not sure there is a solution to it. I think we just have to hope that protesters behave responsibly and realise that they actually do damage to their cause by causing inconvenience to Londoners rather than promote it.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Fundamentally there are two types of society. There is a society which says there are certain bits of territory where you simply do not allow people to come and to make their point or there is a society that is a peerless tolerant society that says, "Yes, people can protest and it's our job to help them to do it in a reasonable way." I think so far the Metropolitan Police Service has done an extremely good job in doing that. The difficulty, I think, is really ensuring that this is not done at too high a cost for the rest of London. Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, I have got a feeling of unreality in a bit of this conversation because we have just previously had questions about G20 and specifically, if I understand this correctly, the Climate Camp, a decision was made some time during the course of the evening that this represented a major thoroughfare, it was intolerable that it should be blocked, Londoners needed to be allowed to go about their lives and so on, and, therefore, it must be cleared. It must be cleared firmly - we can all dispute how so - but that it must be done. Now, I

accept that Parliament Square is a green space and does not necessarily block anything but certainly it spills over into the street and has --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That is the key point. I think you are talking about two different things.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** There is a second thing that if we are concerned about Londoners going about their lives and all being done effectively, what we are hearing now about the abstraction of police from boroughs and so on is affecting the quality of lives of Londoners, whether directly or indirectly it is doing so. I am not sure that I heard clearly enough from Chris [Allison] an answer to Jenny's [Jones] question about engagement with Tamil community leadership around London. That is not the people sitting in the square but other folk who are in charge of the Tamil community centre here or there and whether those individuals are being enlisted to challenge or whether indeed they are party to or involved in the leadership of the demonstration, and whether the points about funding, policing, impact on London overall and so on are being put forcefully enough to them to seek something much more firm in this - and I hear everything too about children and women and so forth -  
-

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** You appreciate the danger of seeming to reward protest or seeming to engage with people. There are real difficulties that the police face in this, Clive [Lawton].

**Clive Lawton (AM):** There is also a real perception that the Tamil demonstration has been somewhat soft-peddled on because of the explosion of concern about the G20 thing. Now, I say this is perception, Kit [Malthouse], and you can shake your head but there is a perception, and therefore we need to be very clear about what we want to say about that. The longer that this goes on the more that perception seems to be justified.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, all I would say to Members of the MPA clearly is that we cannot expect to be the vehicles for very strong criticism of the police in their handling of the G20 and then simultaneously accuse them of soft-peddling in the matter of the Tamil protest. We must be consistent, I think. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Could I give a response that actually goes back to something I have already said, Clive [Lawton]? I think I have already deal partly with something you just said about this perception of difference. The reality is on G20 we had significant amount of police asset there because we did, because we knew it was going to take place. The difference here is on many occasions we did not have the significant amount of police asset there because actually there is not many people there and they have an ability, and they proved it, to actually mobilise lots of people very quickly.

If I have the asset there permanently then there will be no policing left in London, so therefore on most occasions we have responded. That is the difference. When we

have responded, and there have been five days out of a total of, I think, 48 when there has been blockage of the road. When we have had the asset there and commensurate with the risk, we have enforced the law and moved people; on one occasion with a significant number of injuries albeit relatively minor injuries. So there is no difference. We have done it exactly the same way when we have the asset there, appropriately with whatever wisdom we can muster we have enforced the law, so it is exactly the same thought process and approach.

Regarding talking to the Tamils; I think we have answered it to be fair. We have spoken to everybody we can speak to and we will speak to anyone else to try to actually get them to let us know what they are doing, what they want to do so we can assist them to do it, but also ensure we can enforce the law and do it properly. We have spoken to lots of people. Actually I would turn round and say to an awful lot of other people, "Is it the Metropolitan Police Service's responsibility to spend their entire time searching out and talking to people and are the other agencies and other politicians and the people round this table using all their wherewithal, their authority and their opportunities to spread the message we're currently spreading?"

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Kit [Malthouse], do you want to come in?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** It is worth just saying that in this building the Mayor's office has engaged with the Tamil communities with some success. In terms of Tamil community leaders more widely, they have told us that they cannot control and have no control over the protesters. We have engaged directly with the protesters with some success, and you will have noticed that the catering tent has now been removed and the tent at the front has been reduced in size. We seem to have some undertakings that they will start to behave and there has been a reduction in numbers recently.

The protesters are now no longer, or there is no permanent encampment, on GLA land; their tent is now on Westminster land and there we are in the hands of a judiciary who have previously allowed the permanent demonstration of Mr Haw and, therefore, to whom the police would be reluctant, I think, to go to seek some obstruction order and removal of the tent. We are in a strange legal situation but we have had some success in negotiating with them, albeit that they are a very, very difficult group to engage with because none of them will fess up to being a leader.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That is the structural problem we face and I think it is fair to say that Richard Barnes, Deputy Mayor for Community Relations, has been there three times a day.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Chairman, can I just add one other thing? As you may be aware, Clive [Lawton], I have also taken the opportunity at the Home Office Select Affairs Committee to raise these very issues so that we can get it onto some national stage as well as whatever anybody else is doing locally to pick up their personal responsibilities.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I do think, Sir Paul [Stephenson], your point is well made that it is a message that we can get out to everybody in London, everybody watching and thinking about this, that if they want to make their protest reasonably and lawfully they can and we support that and we sympathise with that, but they should not do it in such a way as to prejudice the ability of the police to deliver law and order around the city. Are there any more questions about the Tamils? Jenny [Jones] and then John [Biggs].

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, it is on this issue of communication because - and I was visiting every day at one point just to establish what was going on, how the police were behaving and that sort of thing - it seems to me that most protesters, and I include myself here, we are angry about something. We are protesting because of anger and we are fed up. These people are not protesting because they are angry, they are protesting because they are losing family members, because they do not know what is happening and because they are distressed. It is a completely different situation from the average protest.

It does seem to me that in Southwark there is not a big Tamil community but presumably some Members around here have Tamil communities. Have you actually engaged with the link members on this Authority to speak to Tamil leaders? Have you actually invited Tamil leaders to go down there and speak to the crowd and explain the problems we are talking about with abstraction from the boroughs and how difficult it is for the rest of London? Because although the Tamils are obviously distraught, I think they will understand the pressures that are being created elsewhere.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Jenny [Jones].

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Can I have an answer about have the link members been contacted and have the Tamil leaders in other parts of London been asked to come down and speak?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** I think I may contribute to that, if I may. Croydon does have a significant Tamil community. It does have two or three self-styled leaders and I know for a fact that Deputy Mayor Barnes has certainly been in contact with those individuals assiduously over the period time, so from my aspect I am comfortable that there have been those connections made.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Kit [Malthouse], is there anything more you want to add on it?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** No. We have tried everything we possibly can over the last 50 days to make contact with and find some kind of guiding mind or influence and there is a realisation in the demonstration that if they have a hierarchy they become easier to deal with and they specifically do not want that.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Chairman, if I can just answer the question directly? As Chris [Allison] has said, on our set through CT set we have been speaking to the Tamil community leaders with little effect in terms of reducing the numbers. We have also been speaking to anybody else we can speak to that might have some influence, including, I think it is fair to say, we have raised it with you and you have responded, we have raised it with Government and we have raised it with a number of people to actually say, "We can't solve this problem. It's not our problem to solve."

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I do appreciate the point about opportunity costs and obviously from an operational point of view this is a thorough nuisance and it would be nice if it went away, but I think we do need to recognise in terms of a balanced debate that it is in the nature of London as a city that we have enormous benefits that flow from our being a very open place with people from all over the world and there are various opportunity costs that flow from that and this is one of them, if you like. We do need to have a balance in this and indeed I have a large Tamil community in Newham in particular and I would remarkably concur with most of what the Chairman and Deputy Chairman have said about this, that tactically and organisationally the community does not have a single voice but we should not underestimate the enormous grievance people feel.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think everybody understands the truth of that, John [Biggs]. Thank you. Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** There is one point about that, Chairman, which is that I think following the meeting that Kit Malthouse must have been at there were press statements that there was going to be another attempt to legislate about the whole Parliament Square area. I would be interested to know what the position of this Authority, and the position of the Commissioner, is on whether that is a good or bad idea.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, I think I said something about that in my opening remarks on that.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes. Well, what you said was essentially it was very difficult and you did not want to give people more, if you like, mileage by them moving on. So you are saying that you would be against, and this Authority is against, further legislation to clarify this very grey area about who can do what, what the powers of the police are in respect of Parliament Square itself?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Kit [Malthouse]?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Well, as you know, there has been an ongoing debate about protests in Parliament Square in parliament and both Chris [Allison] and I have appeared in front of the Select Committee that is considering that issue.

The Government and the Prime Minister [Gordon Brown] in particular have signalled the repeal of the elements of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act (SOCPA) that currently govern protests within a mile of the Houses of Parliament, but they have yet to decide what they want to put in its place. Various suggestions have been made, both by the police and by us, the GLA rather than the MPA, but there does not seem to be any clear view from the Government about what they want.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Well, perhaps it would be helpful, therefore, if this Authority or a relevant committee, I am not sure which one it would be, received a report --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think it might be the Civil Liberties Panel.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** We better set it up then!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think you might find, Toby [Harris], this was a job for the Civil Liberties Panel. I think we should move on and --

**Toby Harris (AM):** So we will receive a report at the Civil Liberties Panel which we can all read which will set out what are the various views of what we think would be desirable in respect of any action taken.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Absolutely.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** I would just add and reiterate the point that was made earlier. You can put all the legislation you want in terms of Parliament Square. The question is what tactics are we happy for the police to use to clear the square when protesters decide to break that legislation, as they will, because that is the whole notion of protest.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That is exactly the point. I think this is exactly the kind of subject that would be with profit discussed by the Civil Liberties Panel. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Just to confirm I think it is the case, going back some time, the Metropolitan Police Service have made representation about legislation and we have informed this Authority what our representations were. I think a report was brought to the Authority over a year ago. We are quite happy to bring back to you and let you know what our views are and what the views are within represented government how we should move this issue forward, but I would confirm that that would not necessarily solve the issue we are talking about here, but there is a need for clarification.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you. Jennette [Arnold], you had a question on a non-Tamil matter?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, it is not on Tamil; it goes back to the Commissioner's statement at the tragic loss of lives. I know that we all, through you, Chairman, will

be sending our condolences to the family, friends and the communities. Just to say one of the young men lived in my constituency. I am not going to name him because from the feedback from meeting families who have been in this experience they resent the fact that their loved ones are talked about as a statistic and their names are used in this very negative way at this most tragic time.

I do want to flag up that at a recent meeting where I was at the community paid tribute to the policing service in that part of the constituency. It is a classic and a great example of community working with each other that within days someone, as has been reported in the media, has been apprehended and, as I understand it, is either in court today or tomorrow. I just wanted to put that on the record that we are all sharing the grief of these families.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Jennette [Arnold]. There are two very good points there I think. The first is the amazing role the police have in all sorts of actions to try to prevent tragedies of the kind that we have seen and also the success they generally have in apprehending the culprits. I think that is a very good point; absolutely right.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, can I just say, and the witnesses; I forgot. Because it is witnesses that we need to actually now say thank you to because without witnesses coming forward then we would not be seeing this clear up. I did have another question that the Commissioner has not mentioned and it is a direct question to the Commissioner. I am bringing it up here because I have had an unsatisfactory answer to this thing that I have been pursuing. It is the ongoing use of Form 696.

I do want to ask why the MPS continues to use this form - and I know the Commissioner will agree with me - when the possible discriminatory use of this form, it seems to me, outweigh its sense. It is not a statutory requirement; it is a voluntary form. Local authorities, actually, have the responsibility to actually deal with this. At a time when every time you read the papers and the police talk they talk about this overload of paperwork. Why are you insisting on using this form which has great impacts?

It is unacceptable for a form to be out there used by the police that talks about genres of popular music with young black people. I do not understand which genre of popular music excludes black people or why you would want to just focus on young black people. There is the problem with that form and it must stop. A select committee, as I understand it - I have not seen the report but somebody sent me a text- also are involved in this matter. This is something I have raised some months ago and the answer to my question is unsatisfactory. There is absolutely no need for the police to be involved.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Jennette [Arnold]. Chris [Boothman], would you like to come in?



**Christopher Boothman (AM):** I do have a related question, yes. For me the jury is still out on whether or not it is unsatisfactory. It seems to me that there is an unprecedented degree of hostility and condemnation about the use of this form and it is not just a select committee, it is people throughout the music industry, promoters, event owners and premises owners. There is obviously a lot of concern about this form.

What I acknowledge is that there are lots of challenges around music events in London nowadays. There are people who go to events carrying weapons, there are people who go planning to perpetrate acts of violence on others and there are even some individuals who use entertainment events as a cover for criminal activity. One understands all those challenges and the need to take action to deal with those individuals. Indeed, the responsibility is really the responsibility primarily of the promoters and the premises owners who need to be encouraged to beef up their security and to conduct adequate risk assessments to make sure that they are prepared for these eventualities. There are assertions that are made about the use of this form, I think, which need to be tested.

As Jennette [Arnold] said, the assertion that the form is non-discriminatory I think has to be looked at very carefully because in December, I understand, they removed the question about the ethnicity of the audience but the question is still there about the genre of music. Many people in the community, as well as the music industry, believe that this form is targeted at black music and at the kinds of entertainment that black people like to go and see. There is the other issue about whether it is voluntary or not. Now, if 21 boroughs have incorporated this form into their licensing procedure and if you do not fill out the form you do not get a license, it seems to me that there is a question about whether the form is voluntary.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** A very good point, Chris [Boothman].

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** There are also privacy and proportionately issues. I do not quite understand how people who have committed no criminal act can be expected to give their personal details and for it to be held on a police database for up to six years. The last point I want to make, and this is one that a number of music periodicals have contacted me about, is the assertion that this form has contributed to an 11% reduction in crime at events. I just think these things need to be tested. What I want to know is, firstly we are told a review is being conducted, can we know who is conducting the review, can we know the terms of the review, by when it is expected to be completed and what, if any, MPA involvement there is to be in the review?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Chris [Boothman]. Before I ask Chris Allison to respond, Steve [O'Connell], you wanted to contribute to this.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** If I may, Chairman. Chris [Boothman] will know both of us were approached at the end of last week to speak about this on the Politics Show and as Chris [Boothman] is far better looking than I, I acceded the gig to

Chris [Boothman], but that did give me the opportunity to do some work around that and look at it from a local point of view. Being a true Tory I am the last person to defend paperwork and bureaucracy.

**John Biggs (AM):** You are not a true Tory, come on!

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** For the sake of balance on this discussion and put to one side the discriminatory aspect, if we can try to, asking questions on Friday the form in a voluntary borough which I am talking about was on the whole very much welcomed by licensees because they did not have the network of knowledge about the acts that they were bringing in.

They welcomed the fact that there was a voluntary no cost database whereby the police could then come back and say, "We do have some information about this act," it might be a Scandinavian right-wing Nazi heavy rock band or it could be a Hip-Hop band; who knows what it is, but that publican in south Croydon would not have access to that knowledge. Then the police would give them advice around risk assessment for the gig, voluntarily again, the kick back then of course is if the licensee does not take that offered advice and there are problems. That is when the licensing regime will kick in.

I am pleased there is a review around it but actually asking the people on the ground who are affected my premise by the end of Friday was actually this form does have some advantages to people in the trade.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** In Croydon it is voluntary in the sense that the borough does not make it a condition of the license?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** No, absolutely.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK, right.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Just to come back to it; it can do an application if the police, at that stage, think that there are circumstances around that premises that might lend itself to, but if I am a publican in the south of Croydon and I do not have it attached to my license and I am thinking, "I fancy having a jazz show or rock show - whatever - on a Sunday night," I can get the voluntary arrangement with the police to go and do some information for me which will help me risk assess the evening because that will protect my livelihood and my licence. It made some sense to me on Friday.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Kit [Malthouse]?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** It is worth remembering, I was a Westminster councillor back in the early 2000s when there was a spate of shootings in nightclubs across the West End, including a double shooting famously at the Astoria. Then the

form was brought in in 2005 and it was welcomed by the industry at that stage for exactly the reasons that Steve [O'Connell] mentioned.

Although I think having a review is probably timely and a good idea, I think we have to be very careful that we do not get ourselves into a situation where the form, having contributed to a reduction in shootings in clubs, we now think it is no longer needed and we become complacent about the situation. We dealt with a number of difficulties in a number of clubs where there were significant numbers of shootings in the early 2000s that this form was meant to address.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Jennette [Arnold] and then I am going to ask Chris [Allison] to respond.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Can I just come back to what Kit [Malthouse] has said? Let the review prove that. In other boroughs there were no reductions with this form being used and I know this because I have been pursuing this issue for about two years. I have been trying to do --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No reductions in shootings?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** In shootings where this form is being used. Thank god it worked in Westminster but I am just saying, are we in the business of doing the promoters' work? I do not think we are. Are we in the business of working with local authorities? Yes, we are. I think that there may well be a way through there. I am not saying that the police having identified a property or a premises at risk would not be doing their work; I am just saying that this form, as it stands, I believe that the damaging it is doing in terms of people, their way of life and also the impact on particular communities needs to be reviewed and it does not need to be as it is now.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Jennette [Arnold]. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Can I just add something very, very quickly? I hear the concern around it. I will actually start where I would normally finish and actually say I am very happy to bring a report back to whatever the committee the Authority wants to bring back to actually say, "What is it about? What are we reviewing here? What do you want to review? What is the further information? What is the detailed analysis beneath the statistics that we feel has seen progress?" so that you can see it and you can make a judgment on it. Let us do that openly and transparently.

Kit [Malthouse] is right. It was introduced following a spate of three shootings in New Year's Eve period 2004-05. That was the reason it was brought in, not for any other. It was brought in to deal with that. We need to remember the genesis of this thing. They did work closely with colleagues in Operation Trident and the Trident working group when the form was brought in. I am not going to try to claim it is in all boroughs but it is true to say across the Metropolitan Police Service we have seen an 11% reduction in 2008 of violent crime in licensed premises and critically we

have seen a 29% reduction in the same year of shooting incidents in and around licensed premises. You know that we have been very concerned at certain times of the year of the spate of shootings and violence, and we have concentrated a lot of activity of which this form is part and parcel.

Do I say, Chris [Boothman], that this form is responsible for the 11% reduction? No, I would not do that. I would not claim that. We do believe it has had an effect and a benefit. We do believe there has been a significant amount of support from the licensing trade that has added to it. We have reviewed the form. We have removed some of the phraseology that has caused some offence but our people who are dealing with these issues think it still makes a relevant contribution and, to my understanding, so does the licensing trade.

I am very happy to bring something back to actually do some analysis so that we can be discussing the facts. I think, as you say, instead of actually on either side of this debate throwing about just, if you will, the corporate figures, let us get beneath those figures and find out is it true, Jennette [Arnold], that it has not had any affect in critical boroughs. Let us just challenge that statement and see if it is true or not. Let us bring a report back and examine it and then let us base what we do on the evidence that we bring forward and on the debate around it. We believe at this moment in time it has added to the affect of reducing violence crime. If we believe that and we feel we have got the evidence to do it, it will be irresponsible for us to not do it.

Chris [Allison], I do not know if you want to add some detail.

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** No, I have very little to add. Really it is a simple form; there is a lot to talk about being bureaucracy. I have got it here; it is four sides to be filled out by the people who are actually running the premises. Most people in the premises find it of great use, as was mentioned earlier by Steve [O'Connell], because we have got a promoters index - a team that we put in place in 2005. The bit about it being in licensing policies; there are only 70 premises in London where it is a condition on their license. It may be in licensing policies as a consideration for local licensing committees within the local authorities to consider putting it on the license, but actually only 70 premises have got it on as a condition that they have to do it. That is because they are seen as the high-risk premises. I spoke to Richard Martin, who is the Operational Command Unit's (OCU) Commander of Clubs and Vice which run this desk; they have got about 300 premises who voluntarily actually send in these forms. They complete these forms and they send in these forms.

Jennette [Arnold], I hear the issue about the bits of the genre of music and the stuff. That is actually being looked at and it is recently being reviewed by the Trident Independent Advisory Group (IAG) again and as a result of some advice from them we have taken off those examples off the forms, but, as the Commissioner says, we are more than willing to do a review but we see this as being highly effective, it has reduced since 2005 the numbers of violent incidents inside clubs, it has allowed us

to work with licensees and licensed premises in a far better way to ensure that there is not violence, crime and disorder in these premises because we have got a greater understanding of what is going in. If we just talk about last year; I think there was something in the region of nearly 2,500 events assessed, 38 were identified as high risk but there were only 8 premises closed and they did that themselves voluntarily. This is providing some reassurance for everybody.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Did it have anything to do with young black people?

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** It will have done in some places but in other cases it will have to do with other music.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Well, we will see the review.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Jennette [Arnold]. Chris [Boothman]?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Can I just give an example of what a young black promoter said to me over the weekend? He said that for many years he had had lots of successful events where there was no trouble. He then had one event where there was a shooting and it then took him the best part of 18 months to be able to put on another event because that shooting was held against him. It seems to me that there are lots of quite tricky issues that need to be looked at in terms of assessing how this form influences decisions that are made about events.

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I fully accept that. The form will look, and will cause us to look, back at previous events and the previous history. That does not automatically mean that because something happened we will automatically say no to an event. What it says then is how will we work with the event owners, as in the people who own the premises, to put in appropriate control measures to make sure that we are satisfied this event can pass off safely because that is all we are trying to achieve - an event that passes off with the minimum of crime and disorder and certainly our primary goal is a reduction of shootings and a reduction of people being seriously injured at events.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. I am the last person to defend any piece of paperwork but that, it seems to me, makes an answerable case really for the existence of this form. I think this review can obviously look at ways of improving the way it is applied and making sure it does not have the damaging effects that some Members have raised.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, I think that is a little premature. You may feel it is a strong case but I understood there was going to be a review and we are going to see what the review draws out. This form might be producing interesting information but not fundamentally relevant.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well let us see what the review says.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I think we should.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Just to be clear there is no intention to stop using it pending the review.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Can we move on now from that subject? Caroline [Pidgeon]?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I would like to ask the Commissioner about the efficiency savings and so on that you will be making presumably over this year and future years in terms of the budget. I would have expected these to be very much based on the central operations rather than front line policing, but I was concerned to learn from the borough where I am a link member that they have been asked to lose two Superintendents, four Chief Inspectors and 15.5 Inspectors from their front line policing team this year. I found this rather astonishing given actually we need to be making sure we have got more front line officers, I would have thought, instead of less. I was wondering who has made this decision and what the plans are to review it because I think it is of huge concern. I have had it picked up from other boroughs as well.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Caroline [Pidgeon], any reductions that have been made this year will have been a result of decisions made last year in respect to budgeting. Then those decisions - and we have gone through a whole scrutiny process with the Authority - as to where we are making the budget cuts and efficiency savings and where we were not. I can say in my entire time in the Metropolitan Police Service the balance of savings has been always out of back office as opposed to front office, but everybody has to make efficiency savings.

I do not know about the detail of the one you are talking about but if we are talking in year this year that has been the subject of scrutiny and budget discussions through this Authority. I can go back and find the detail of that but it has been through this Authority. If we are talking about budget savings for next year and ongoing discussions there have been no decisions yet as to where that will fall. In fact, I chaired a management board yesterday that is still looking at the principles of looking at where are the big-ticket issues through what we are calling the SIT programme to actually say we need to concentrate our attentions so that when we do come and talk to the Authority and go through that scrutiny process we can actually talk about exactly what you are talking about and making sure that if we have to make savings, which we will have to do - and we should do even if the economic climate was not looking very difficult, but it is looking difficult - ensuring that it has least damaging effect to our operational capability. I am absolutely committed to that being the principle driver.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Well, it may well be these are for the next financial year rather than this year.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Well, no decisions have been made.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Boroughs such as Lambeth have been asked to look at how they could lose this number of senior officers and I think that is of real concern. I would like absolute assurance that you are going to be looking at the back office and all that function rather than front line police officers.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Well, I think I have given you that assurance, Caroline [Pidgeon], but I would turn round and say these are questions being asked of senior managers. I will continue to ask questions of all senior managers and how they can make proper savings, but my commitment is, and it will come back transparently through this Authority, we will look to make all savings and minimising any reduction in our operational capability. In fact, quite the opposite, (inaudible) policing presence, I want to increase our operational capability particularly our street capability.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK, thank you. More questions on budgets and efficiencies of policing? Dee [Doocey] and then John [Biggs] and Joanne [McCartney].

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, my understanding was similar to Caroline's [Pidgeon] that boroughs are being asked to reduce the number of police officers next year. I understand the targets they have been given as 5% and 10%. Now, I absolutely agree with you, Sir Paul [Stephenson], that there is always room for reduction but we ought to do it by zero budgeting. We should not be saying to borough commanders, "You have got to lose X number of staff," that is not the way to do it.

I am concerned that perhaps the way this has been communicated has not been the way that you would perhaps want it to be because if you are saying Territorial Policing (TP) has got a budget, for example, that if they lost 5% we would save £68 million I have no problem with the principle of saving £68 million from any budget but that is at large, but it should not be on the basis of front line policing. When you consider that there is a budget within the budget of nearly £700 million of what I would describe as non-front line and non-specialist policing, if £68 million needs to be found it should be found from there. I do think you need to perhaps just check the stories and instructions that are being given to borough commanders and make sure that they are in line with what you have just said to Caroline [Pidgeon], which I do not think we would query, that anyone needs to make reductions in large budgets and we should always be looking for efficiency savings.

Can I ask you specifically on your report on page 90 under Section 34 'Our People'? You talk about the number of police officers increasing to 32,766 but that is actually 517 less than in the police plan. You also talk about the number of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) increasing to 4,627, but that is actually 89 less than in the police plan and I wondered why we are running at such a low level. Why is it much less than the police plan that we all voted for specifically when we

were told that the police numbers were increasing? You will remember I raised this myself.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** On your second question I am happy to bring a note back to explain it and if it is not satisfactory then we will have another discussion about it. I am happy to circulate a note.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Fine. I have got two other very brief questions --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Can I answer your first point before your next point?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I entirely agree, and I am giving an absolute commitment, that I believe that any cuts we make or any efficiency savings we make, or indeed any increases we can make, should always favour our operational capability and front line capability as long as we do not cut our infrastructure to an extent that we make cuts this year that we have to put back next year because a lot of organisations have experienced that kind of stupidity.

I still think it is hugely important that every senior officer in this organisation gets a message that their job is to minimise cost, their job is to deliver with the lowest unit cost of delivery and, if you look at the history of the Metropolitan Police Service and turn back four years, that was not a culture that is in this organisation. We must continue to ask those questions but no decisions have been taken, it will be transparent here and you have my commitment I will be looking to minimise front line and maximise non-front line within the context that I have just said - I do not want to cut things I am going to put back next year. You have got my commitment on that, actually, and the evidence of the last four years when I have been running the budget process.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I welcome that, Sir Paul [Stephenson], but that is not what your borough commanders have been asked to do and I do think that you need to get on top of this and make sure that this --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I can tell you what they have been asked to do. They might have interpreted it differently and I will look at that, but I know what they have been asked to do.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Well then there is a problem.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Can I bring in Steve O'Connell?



**Steve O'Connell (AM):** I will come in briefly on that. As a proud part of three link members having conversations with three borough commanders, those leaders have quite rightly been asked to consider savings between 5% and 10%. They have not been steered to cut this Superintendent and that Constable, and that is absolute nonsense. We have asked them to go away and do a very legitimate piece of work around their budget in the whole new environment of accountability and budget making. It is for them to make those budgetary savings, but obviously we will be looking at them as back office savings. The borough commanders find that uncomfortable but it is part of their position and their authority and their job to do so. There is no causal link between a Superintendent lost somewhere in Southwark, or wherever it is, to that steer that has just gone out recently.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Steve [O'Connell]. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I have got two very, very brief questions. The first one I am sure Sir Paul [Stephenson] will just nod.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Be careful now!

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Can you please publish on the MPS website the guidance which was issued to officers about enforcing Section 58 of the Terrorism Act? It is just that I think it ought to be available to the public.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I cannot think of any security considerations, Dee [Doocey], but if there are then subject to that I will let anybody know what the guidance is.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Right, and the second thing was, and you might want to come back on this one, following the Court of Appeal judgment last week versus the Commissioner, what changes are you making to the guidance for the retention of photographs of suspects? I was highly involved in this because somebody in my local area was involved in overt filming and as a result of that there were various changes made. I just think that this needs to be changed again as a result of the court case.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** On this one I can say we have got the judgment and of course the judgment has said and endorsed the taking of photographs for public order events but it has made comment on the retention of photographs where there is not a suspicion of criminal activity. We have taken account of that and we are reviewing our processes accordingly. Chris [Allison], I do not know if there is anything you want to add on that?

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, that is exactly it. In relation to the specific individual, Dee [Doocey], the direction of the court has already been undertaken in relation to that individual and we are now reviewing not only everything else that we have got but how we do it in the future. I

think the key thing here is it was accepted by the court that it is a valid an appropriate tactic. What they said is subsequently when you have discovered the fact that somebody has not committed an offence that you suspect them of, then we should be getting rid of it and we are going to do just that.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, I have read the judgment. It was the knock on effect on other things that really needs to be addressed.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Thank you, Dee [Doocey]. John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** I am happy to give a small prize to anyone who can understand the Section 58 guidance without reading it at least three times beforehand. My question is about resources and it is that it is a matter, I think, of public record that the Mayor's budget tells us we will have more or less exactly the same number of police officers in three years' time as we have now. I think a handful more than we have in terms of headcounts. I have a reply from Anne McMeel [Director of Resources, MPS] which tells us there are now 1,053 uniformed officers funded either by the boroughs or Transport for London (TfL).

The question in my mind is about opportunity costs and there are a number of angles to this, and I do not want to delay us unduly today, but it is something I would be interested in pursuing over the coming year. One opportunity cost question is obviously if those people are tied down to a particular post in boroughs or on commands then it reduces the pool from which people can be abstracted for other purposes.

The second is, although we should not look gift horses in mouths, there are clearly challenging questions about the way in which we are bettering our resources more generally by deploying an increasing number where now I think over 3% of our officers are funded by resources from other places. Indeed, we are now finding the boroughs are demanding a place at the table here to command those resources because they are now paying for 3% of our officers. It is an unintended consequences question. I think it is something that we should spend a bit of time over the next year discussing but I would welcome your initial comments on it, Sir Paul [Stephenson].

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Chairman, I actually think it is a real issue and has been a real issue for us for some time. As you seek to increase your income base what conditions you apply to the income base that actual reduce your overall effective use of that particularly when you are in a dynamic environment and we have just been discussing the Tamil protest. To my knowledge every time we do this, every time we enter into as new agreement, we always caveat it. We always caveat it with subject to whatever - it is right that people are paying extra and additional and it is extra and additional to what they are going to get that where they are doing the extra and additional it is right that they get the service they are thinking they are paying for - the exigencies of the duty and the

right of the Commissioner to redeploy and I think exigencies, emergencies, whatever.

It is a real issue of how much of our budget we allow some ring-fenced use and it is always a concern. As Commissioner I would always prefer to have no ring-fencing but actually a lot of our funding streams come with ring-fencing, for instance, PCSOs. The funding from Government is ring-fenced to PCSOs, so, therefore, we would naturally chase the money - and I am not making comments about PCSOs now - even if we did not want to increase the PCSO base and we want to use the money more wisely anywhere else. I am always constrained by ring-fencing, so it is a relevant debate and a proper debate to have to say how much of our budget should we reduce the discretion around but I always retain the right as Commissioner for exigencies and emergencies.

**John Biggs (AM):** Very briefly; I think there is a follow up which is about value for money and operational efficiency which we need to look at in parallel. For example, it is a headline that we want to have more police at transport interchanges but we do need to rigorously scrutinise that and see whether they are actually delivering - although they may be making people feel a bit more secure - serious reductions in criminality or detecting crimes or whatever. Thank you, Chairman.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** A very, very reasonable point, but I think all of the evidence we have seen so far is actually they are having a very significant effect at transport interchanges and on public transport. I do think actually it is something that Londoners want to see and I congratulate the Commissioner and TfL on what they have jointly been doing. Kit [Malthouse], do you want to say anything on that?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** No, really, other than we obviously in an increasingly difficult financial environment what we are doing, and Steve [O'Connell] is quite right, is just asking the what if questions generally across the budget process. No decisions, as the Commissioner has said, have been made but we just want to prepare the ground for two things that I have said months ago. One, that we are going to have a difficult financial environment, but two, we do need - the lesson of the last five or six years financially - resilience building into our reserves and balance sheet because when significant events do happen like the Tamils or, pray god it never happens again, a terrorist attack we do not get that much financial assistance from elsewhere and we have to deal with that ourselves. So, building some wriggle room into the budget is pretty key.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. A new subject? Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Well, I wanted to ask about residential burglary. Congratulations on keeping it under control, but I am sure you are aware that across London the picture is different in each borough. I have two questions really. One is, by focusing on burglary are you also telling boroughs not to stop their, for example, long-term drug work because obviously there is a causal effect with that. I think the danger with saying, "We're, this year, going to focus on residential burglary," is that

we forget and borough officers do not deal with those problems which do contribute to the long-term effects of burglary.

My second question, it is something I raised before, is about how we disseminate best practice. I will give you an example. In one of my boroughs there has been funding, I believe from Government, for the police and the local authority to work together. They have gone round, surveyed a number of streets, given advice through the doors and knocked on doors to tell people to keep valuables out of sight, give them practical work with locks and whatever and burglary has dramatically reduced in those six streets that that work has been done in. I am just wondering are we able to put money into those sorts of schemes as well.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Dealing with the “by concentrating on burglary do we not concentrate on drugs”, it is a constant problem; the more priorities you have the less you have priorities. We all know that in all our lives. I have said that the key issue is safety and the key issue in that is violence. I have always included - I do not think it is artificial - burglary in that bracket because it is a violent offence. It violates people’s sense of security in a way that I think in recent years because of the very proper concentration on terrorism, proper concentration on street robbery and all the other issues, I just got the feeling that maybe we are forgetting what a hideous offence burglary is, that that is the one place that people have the right to feel secure and if it is violated it leads to terrible consequences. I am not redirecting it other than I am saying where we are not making the progress we should make then we should put extra corporate asset into it.

What we have been actually doing over the six months of the last financial year is using corporate tasking to actually redirect some of our corporate asset to assist boroughs around there. I am not saying they can stop doing everything else, but I am just trying to remind people and then putting some pressure at the highest level in the organisation to say, “Just remember somebody whose house gets burgled is such a hideous offence,” and I wonder have we kind of forgotten this. We have almost become immune from it because it is so hideous. I am not redirecting it but I am still saying it is about violence and particularly it is about youth violence, but I am concerned about the pressure that is going to come on burglaries. If we do not respond to that then however well we might be performing well elsewhere if people cannot go home and feel safe that will not increase confidence and confidence is the overall thing we are trying to achieve here.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I think there was another question. Sorry, I forgot.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The point about funding different schemes that may reduce burglary.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** The scheme you are describing is actually nationally recognised best practice and we do do it. It is the case that we know of research - and I will not give the precise number of weeks because I will just get it wrong - that if a house is burgled the likelihood of that house being burgled, I think, over the following six weeks is infinitely higher and burglars work out when insurance policies pay out and people replace the goods and then they go back and burgle them again. Also, for neighbouring premises their risk is higher for a period of time, so it is the case - I am trying to think of the scheme now.

**Chris Allison (Temporary Assistant Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Repeat Victimisation.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, MPS):** The Repeat Victimisation Scheme; that we actually do target assets, leaflets through the door, etc, when there is a spate of burglaries to make sure that neighbours do know about it. It is interesting only this week I was speaking to actually a journalist who was actually saying to me he was fed up of leaflets being put through his door because it is making him feel unsafe. There is a downside to this but I did explain to him that this was the scheme that actually said, "Well, probably one of your neighbours have been burgled and your risk is great at this moment in time." That is one of the lessons we have learnt almost nationally and I know even before I came to the Metropolitan Police Service we were actually putting that into effect.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. I notice several Members of the MPA already on their BlackBerries. I am not accusing Members of allowing their attention to wander but I do think that we perhaps could try to move on quite quickly through the rest of the discussion of the Commissioner's report. We had a very, very full discussion; lots of interesting issues raised and we have got only a very short time. Does anybody want to ask any more questions about the Commissioner's report? Dick [Tracey], then Jenny [Jones] and then I propose, if you do not mind, to move on through the rest of the agenda.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Could I raise paragraph 30 which is about the review of the Section 44 powers under the Counterterrorism Act? We did talk at the last meeting of the MPA about these people who were being stopped for all sorts of curious reasons, not least perhaps pointing a camera in the wrong direction which may or may not have been justified. I wanted to get some more detail out of the Commissioner and Chris Allison there about the pilot in four boroughs: Southwark, Brent, Newham and Tower Hamlets. I wonder why they were particularly selected and perhaps why Westminster has not been selected as one of the areas where surely there is a greatest collection of people going through and maybe doing things which could come under this Act.

Also we were, I think, promised at the last meeting the numbers that had been stopped under this particular section. I do not know whether that information has

actually been supplied anywhere else in this great volume of paper we get, but could you answer those questions please.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I will happily produce less volumes of paper should you so wish, Dick [Tracey], but I think a report went to Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) on the numbers. I think that is the case. Somewhere within your volumes I am guessing you have it. Regarding why Westminster was not included in the pilot; well, actually, if you look at what we are going towards on the pilot which is actually reducing the use of this by concentrating on two broad areas.

One, actually concentrating on iconic sites and, two, it is actually setting the authority on specific occasions for use of this power at a senior officer level rather than a blanket approach. If you look at Westminster it has so many iconic sites it actually will not, in my opinion, necessarily reduce the right of particular places where we need to research. So I am guessing we have actually chosen other boroughs that do not have quite that number of iconic sites, but happily I will check on that and let you know.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. I did give the Commissioner some notice of some questions that I would like answered and it comes under the umbrella of your Violence Against Women Strategy. In that Strategy there is a note about supporting the boroughs and wanting to control proliferation of lap-dancing clubs in their areas. Now, that suggests there is a problem with the proliferation, but a Metropolitan Police Service police officer said to a parliamentary committee that, "Lap-dance clubs have no connection to crime and disorder or prostitution." Now, that seems a bit odd. Is that a Metropolitan Police Service wide view? I have got four questions. I will just say them all, shall I?

I want to know is the Metropolitan Police Service currently doing anything to actually investigate the link between lap-dancing clubs and prostitution, and if not, will you now. Lastly, the Mayor's strategy also talks about,

*"Working with the Metropolitan Police Service police to get tough on trafficking and the sexual exploitation of women ahead of 2012."*

Now, I am not quite sure why 2012 is such an interesting date but it does strike me that this is going to need some restructuring or some re-diverting of resources. What is the Metropolitan Police Service going to do to actually get tough on trafficking and sexual exploitation of women? Those are the four questions.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Right, I have got a quote in front of me of what was said, Jenny [Jones], and my understanding of what was said, and it is a report,

*“There is no evidence that they - that is lap-dancing clubs - cause any crime and disorder. They tend to be fairly well run and they tend to have a fairly high staff ration to customers. The people who tend to go there tend to be a bit older so they do not drink so excessively and cause the crime and disorder problems outside.”*

That is the quote I have. I think what officers have to do when they are asked questions is openly answer the questions on the basis of the evidence that they have and not necessarily on their personal views or wider views as to irrespective views on lap-dancing clubs. It is the case the irrespective of any views on lap-dancing at this moment in time we do not have intelligence, apart from certain specific cases where we do take action, that lap-dancing clubs per se either are the cause of crime and disorder, I think for the reasons just outlined, or indeed that they are necessarily linked with the organised crime and prostitution. There will be examples where they are and we use the intelligence to concentrate on those examples. I think he was trying to answer the question honestly on the basis of what we believe is the case as opposed to what other views there might be about lap-dancing clubs.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** So you are investigating the links between lap-dancing clubs and prostitution?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Where there is intelligence we do investigate, as you would expect us to do.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, what I am trying to say is have you done any in the last year, say, or in the last six months? I actually want to know if there are any ongoing investigations, and if not, why not, because if you look up on the internet you will find very, very clear links and it seems to me that this is something that could easily be done by the police and ought to be.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Well, I would say, Jenny [Jones], it is based on our intelligence we have got to be careful of making the assumption lap-dancing/organised crime/prostitution. We think we have got to be careful about that, however, where there is a connection we do mount operations. As to what operations we have mounted in the last six months; the operations we would likely mount around that would be long-term operations and perhaps not something I would share here. I do not have that information but happy to have a discussion outside of here with the people that do, Jenny [Jones].

**Jenny Jones (AM):** What about my question about what resources you are going to direct towards this part of the Mayor’s Strategy of Violence Against Women?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** I think we were discussing previously the idea that we were going to remove the human trafficking unit because of lack of Home Office funding. It is something that the Home Affairs Select Committee raised with me. As you know, we have taken the decision not to remove that funding and to actually keep the human trafficking work there despite the fact that we do not have the funding from Government and a review has been ongoing. We are addressing the resources that you saw in the budget last year to this particular area.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Kit [Malthouse]?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Can I just say on the 2012 date? Well, the lesson of previous sporting events, particularly the Athens Olympics, is that there is huge rise in trafficking.

#### **117. THE MPA MEMBER ROLE**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Good, thank you. That was a very full discussion on the Commissioner's report. Now, can I ask that we move to Item 7 which is to do with the MPA's Member Role. I think there has been a discussion of this and some conclusions reached at the away day. Catherine [Crawford], do you want to introduce the report?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** It does reflect quite extensively the discussion, Chairman, that Members have been involved in developing the proposals. The objective is that we should now move forward on some of the development side of what is proposed.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Good. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I have got two issues on this. First of all I do not agree with the third recommendation that the Chief Executive be authorised to make any minor changes in consultation with the Authority's Deputy Chairman. I think if we are agreeing this and it affects us all it needs to be all of us who make that decision.

Secondly, I raised on the away day that there was nothing in here about assessing the Chairman's and Deputy Chairman's performance, support, training and skills analysis and so on they would need over the year. I was assured that would be in the next version and I do not see it anywhere here. Could we clarify how the Chairman and Deputy Chairman will be assessed about what support they need each year?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Any other questions people want to raise on this? Clive [Lawton], Dee [Doocey], John [Biggs] and then Kirsten [Hearn]. Clive [Lawton]?



**Clive Lawton (AM):** On page 98 2.1(A)(3) it says,

*“Ensuring that the MPS is answerable to Londoners at a local and pan-London level and that there is an opportunity for local people to influence local policing priorities.”*

The singular of “an opportunity” smacks to me of a lack of community engagement on a more regular basis. I wonder if that can just be amended to “opportunities” otherwise it feels a bit tokenistic.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** All right. Thank you, Clive [Lawton]. Dee [Doocey] and then Kirsten [Hearn].

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, paragraph 3.4 on page 101, the last and penultimate lines,

*“[...] could be made available to the Party Group Leaders and the Mayor to aid decisions on appointments to the MPA.”*

It is not actually the group leaders who decide on who should be put forward to the Mayor for the MPA it is the groups themselves, so I do not think that is appropriate. I do not think this takes into account the reality which is that the Mayor actually formally makes the appointments but it is done on proportionality and it is done by whoever the groups want to appoint rather than somebody deciding that they are appropriate or not. I would hate us to lose track of that, so could that be amended please?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure we can take account of that. Can I just interject to say I think Sir Paul [Stephenson] and Chris [Allison], your duties are now over here, aren't they?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** I think the Commissioner might be interested in the discussion that is happening on the Civil Liberties Panel, I would suggest.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** All right, I did not want them to sit through this. Any other points on this? Kirsten [Hearn]?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Just a couple of things. Have you had an opportunity yet to do an equality impact assessment on this because it always seems like it would be helpful? A second point: you might want to think a little bit about what other support Members might need, for example disabled members such as myself. There was a thirds point which I have completely forgotten. Oh dear, never mind.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK, those are points well made and well taken. John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** Two points. First is I think however inconvenient in a busy day it might be the Chairman should be available to meet with individual Members of the Authority and discuss their concerns and their priorities. I think that should be part of the duty of a Chairman and that is a serious point. I think it is an obligation that should sit on you as Chairman.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, I hope I am always available to you, John [Biggs], anytime and indeed any other Members of the Authority.

**John Biggs (AM):** Well, it does seem to have a party preference to it, but nevertheless I just thought --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think you are coming in this afternoon.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** We are holding open lunches for everybody to come to.

**John Biggs (AM):** The second point though is I do not think we have any problem with this as far as it goes but it is very managerial and in no way should it be taken as diminishing the duty of members as individuals to act in whatever way they think is reasonable and proper in the execution of their duties and their holding to account of the Metropolitan Police Service in London. I think there is a risk with these things that you get very clever and you managerialise it. I try not to be an overly awkward fellow but my duty is to be awkward from time to time, Chairman.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No, you are totally right. Kirsten [Hearn], your last point.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** I remembered. Yes, it was about what will be the sanctions on perceived poor performance because a performance regime as this year's indicates that there are two sides to the story.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes. Well, that is a very good point. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I want to agree with John [Biggs] for a change. I think this is a fairly challenging list of things to do, particularly for people from smaller groups who do not have the same advantage of a lot of resources here at City Hall, and certainly I do not think we could use more resources from the MPA, but perhaps I am wrong. I would like some more support if that is a possibility if I am going to fulfil this role. I think also individuals are always going to do things differently and to try to fit us all into the same box is actually a bit unrealistic. I would also like to say I think is not actually the document that we expected to see today because it does not include the stuff that Caroline [Pidgeon] mentioned and so I think it has got to come back to us and it has got to have those changes in it.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Any other points on this? Victoria [Borwick]?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Are we moving onto the link member role or is that separate?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Bring it up.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Fine. I know that some of us have raised concerns before about this point 2 which is page 103,

*“Act as the nominated police MPA signatory to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) plans and submissions.”*

I know some of us have expressed concerns that the timetabling or however the decision is arrived at it is perhaps inappropriate for us to be a sign off if we do not have enough knowledge and I have talked about this before and we have talked about this at various sub-committees. Possibly it would be better for us not to be involved if we are signing off something that we do not know sufficient about. I do not think at the moment we are adding anything because of the timetabling and the way the budgets work and everything else there is a scrutiny process that this goes through whether one likes it or not and back to the comment you made earlier, Chairman, about not wishing to make more paperwork, sometimes signing these things off I just think we possibly should look at that paragraph again.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Thank you. Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, can we just have more thoughts on what Victoria [Borwick] has raised because we are signing off as one of the ten statutory members of the CDRP plan. I sit on three, Victoria [Borwick] so if I can manage to be on top of it then --

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** No, it was not that we would not be on top of it. What I meant was I think that sometimes the information that we have is not perhaps as full as it might be.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, but we also have the support of officers. If we are not going to want to sign off these then really what are we saying about our role on these bodies as a statutory member? I just think we need to actually take that away. If more work needs to be done then that is fine, but I would imagine partners sitting round would have a problem with that.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** If I may help on this?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Hang on, Jennette [Arnold]. Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I think that there was discomfort around this which was particular to last year. Several of us were newcomers to the Authority and within a fairly short space of time found ourselves having to take responsibility for a borough about which we could know very little and, therefore, I would have shared

Victoria's [Borwick] view a couple of months ago. I think in the normal run of things it ought to be proper, as Jennette [Arnold] says, that we should know what is happening here and it seems proper that the MPA Members should be able to sign this thing off. I think it may just need to be recognised that periodically and with the new Members there needs to be a particular support structure in a given borough, but taken overall it seems to me to be the right procedure.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Well that is a point well made. Any other questions or comments on the role of Members? Yes, Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Just a general comment, Chairman, but I think this is just a little bit too prescriptive. I do not have a problem with the individual elements of it.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK, too managerial said John [Biggs].

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I think it should be a set of guidelines for us to work within because I suspect that the sort of input that people in inner London boroughs with major crime problems have and the sort of input with outer London boroughs are slightly different. I think you would need to spend your time in different ways. I think it should be guidelines rather than, "Thou shalt do this, that and the other."

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Well I think it is clear that this report does not carry unqualified support around the MPA in spite of it being strongly desired by Members of the MPA. I think it would be fair to say that the Members, and Joanne [McCartney] in particular, actively wanted some definition of the role to be brought forward. Clearly it is now felt that in some ways it is too prescriptive and too managerial - whatever adjective. That is the suggestion I am hearing from some quarters. Might I suggest, Catherine [Crawford], that we remit it to you for revision and to be brought back for further discussion at a later date?

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

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I say just, Chairman, I have expressed concern about the role of link members because I think we all do it differently and there is no great guidance as to what we should necessarily be doing which is a particular problem for link members, especially new members. I did not make comment on the performance framework that seems to have developed around this at all, which I think again is very prescriptive and should be guidance only.

#### **118. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you so much. OK, well I think all those points are very well made. Can I, therefore, propose that we get onto Item 8A and approve the appointment of John Biggs to the Corporate Governance Committee?

**Authority Members:** Agreed.

## **119. MPA COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It is accepted. Item 8B, this follows consultation on the MPA Committee Structure. Members, can I move that we agree?

**Authority Members:** Agreed.

## **120. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much. Can I have reports from the committees? Catherine [Crawford], I would ask you to present those reports.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Members have had an opportunity to read the reports, Chairman. I think that the usual practice is just to invite any questions for the chairs of the various committees who are here today.

## **121. CIVIL LIBERTIES PANEL**

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Any questions from Members of those chairs? There being no questions I am going to move immediately to Item 10, the Civil Liberties Panel. I am grateful that the Commissioner and Chris [Allison] have stayed to hear this. I do think this is an important development. This is the first body, I think, in the country to have instituted such a Civil Liberties Panel. In the course of our discussions today it is clear that this is a sub-division of our labours that will be a great use to us and to London in considering some of the questions that are before us. We have had a long discussion already about the issues around Parliament Square; that seemed to me one of the things that could be with advantage discussed by such a panel. Catherine [Crawford], do you want to introduce the report or shall we go straight into the discussion?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Again, Chairman, this has been not with a great deal of time to consider it because we are anxious to move quickly but we have circulated this. I know some Members have some views about some aspects of the terms of reference. We have been able to incorporate some helpful comments but I am happy to go to questions.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Questions, suggestions or comments from Members? Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I just make a few comments if I may? I think it is going to be helpful if we can just separate out the general terms of reference of the Committee itself from the individual themes of work, because I do know, for example, that the public order is talked about in paragraph four as well as on its own.

Can I also make two further points? One is only in the Firearms and Taser Scrutiny is there a terms of reference that this panel will make recommendations. In the

general terms the committee is not empowered to make recommendations; in the public order terms of reference we are only to monitor recommendations from the HMIC report and there are no recommendations that we can make on equality objectives either. I would like to see every portion of this paper to be that we can make recommendations.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** You want recommendations about absolutely everything?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Well, I think the terms of reference as a committee as a whole has to be to make recommendations.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** No, hold on. That was not how it was envisaged that it would work. The panel reports would come to full Authority and Authority would then make recommendations. That is the way it works.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The panel has to make recommendations to the full Authority. I raise that because under the Firearms and Taser there is a terms of reference that the panel will “make recommendations to the full authority”.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Well, you can make recommendations to the full Authority.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK, it seems to me wholly commonsensical that if we are going to have a Civil Liberties Panel it is going to be able to make recommendations on a wide range of themes to the whole Authority.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I say that this goes back to Mr May’s point earlier as to what influence this panel will have. I think that is the influence. The second thing I want to ask is for the first bullet point it says,

*“Develop a shared understanding of civil liberties and human rights and the consequences this has for policing. This will include developing a clear understanding the legislation in this area.”*

I am wondering who is that sharing with. Is that with the MPS? Because there may be times when the panel and the MPS has a different view and a shared understanding is not going to be practical and we may have to make recommendations and it is for the Metropolitan Police Service to decide whether they take them on board or not. I just want some clarity over that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** My understanding is that this would be an understanding shared across the Authority.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I do not think it is quite so --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure we can clarify the wording there, Joanne [McCartney], to satisfy you. Kirsten [Hearn]?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Will these meetings be in public or is this a private panel because I would like to see that enshrined as being in public and that the community are invited to watch.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I have no objection to having them in public.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** It just does not say.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I think that would also go towards some of the points that were made earlier on about the transparency or otherwise of our deliberations on the public order issues.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** I think it is intended that the normal rules would operate, which is that effectively it is for the panel to decide. There may be issues that you would want to consider around some covert activities that are appropriate to be done in public and that is for the panel to decide at the time.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** In general the presumption should be that meetings would be held in public.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Absolutely right, yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Well, that is the presumption with all meetings in the Authority.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Absolutely right. That is our way. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, I have just one question. I understand that we can make recommendations and that anyone can come and listen, I think that is fine. I also have no problem about perhaps there might be one witness we might want to see in private, I cannot imagine, but we must allow that. What I am not clear about is let us say that the panel made a recommendation just for instance to the MPA that as of now the practice of kettling should cease - I am just picking it out of the air - let us say that the MPA endorse that recommendation. Does the MPS have to accept that and instantly put it into practice or is this just having a panel and spending a lot of our time for the sake of it and does the MPS have the right to say, "Go away we're not interested"?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, Dee [Doocey], as you know - it is a very good question and a lot of people are very interested in that whole area - the MPS has operational independence and must have operational independence. Clearly it would be a matter of interest and consequence if the MPA were to issue such a recommendation but the MPS has operational independence.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** So we could spend any amount of time going through asking expert witnesses, we could spend huge amounts of time determining what we thought was right or what we ought to recommend, the full Authority have that and then they might say no?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** That is what we do all day every day.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well, they might do.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** A recommendation is not an instruction; that is clear.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** No, I am not suggesting it is. I just wanted to know what the bottom line was.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It would be quite wrong for us to start to second guess the MPS in matters of operational discretion.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I just wanted to be clear of what the situation was.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Your point is well made. Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes, just to follow on from Dee [Doocey]. Of course operational independence is absolutely correct and the Metropolitan Police Service has independence in respect of individual operations. However, it is for the Metropolitan Police Authority to set the strategy and the Metropolitan Police Authority does have responsibility for the budget and does have a number of levers, so I suspect that it would not just be a question of the MPS saying, "No, we don't want to do it and we're not doing it." You would get into quite an interesting constitutional dialogue which would be resolved in a number of ways. My concern about this - it is not a concern actual, I think it is very welcome - is I suspect it is going to lead to a substantial amount of work in a number of areas and I hope that this is not going to lead to duplication with the work of other committees and we will have to work very hard to avoid that, but I would be interested to hear from the Commissioner since we have obliged him to stay --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No, he very kindly volunteered to stay.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Well, it is one of these cases where we set the strategy, we have the budget we make senior appointments and so on. What arrangements are the Metropolitan Police Service going to put in place to ensure that there is an adequate flow of material information and reports to this new panel, because I suspect what we do not want to see is this is seen as a second-ranking panel and it does not really matter whether it gets proper reports. It is going to be very important that we get the proper information and the proper arguments before us as to why the police are following a particular operational process as to what the arguments are both for and against that we can consider those properly, or the members of the panel can consider them properly.



**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Toby [Harris]. Sir Paul [Stephenson], do you want to come back on that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** It is a fairly vague question, Toby [Harris], seeing as though we have not seen what this committee yet want to ask me how I am going to respond to it.

**Toby Harris (AM):** I expect they are going to want a lot.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis):** Yes, but I would treat it with the same courtesy that we do the Authority and actually we do try to bring answers. They are not always answers that you like or they are not always the full answer and we have to go back and do more, but we have always treated this Authority with courtesy and we have always tried to give the due attention and we will do with this committee.

I expect it is an important committee and, if I can go back to your former point, it has been the case since I have been in the Metropolitan Police Service that we have always recognised, if you will, the subtleties of that relationship between operational independence and the Authority's responsibilities, we have always recognised the various levers and I think it has been the case, despite the fact that there will be disagreements, we have always worked very hard not to go down via the operational independent route as we have done on the Tasers, and I have done that personally on the Tasers, to actually say, "We should take note and we should try to work and ensure we have the support of this Authority wherever that is possible," but remembering our separate legal responsibilities and I have made that commitment.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. I am going to take Jenny [Jones] then Jennette [Arnold] and then I am going to propose that we bring proceedings to a close. Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I have got two problems with the paper but first you have been using the word committee; it is not actually a committee it is a panel, so the whole status of this is a little bit dubious actually and just how much support it can get. We have already been given this huge job to take the oversight of all of the reports into G20 and that is a massive piece of work if we are going to do it properly. So the status of this panel I think needs to be explained. I do not know if Kit [Malthouse] can do that to us so that we can understand the thinking behind this.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** What, so the difference between a panel and a committee is what is worrying you?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** The two things I am worried about are it says in the terms of reference that things should be decided “on a priority basis as directed by the MPA,” that is quite a strong word and I wondered if we could use the word ‘agreed’ rather than ‘directed’ because I am sure that this body is going to come up with its own ideas about what it wants to do and it is incredibly important because so many things could fall into this panel - the civil liberties issues of stop and search could fall into this panel as well.

The second problem I have got is I think six members is far too small for the amount of work that this panel is going to do and so I am very concerned that we change this word ‘directed’ and increase the size of the panel.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Right, thank you, Jenny [Jones]. Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman. Jenny [Jones], thank you for raising the issue about stop and search because I would have thought that that was part and parcel of the public order bit, I think, and I do not know how that will fit into this. The questions that I started with earlier I can withdraw because I did not think that this was a standing panel that would last forever, so that is why I was asking about how it would be reporting back to the Authority. Now we are saying it is a standing panel like all the other committees.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that would be by far the most sensible myself.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** What is that?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That it should have a standing composition and it should be there to be referred to in matters of civil liberties.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, I am easy, I just need clarity. Also can it be clear then that this panel will be reporting directly to this Authority because that is what Kit [Malthouse] has said.

f

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes, I think that is clear.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** So all the reports will then be flowing to this Authority for this Authority then to have a debate about any recommendations.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes. The panel’s job is to consider issues for the Authority and then for the Authority obviously to take a view on what the panel has found. John [Biggs]?

**John Biggs (AM):** Do you have a timeline in mind?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, because it is standing panel.

**John Biggs (AM):** I think in terms of the primary purpose which is to look at the events of G20 and how they were managed. Do you have in your mind a timeline on which this will report?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** The panel should decide.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I see no reason why that should not be one of the first things that the panel decides. Just to get back to Jenny's [Jones] point in conclusion which was really because she thinks that six members is too few. I do not know whether, Kit [Malthouse], whether you want to comment on that but it is my feeling actually that it would be quite good to have a streamlined and committed panel and not to abstract - to get back to a metaphor in previous deliberations - too much resources from other committees.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** That is the issue. I think if the committee becomes too big people will have a tendency to do that and remove themselves from a lot of the other work that the Authority needs to do.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is not a committee.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Or whatever, panel/committee. I am slightly losing the will to live here because there is only so much process I can take!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, my experience is that committees do not necessarily increase their efficiency or effectiveness by virtue of their size so I am a bit puzzled by this suggestion that if there were eight members it would be very much more effective than if there were six.

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Eight, six, ten; we could all be on it!

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Perhaps I can answer that. The thing is that as the issues come up we might not all care about them as much and we might choose not to sit on the panel for that particular --

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Well, can I make a suggestion? What we are saying is we will agree the terms of reference with the amendments that have been proposed and then we are going to agree the membership at the next meeting. What we will do is in between invite expressions of interest. If 23 people say they want to be on it then we can agree what the number is at the next meeting.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that sounds like a very good way forward. Dee [Doocey] and then Joanne [McCartney], can we be as quick as possible?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Sorry, Chairman. I really want to disagree with Jenny [Jones]. I do not think that if Members stand for a panel or a committee then they can just

pick and choose which elements they want to go to. I think you either go on it or you do not.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I agree with you, Dee [Doocey]. I also disagree with the assertion that people might care in differing degrees about various civil liberties issues.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** You are either on it or you are not on it. You cannot just pick and choose what you go to.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I am concerned about the timeline now because you have that the membership is coming back for the next meeting. Could you just remind me of the date of the next meeting, Catherine [Crawford]?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** Twenty-fifth June.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** We have the HMIC report coming out about the same time and this panel needs to be up and running and have had its first meeting before that, it seems to me, to go through the terms of reference. I think we need to do it sooner than that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Absolutely right. Thank you very much Members of the MPA. I think we have successfully --

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Is that a commitment that we are going to sort out the membership in the next, perhaps, seven to ten days?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** We will attempt the Kissinger-like [Henry Kissinger, German-born American political scientist, diplomat and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize] diplomacy to sort it out in the next couple of weeks.

**John Biggs (AM):** In terms of a formal decision though?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** The formal decision; but you can have the date in your diary those people who end up being on it.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** We have met Kissinger, Mr Malthouse. You are no Kissinger!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Members are all speaking at once. Can I say it seems to me that we have a procedure and a timetable for the setting up of this panel and we have according to be a new Civil Liberties Panel. I think it has been a very successful meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority. Unless there is any urgent other business --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** May I make a proposal?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** John [Biggs]?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Sorry, who wants to speak? Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes. Well, could we not between now and the next meeting actually have people put their names forward and actually agree offline the people so that when we can ratify it at the next meeting we can actually have a meeting of the panel almost immediately?

**Kit Malthouse (Deputy Chairman):** That is what I have just said.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well, I just did not feel the urgency on this.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Everybody was shouting over me.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that is the conclusion of the meeting. I am sure the minutes will reflect that. John [Biggs], do you have a point to make?

**John Biggs (AM):** I have no desire to be part of this panel, Chairman, I would like Joanne [McCartney] to represent my interests there alongside other Members who are on it, but I would be disappointed if it had not met before 25 June. I think it is very important we get a move on with this. There is a public interest in doing that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am delighted that this idea has received such lively and emphatic support from Labour Members.

**John Biggs (AM):** As Chairman I would expect you to facilitate that, Chairman, and make sure that it did convene that it does meet on that timeline before 25 June.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think we will do our best to satisfy and I am very glad that this panel, as I say, meets with such approval from Labour Members.

Thank you very much.