

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on 24 September 2009 at 10 a.m. in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

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

MPA Officers:

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive) and Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive).

MPS Officers:

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner) and Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner).

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Good morning Members of the Metropolitan Police Authority. Can we possibly take our seats? When everybody is sat down we will go round so that everybody can introduce themselves, starting with Catherine [Crawford] on my left.

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

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

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

James Cleverly (AM): James Cleverly.

Richard Tracey (AM): Richard Tracey.

Reshard Auladin (AM): Reshard Auladin.

Cindy Butts (AM): Cindy Butts.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Jennette Arnold.

Neil Johnson (AM): Neil Johnson.

Deborah Regal (AM): Deborah Regal.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Graham Speed (AM): Graham Speed.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Christopher Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Clive Lawton (AM): Clive Lawton.

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

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Paul Stephenson.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): Kit Malthouse.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): And Boris Johnson, the Chairman. Good morning everybody.

Since we last met in July the Authority Committees have met and we are going to have an update later in the agenda on the business Members have discharged on their behalf. Met Forward has been distributed across London. We have had **generic equality schemes (GNES)(?)** for Hounslow and Barking and Dagenham. The budget scrutiny process has begun in earnest and there is a paper detailing the timetable for the business plan today.

I am very pleased to announce that we have appointed Bob Atkins as the Treasurer of the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) and Julie Norgrove as Director of Internal Audit. Julie [Norgrove] will be taking over from Peter Tickner who has given over 14 years of dedicated and passionate service to the Metropolitan Police Service and to the MPA and we all wish him well in his retirement.

I would also like to take this opportunity to praise the Commissioner and his officers and staff for the professional and peaceful operations conducted over the summer, policing Climate Camp and the Notting Hill Carnival. I think they were both very skilful bits of

policing and did a lot to confirm public confidence in the ability of the Metropolitan Police Service to handle events such as this. I know that those Members who could attend the briefing session at Gravesend over this period found it a very useful and informative briefing.

I should also tell you that this week is London Week of Peace which gives communities across London an opportunity to work together to express their commitment to challenge and reduce crime.

Sorry, I am being corrected. I am told that Chris Boothman presented the peace awards yesterday on our behalf. I was going to say Cindy [Butts]. Thank you, Chris [Boothman].

Christopher Boothman (AM): You will be pleased to know that someone paid £500 to spend a day with you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): You are joking! Did anyone offer £1,000 not to spend the day with me!

Christopher Boothman (AM): I was tempted to bid for it myself!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Jenny [Jones]. I cannot think of anything nicer than to be accompanied by Jenny [Jones] for the day, whatever the price! Thank you, Chris [Boothman] for that.

Finally, of course, Kit [Malthouse] visited the dangerous dogs, the mounted branch and the air support unit.

Can I ask whether there are any apologies for absence or declarations of interests that Members wish to make? Where are Toby [Harris] and John [Biggs]? I do not believe we received any apologies in advance did we? Right. Well then I expect they are on their way, therefore. Any declarations?

Members will have consulted the minutes of the last meeting. Can I ask whether they have any matters arising? Joanne [McCartney] and Jennette [Arnold]. Why has everybody moved places in some curious way?

Jenny Jones (AM): We always do.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): We are told where to sit.

Reshard Auladin (AM): We wanted all the Conservatives to sit together!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Reshard [Auladin].

Richard Tracey (AM): The heavy team.

Reshard Auladin (AM): It was supposed to be a joke!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): It was a good joke. OK. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I ask for an addition to the minutes please because, at the last meeting, I did raise the issue that we still had not received a report from the Chief Executive about the implications for Members arising out of a Standards Board investigation? That had been promised at the February meeting --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Have heard you mention this several times now, Joanne [McCartney], yes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): -- I had to raise it last -- according to the transcript it was guaranteed for this meeting today. Well I would like another guarantee that it is going to be added to the minutes of the last meeting and it will appear on the next agenda.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I am sure the Chief Executive will be --

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): If I could update Members on that. I am sorry it is not here today. We had hoped to do that jointly with the Greater London Authority (GLA) but, for practical reasons, it seems that that is taking a bit too long so we have decided to do something unilaterally. The Standards Committee met yesterday and it has agreed a draft protocol. That goes back to them for final sign off and should be circulated to Members fairly soon. There was a meeting yesterday morning in **DFS(?)**.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I hope that is satisfactory, Joanne [McCartney]. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman. It is about the London Gang Tactics Board which I raised last meeting; information about when that Board would meet. I was told I would be informed. I was informed. That meeting was cancelled. The minutes show that the Vice Chairman would be discussing with Members how they would feed into the work of this Board.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I remember you raising this, Jennette [Arnold], and I know how much importance you attach to it --

Jennette Arnold (AM): It was an incomplete minute because there was also an agreement that I would join the Board. I have received an invitation but, again, I raise the issue about when will this Board meet and when will Members be meeting with the Vice Chairman to feed in their thoughts on this.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK.

Jennette Arnold (AM): The other issue, if you could just wait a moment, Mr Mayor, is on point 18.27 Form 696. At the last meeting it was not so much Members, it was myself who asked the Commissioner, if that can be corrected because that actually took place --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): You would like that corrected in the minutes to reflect the fact that you asked the question and not the Members?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. I am sure that can be done. On your first point, Jennette [Arnold], perhaps I could ask Kit [Malthouse] because I know you have raised this before.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): There is now, I think, a date in the diary. We did have an original date but the Metropolitan Police Service is currently doing some work on this issue and we thought it was a good idea to put the first meeting back until after that work had been done so that we could receive it and have a look at it. But I think there is a date in the diary now for --

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): November.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): For November.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you so much. Any other questions on the minutes? Good. Then I hope those minutes can be approved.

I therefore call on Sir Paul Stephenson to make his report.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you, Chairman. As usual I will widen out afterwards but I will concentrate on performance first if I may. I am trying to add to the point by concentrating on the current financial year which is, in effect, the performance year for us in this Authority.

On the positive side, overall offences continue to be down against the same period of last year. Some 4,300 plus less offences. Serious acquisitive crime is also down. It is marginal but it is down another significant number of offences down by over 1,000. Probably the biggest drop - and I am very, very grateful for the drop and it is good news - is homicide. It is now at its lowest level for over nine years. I will not go on percentages because the percentages are huge but, actually, the numbers make more sense when we are talking about homicides. There are actually 36 less homicide offences in this period of this year compared with the previous year. That is a very, very significant reduction. No doubt people will want to know why. Actually I think some of the things we have been doing have contributed significantly to that; Operation Blunt, what we have been doing around that, charging for knives. Various issues that we have been doing, I think,

have had a beneficial effect. I always say it is obviously very difficult to claim success when you are still talking about people have died, but it is a very significant drop. Of course, as you know, compared to other iconic cities across the world, we already have a much lower homicide rate.

I think the very good news, if one can put it that way, is the priority - and it has been a priority for this Authority and, sadly, for the Metropolitan Police Service - on youth violence. That continues to fall. It is a positive trend but it remains a priority for us. It continues to fall across the piece on youth violence and knife crime. We continue to see it as a priority because it is still not where we want it to be. We have got to redouble our efforts. Last week we launched the annual online youth survey because, whilst we can talk about significant reductions in youth crime, we also need to know the perceptions, what are they thinking, what are the issues and what could make it better from the people who are most affected. It is the youth because we are talking about young people being killed and we are talking about young perpetrators.

More serious violence and assaults with injury. There is a small rise there but it is more or less flat stable. We are talking about 27 more offences so it really is flat stable. But that is not good enough as far as we are concerned and I think I mentioned, at the last Authority, the launch of Operation Verano which is the umbrella operation to bring together a number of activities to get maximum benefit out of the asset that we have got to actually continue our assault on assaults and bringing violence down.

Robbery. An iconic crime in this city and you know we have had real success over a number of years now from a very great high. That has been troubling us, as you know, for a number of months. That is marginally up but I think we are making strides there and that is something that, again, will be covered on Operation Verano.

Business crime. Whilst, again, that is slightly up I am actually delighted that we are not looking at the same percentage rises if you remember I was talking about before Christmas here. We were talking about 10% rises then. Well it is significantly down on that.

I want to turn to what are the real challenges and there are some challenges in what I have just said. Burglary continues to be a challenge. Some good news in this in so much as, I think, when I spoke to you last time I was talking about an over 10% rise in burglary. We have been doing a huge amount of work around this and we always saw the opportunity of August in particular and then the months of September into October, for different reasons, as an opportunity to start to reverse this trend. We do know that August generally sees a rise in burglary; very often associated with holidays, empty houses. We also know that September and October see a rise for different reasons; the onset of dark nights. So we do know there is an opportunity, if you will, to take off that rise. Generally speaking, there is a rise in August over July. Well what we have seen is a reduction in August against the July figure. We are still just over 8% up on burglary but, if you will, whilst it is kind of (inaudible) looking at it, it is reducing the rate of increase. We have got a lot of things in the pipeline to continue our efforts on this.

We are doing an assessment on the effect of the release of criminals, the release of burglars - and I know that is something, Tim [Godwin], you are looking at for me - and whether the proportion has changed and getting the information out of Her Majesty's Prison Service as to just what is happening and how we get the best data from their information technology (IT) systems so we can better prepare for the release of those prisoners. That does concern us. I have spoken before about the difficulty of linking recession with burglary; you have got to be careful there. But there is history to inform us on that.

So what are we doing? Refocusing our efforts on the intelligence. The bottom line is we need to know who is doing it, when and where. This is not rocket science but it is actually gathering that intelligence.

Forensics. Something that Tim Godwin has majored on in the past and had a huge success on bringing burglary down and getting increased convictions. Some operations targeting key burglars and we see different groups; those from organised criminal networks represent about 10% of total burglaries, but also targeting vehicle thieves which account for about 16% of our burglaries at this moment in time. I think I have mentioned before that trend of burgling a house to steal a car; taking the keys from the house. So we are concentrating on that and, actually, whilst we are concentrating, quite rightly, on satisfaction.

We are also about to relaunch Bumblebee. Bumblebee had, I think I am right in saying - and it was for the Metropolitan Police Service a number of years ago which was a campaign - it had something like 95% market penetration of actually what we are doing on burglary, what the issues are and what effort is going into it to actually try to get the message across to people. It was a very successful campaign. We restudied Bumblebee and we feel there is value in relaunching it and we are going to do that.

I turn to the other area of concern for me and that is gun crime which I have mentioned before. Gun crime, you will recollect, last year decreased by over 25%. Well, against that reduction, we are currently up by over 13% in this financial year. Now that includes intimations. Of course gun crime now, I think I am right in saying - Tim [Godwin] you will correct me and you are not, you are nodding - includes intimations. An intimation we have got a gun. So we have got to be careful here about the figures. But I think, within that figure, my particular concern is the rise in shootings *per se*. That is not intimation. There is a rise in shootings and that causes me, properly, real concern.

Again, fatal shootings are similar to last year. There is no significant alteration there. I am, actually, very pleased to see that Trident murders are following homicides in actually significantly reducing in number. But the actual number of shootings which are not leading to fatals are up. We have been studying that and we have got a study ongoing at this moment in time about gangs and I will bring that back to this Authority of what are the key drivers and what are the key issues because there is, certainly, connection, we feel, between the shootings and gun activity - turf, punishment, retribution, that sort of

thing - that is not leading to homicides but, nevertheless, is a very worrying trend, and that does bother me.

A lot of activity into the shootings and what we are going to do about it. Perhaps that is for talking about on another time, particularly when I bring back the gun study.

If I can turn to some positive outcomes since we last met and I think it is right that I talk about Operation Overt which you might better recognise as the airlines plot. You will, of course, be aware that earlier this month three men were found guilty of conspiracy to murder by detonating improvised explosive devices on board transatlantic passenger aircraft. Between them they received over 130 years of imprisonment. It was, and I have to say it, the result of what I consider to be an absolutely thorough, meticulous and successful investigation. It was particularly difficult. I recall it. I recall the day when we actually performed the arrests. I know I stood outside the Yard and I stated then that I was confident that we had disrupted attempts to commit mass murder on an unimaginable scale and I stand by that comment and I pay tribute to the people involved in that; both ourselves and other agencies.

But what it does say to us, and whilst it is some time ago, but it is the case as far as I am concerned and I have said it before, the threat is enduring and we have got to be careful that, whilst I am delighted, if we can prevent incidents, we have got to be careful that does not send a message that there is not a problem here. We still have a problem and we have got to work with our communities, in particular, to make sure we get the message across, get the support and get the cooperation because we still say, and we have always said in terms of campaigns, it is communities that will defeat terrorism, because that is what will stop it.

You have already stolen my thunder, Chairman, in that I did want to mention Notting Hill and Climate Camp. Well I would would I not? Because I do think it went very well. In doing that, on Notting Hill I want to pay particular thanks, if I may, to Chris Boothman. I do not know whether people realise the amount of grief actually and difficulty that we partly gave to Chris [Boothman] because of the **goal**(?), but actually other people did, and we are, genuinely, very, very grateful for the work that you did, Chris [Boothman] - at the risk of embarrassing you.

I also want to pay thanks on Notting Hill - as you know, you have been around this a long time, it is a difficult, difficult operation - to Commander Bob Broadhurst and Chief Superintendent Mick Johnson and all the Metropolitan Police Service staff involved there. I think they did a very, very good job. Notting Hill was a successful carnival and the offences were down and the arrests were slightly down. That, to me, is rather pleasing.

I also want to thank people for Climate Camp because, in the context of what had happened previously and a somewhat difficult back cloth to all of this, I do think it was a very successful operation, very sensitively policed and, actually, effectively policed and led by Superintendent Julia Pendry and Superintendent Ian Thomas. I think it is right that

I name them here because I do think they did a particularly good job and I am grateful for their efforts.

I just want to turn briefly to the Blair Peach report because you will recall that I took the personal position, here at the Authority, when it was first raised in my commissionership, that my instinct was I wished to publish it, but I did explain the need to review the material and actually make sure we made the decision in line with the conduct, the law and best use of public monies etc. Well that is still my intention and where I am going with it but it is quite a lengthy process. The initial draft consideration of redaction of all statements is to be completed by the end of October and I would point out this inquiry generated some 29 boxes of documentation. It is not an inconsiderable feat to do and we are ongoing with that.

We do have to go through a process of interested parties being invited to comment on the proposed submission and given the opportunity to challenge. That is fair. I think it is in line with what I think has been called previously as the salmon process. I do not know if it is exactly a salmon process or something like that. Once we have reviewed and deemed suitable for disclosure then we will publish that and all final documents. I anticipate doing that by the end of December. That is the target I have set myself and that is what I do want to do.

If I can, Chairman, I know there have been a number of questions submitted and I think that, if it is OK with you, I will quickly try to go through who has submitted those questions, what the questions are, give you an initial answer and then I will follow up anything if you wish.

Jennette [Arnold]. Hi, Jennette [Arnold]. I know that you have got a number of specific questions about Form 696, something we have discussed several times in the past. I understand that Chris Allison spoke to you at length on Tuesday regarding the issues. I have to say, in its current format, I remain convinced that Form 696 is of great value. I know we are giving you a full and lengthy reply to all your issues but the one thing I can say, Jennette [Arnold], I know you have a particular issue regarding the change about question on the form which we did change and we changed it to the make up of the group. I know you are still not happy with that. We have withdrawn that question completely from the form now. That is off the form. I remain convinced that, on balance, that form is the right thing to do but we will give you a full and detailed reply. I am happy to circulate that just to you or all Members, and all your questions on that. I will come back to it if you wish.

Victoria [Borwick], I understand that you have been asking questions around Sapphire teams and, in particular, what the implications would be, will victims be interviewed on borough, how do we anticipate prosecution rates and how it will be judged? This was a difficult decision to actually do, on the Sapphire teams. It is an unbalanced decision, I have to say. Professionally there are different views as to whether we should have left it where it was or do we do what we have done. On balance, I think we have done the right thing and I think that is the right way of looking at it and keeping it under review.

What will the implications be? Well we are taking that central approach and that central command to ensure that we can drive up the standards on what are some of the most difficult investigations and actually achieve a level of consistency that perhaps we were not always achieving before. Although I have got to be careful not to criticise some people who were doing a splendid job on many occasions in many areas. So we think it is the right decision.

In particular you asked will victims be interviewed on their own borough? Yes, they will. In essence - I think I am right, Tim [Godwin] - we are talking about relocating staff in covering two boroughs. So we are not talking about bringing everybody to the centre. This is still a function that will be carried out on boroughs, in liaison with borough officers, but we are actually taking a central command of it to try to drive those standards up. Like I say, I think it is the right decision, but we will keep it under review.

How do I anticipate it will help prosecution rates? Well we do know there is a real difficulty with attrition rates right the way throughout this. I think it is being discussed again this week. It is part of our attempt - and that comes to your last question, how will it be judged - to assist those attrition rates. That is what we want to do. Success is more than just attrition rates in these sorts of hideous offences; it is about victim confidence, it is about satisfaction and a whole lot of factors. Again, I will give you a more detailed response in writing but, at this moment in time, that is my response to you.

I want to turn to the issues around Harrow borough because, Kirsten [Hearn], I think you have asked a question of was there a community impact assessment done? I understand somebody has contacted you on that. Indeed there was a community impact assessment done. That gives me an opportunity to just widen out that issue, actually, and talk a little bit more about some concerns. As probably everybody remembers, Friday, 11 September, demonstration organised by a group called Stop Islamation of Europe, or SIOE, for short, took place outside the Harrow Central Mosque in Station Road. They were protesting against, I understand, the introduction of Sharia law in Europe.

Some key points I think. Firstly, the SIOE and the English Defence League that has been referred to, *per se*, are not viewed as an extreme right wing group in the accepted sense and have the right to protest, no matter how palatable or unpalatable their views may be. That is something we have discussed here and various thing.

I have to say, in terms of the potential rise of extremism in London and in this country, the concern for me is how groups like that, either willingly or unwillingly, allow themselves to be exploited by very extreme right wing groups - National Front, British Freedom Fighters - how they can exploit that raised profile. I think that is something we should be concerned about.

But in being concerned we have got to be very careful, I think, to make sure the problem is in context and we do not overplay their significance and give them an oxygen that,

actually, serves their purpose. So it is about recognising there is an issue here and dealing with it properly in a context.

The Harrow protest did not come as a surprise to us; we were aware and we were aware of the various problems that were likely to occur and we did put, I think, a very appropriate policing strategy in place and I will come back to why I think we can evidence that. There was very effective community engagement which led to an excellent dialogue. Again I will come back to that. The fact there were only ten arrests made, I think, goes to the success of the operation in the way we policed it against how these operations might be policed elsewhere and at another time.

But if I can just quote from Councillor Susan Hall, the Deputy Leader of Harrow Council, she said,

“In the run up to 11 September the police and the council took a completely coordinated approach. The Borough Commander and Deputy Leader visited the mosque in person on several occasions to offer a reassurance message and a leaflet countersigned by the police and the council went to more than 2,000 mosque worshipers and local traders. The police community meetings were extremely well represented by members of different faith communities and actually did prove a vital forum for getting messages out.”

She said,

“The policing on the day of the mosque demonstration was exemplary, the police showed enormous restraint despite rising tension throughout the afternoon, culminating in some clear provocation from gangs of youth.”

That was very difficult and I do not think we are out of the woods; I think there is an issue here and I anticipate we will have some further problems but I think it is trying to keep that into a context and we are doing everything we can and putting our appropriate structures in place to ensure that we can cover that properly.

I think the key message there was the work that actually was done on community impact assessment and the work that was done between ourselves and the council, in partnership with the mosque, to try to ensure we had a coordinated approach. Out of a difficult situation I think we did actually police it rather well and I think the local people who did that deserve credit for that. Happy to come back to that if you wish.

Jenny [Jones], I think you have raised the issue of the cancellation of the Al-Qaeda demonstration in Trafalgar Square. I think this is more an issue for the GLA, actually, rather than me, because I understand that it is a GLA decision to decide not to allow the event to go ahead on their land without public liability insurance. That is a matter for the GLA; that is not a matter for me.

Jenny Jones (AM): May I answer that?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Would it be possible for the Commissioner just to finish his answers to (inaudible)?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): What we did do is facilitate the event which, is an issue for us, in Waterloo Place. The policing operation was increased in size and scope as a result of the disorder that had occurred in Birmingham and the incidence at Harrow. So you would expect us to scale that up. In the event a number of potential troublemakers were identified but largely deterred, I think, by the extent and nature of policing tactics. So, again, without wishing to sound complacent, I actually think it was dealt with very well. I think the issue of should it take place or not and where it takes place; that is a matter for the GLA.

Jenny [Jones], I think you are interested in a second question around the costs of very important person (VIP) protection. Happy to discuss offline but it is long established that we would not discuss, publicly, comments on personal protection, security and associated costs. But very happy to discuss that offline.

Deborah [Regal], I think you have made a point on innovative ideas around chaplains on boroughs, I think from your own link borough. Firstly, can I thank you for your support for the initiative. The proposal to roll this out more is being considered. We have got to consider it because we have got to consider, certainly in these constrained financial times, how we are going to do it at nil cost? If we do it, that is what has got to happen. Or find it from somewhere else. What are the benefits of it and how do we properly target it? I think, where we have done it, it does look like we are successful and it is well received so it should it properly be considered for a wider roll out. I am happy to give you a wider answer on that or liaise with you about what plans might take place.

Richard [Tracey], you wanted to ask me can I commit to finding a way to tackle the £1 million hotel bill highlighted last week and I think you have got another question as well. Firstly, it is a bit longer answer. We have a number of checks in place for booking hotel accommodation. All bookings are made by a central external supplier, a booking agent, who searches for the most competitive rates within the authorised budget and within the scheme that we have got. All individual hotel bookings are claimed by individuals and require managerial approval. The information published gives an interpretation to hotel usage that could be a little misleading. Our hotel usage does include rooms supplied when required for officers required to undertake aid in extreme operational requirements. This is not just people going to conferences. For much of the period reported this involved officers located in London on counter-terrorism work - because it was long - hotel rooms required to support work of royal and diplomatic protection officers - and I know that is an issue that is near and dear to the heart of this Authority about cost etc - and occasional use of hotels for training venues, and I want to come back to that straightaway.

Whilst that is all very well, actually, the article and the request does prompt us to look again; have we got it right? Certainly on the use of hotels for training costs I have made

it absolutely clear that my expectation is that we will not pay for any hotel for training costs unless we have absolutely exhausted Metropolitan Police Service premises first. There is a natural desire, if you speak to trainers, to try to get people out of the workplace environment so they are not disturbed etc etc. Well we cannot do that anymore. That does take place. It is on competitive rates. We will exhaust Metropolitan Police Service premises first and I have made sure that is my expectation. So any such practice stops.

We have actually got to make sure that we are better at ensuring we know exactly what is happening right the way across the Metropolitan Police Service estate every day as to the use of our estate. I know Tim Godwin is leading on some work and research about occupancy of our estate and how we get better use of that to reduce costs. So I think there is some work to do there. Also, it is an opportunity for us to review and reissue our Hotel Accommodation Policy and ensure that we do look at any potential for abuse and ensure that we are completely on top of it. It is about intrusive supervision.

So I think the article could mislead in terms of totality but, within it, it does prompt us to look again.

I think your second question - I have been speaking for some time now - on discrepancy figures and I think you have got a number of issues there. If I could ask Tim [Godwin] to pick that one up for me?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Chairman, with permission?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Tim [Godwin] of course, yes.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): You asked specifically how many rape allegations did we receive in 2008/09? That was 2,939 allegations of rape. 2,180 of those were classified and confirmed as rape offences within the Crime Reporting Information System (CRIS) system. I know you want to know what is the reason for no crime in rape? There are a number of guidance and protocols that we comply with. One is that we get a number of people who report rape within the boundary of the Metropolitan Police Service but the actual offence occurs outside of the Metropolitan Police Service area. That happens quite a bit on some of the outer lying boroughs and it also happens where people self refer to our havens in central London, which is a service not provided elsewhere at the moment outside of London. As a result of that they are initially recorded in London but then the crime is transferred to the country force that actually then should oversee the investigation. So it is no crimed here and then crimed in Essex, Kent, Sussex or wherever it is.

Where, after investigation, it is identified that the events did not occur in that fashion they are then no crimed, but they are fairly rare in those circumstances. Then there is the other area where there are retractions or withdrawals of statements from victims.

In trying to get this consistency piece which we mentioned before, where the decision takers are consistent across the whole of the 32 borough areas, that was transferred to

have oversight from central Sapphire controls to make sure that that was being appropriately done. Equally, it is another area in terms of interpretation of rules, that we constantly review. There is a review going on as we speak. That is equally another reason why we have gone over to the centralised command. So that is where we are going.

What controls it? We comply with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) guidance in rape investigation and obviously our efforts, as of 23 (?) with our new rape command is to improve that still further.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Tim [Godwin]. Commissioner, is that the end of your report?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is. I do not know whether it is going to come up in general discussion but, if it is not, not wholly linked to that but I suppose it is an option to get into it; I was talking to Superintendent's Association recently and I raised my concerns over the amount of diversion that takes place away from the summary justice system. I am talking now about cautions through fixed penalties etc.

I think, over a period of time, there has been a view that, because the summary justice system, the magistrates' system, can be bureaucratic and lengthy etc - I make no criticism of magistrates there but that is the case of it - there has been an increasing tendency to find ways of diverting away from that system. I have a real concern that that reduces the respect and the majesty and the full proper implementation of what should be the right system and, in a way, we have been going down a line of instead of fixing the right system, we have been finding a way around it.

I think the balance is wrong. I think the balance of diversion now is wrong. I know there are a number of articles about it and I have been quoted today. It is an issue, as I say, I raised with the Superintendent's Association. I think we do have to look again at the number of times that we do caution and I think we do have to look again at the use of the fixed penalty ticket. I think we do have to look again at how we can make the summary justice system dynamic, smart and responsive so we can have magistrates giving the proper sentence and giving them the opportunity to actually do something different. I know that approach has --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): All virtual courts currently.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes and I want to come back to that, Chairman, if I can. I do think the magistrates would support this. I am pretty sure the senior judiciary do. I think we have got the balance fundamentally wrong now.

The work that Tim [Godwin] has been doing nationally and, particularly, here in London around the virtual court system is designed to address this and we have a certain ambition, here in London, and I just wonder whether you want Tim [Godwin] to say anything about that or not?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Tim [Godwin], yes, if you want to say something more about that, then we will conclude the Commissioner's report. Then what I think I will do, if Members are OK with this, is have general questions and comments on anything arising from the whole of the Commissioner's report and, in that context, I think Members should feel free to come back on any follow ups they want to make to the Commissioner's answers to their written questions. Is that OK? Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Following on from the Commissioner's directions, penalty notices, fixed penalty notices, are an unsatisfactory, in our view, way of dealing with some of the criminal offences. One of the problems is can the summary justice system cope with the volumes because, nationally, there would be some 400,000 additional offences that would go through courts etc. That is how many offences are dealt with in that fashion.

As a result we have developed the virtual court. It is now in 15 centres in south east London and in Westminster and it is currently being used and being run up through Camberwell Magistrates' Court. We have had incidents where a person was arrested at 4.30 p.m. for breach of an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) and actually convicted and in Brixton Prison by the afternoon. That is the sort of instant justice that we actually want to achieve but we do also feel that the magistrates should have the ability to caution someone. They do it through conditional discharge and absolute discharges but there is something else about making it independent of the police.

We intend to pilot that from January once the new powers come in. The law changes in October. I am told it is going through in terms of the Coroner's Criminal Justice Bill which means that the consent requirement of offenders to appear before the virtual court will be changed. We hope to get the Royal Assent and then the powers by January. At that point all first appearances can go through the virtual court. We are negotiating with the court service for longer hours. So, as a result of that, it will be more effective and efficient to actually put those offenders in front of a magistrate, rather than a fine effectively issued by us through a penalty notice. So that is where we intend to go.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much, Tim [Godwin]. Well that is the conclusion of the Commissioner's report. I want to pay tribute to the real progress that is clearly being made in homicide and in youth crime although there are obviously matters for concern around burglary and gun crime, as you say. I suggest that we have now general questions about any aspect arising. I think Reshard [Auladin] and then Kirsten [Hearn] please. Reshard [Auladin]?

Reshard Auladin (AM): Thank you, Chairman. Two questions from me. One about Harrow. It is true that the local community in Harrow were very satisfied with the policing. They were full of praise of the policing tactics that were used on that day. I have attended two or three community meetings there as **lay**(?) member, as well as the crime and disorder reduction partnership (CDRP) meeting.

There were two questions that I think people wanted really some answers to. One which is, accepting that this group has the right to legal protest, their tactics seem to be that they will bring in a small group of people who will create the maximum amount of disruption. It meant that the local authority had to divert significant resources to deal with this, as well as the local police and the Metropolitan Police Service as a whole. Therefore we do need to have a long-term plan and they wanted to know what the long-term plan would be because, if they turn up again in a month's time, they had to close the road which affected all of the trade along that particular road and, also, they will not be able to sustain the sort of resources that they had to spend on the day. So there needs to be some concerted plan to deal with these groups.

The second point was there was a bit of a question mark as to where the group was actually positioned on that day; they were allowed to, in a sense, be directly opposite the mosque or very near a war memorial. I think there was a question mark as to whether such fascist groups should be allowed to next to a war memorial but that is a question that, again, we need to look at.

My second point is about complaints. You will have seen the (Independent Police Complaints Commission) IPCC report that came out this morning. It is clear that the Metropolitan Police Service has a significant rise in the number of complaints that were recorded against it. Now I think, on the one hand, we have to say this is something that we really need to support; it means that people have the confidence to complain against the police and so on and so forth and it is something that we have been encouraging people to do.

On the other, there is this perception that the behaviour of the police is not quite up to scratch. I appreciate the number of substantiated complaints are very low, nevertheless, it plays directly into the public confidence. Can we then seek some assurance as to how we are going to deal with this?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Reshard [Auladin]. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The plan for going forward. Of course we need a plan. We have actually put a lot of structures in place dealing for the wider issues around the issue of right wing extremism. I have indicated that.

There is an issue where you say about the resources that had to be applied and whether that can be sustained. That is an issue that you have been aware of, I have been aware of, and actually it is part and parcel of what we do here in London in the public order policing. There are people who have demonstrated and of course we are having that debate with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) about demonstration, the right to demonstrate and not lawful demonstration. It is a difficult issue, taking into account the Human Rights Act. But actually it always diverts resources. Actually what we do with Climate Camp diverts resources. It diverts this Authority's resources. It diverts local authority resources. So all these things will divert resources.

I still come back to the point - and I am not trying to over labour it - whether the views are palatable or unpalatable, if they are a legal organisation and if what is taking place is in keeping with the duty to facilitate the right to protest - which we discussed coming out of G20 - then I have a duty to do that, with the resources that are available to me through this Authority. It is a real balance and I am conscious that views, on many occasions, may be unpalatable, but that is not for me to make a decision, that is actually for Parliament and various other people to make a decision of what is right and wrong on law and what is palatable and what is unpalatable. I do not think you would want me to go down that line.

But I do take the point; it is incredibly sensitive and it is about confidence of communities and that is why we have to work hard with the communities to try to get them to understand what our proper position has to be.

Your point about the positioning. I am slightly unsighted on that, Reshard [Auladin]. It is a matter of (inaudible) and I will take that away because that is always the case with tension and, actually, with football policing and the way football -- so that people are (several inaudible words) football grounds.

On complaints I am going to pass over to Tim [Godwin] but I think, as you know, it is always that difficult area, it is not? It is a bit like those iceberg crimes when they are going up and we celebrate they are growing because it is increased confidence, but when is it because there are actually more crimes?

I think part of the reason and I think the IPCC has mentioned this; there has been a widening of who can make a complaint and there has been a widening of the number of people who formally apply to the complaints systems, police community support officers (PCSOs) are now in there. So there are more people to complain about and there are more people can complain, indirectly. I think the third point is there is more access to the complaints system.

But I am not complacent because the reality is, even though there is only a 4% substantiation rate, you are absolutely right, it is about public confidence and we have got to take account of thoughts and feelings etc and we have got to learn lessons from any complaint; whether it is substantiated or not, does it tell us something about the way in which we are training people and the way in which we are supervising? I will - and I always will - come back to intrusive supervision.

Tim [Godwin], is there anything you want to add to that?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): The only thing that I would add is that we are monitoring, through the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS), as you will be aware from the Professional Standards Sub-Committee, that where we identify (inaudible) going up etc we go into the boroughs, we discuss what is occurring, we look at if there are any issues or problems, we identify repeat persons getting complaints -

even if they are ultimately unsubstantiated - their multiple receipt of complaint, then we get involved in all that.

The one thing I would want to put on record though is that we have had the 15% increase. That is of concern. We will actually monitor what is going on. The IPCC do say it is because it perceives it to be a confidence issue, access via the internet and various other things, but we are not that complacent. Per 1,000 police officers, 2008/09, we had 316 complaints. The national average is 338. So we are below the national average in terms of complaints per police officer, to put it into a national context. So even though our rise is a significant rise, in terms of that, we are still below the national average in levels of complaint. That might mean that they lack the confidence in us compared to elsewhere because there is always a reverse of a coin. But it is a piece that we are picking up, that we are driving forward and we will be working with the Committee to look at that.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. That is very interesting. Are you happy with that, Reshard [Auladin]?

Reshard Auladin (AM): Yes. Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. Kirsten [Hearn]?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): On a similar theme I wanted to just extend the question I had asked which is very much about how you are assessing and addressing the impact upon the Muslim community and wider in London, and on black and ethnic minority people. The feedback I have been getting from the community is of great unsettlement in many ways, partly because they probably have not had the information that you gave to those in partly. It is about how do you spread that information? The question I am constantly being asked is, "Don't such demonstrations incite hatred and isn't that a crime?" How are we explaining much more of the tactics being used and why broad tactics are being used when allowing such demonstrations to take place? The community very much feel that you are allowing a crime to take place.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think you make - without wishing to sound at all patronising - a valid point. We did have a very good dialogue with, as I said, 2,000 people in Harrow etc but the wider point, that actually that does reflect on communities right the way across London and how we are spreading that message, that is something I will pick up. I think there is a very proper point there, and I take it.

There is an offence of inciting hatred and we will police the law. If the law is broken we will either enforce it then or we will go back and enforce it afterwards. There is an issue that sometimes actually doing arrests at the time depletes your ability to police the event. We have a track record of actually going back afterwards and performing arrests. There were ten people arrested at that event you will recall. So we did enforce the law.

But what we should not do is try to make the law. That is what we should not do. We should enforce the law and we should police events, and crimes, according to the law laid

down by Parliament. That is what we are doing. I understand that this causes real concern with communities across London so that is why your first point is very proper; that we explain what our role is and what we are doing about it. But if there is something more to be done, and the legislation does not cover it, then that is a matter for the people to debate. But we are enforcing the law, Kirsten [Hearn]. That I can assure you. And we will.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. Kirsten [Hearn], are you happy with that? Clearly when there is an incitement to hatred then the police must enforce that. I am going to go to Dick [Tracey], then Jenny [Jones] and Caroline [Pidgeon], Jennette [Arnold] and Clive [Lawton]. Dick [Tracey]?

Richard Tracey (AM): Thank you, Chair. One or two follow ups. One on the answer to the rape questions. The one significant area I think is when young women come in with allegations of rape. I would just like to know, from the Metropolitan Police Service, what support is given particularly to young women who might be far more inclined to withdraw their allegation if they are not given the right support because, clearly, they are extremely sensitive to this - although that is not to say other women are not sensitive - but young women especially.

Another question that is not in any way related. I am rather interested to hear an update on the events surrounding that West Ham Millwall football match. What action has been taken, moving forward, and, indeed, have the football clubs met the costs of the extra operations required there?

The last one. A number of my constituents, especially in Wandsworth, have been complaining to me recently about what they see as an excessive amount of use of the police helicopter. Now it may be that we have got a place called Wandsworth Prison in the patch but it does seem to be buzzing around and I, personally, was woken up 6 a.m. recently by the thing circling round my house. So I do not want to be personal about it but I am receiving a number of these complaints and so I wonder whether it is always strictly necessary to hover around for quite so long?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you, Dick [Tracey]. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will pass the rape issue to Tim [Godwin] but I think he is going to talk about the havens.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes. Do you want to do that now? The havens obviously are a place for all victim referrals which we set up some years ago in partnership with the Police Authority and health. Every haven has a dedicated specialist advocate worker to deal with young women, specifically 13 to 18. There are other systems in place for under 13s. As a result of that they look after their care, the follow up visits, counselling etc etc. Equally, in Whitechapel and Paddington, that particular element, in terms of young women, has actually set up a violence prevention programme

where they are working with schools. So they are actually pursuing it through that. So there are special arrangements for young victims.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Turning to the West Ham Millwall football match, Dick [Tracey]. Firstly, right from the outset we treated it as a high category match and we had a very significant deployment on it. As it turned out, the behaviour was outrageous and we had to call in additional aid. That is what happened. I think we did it very well actually and I think it was policed very well and we were well up for it. Unfortunate phrase! We were in a position to deal with it with the additional resources we brought in - that is going to happen from time to time - but we always knew it was a high priority match.

Have the clubs met the cost of the investigation? We have no way, legally, of enforcing that. There is a very clear scheme, it is not a scheme that many people like, but we have a very clear scheme; we charge the clubs for the police personnel within the ground. Essentially, that is it. That is as far as we can go. This Authority, in a previous guise, has discussed it often and actually the Metropolitan Police Service and the Authority together came up with, "If we cannot do that", came up with a very good alternative.

I have to be fair to football that following the work with this Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service what they have done in investing in youth engagement in this city, through the Kickz programme, has been phenomenally successful. I think I am right in saying there is something like 15,000 young people who come off the streets of London three times a week to actually attend - and they want to attend - not because Tim Godwin might occasionally turn up or I might turn up, but because there are some football players and stars and the clubs actually act as a magnet to get these kids to come in and do something positive. So, in the absence of being able to charge what we would like to charge, I have got to be fair to the clubs, they have done, I think, particularly led by --

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

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Richard Scudamore but also Charlton Athletic has led the way in their community programme. So I have got to be fair to them. But would we like to charge more? Of course we would. But we certainly cannot charge for investigations. Though we treated it very seriously.

The one thing I did not mention when I was talking about the issues around right wing extremism, the potential link between football thugs and hooligans and right wing extremism is not lost on us.

Your last question on excessive use of the police helicopter. You have mentioned this before, Dick [Tracey]!

Richard Tracey (AM): Been woken up before too you see!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I find one of the joys of living in London I am woken up by planes, helicopters -- I am not diminishing it; but actually we do use the helicopter. It is a highly valuable tool and that is what it was purchased for; to assist policing on the ground. The new ones that we bought are quieter than the old ones but we just do not have a silent helicopter.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): I am sure we would be happy to arrange a visit to the chopper squad for you, Dick [Tracey], if you would like to go!

Neil Johnson (AM): As a resident of Wandsworth I concur, but my standard answer to the complainants is, "Be thankful, it's one of ours"!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Very good point, Neil [Johnson]. Thank you.

Neil Johnson (AM): (inaudible) are so noisy are they not!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Members of the MPA, the Commissioner has been answering questions for a long time now and there are a lot of people who want to answer so let us try to keep to the order. Jenny [Jones], you are next.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. Just to pick up on a few things that you mentioned and I have got two new topics. I do not know if you want me to talk about them now or ...?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Could he possibly answer them all at once? I think it might save time.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, of course. First of all, the (inaudible) demo. What I was really asking about - it is my fault for not giving you a specific question - is did the Metropolitan Police Service give advice to the insurance company? I know very well it was a GLA decision but it was based on their insurance company wimping out on it all. So I am curious about whether the insurance company asked the Metropolitan Police Service for advice or if the Metropolitan Police Service gave them advice? I am sure you cannot tell me off the cuff but I would like to know that because, if you did, you stopped legitimate protest in London so, obviously, that would be a cause for concern. But, if you did not, then I will have a go at the Mayor instead!

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Win/win!

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, win/win!

On the cost of VIPs. This is an area where Anne McMeel can put a red pen through it on the budget and it would have the full support of the Police Authority. Why are we protecting Musharraf [Pervez Musharraf, former President, Pakistan]? I do not understand. Perhaps somebody can explain that? So we need, I think, as a Police Authority, to support you and reduce your costs in that area.

I would also like to congratulate you on the Climate Camp policing. It was a triumph for reducing resources and I think it was all handled very well. There were some tough decisions and I think it was pitch perfect. So well done on that.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Excellent.

Jenny Jones (AM): On the issue of rape, I mean a lot of us are very worried about that around the table. You have got the rape unit starting up so we will be expecting some fantastic results from that. Just to put a bit of pressure on you.

On the Blair Peach report, it has got to be done to the satisfaction of the family. If the family is satisfied you will not hear another peep out of the rest of us because we only care that the family gets the sort of response that it wants. Those are the people to be directing your efforts towards.

On this issue of hotel rooms, you did not expand on the issue of flights because I understand police officers are taking first class flights and business class flights. Now, even our Mayor goes steerage! Well apart from coming back from New York. I think he went first class coming back from New York.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): At no cost to the taxpayer, Jenny [Jones].

Jenny Jones (AM): Oh so you are taking freebies from airlines!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): If I am asked to turn left when I get on a plane and I am not being charged, I am not going to say no.

Female Speaker (AM): Shame on you; you should go in steerage!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Nonsense. Give me a break. Honestly!

Jenny Jones (AM): Anyway. That is something else for the journalists in the room. Can I just say, on the issue of flights, I just do not see -- it is possible the authorised budget for hotel rooms is too high and it is possible that the authorised budget for flights is too high as well. When we are looking to cut costs and Tim Godwin is talking about reducing the number of police officers on the streets, it is unacceptable --

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): We are not talking about reducing the numbers on the streets.

Jenny Jones (AM): -- that we are spending so much money on flights and hotel rooms. You really have got to get that under control. Unless it is a scare tactic.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Jenny Jones, is that almost your last question?

Jenny Jones (AM): I have two more issues. The first is uninsured drivers. I do not know if you have time to listen to Radio 4 in the mornings. There is a big thing on uninsured drivers. This is something I have been talking about for nine years in this Authority. Apparently London has 13%. We have always been talking about how we have got 10% of uninsured drivers, ie 10% of the drivers on the roads are illegal. Now the insurance companies are saying 13%. We have got the biggest problem in the country. Now we are taking illegal cars off the road. I think we have raised something like £3 million from doing that. The Mayor immediately filched it for his bobbies on the buses. So what I am saying is can we start putting some of that money back into catching more criminals in cars? It is a success story. We are catching them but there are still thousands and thousands of them out there and we need to get them off roads.

Then my last issue is stop and search of children. Now in May you did say you were going to have a review of this. There has been somebody stopped since. It was Section 44 you were going to review. There have been two children stopped since. I gather it is being looked into so you probably do not want to say anything. But of the 58 children who were stopped under Section 44 last year, can you tell me how many were involved in terrorism? How many links there were to terrorism?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Right. Is that the last question?

Toby Harris (AM): I am sure it was the same percentage as other people stopped under Section 44.

Jenny Jones (AM): Ie zero.

Toby Harris (AM): It is a deterrent rather than anything to do with --

Jenny Jones (AM): Right. Well thank you for the Home Office, Toby [Harris]. I am curious about whether any of those searches led to further action or if there were any arrests? I am assuming not and therefore I am asking the Commissioner if you are going to review the use of stop and search against children, because I think it is unacceptable, especially when you are stopping and searching children as young as nine, and six in one instance?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. There is a wide range of very good questions there, Sir Paul [Stephenson].

Jenny Jones (AM): Very good questions. Thank you.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think there were eight actually!

Did we give advice to insurance companies? Two parts to the answer. I did not realise that was the point of your question. I do not think it is our remit to advise insurance companies but I will check. OK? But I certainly do not think it is our remit to advise insurance companies and I cannot imagine why we would have done that.

Secondly, on VIPs. I take your point but I still say it is not something that we would discuss in open forum. You are asking wider questions of why we should protect certain people. I have a duty to do certain things and I think you are recognising that in the way you phrased the question. I will carry out my duty. If you want to have a wider debate about the (inaudible) of that I think that is for another question in another place.

The third point -which I thought was the best point - saying you thought it was an exceptional climate camp so thank you, Jenny [Jones]!

On rape you gave notice of something to Tim [Godwin] and I am sure he has picked that up.

Blair Peach. Satisfy them. It would be very nice to satisfy everyone but I just made it clear, right from the outset, I want it published. That is my starting point. But I have got to do it properly. If I do it clumsily or improperly then this Authority could end up with all sorts of claims against it or we could end up with unfairness to various people. I do hope to satisfy the family. I hope to satisfy everyone by being as open and as transparent as all the rules and regulations and everything we have got to do allow me to be. I do not want it to be anything else on this matter.

Airline flights. You said I did not expand it to airline flights. That was because that was not the question to me. The question to me was about hotels. But now you raise airline flights. Firstly on the hotel issue because you did go back into that. I actually did say in my answer, Jenny [Jones], whilst we have a policy and we are implementing that policy, it is actually a good timely reminder for me to review have we got it right? I have already said that is what we are doing. But you have got to have guidelines and you have got to comply with them.

As for airline flights. We also have a clear policy on when we go business class and when we go steerage. We have had that policy in place for some time. I can share it with you. We comply with it. We do comply with that.

Uninsured drivers. We have done an awful lot around uninsured drivers here in London. Successful in terms of the number of people we stop. We do take the point; the sort of people who are likely to drive their car uninsured are the sort of people who like to break other laws. It is a very, very serious matter. As you know, we have used automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) very heavily. We have had specific operations and we have had the reclaim stuff and the seizure of vehicles so we have done a lot.

Your issue about you want to do more. Well of course I have been through our challenges and it would be nice to do more on lots of things. We always keep an --

Jenny Jones (AM): Raising money. This is a money raiser.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): And the Mayor has taken the money.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): That is a debate between you and the Mayor that I am not going to get into. But I do not think there is any policy of hypothecating money raised, or money coming in, to any particular asset. We do not do it that way. Actually, I do not think this Authority wants us to do it that way because we do not ring fence and hypothecate. That, actually, is a bad way to use money very often. I think the other debate is between you and the Mayor and not me.

The stop and search of children. I am just going to disagree with you on this one, Jenny [Jones]. The two occasions that I am aware of, let me just go into some detail on one, less on the other and let me deal with the less one first. That is the one under Section 44. Of course that was a stop and search with a 43 year old adult present. So it was not without an adult present. That is being investigated by the IPCC and it would be entirely improper for me to go further, other than your question around Section 44. I am very grateful. Lord Harris gave the answer that I would have given had I thought of it! But there we go.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think he was being a bit sarcastic.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): More detail on the other one, and this is where we are just going to disagree I am afraid. I think the instance you are talking about, 5 August this year. Between 4.15 p.m. and 5.15 p.m. police were called to a stabbing of two youths in that area. Suspects in that area and, due to those stabbings, large scale disturbance in locality and threats of repercussions from local youths. Result of that incident, Duty Inspector properly authorised, as far as I can see, Section 60 stop search which is what the **advice**(?) was. I suspect they were **supported**(?) by the Authority for doing that, with the problem we have in this city around stabbings.

The officer that was part of this (several inaudible words), who was employed, that day, to deal with knife crime and disorder from such crime. They stopped a group of youths and they used their powers. This has been thoroughly investigated and found there is no case to answer because the officer, actually, says that they did not search that youth although there was a question of was there a patting down of the pocket? If there was, it was thoroughly legal and, actually, we do have young people who commit crime and when you have got a group of youths and there has been a stabbing, then it is entirely appropriate to do it. It is how you do it and you have got to do it fairly and properly.

But we cannot have a situation where we say we will never ever search people of nine. Firstly, how do we know they are 9 and not 11? Secondly, how do we know they have not got something in their possession, like a knife, because they are with groups of other youths? Thirdly, even if they are below the age of criminal responsibility, we would not want to leave them with a weapon and it is not beyond our experience where older youths ask younger kids to carry weapons. So I will not have a policy where we say we will never ever search young people.

What I will have is a policy that says, “You have got to exercise your discretionary powers, with the training you have been taught, with common sense, with professionalism and stand accountable afterwards”. That is where I think we should be.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much, Commissioner. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I have three questions; two from the written report and one from your oral update. The safe bus initiative which was supposed to be about dealing with the after school period. I cannot quite work out why you start it in July when the schools were breaking up? I am wondering what the thinking was particularly around that, rather than starting it in September and, perhaps, a bit more information on that.

You mentioned in your oral update the youth survey that has just been launched and I am wondering how you are really getting that out to youth groups and youth websites, maybe some of the boroughs have, such as the whatever one I know about in Southwark, to make sure that we are really engaging with young people?

Thirdly, just on counter-terrorism. Just wondering, does every borough still have at least one prevent engagement officer?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am going to pass the safer bus for July to Tim [Godwin]?!

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Do not know. Find out. I do not know why it started in July. It does seem bizarre. Not briefed on that one. Good initiative though. But we will find out.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We will get back to you.

Similar answer to the youth survey one. I take the point. I cannot give you a detailed answer but I will get back to you on that because it is important we use all the appropriate means to get out to them. That is the intention. I am sure we are doing lots and lots of things to make sure we get it out there. We will give you the answer back and, if there is some further advice coming back in to us we will listen to it and take it because it is an important initiative as part of an extension of Blunt.

Sorry, your third question was, Caroline [Pidgeon] ...?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Does every borough still have at least one prevent engagement officer?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I do not think I can answer that. Not because I am trying to be evasive. I will come back and tell you, is there one in every borough? It might be at the moment, I do not know if there are any vacancies or

something like that. I think the answer will probably say, no, but I will come back to you and give you the details.

Toby Harris (AM): The situation is that every borough is covered by a counter-terrorism (CT) liaison officer and the programme of having prevent officers linked with every borough is being rolled out. That is still in the middle of --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): That is very helpful.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): That is the second time Toby [Harris] has come to my aid!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): If it should prove by any chance that Toby [Harris] is wrong, I am sure that you will be able to provide Caroline [Pidgeon] with the information she needs. Thank you very much, Caroline [Pidgeon]. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you, Mayor. I have got a follow up question for Sir Paul [Stephenson] but can I just start off by thanking Sir Paul [Stephenson] for his report and I welcome the report from the Commissioner about the improving performance in the service, especially as this is reflected certainly in the three boroughs that I am linked with. I wondered if he could say some more because, certainly in one of those boroughs, the level of confidence, even though we have got this increasing performance, is really at an unacceptable level.

So I wonder if he could say something about the work that I believe is being led by Doctor Betsy Stanko and when and if he has plans to share that work with the Authority and then, if not, I would certainly appreciate some briefing on that. What is happening, it seems to me, certainly in the three areas I know of, everybody is starting to develop their own confidence model. Now the thing is we start off saying that we are all round the table to deal with the issues so I am a little bit concerned if everybody is then going to go off and pick up and develop their own confidence tool or whatever that is. Some thoughts from you on that would be well welcomed.

I also need to come back to you on Form 696 and to start off by saying, Commissioner, I welcome your statement that now the question on - I have got this right - ethnicity and the reframed question which talked about make up of patrons will now be removed from the form. I think that that really - campaigners like myself - will welcome that and we will see that as the police listening.

Now I would like us to move on and say, "Please keep your mind and heart open" because, let me tell you, this is not going to go away. For instance, there is cross-party support. John Whittingdale, Conservative Member of Parliament (MP) and Chair of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Select Committee, and I are in the same place. In fact it is such a worry that my constituents think I am going to change parties! But I am not. Because he is with me by saying that this form is totally unnecessary because of the detrimental impact it has on promoters to go about their

lawful business. Lord Clement Jones in the House of Lords says that the time, if you like, is up on this form and would agree with me, and others, that, when it was introduced in 2003 it absolutely was necessary, but now that we have the Licensing Act and now we have intelligence led policing and now that issues have moved away from some of those notorious centres that were badly licensed and badly managed, you do not need to use this form anymore.

So will he agree with me that, given there is this body of support for this form, that what he should be looking at would be to say to his officers, "Let's see how we can use this form, in the first instance, in a very limited way with a view to removing this form" given that we currently have, on the Downing Street petition site, 17,000 signatures? These are disk jockeys (DJs), musicians, business people and supporters who have seen the detrimental effect of this form. This is bad for young musicians who are starting up in their career, who have been stopped from putting on a gig in a pub and that is where most musicians start.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will deal with your first question on confidence, Jennette [Arnold]. I am happy to share anything. I understand that Betsy Stanko has already done a briefing to the Authority on her research --

Jennette Arnold (AM): I missed it.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): -- and I think papers have been submitted.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): That is right. There was a briefing for Members on confidence.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Well I missed it. I will have to find it.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): But the wider point about, if you will, everybody having a different scheme. That is why we have set up, under the chairmanship of Tim [Godwin], the Confidence and Pride Board, to ensure that we do fully understand the drivers of confidence and ensure that, where we do understand and approve them, then we act in a coordinated way across the force area to ensure we put that into practice.

But you are right; it is a troubling issue and a conundrum that confidence often does not go with, if you will, crime performance, where we can have very, very good crime performance that you would think would affect the confidence, and it does not. That is a very troubling issue. I suspect, in some areas, there are issues of history of a long antipathy between the police and certain communities have to be overcome, and it takes time. But, certainly, there is work being done by the Confidence and Pride Board which Tim [Godwin] is chairing. I do not know if you want to add to that, Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): No.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Right the 696. Let us find the areas of agreement. Open mind? Yes, absolutely open mind. We will keep an open mind. We will keep an open mind and I promise you that.

Look, you talk about a body of support, Jennette [Arnold]. Well there is a body of support on the other side. I think we have got to just recognise that. Let me just quote some things. I do not know if you heard the Deputy Chair of Trident Independent Advisory Group (IAG) --

Jennette Arnold (AM): I know him well and I would not follow his quote too far.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): You might not. But, actually, you quoted a body of support; let me quote back bodies of support. Let me tell you that you asked me to use it in a limited way. At the moment there are about 70 premises where it is anything other than voluntary, out of 17,000 licensed premises. So I do think we have got to recognise that we are trying to deal with an issue here. I think we, jointly, would join hands of how we deal with the issue.

We feel we have listened, we have altered - and I am grateful for your acknowledgment of that - but we actually feel it is doing a service. Our view is the overwhelming view of the Promoters Forum - and they are, after all, the people who are most affected by this - is that the form is an effective tool for engaging with police and gives them reassurance that we are doing everything we can to help them run a safe event.

Now I know there is a petition and I know there is a very effective campaign. I keep asking the question, I have an open mind and the reassurance I have been given is, actually, there are a lot of people who support this. At this moment in time, we think, on balance, it brings more benefits than disbenefits, but I will keep an open mind. I suspect you will not let me do anything other than keep an open mind on it.

Jennette Arnold (AM): This is not a personal crusade so I am not going to take up Members' time but I would just ask the Commissioner to allow me to continue to carry on this discussion with Chris Allison --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Absolutely.

Jennette Arnold (AM): -- because I have heard that there are boxes where there are thousands of these forms that have been collected, that have not been dealt with in any way, that there is no system of capturing the data that has been collected and that the whole thing needs sorting. So, if I can, I will continue to press this --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I think you should, Jennette [Arnold], and no one can doubt the sincerity with which you are pursuing this cause but I think you should take it up, as you say, with Chris Allison offline. Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): First of all, can I welcome your comments about summary justice and the impacts on the magistrates' courts? I think it is probably representative. I have been a magistrate for ten years now in my borough and, at the beginning, we ran six full courts regularly every day. We are now running only four. A proportion of that reduction is, without doubt, the product of efficiencies and speeding up the process and so on, but a proportion of it is certainly taking people out of the system.

I do not think it is necessarily beneficial so I welcome your comments while, perhaps, just putting parenthesis around what is happening with youth because, clearly, there is a benefit in trying to prevent some young people from getting into the criminal justice system. I am sometimes bothered by the way in which some young people do things which of course, in an unacceptable way, would have previously led to a clip round the ear, now brings them before the courts and gives them records and so on, which we do not want to do.

Two points to raise. The Mayor now has provided funding, albeit perhaps not quite enough, for more rape crisis centres and we have been talking about havens, and the culture of these two kinds of provisions are somewhat different. I am concerned to know that there is proper effective and constructive communication between them. Clearly, a woman turning up at a rape crisis centre gets a different kind of experience to a woman turning up at a haven and it would be a terrible shame if the right interventions were not made in either place and both places. So I would like to know that there is a seamless connection between those things.

In the numbers mentioned in relation to rape reports and then those that go forward, you gave explanations, Tim [Godwin], to the discrepancy in numbers. I think it would be very reassuring to have specific numbers. That is how many of that 700, 800 go out of the area, for example, and how many do other things, in order to understand that discrepancy.

Then to the matter of demonstrations. I am of course fully supportive and encourage the right of people to demonstrate. That is obvious. But it is quite clear that some demonstrations are devised in order to draw attention to a cause and some demonstrations are devised in order to be provocative. The provocative nature of them is usually defined by where they go. I mean, most famously, many decades ago, the black shirts through the East End of London in order to provoke a response by the people amongst whom they were demonstrating. I wonder whether there is anything that you would like to reflect on in terms of the provocative choice of location of demonstrations as opposed to the business of demonstrating? There is drawing people's attention to one's concern is not necessarily the same as going and confronting the very people about whom one is concerned, in order to provoke confrontation.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Drumcree point.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Let me do the summary justice one first. Thank you for your support, Clive [Lawton].

Actually there is an interesting issue, of course, that if we are going to be successful in what Tim [Godwin] has very innovatively started now with some of the people around the virtual courts, we will have to see greater flexibility of court time which brings huge benefits, not just benefits in efficiency of justice, bringing justice closer to the Act etc, but it actually brings benefits of increasing the opportunity for diversity in magistrates because not everybody can afford to take time off work between certain hours just Monday to Friday. So there are real benefits on some innovative thinking around how we look at making the summary justice system work.

There is also an issue, I think, about - and I think Tim [Godwin] mentioned it - why can it not be that magistrates actually give cautions so we do not necessarily associate the summary justice system with the criminal record? But what we have got to do, we have got to remember that the very logical approach of introducing more diversion because it seemed like a good way of using public money and to get round a system that was not dynamic enough, actually is bringing more and more the police service into the corrections side of the business. I am not entirely sure that is where I want to be.

I am pretty clear - and I was clear recently in talking to some people - about what the role of policing is, because it was the same now as it was when I was told 34 years ago. Now there are huge amounts more complexity. It is about save life, prevent crime and detect crime. We have got to cooperate with lots of other agencies but, actually, are we in the right business when we start going to correct (inaudible). So I think there is a really interesting debate around that and I look forward to that debate because I do not think it is going to be easy, but I think we need to do something about it.

I am going to ask Tim [Godwin] to comment on the rape crisis centres - when I say verse I do not mean versus the havens. I think that is the actual point; it should not be verse. They are different things but there should be that link up.

Demonstrations. It is really very difficult. You are right; some demonstrations are designed to provoke. We do everything within our power and we learn lessons and we can do more on occasions and we have learnt out of G20, to try to influence groups not to do that. We have certain rules. We have certain powers. It is right that we should use those powers to ensure we do everything we can to maintain community safety and do everything we can to build public confidence in our role, but we cannot go beyond that. Where we can use the powers, we do. Where we cannot, we try to influence. I am satisfied that that is what we are trying to do but we always have to revisit this because it has always been one of the most difficult areas for us.

Chairman, you mentioned Drumcree. I had a command, going back a number of years, on Drumcree. On that road that goes through that very troubled area. The whole issue there is I am sure lots of people would have wanted to stop that because it was one of the most bitter places I have ever been. But we could not do that by law so we had to try to police a very difficult circumstance. Now that is an extreme example but, nevertheless, we find ourselves in that position.

I think the critical issue is - and I think it is where Kirsten [Hearn] was asking the question - we make sure that we get out, write to all the communities, what the police role is, what we can do, what we cannot do and how we can liaise with communities to mitigate the effect and protect communities and give them confidence. But it is not easy.

Clive Lawton (AM): Sorry, Chairman. Can I just say that, as far as Drumcree is concerned, for example, there is a long tradition of having marched in that area and, therefore, being called upon to not march sounds like you are having rights removed. There is a difference, for example, if you are wanting to stop Islamification of Europe or whatever it is. Surely that statement is not to be made to a bunch of Muslims living in a place; you want to make it to a bunch of other people. So you go to a Muslim area to stop Islamification is clearly designed to provoke people. So I think there is a big difference between saying, "We've had a long tradition here, you cannot stop us" as opposed to saying, "We want to go to a place and provoke a bunch of people".

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is not for me to revisit what I did in the past or, indeed, the issues of another jurisdiction. I think there are some differences but the issue of provocation is exactly the same issue, in my experience. However, what I cannot do is do things that are beyond the law. That is for other people to discuss. Do I regret that there are groups that will deliberately go into an area, disturb communities and provoke? Of course I do. You would expect me to regret that. But I do not think you want me to decide on how civil liberties should be designed in this country. It is the big debate. I think my job is to ensure I inform the debate in a proper fashion. It is for other people to decide what is the balance of civil liberties. It is not my job.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): But I will do everything I can to minimise that disruption to the community because, actually, it is deeply, deeply disturbing when any group tries to do that and I am concerned about it.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. Tim [Godwin] on the rape crisis centres?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): In relation to rape crisis centres and havens. Whilst, personally, through the Metropolitan Police Service and with the MPA, we were setting up the havens, it is actually quite appropriate that they are independent of us now. Whilst we significantly part fund them, with health, they are keen to maintain their independence status as a haven so that victims have the confidence to go forward and they will not automatically be part of a police process. As we know, somewhere in the region of 20% self refer and do not want the police involved at that point, but we still gather intelligence in terms of serial offenders but we do not know the identity of the individuals.

Likewise the rape crisis centres are under different management. They are not managed by the police. Our job is to encourage that sort of network and seamless connectivity,

and I am sure it is going on, to actually support each other so that they are compatible and not competing. Our role is to facilitate that but we do not obviously manage either the rape crisis centres or the havens.

In terms of the specifics in relation to the no claim breakdown in terms of how many are where the evidence is that the event did not occur? As I say very rare. In relation to out of town and then transferred to another police force and those that are retractions or withdrawals of statements by victims, I will get that broken down and make sure that you are aware of it.

Clive Lawton (AM): Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have two areas. One is on the hotel bills. I am glad you are revising the policy because the headline figure did look extremely large and obviously gave cause for concern. Do you have any indication at the moment of the savings that could be made from a revised policy and, if not, could you bring that back at a later meeting, once that revision has taken place?

My second question is about the town centre patrols and that part of the written report. Can I ask, with regards to these town centre patrols, are you monitoring where those offices are actually coming from? My experience is that they are coming from other parts of the borough so they are being taken away and put into town centres. I know, for example, one of my boroughs does that with a great use of Specials and another does not, so there may be some conflict and some issues that may be emerging. Can I check that you are doing that because there are no extra resources there for that?

Secondly, on that, you have highlighted in paragraph five, that, in those town centre locations, crime has fallen significantly, which is to be welcomed, but there is no very context to know whether, in the surrounding areas, crime has gone up, so it is very hard for us to judge exactly how they are working. So can we also have that next time this appears please?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Joanne [McCartney].

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Hotel bills, if I may correct, I did not say I was going to revise the policy; I said I am reviewing the policy. Of course it is a big number but we are a big organisation and we do have a lot of people legitimately staying in hotels. So we have got to put some context here.

With Specials, there are 54,500 people, working - something like that - round this organisation. That is without the Specials. So I have got no idea of what savings could be made but we do have to look everywhere where we can to make savings but ensure that we do have proper policies so that people can have proper accommodation to meet the operational needs and the needs of the organisation. I am reviewing things but

revising, I think, would be wrong to say that. If I need to; I will, but reviewing is the first part.

Town centre patrols, Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Town centre patrols. They have come out of the borough strength and the borough deployment; it is not new money and they are not new posts. One of the things was to create the discipline of enforcing the single patrol which is coming through the presence part of our programme of service delivery whereby, where others might have been out on a double patrol during that time, when they go down to a single patrol, you can retain the single patrol and the additional hours are spent in the town centres. That is one way of monitoring how many extra patrol hours we get as a result. But they will vary between places. It is down to the individual borough commanders. It is monitored though through territorial policing. Do not have the data here to hand but I can make sure we get that.

In terms of displacement of crimes, I have not got the data here to hand on that but it is something we would look into in terms of neighbouring wards etc. What we find is often that the town centre crimes are very specific to town centres; from shop theft, criminal damage and various other bits. But I will have a look to see if there has been any drinking gone out of town centres and into the wards and see if that has occurred.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I think that would be very helpful. This looks like a very good policy as a headline, if you like, but, for example, I have got one town centre where there are four safer neighbourhood teams that patrol it and we have got an enhanced safer transport team doing the same corridor --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): You think it is overkill?

Joanne McCartney (AM): -- and putting the extra resources in may be having a detrimental effect elsewhere.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. We should bottom that out. Thank you. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): Yes, thank you, Chairman. I just wanted to pick up the point about VIP protection because the issue is often, as I understand it, one where there are international obligations which the Metropolitan Police Service is required to fulfil. The key issue for us as an Authority, and has been raised by Kit [Malthouse] in correspondence with the Home Office and quite a number of discussions, and you have also written as I understand it, is about the reimbursement of those costs, whether it is going to be at the full rate? Also, I think this applies particularly to the Musharraf case, where the in-year variations are going to be properly recognised because, at the moment, they are not.

My specific point was really to follow on from the incidence in Harrow. It seems to me that - and this relates, I think, a little to what Kirsten [Hearn] was saying earlier - this actually provides an opportunity to the Metropolitan Police Service, at borough commander level, to be renewing and reinvigorating discussions across London with local mosques and with local community leaders from the Muslim community specifically to explain the response that was taken in Harrow.

It would also be an opportunity to brief people on quite a number of other changes that have happened, for example, the new approach on Section 44 stops, maybe to comment on some of the indications (inaudible). Now this may well be happening in many instances because those would be the nature of the relationships that borough commanders and liaison officers are having, but it might be something that should be looked at in terms of using this as an opportunity to say, "Look, we'd like to come and talk to you about this particular matter because it may be of concern to your community".

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I agree. Certainly, I think is your work(?), Toby [Harris], a lot of this is driven through (inaudible) not at (inaudible) and we need to ensure that we are learning the lessons we have done from Harrow and making sure we do get those messages out, so I take the point.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Commissioner. John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I had four little things. Before that though, I think this is my fifth full Authority meeting and I very much welcome these question and answer sessions and I think inquisitive members of the public would find it helpful because they clarify, absolutely, who is in operational charge of the Police Service in London. I am not making that point for particularly partisan reasons but I think that there was some unhelpful media coverage over the summer.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I had a feeling you might try to drag it in!

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): We were having a sweep upstairs about what the question would be!

John Biggs (AM): There is a serious point which is that the Police Authority does need to remind itself what its role is, which is about accountability, about discussion of prioritisation of resources and so on. If we get confused about that we are going to get ourselves into a terrible tangle and maybe the training needs of Members needs to be revisited from time to time.

I had four points. One of them was substantially raised by Toby [Harris] which is about VIP protection. I would agree with what he said but Londoners need to be reassured that there is not any material depletion of available policing resources for their own needs as a result of this, as a result, perhaps, of national governmental decisions --

Jenny Jones (AM): Well of course there is. Of course there is. Of course. It costs a lot of money.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Could you put the question here.

John Biggs (AM): No. The principle which we should assert, as a Police Authority, in my view, is that we totally respect our capital city role and we totally respect the need to protect VIPs but that should not detract, in resource terms, and we should beat our shoes on the table, or whatever metaphor we want to use, to ensure that it does not detract from our general policing capacity. I am sure everyone would agree with that but we need to make that point again and again and reinforce the will of our Chairman and superb Vice Chairman in making that point on whatever forum they are able to do it.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): We are in heated correspondence.

John Biggs (AM): The second point which is, perhaps, another quickie as well is that I respect absolutely Jenny's [Jones] view about transport enforcement and I think, as I go out there in the field and talk to my constituents and so on, it is very clear that people feel very strongly about this, in terms of detecting crime and making London safer. It will always be in competition with other more immediate things but, clearly, the Police Authority should, from time to time, revisit this debate about resources for environmental enforcement issues, because it is massively important to people's confidence in the sense of safety in places in London.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Yes.

John Biggs (AM): That feeds into my other two points which are more substantial although, perhaps, the answers can be addressed over the coming months. The first of these is that, in two of my three boroughs - I have got three boroughs that I am link member for - we are talking in different ways about joint tasking with the local authority where we are marrying together particularly the local community policing presence with environmental enforcement and other local council activities. I am wondering what, if any, progress we have made towards a common protocol that applies across London? There may be merit in inventing 32 different ways of doing this, but there may be merit, also, in looking at good practice across the boroughs. There may be stuff already, because I am new here.

My final question is that, since I have been on the Police Authority, there have been a number of incidences of what you might call centralisation, so serious sexual violence being one. I support that and it makes sense. I am wondering, as a counter poise to that, what thinking there is about further devolution of other functions to borough bases or whether we are, in a sort of tidal fashion, sucking things back into the centre, as people tend to do, and, in a few year's time, they start pushing them out again, whether there is some thinking about that?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thanks, John [Biggs]. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): As briefly as I can. I just note the points you made earlier, John [Biggs], at the start. Two or three boroughs joint tasking. Huge importance. Entirely agree. Ways to drive that is through the GNES meeting but also through London Councils, and we are keen to do that. Again, I recently said to the Superintendent's Association, the way forward for all of us is joint tasking, joint coordination and joint action to make sure that we are all -- because, actually, our priorities are largely the same and, if they are not, they should be. So there is a way of doing that. The GNES meeting is an opportunity and London Councils and the work we are doing with London Councils is, also, another opportunity.

John Biggs (AM): It would be useful for the Authority, as background reading or at full Authority, to read something about the thinking on that, Chairman.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK. We will put a note around about that, if that is OK with you, Chairman.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): That would be great.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The centralisation debate. We are not doing, "We'll centralise this so, therefore, we have to centralise that". I do not think that is what you are asking us to do. But, actually, it is about being very aware of the very easy tendency to centralise and just keep doing it because it is the automatic answer to everything when, actually, it is not.

It is not my intention to keep centralising and I think, as I indicated on this particular issue, it was a very balanced decision as to whether this is the right thing to do. It took us some time, professionally, to come to that view. We did have very proper, and to be encouraged, professional debates and disagreements at the most senior level. I would expect that. So we did not take that decision lightly, to go towards a centralised command but, actually, in its delivery, it is still out there on boroughs. People are not being brought in to some big hub in the centre and being deployed out there. A lot of the stuff will still take place out there on boroughs; it is just where is the actual command for getting the maximum benefit of the asset and actually ensuring we get the right standards. That is coming from the centre.

But I take your point; we have got to be very cautious we do not just centralise everything.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. Right, I am going to take Valerie [Brasse] and then Dee [Doocey] and then Chris [Boothman] and then I am, regretfully, going to bring the discussion on the Commissioner's report to a close. Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you. One of the advantages of coming this late in the queue is that most of what I wanted to ask has been asked but on that very specific last point about centralisation and bringing Sapphire into Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD),

can I ask you particularly, if you are going to bring updates back, and I know you said you would to Victoria [Borwick], that you cover how exactly we are going to assess victim satisfaction with the changes, given specifically that the victims of serious sexual offences are not picked up in the user satisfaction survey?

The other point is what are we going to do and how is it being handled in the transition phase? As this is being done incrementally it is not one big bang and it did not all happen yesterday. How are we bringing local victim groups, in the boroughs where transition is happening, on board to ensure that we have shored up their confidence in how the Metropolitan Police Service is going to handle serious sexual offences? That is in relation to that.

Then I have one very different question. I suppose I ought to know more about **Met Call**(?) than I do but, given an incident that happened on my link borough, I am very interested to know what evidence is collated, prior to Met Call and post, around preventable deaths and whether we have the figures that suggest that since Met Call has been implemented, preventable deaths has gone down?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Since we have had Met Call in the three command control centres, that any analysis around preventable deaths has actually gone down?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): On the second point I will have to take that away and give that some thought.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I realised you would.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think there are some very real difficulties in what you are asking for there. Some very real difficulties. But I will take it away and think about it and maybe get back to you on it.

On your first point, you have made two points around Sapphire. We will include that. We will either circulate a note or bring it back to the next meeting.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Valerie [Brasse]. Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you, Chairman. A question which I am happy to have answered at a later stage. Operation Bumblebee. It says the budget for this phase of activity is £2.1 million. The previous Commissioner's report said that £242,000 has been allocated and it is estimated to rise to £1 million. It might be different periods of time but I would be interested in knowing the answer to that.

The second thing I, like everyone else, has got a particular interest in accommodation and flights, particularly in view of the fact that we have got to make, what I think have been described as, draconian reductions in the budget. We are now even looking at frontline policing according to --

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): No, we are not.

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes, we are, according to the papers that we have had sent round to us. I will show you them, Kit [Malthouse].

I was just going to suggest that it might be a useful case study for us to look at accommodation and flights in one of these, what I am sure will be, excellent workshops which Kit [Malthouse] is going to facilitate. So I think it might be quite nice, rather than us just working looking at huge numbers that it is quite difficult to get your head round, if we just take something like that which is a distinct area that might be quite good --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): You want to look at particular case studies of flights and ...?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. I think it might be an idea to use, for one of these budget workshops -- I do not quite know what Kit [Malthouse] has got in mind but I know he wants a much more open and transparent process for us to arrive at the figures. I just think, if we did a piece of work on that, it might be quite useful. Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): I will leave it to the ingenuity of the relevant committee to devise a fair way of doing that. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will provide a note on that, Dee [Doocey]. I cannot answer you now.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK. Excellent.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Your second point is with the Authority and not with me.

Dee Doocey (AM): Absolutely. I am sure Kit [Malthouse] and I can speak further on the matter.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): Yes. Happy to (inaudible) --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Good. Superb. I think Chris [Boothman] is the last question.

Christopher Boothman (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I would just like to say a couple of things. Firstly, Notting Hill Carnival. I do not think it is right that I should take the credit for what happened at Notting Hill Carnival; there were many people that worked

really hard to make it a success. By and large the feedback about the policing was extremely positive. There were a few concerns which I will raise in the formal debrief offline. I just wanted to pay tribute really to Sergeant Trevor Jenner who worked his socks off and was a brilliant ambassador for the Metropolitan Police Service. He did all kinds of things to make the event work more smoothly, he kept his cool in some of the most difficult meetings that we had in carnival and, as I said earlier, he was a brilliant ambassador for the Metropolitan Police Service and I would like to pay tribute to the work that he did this year.

The other issue that I want to raise; I am afraid I have got to go back to Form 696. I am coming from a slightly different slant than Jennette [Arnold] really. My issue about 696, my main issue, is whose responsibility is it, whose remit is it, for creating a bureaucracy to collect generic information about music types, spectator make up and personal information about performers in relation to venues? I have to say I do not think it is a policing function; I think that is, more properly, the function of a licensing authority. So I think that the bureaucracy around this form represents mission creep in terms of policing in a democratic society.

In order to do the thing properly and fairly, I question the resources required. So my question is really about has a cost benefit analysis been done about this function being discharged by the police? In saying that, what I want to make clear is that no one is questioning the targeting of gangs who are likely to commit acts of violence, no one is questioning the targeting of criminals or gangsters who are masquerading as performers and no one is questioning the targeting of premises being used as a front for criminal activities. What people are questioning is the justification for police gathering information, and particularly personal information, on people who are not suspects or aiders or abettors of suspects and keeping that information for up to six years.

I agree with Jennette [Arnold]; this issue is not going to go away easily. The comments I have mentioned are on the back of the original conception of the form which, in my view, was conceived in ignorance of the dangers of racial stereotyping.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Chris [Boothman]. I know the Commissioner has already answered Jennette [Arnold] on this. Do you want to say anything further, Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Only that I will make sure your comments are passed on to Trevor Jenner and thanks for that.

In terms of whose responsibility? I think you make an interesting point actually, Chris [Boothman]. A very interesting point. However we have always liaised with event organisers about issues of community safety because that is part and parcel of my remit. But I think you do make an interesting point.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much. Right, folks, that concludes the Commissioner's report and discussion thereon. I am very, very grateful to the

Commissioner. I know, Jennette [Arnold], that you and Chris [Boothman] are going to have a further opportunity to --

Jennette Arnold (AM): He is going to say, yes. I do not know why he does not say that today.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): -- discuss Form 696 and the issues it raises.

I want to go now to the race and faith inquiry and thank you, Cindy [Butts], for your letter. I much appreciate that and I understand completely the reasons why the full fruits of your labours are not yet before us. I want to thank you and your team, on behalf of everybody in the Authority, for the hard work you have obviously done. I do think what you have been doing is absolutely vital. Just looking at your eight page summary on your preliminary findings, I do think it is very, very helpful because you are being very balanced, it seems to me. You are finding lots to praise and lots of success to acknowledge, but you are pointing to the hard work that needs to be done to build even more confidence. Is there anything you want to add to --

Cindy Butts (AM): I was going to say thank you for introducing my report! There are a few things I want to add. Members are aware of why it is we do not have a full report so I do not intend to go into that to any great detail. What I would say is that the Vice Chairman, in view of the fact we do not have a report, requested that I produce a report which would really indicate to Members our emerging findings, where we are to date and to really give an indication of some of the areas that we intend to report on when the full report is ready. The Vice Chairman was also keen that we give some indication - because I think it is only right and proper - to the Metropolitan Police Service so that you are aware of some of the areas, again, that we will seek to be addressing.

Now what became abundantly clear throughout the entire process is that the Metropolitan Police Service has done some fantastic work. That became extremely clear to us. There was lots of innovation. There was lots of creativity. I have pointed to some of those areas within the report whereby people came along and talked about the good work in relation to recruitment, the setting up of the leadership academy and how that contributed to the Metropolitan Police Service's direction on equalities and diversity.

Equally we heard some very good examples of some of the work that some of the specialist units are doing and, in particular, I pointed out the work being done by Operation Trident.

However, I do want to make it really clear that while we witnessed and we heard about innovation and creativity, what sat beside that and sat beside that in a very uncomfortable way, were the experiences of black and minority ethnic officers who had been subjected to discrimination, mostly in relation to promotion processes, and I have sought to give Members a flavour of where that discrimination exists.

Now, what I have to make clear as well, is that, particularly in relation to promotion processes, it is not just black and minority ethnic (BME) officers who are saying that the processes do not appear to be fair and that they are riddled, at times, with inconsistencies. We heard that from black staff and non-BME staff equally. So what we would like to do, through our final inquiry report, is not just make outcomes for BME officers better; we want to make outcomes for everyone better. So I hope that Members will accept the interim findings in that vein because we intend to make practical solutions to some of the problems that we believe the organisation is still subject to.

Now, I will not go through all the areas. You can see them here before you. But what I would want to point to is two things. Firstly, the lack of a clear direction and vision in which the organisation is heading in. I would invite Members to consider that issue based on what is in the report and not to consider that issue as is reported in the press because this is not a direct slur against the Commissioner; what I am saying is that a new direction is needed, I am confident that the Commissioner and his senior management team, having made the decision to appoint Tim Godwin, the lead officer, with the support of the MPA and the many officers that we saw, BME officers and non-BME officers, want to see change. I am sure, together, if we work together in partnership, we can ensure that the Metropolitan Police Service does have a vision to which it can work towards.

MPA Members, when the inquiry was launched, requested that the panel also look at the processes that are employed by the MPA. We have not shied away in doing that. We have recognised that there are a number of areas in which this organisation is deficient. Quite frankly, the fact that it has no senior officer with equalities and diversity expertise does our work a disservice and it also means that we are not in a position to effectively hold the organisation to account. That needs to be addressed.

In addition you will see some other areas that we have pointed to in relation to the MPA and I sincerely hope that you will support the work that we have done thus far and you will support the inquiry panel, going forward, so that we can produce a report that properly reflects the work that we have done, to date.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much, Cindy [Butts], for introducing the preliminary summary of your report. I am sure Members will have had a chance to look at it. I think it is a very interesting and good bit of work. Commissioner, do you want to say anything in response to what Cindy [Butts] has had to say?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Only very briefly to say that I think you would acknowledge that I have consistently stated my position which is that I think this organisation - including long before I came to it - has made very, very significant progress on this issue. But also, I have always said there is much more to do. I actually think your emerging findings sit very comfortably with that statement; there is more to be done. I am very grateful for acknowledging the works of thousands of officers in this organisation and what they have done over a number of years to actually improve the situation.

I also think the areas you have outlined are entirely consistent with what I and a number of other people actually said to you in the evidence session; where we have made good progress and where there is more to be done. So I do not think, frankly, there is a bus ticket between us on those areas.

I think the real issue is -- I might dispute wording but, frankly, that is semantics. I think we do have a vision; I think it is how we get on now and deliver on some of those areas we need to do something about. I welcome your support for the move of putting Tim [Godwin] in charge of the Diversity Board, the change we are going to do to the Diversity Directorate with the director there reporting directly to Tim [Godwin]. I think that will make a difference. I know we have discussed with you a very detailed action plan that will be very detailed with who, what and when is to be delivered around the areas where we need to make further improvements. I just look forward to getting on with it.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you. Just on your points about the MPA, Cindy [Butts], clearly the mere fact that one of the first things that we did was to ask you to do the race and faith inquiry I hope demonstrates the commitment of this body to that agenda though, clearly, I take note of what you say about the need to put, in more structural form, the role for someone to have oversight of diversities. That is obviously something that, I hope, we will all think about. I am informed it is actually proposed in the restructuring of the MPA so that may go some way to address the points that your respondents have made but, clearly, that is something we need to think about.

Can I propose, folks, Members of the MPA, that since we have been running for quite a long time - I do not in any way wish to curtail this discussion but I am just aware that some people need to leave after two hours - so I hope that we can try to deal with this as briefly as possible? I am going to go to Kirsten [Hearn], then Jennette [Arnold] and then Dee [Doocey].

Kirsten Hearn (AM): I am looking forward to reading the report and wondering what it is that needs to be put in place to ensure that the report is delivered and can we agree to do that? I feel a bit unhappy that we have not had the report and I would like it to happen. So what do we need to do to put that in place to make it happen?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): The most important thing obviously is that we should get the full report and have a proper reflection and discussion about it and I am sure that we will want, if it is on the lines that we see in these preliminary findings, very much to welcome it and to implement it. Kit [Malthouse]?

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): I have had discussions with Cindy [Butts] and the rest of the panel and asked them to come up with a proposal pretty quickly about timescale and what will be required, in terms of resources, to get that completed. I think we are pretty hopeful that we will get a report some time very early in the New Year but we have yet to flesh out the exact plan to get it finished. But it will be in that kind of timescale.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. I tell you what I might do; I might take as many questions as there are and then put them back to Cindy [Butts]. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, can I just start by adding my congratulation to Cindy [Butts] and the team for their absolutely extensive report? Like Kirsten [Hearn] I would just like a total commitment that the resource needs can be put behind producing the report as soon as possible because so much of what is said in this report will be new to people and they will want to see the evidence.

In a sense, can I just say, none of what is in this report is new to me and that is why I raised my concerns when you announced this review. Because I did not really see the need for yet another inquiry and yet another report. What we wanted then, and what we want now, is actions, not more words. Having said that, I think what this report does, yet again, is bring us up to date and, as Cindy [Butts] said, the stories of those people who have experienced the excesses of discrimination, they ring true just in this summary. What I also appreciate is the identification of just how far both the Service and this Authority has moved, certainly since 2000 when we were in the darkest of places. So I welcome that.

Most importantly for me - and this is where we then have to see the real commitment of you, Boris Johnson - is that are you up for putting the resource and the advocacy and the commitment to getting action where the action is needed and that is in the places where the sun don't shine. I mean in those places, those specialist units, I mean in those places where we can go and walk, where, in 180 years of this Service I bet you will find women have never served. It is 180 years next week since this Service was formed. There are still areas that women have never served in. There are whole areas where I do not even think that BME recruits and officers have even had a secondment to. These are areas that need dealing with and we now need to see this document because it is on this document that we will be able to judge our leadership of this Authority and also see how the Service will continue the momentum that was set in train by the Stephen Lawrence report.

The point though that is missing for me - and I think we could deal with that today - is there is a sore that we need to sort and that is the Metropolitan Police Service Black Police Association (BPA) felt that they had no option but to issue a boycott against the Service. That is not mentioned because that is not what you wanted to put in but I do believe that we should actually now be hearing how some mediation or how some action can be taken to address that. It just seems to me that that would be a really good sign that if we could get some sort of statement from both the Commissioner and the current head of the Metropolitan Police Service BPA then perhaps, once they have seen this report - because it is my understanding, just talking informally, that this report, if you like, vindicates the concerns that they have had - that we could get that boycott lifted or whatever it is you do with a boycott.

Then, of course, I think, like others, I really would want to see the detailed process and cost associated with the specific actions that are needed to take us forward. Thank you.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Jennette [Arnold]. Before I go back to Cindy [Butts] I would like to bring in Dee [Doocey].

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I, too, welcome what Cindy [Butts] and the team have done. We are very grateful for the huge effort and the amount of work they have put in.

My concern is about what will actually happen to the eventual recommendations and will they actually be implemented? I have seen, in the five years I have been on the MPA, a lot of people spend a lot of time in these sort of committees or panels and then we make all sorts of recommendations and they either fall through cracks, are ignored or there are all sorts of good reasons, namely to do with various other organisations, why they cannot be implemented.

I will give you just one example, a short example. Last year the Turkish community raised with me an issue that the Turkish and Kurdish communities were aware that the Metropolitan Police Service wanted to recruit many more Turkish and Kurdish people into the PCSOs because there was a shortage. The community was very keen to do this so they laid on, at their expense, two roadshows and it culminated in 105 people putting in an application - they were standard forms - in order to say they were interested in becoming PCSOs. Not one of them got a response from the Metropolitan Police Service. Now I raised this at a very senior level in the Metropolitan Police Service. I sent a letter on 18 July and I finally got a reply on 17 October accepting basically what I had said and the concerns I had passed on - not arguing that any of them were not true - and explaining how it would be sorted. I have spoken to the community today and they said that things have got worse, not better. There is now no contact between the Metropolitan Police Service and the Turkish and Kurdish communities at all.

It just bothers me that we can spend, if we are not careful, a huge amount of time and a huge amount of resource in trying to sort out a problem and then nothing happens. So I just really wanted to feed that in because I think it really is important that we do not waste our time and that when we make recommendations, unless there are absolutely overwhelming reasons that they cannot be done - and I have never known one yet - I would actually like to see at least a dialogue and then those recommendations accepted. Otherwise, frankly, we are all wasting our time.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Absolutely right. You are really making the same point, effectively, as Jennette [Arnold]; this great process must generate some movement and some action. I am determined that it should. Clearly we cannot, yet, on the basis of what we have got, produce recommendations for action. We are waiting for the full report, so I understand.

Cindy Butts (AM): Of course. Can I just deal, briefly, with some of the issues that have been raised? Jennette [Arnold], you talked about - and I think Kirsten [Hearn] as well - about what we need to take the work forward. As Kit [Malthouse] has said, the panel has

compiled a small note that will go to Kit [Malthouse] detailing what resources we need and a timescale that is reflective of the further work that needs to be done, rather than an arbitrary timescale which does not fit with what is needed to be done. So that is the intention. What we need is a team of people with the requisite skills and expertise in order to do the work and I am sure that that will be found.

In terms of actions, not words, there is a string of recommendations that sit beneath the report that you have here. When we have the right team of people in place then those recommendations, practical recommendations, will sit with the report. So we are entirely focused upon the actions and not just words.

In terms of making sure that recommendations are implemented, two things I would say to that. Firstly, that is about the Metropolitan Police Service being committed to the issues. Secondly, it is about us - about you and it is about me and everyone else - ensuring that the Metropolitan Police Service, in committing to the recommendations, makes sure that they are carried through and implemented. That is for us to make sure that that oversight of those recommendations is done.

Equally, the Commissioner has already pledged to us, when he came to see the inquiry panel, that he agrees to put those recommendations in his performance and development review (PDR), so he will be held to those. Of course those recommendations that are accepted.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Correct. I promised John [Biggs].

John Biggs (AM): Just very quickly, I share a number of Jennette's [Arnold] anxieties and I agree, broadly, with what both her and the other speakers have said. My anxiety is about the rigour of the evidence base in this report. I just guess I worry about that. There is a legal process by which an individual can ascertain whether they have been subjected to racial or other discrimination. This report will have received evidence -- I have no knowledge of how it has actually done its work and it may have had an impossible task and it may have been set up to fail, actually, as a result of this, but one needs to separate assertions from evidence based conclusions. I think we will not do any service if we get muddled up between those and we will not do any service to BME officers or others who face discrimination -- and I have no doubt at all that the organisation, like all organisations, still has structural problems with discrimination in the way in which it treats people, but unless we have real rigour in this report it will be at risk of being marginalised.

It is a very important piece of work. If I had started I probably would not have set off in this direction but I was not here then and, anyway, I am a humble opposition Member. I just wonder whether we are setting ourselves up to fail and whether maybe some additional resource is needed, or maybe some further, independent, eye is needed to ensure that this report, when it comes out, has the rigour and has examined its evidence in a way that means it will stand up to proper examination. In no way am I belittling your role in it; it is just I think you have been given a pretty near impossible task,

Cindy [Butts], and we want to make sure it does not blow up and not achieve its objectives.

Cindy Butts (AM): That is why it is so important to make sure that we have the requisite resources to support the work in doing the analysis and presenting our findings so that they are evidence based.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, I raised the issue about the black BPA.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Hang on, Jennette [Arnold]. I am going to bring in Chris [Boothman].

Christopher Boothman (AM): I just want to add to that point there really. I think that one of the issues with a report like this is that it has to meet so many different expectations; there will be expectations on the part of the Police Service, expectations on the part of Members, expectation on the part of BME officers.

What is important is that when it gets proofed it gets a certain number of different kinds of proofing. Now obviously it needs a legal proofing to make sure that the assertions made in it stand up, but it also needs to be proofed by people who understand how, in particular, discrimination law works because, all too often, when we talk about issues in this arena, we are talking about beyond a reasonable doubt. This stuff is balance of probability stuff and also, in relation to the law that is developed in the tribunals, it is based on inferences.

So what is needed to be produced is actually quite a sophisticated piece of work that has to hit a number of different kinds of bases. I just hope that input is made before it becomes a public document.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. I think that is a point that everybody seems to be agreed on. Jennette [Arnold], do you want to say anything further?

Jennette Arnold (AM): I just raise the issue now that we are here today about the boycott and whether or not the Commissioner had anything to say about that?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Why do we not bring the Commissioner back in for one last remark on Cindy's [Butts] report and we will thank her and move on to the next item.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): In response to that, Jennette [Arnold], I am not going to revisit everything that was said between us all at that time. I regretted it. It was a matter for the MBPA that they wanted to do that. But I am on record, and I have been on record on a number of occasions, saying I want to work with all staff associations and staff supported associations to make this organisation as good as it can possibly be. I have met with the MBPA. I want to work with the MBPA. Let me make it clear; race and faith are an issue for the Metropolitan Police Service, just like they are

an issue in society. They are an issue for the Metropolitan Police Service and we will get on and do things about it.

If I can just move on to the recommendations issue? We have only just seen the emerging findings. The emerging findings are at a certain level. I do take, actually, John Biggs' point but, to give some reassurance, as I was saying, the areas that have been outlined are exactly the areas that we were agreeing on in taking evidence and exactly what we have been saying; that we are making progress, more to do and, actually, the areas that have been looked at are where we know we have got more to do. I think, as Cindy [Butts] knows, we have a piece of work already in place, with a detailed action plan, to take matters forward, and we are waiting for this inquiry to actually add to that, or otherwise.

As to committing to implementing recommendations once we see the detail of this we will sit down and discuss it and what we agree to do we will do. If we say there is something we cannot do then we will discuss it, I am quite sure, and understand the reasons why. I do not think there is any difference.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you very, very much. I think we will all want to thank Cindy [Butts] and her team for what they have done. Clearly you are going to need more time and more help to get it done in the way that will make the effort worthwhile and will provide a body of work that we can really draw proper conclusions from and make proper recommendations from. So that is obviously what you are going to be working on over the next few weeks.

I think we should get on as fast as possible to item six. I wonder whether, Tim [Godwin], do you want to take us through this one or can we defer it? The five Ps?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I am very happy to say that it is fairly self-explanatory. It was a request from the Authority for a commission paper. If there are any questions in relation to any element of it, I am very happy to take those at any time and, as we develop some of the stuff around presence, automatic personnel locator systems (APLS) etc, we will keep the Authority informed.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Shall we add progress? Punctuality? Good. OK. Thank you.

The budget and business plan. Members will have had that before them. I do not think we need to have much of a formal discussion about it. Can I take it that it has been approved? Noted?

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): It has been through the committee processes.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Been through the committee processes. Thank you.

Item eight. The scrutiny of crime and disorder matters under sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act. That seemed, to me, to be fairly self-explanatory. I trust Members have had a chance to look at it. It has been through the process. Are Members willing to approve that? Thank you. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I had understood - and Catherine [Crawford] did not come back to me again on this last night - that we were looking to see whether we could be exempt from this? Exempt from Members having to go. It was a discussion we had at that lunchtime briefing. Maybe I had misunderstood but I thought we were looking to be exempt from this particular responsibility because Members were covering so many boroughs and things, they felt it was going to be a really huge task.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Chairman, I am sorry if something I said or did not say over lunchtime has caused confusion. I cannot even remember which lunchtime it was now. This is only guidance. We are not in the process of negotiating any exemption from the guidance from the Home Office because I do not think we need to; we can interpret it as sensibly as we can. What option two here sets out is, in fact, as flexible an approach to being involved where it is appropriate to be so, in scrutinies, as seems sensible. It does recognise that, in certain circumstances, officers could represent Members. It fell to Cindy's [Butts] committee and I think that was the unanimous conclusion. But I am sorry if I gave an impression that there were negotiations. I am not sure where that has come from.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Otherwise, can I take it that the Authority is content? Thank you.

Could I ask Members whether they have had a chance to study item nine; the MPA Member's role? Any questions or comments on conclusions thereon?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Can I just clarify that every Member of the MPA, with obviously the exclusion of you as the Mayor, is a link member with at least one borough? Is that absolutely the case?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): That is as I understand it.

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): I am not.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): The Vice Chairman is not.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): You are not and, Toby [Harris], you are not. OK. It just seems a number of Members are covering -- I mean I only do one borough and it is a huge amount of work. Jennette [Arnold] and John [Biggs] and others are doing two or three boroughs. I just think it is really huge and it is a huge responsibility.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): You would like to know whether that burden is being shared amongst Members? OK. Well I am sure we can get back to you on that with a

full answer. But can I take it, otherwise, that Members are content with item nine as it stands? Thank you.

On item ten which is about MPA restructuring I know that there were some questions last time. I hope that they have been satisfied by the paper before you. Thank you. Sorry, Chris [Boothman]?

Christopher Boothman (AM): Sorry, Chairman. If we can just be assured that the comments raised by Cindy [Butts] will be addressed in the restructuring?

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

Boris Johnson (Chairman): On the role of the BME?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): No. On the need for --

Boris Johnson (Chairman): On diversity. Of course.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): That is already addressed in the (inaudible). Quite clearly.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Yes. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): And on that and the comments we raised at the meeting we had. And also, given that we have just agreed the Member's role, there are significant roles in boroughs and that needs to be addressed in the new structure.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you, Joanne [McCartney]. Thank you.

Amendments to standing orders. Can I take it the amendments to standing orders are acceptable?

Toby Harris (AM): Just one point which is about the terms of reference of the Corporate Governance Committee and the full Authority in relation to the final account. I think the normal position would be that the Corporate Governance Committee, in the same way as an Audit Committee, would advise the body responsible for the accounts, which might be finance and resources, about that. I would suggest that the standing order reflects that rather than have the whole process of signing off the accounts being done simply by the Corporate Governance Committee. I do not mind doing it but it does not seem to me it is entirely proper --

Kit Malthouse (Vice Chairman): In the end you sign the accounts.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): That is, I am sure, acceptable. Thank you. Can I therefore ask whether the MPA has had a chance to note the reports from the committees?

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, just on page 111 in the report of the SOC Tamil protest, it says, blah blah blah and then the paragraph ends with, “It was agreed to”. What was agreed to?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes. We always agree!

Boris Johnson (Chairman): It was agreed to.

Clive Lawton (AM): Maybe there should be an extra o at the end. Agreed to. What was agreed to?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): No, hang on. Contains proposals. Hang on a minute. A report was provided. The report was agreed to.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): May I offer to circulate an amended version of this report which shows what was agreed?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): There is no full stop.

Clive Lawton (AM): Should just be, “It was agreed”?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Yes.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): No. I think there is a gap --

Clive Lawton (AM): Is there something that was agreed?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): -- and we will circulate -- but I cannot, at the moment, remember quite what we agreed to.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Well it says a report was provided. Surely the report was agreed to?

Clive Lawton (AM): I assume that is supposed to say, “It was agreed to carry out a further review” or ...

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you eagle eyed, Clive [Lawton], who spotted the absence of a full stop. Catherine [Crawford] will clear up the mystery of the missing full spot.

Is there any other urgent business? There being no other urgent business I declare this meeting of the MPA concluded. Thank you very much, Commissioner. Thank you, Tim [Godwin].

The meeting finished at 12.15 p.m.