

Appendix 1

Extract from the transaction of the full Authority meeting on 29 October 2009 – Commissioner's update – Agenda item 5 – Routine armed foot patrols

Can I now turn to the CO19 issue - or rather the MPS issue - regarding reporting of a change of tactics of the idea of routine armed foot patrolling in the MPS. You will see my statement I issued on Tuesday and it is important I make absolutely clear to the Authority again where I stand, and where the MPS stands, on the issue. In that statement I said quite categorically that I had - and the MPS has - no intention at all of introducing routine armed foot patrols on the streets of London on our estates and I repeat that statement here today. I also do not believe that there is current necessity to change, or adjust, our existing firearms' tactics.

I can fully understand why any suggestion of such a move would cause widespread concern and grief to a lot of people, certainly amongst Authority members who have been having to respond to a lot of concern from communities - I acknowledge that and I regret it - and some members of the community who are genuinely concerned about such a change of tactic.

I wish to stress that, if I considered it was necessary to routinely deploy armed foot patrols in the way that has been recently reported, I would wish to ensure that I consulted and communicated with the Mayor, with this Authority and with communities. I do not think there is a need to do that at this moment in time because I do not think we need to go to routine armed foot patrols in the way that has been reported.

I think it is important to explain the context of this situation and how it arose - and I regret the way it did arise. What we are talking about is eight pre-planned intelligence-led operation undertaken by CO19 on five boroughs which involved them working alongside neighbourhood teams and sometimes, it has to be said, walking alongside their unarmed colleagues. Two of these operations were for 20 minutes in duration, five were for an hour in duration and one was for two and a half hours in duration. That is what we are talking about; these eight very limited patrols. They were pre-planned operations.

These operations were put together for the best of reasons by officers. They actually did a huge amount of work at a certain level and they were doing it to support local communities and local unarmed officers which is our tradition and a tradition that is going to remain. Each operation was authorised as a firearms operation by local borough superintendents and a community impact assessment carried out.

It is important to note, by the way, that on two of the operations firearms were found; two rifles and one hand gun. So let us celebrate the fact that we did find something. But they were not routine deployments, as reported, of armed officers performing foot patrols on these estates. They just were not routine. They were pre-planned operations.

However, the manner in which these operations were planned and carried out did amount, in my opinion, to a small extension of existing firearms tactics and also the communication of this gave the impression that armed officers were going to be routinely patrolling alongside their unarmed colleagues. This was not the case and it will not be the case. If it ever needs to be the case that we are going to do something as reported, I will do what you expect me to do. Whilst it might be an operational matter, this is a matter that would be a significant change of style and I would come back and talk to the Mayor and this Authority, unless I was in an emergency situation.

Regrettably I think, and I have to say this, there was a failure to recognise the significance of this tactic by officers who were well meaning round it. They did not recognise the tactic and its potential to generate the view that this represented a step change in routine policing style. Accordingly, it should have been escalated within my organisation and it was not. I regret that. When this issue was first brought to the attention of Tim Godwin, the Deputy Commissioner, last Thursday, he acted decisively and immediately and put a stop to it. There was no need for within the MPS clarification. It was stopped immediately and he made that clear with the MPS, "We are not doing this because it is giving the wrong impression" and I am grateful to Tim [Godwin] for doing that.

The MPS has a long and proud tradition of being one of a handful of major cities around the world - and we were just talking about other cities around the world - where officers are not routinely armed and I am determined to maintain that position. I am very proud of what those unarmed officers do, just as, indeed, I am very proud of the officers who provide the necessary armed support to allow them to do it. So far this year there have been over 1,500 pre-planned authorised firearms operations. You can do the math yourself and some people around this forum are clearly better at the math than I am, on occasions. That is approximately about 40 a week so it is not surprising that neither the Deputy nor I would be told about a pre-planned firearms authorisation, but I repeat what I have said previously, there was a misjudgement that people did not see that, by this small extension, they were going to create a significant impression of a change to our style. That was a mistake and I regret it.

That is simply it. It was a matter of judgement. I can say that, had it been escalated in the way that I think it should have been, it would not have got to this stage and I would not have had to consult with this Authority because it would not have happened. That is simply it. However, as soon as the Deputy was made aware, he immediately instructed that firearms officers routinely walking the streets of London with their own unarmed colleagues, as was being reported, is not an option, and will not be an option unless we go through the process I have just spoken about. I regret that an article in a policing magazine led to this impression in the first place. I think it was unnecessary and I genuinely do regret it.

I fully acknowledge that the MPS' communication in this issue has not been at

its best - I think I could say - and that messages in relation to what we were doing and what we are not doing in this area could have been better and more effectively communicated, yes, to members of the Authority, but actually wider to the public.

A little context. I should remind members, as I said earlier, that although we have seen this recent rise in gun crime, it is important to put it in the context of the last five years and in the context of what I have said in comparisons with New York, Baltimore and all these other erroneous comparisons, in my opinion.

Firearms officers will, of course, continue to be deployed in support of their unarmed colleagues - and so they should - and I fully support them in the work they do and we would be in a very difficult situation without them volunteering for that sort of work. Indeed, they will continue to patrol - which is routine - in airports and other locations where there is specific intelligence requiring armed officer support, as they have done for many years. As you know, you go through the airports and various places where we do do this.

If the MPS was ever to move to a situation where there was a requirement to routinely deploy armed foot patrols in our wider communities, as was being reported, then I come back to say I would, of course, consult robustly and communicate with the Mayor and this Authority and communities. However, I repeat, I do not believe, at this time, that is necessary. So that is why I do not feel I need to consult on the tactic; because we are not doing it.

There will be no move towards routine arming of the Metropolitan Police Service officers by stealth. This is not a development that I believe is necessary, the majority of my officers do not believe is necessary, I am quite clear that I do not think this Authority believes it necessary and I do not think the majority of the public think is necessary. Any such thing should be properly done, properly considered and done on the base of intelligence.

Thank you, Chairman.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Commissioner. I think that is extremely helpful. Can I propose, Kirsten [Hearn], before I bring you in, Chris [Boothman] and before I bring members of the Assembly in, because I know that everybody will want to have a chance to ask questions, that, since we already have some pre-tabled questions of which the Commissioner has been made aware and since they relate directly to some of the principal subjects that he has talked about in his report, notably homophobic hate crime and the CO19 business, I think it might be to the advantage of this meeting if I ask those who have tabled questions relating to the big subjects to go first and then there is, obviously, a long tail of other subjects that I am sure members will want to bring up? Would that be OK? I propose we go first to the CO19 patrols.

Toby Harris (AM): And we will deal with questions on CO19?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): And we will take all questions on CO19, as a group. We will then, I propose, Kirsten [Hearn], go to homophobic hate crime and take all those questions and we will then see how we get on, but I think we could go to some of the other questions that have been pre-notified? Is that OK? So I propose that Joanne [McCartney], since you are the constituency member, you put your question about CO19?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I start by just welcoming your statement today because I think your statement today actually went further than the full statement you put out a couple of days ago because you do recognise that the operations that have taken place did constitute a small extension to existing tactics? Can I also say that I do not think anyone here would wish to denigrate CO19 at all; I think they do an excellent job and certainly I would be the first to say, representing Haringey, that some of the pre-planned operations they have done there which have been intelligence-led are extremely welcome and extremely necessary. I am glad you have acted on this and your statement today is most welcome.

I do have some questions still about how this arose and perhaps, particularly, my concern is that senior management in the MPS did not know about it and you have helpfully said that you should have done. So I want reassurances about what instructions you have given so that this does not happen again.

Secondly, it seems to me there was a mismatch between senior management and the MPS' communications arm because, certainly on Thursday when the story seemed to break, the MPS press office put out a statement which did, in fact, say a lot of this stuff about the fact that it is going to be ramped up next month, there was this special unit that were going to do estate sweeps and that came out of the MPS' mouth itself. Certainly the MPS put an officer up - a CO19 officer - to give interviews which further, I think, gave the impression that this was something new as a departure from normal tactics and, again, it was going to be ramped up the following month. Just to quote one of the things that that Inspector said, he said that, "We will walk through estates. Sometimes we will be carrying larger MP3 carbine single shot weapons. Other times we will be more discrete". So I think just the messages that were put out by the MPS did not assist this.

Certainly since this story broke I have had pages of comments from communities in Haringey who are angry that they were not consulted, extremely concerned that their community is being labelled as a no go area and certainly comments that they would feel less safe if they felt there was a need to have armed police walking the streets. So I think it would be useful if you could certainly feed down through all those community channels exactly what you have said today because that would allay a lot of the concern that has been put forward. I want to know what instructions you have put out.

I am glad you have recognised that this would have been a step change in policing and that people were not being hysterical when they made comments about this because I think, what you said today, quite clearly states that this is an extremely serious matter and that it is a matter that, if this had been

correct, this Authority and others should have been consulted about. Thank you.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): What have I done about making sure that it does not happen again? I have done what you expect me to do and we have given appropriate advice to the appropriate people. That is not about blaming people actually because I genuinely do believe the people involved in this were acting with real good intent. We just missed a trick here. The judgement was not there to actually see that this would lead to this picture that we were a significant change in style. We just missed it. It should have been escalated and it was not. The message I have just given you now has penetrated the organisation and we have given appropriate advice.

But I have got to go back to the fact that all firearms operations are properly authorised under a rigorous system. So the actual conduct of them is very tightly controlled - and so they should be - but it was just a judgement that people did not quite get it that this would be perceived in such a way and look like the alteration of a style and actually suggest that it would be routine. It was never routine in truth because it was specific firearms operation. But we should have realised that would be the perception. We just failed on that. It should have been escalated.

You mentioned about the way in which the officer who spoke to the police review - the wording in that - actually did lead to the perception of routine armed patrol and a step change. Actually --

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): -- and his interview on television.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): And his interview.

Joanne McCartney (AM): The wording I read out was from a television interview that was given on Thursday.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I know. Actually it was that publicity, if I am going to be perfectly honest about it, that drew it to our attention because it had not been escalated, and it was actually that publicity that created the problem because the wording used allowed the perception that this was routine armed patrolling in support of unarmed officers, and that was a significant change in style. It was not routine so that was actually wrong, because it was specifically authorised, but, in a funny way, that was the thing that drew it to our attention that made Tim Godwin jump out of his seat and say, "No, no, no".

I cannot do anything other than regret the fact that it should have been escalated prior to that. It was not. People had been advised but they were acting with honest and good intent in trying to protect the public and their unarmed colleagues but I think we just made a misjudgement in the organisation.

Joanne McCartney (AM): One final thing. You said that the message has been permeated through the organisation. What about out to the local community groups?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): That is why I put the statement out yesterday, that is why I am trying to be as clear and as explicit as I possibly can be here today and we will look at any other means that we can put this out and any suggestions, I will clearly take those on board.

The one thing I have got to be very careful of, Joanne [McCartney], is actually not saying that we are not going to do armed operations and that there will not be people with guns. In my wording I do not want to mislead communities either. You will see armed officers on the streets doing the things they have always done. It was this perception of a move into a routine armed patrolling through the streets, as reported, that created the real concerns, as a result of which that is why we are trying to recover the situation and clarify what we are and not doing. Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Can I add one thing, Chairman? Quite rightly I was given some feedback before coming in from Jennette [Arnold] in the sense of how quick did we get our message out that countered the original message? It is very difficult, once one message has gone out, to send then something that is totally contradictory out. Did we succeed in that on the Thursday and into the Friday? We tried to put some briefings round. Did we succeed? No. We tried very hard. I accept full responsibility for that. Obviously, again, it was one of those situations that we would not have wanted to get into in the first place and certainly we would try to correct as quick as we can, but it did become problematic and the feedback is well understood and received.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Good. Now lots of people want to come in. I have got Dee [Doocey], Clive [Lawton], Jenny [Jones], Caroline [Pidgeon], Reshard [Auladin], Jennette [Arnold], Valerie [Brasse] and Steve [O'Connell]. So I am going to go first to Dee [Doocey]. And Toby [Harris] and Chris [Boothman].

Dee Doocey (AM): I too welcome your statement which is very clear. I have a real problem trying to understand though how this happened. In a hierarchical organisation such as the MPS - which is probably the most hierarchical structure I have come across - how can a CO19 officer - and, like Joanne [McCartney], I am not blaming the officer at all - appear on television and make a statement - which anyone with an ounce of common sense would know was going to be of major concern - which appeared to suggest that police officers were going to be on motorbikes and having all this type of guns and that type of guns without you, your Deputy or any of the senior management team knowing about it?

How did this happen when you employ 76 people to deal with the media? Were they not consulted? Did they not consult you? It just does not make any sense at all because you say that, as soon as Tim [Godwin] found out

about it, he put a stop to it - and that is fine - but we are, round this table, very used now to learning of what the MPS is doing through the television or through journalists phoning us up and asking us for quotes --

Toby Harris (AM): So we are in the same position as the Commissioner.

Dee Doocey (AM): -- but I had not realised, until now, that you are in the same position as we are! I find this thing quite extraordinary. Are you really suggesting that CO19 officers can make decisions of this magnitude and just announce it on television?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Can I make a proposal? Commissioner, before you come back, I have a feeling that many of the questions that are in people's heads will be on roughly the same sorts of lines, so I think it would be a good thing, therefore, if we actually took a bunch of questions at once just to give everybody time to think what the most effective question they want to ask is. Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): I had originally put forward a question which asked, "Is this a change in policy or a change in practice and, if it is a change in policy, who did you consult and, if it is a change in practice, how did you go about communicating to relevant people in local communities what was going on and why?" I am now entirely reassured, by your comments, that it was neither a change in policy nor intended to be a change in practice; but merely a cock up and so I want to concentrate on that.

I echo Dee's [Doocey] concerns about the communications and the command and control process, but I am also influenced by something that Jenny [Jones] said in one of her many encounters with the media about the business of more guns on the streets not necessarily making anybody feel safer. I wonder what might be understood to be happening, culturally amongst the police on the ground, that a relatively senior officer might think that more guns are not a controversial significant issue.

Now we all know that these things creep. I guess we can all remember the first time we saw a police officer with a gun, maybe at an airport or something, and it was a shocking remarkable thing. Now I guess we are pretty used to seeing police officers with guns at airports and so it goes and so it creeps. If there are areas where guns might start to be seen as normal amongst the criminal groups, are the police officers who are dealing with them also starting to see guns as normal in that process and, therefore, it does not occur to them? So I am very worried about the cultural implications of this amongst, perhaps, sectors of the police service who are more familiar with the use of guns and consider them to be routine tools for their work and, therefore, they bring them out more quickly and more readily and do not see any controversy in doing so.

Side by side with that, of course, is the comparatively macho articulations, I think, of the various statements that were made along the way about the use of guns and how this is all fine and it is good and it is going to sort things out.

I hear your regret and I too regret these things but rather, as Dee [Doocey] said, we thought we were in this situation and we thought you were in that situation! That you feel regret and I feel regret is very nice to know; we are in common there but you can do stuff about this. So I would be quite interested to know what level of retraining, advice, intervention, demotion, new systems or whatever have been put in to ensure that this is kept under better control in future.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you. I think the Commissioner should soak up a few more. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. Commissioner, I have got a couple of questions. The first one is about language because what you have said is there is going to be no routine armed foot patrols, but you have called them pre-planned. I heard the word was proactive, rather than reactive. Are you going to have any *ad hoc* armed foot patrols that are not reactive because that would be a departure - as you have described, it would be a small extension - and that really ought to come to us?

My second question is you called this a CO19 issue and you also said the judgement was not there. I would like to know, is CO19 out of control?

Kit Malthouse (AM): Oh Jenny [Jones], that is just not a sensible thing to say.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): It is OK. Jenny [Jones] is allowed to ask her questions. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I wanted to pick up the issues around community reassurance because I am the link member for Lambeth and obviously there are huge concerns, particularly in the Brixton area, that their area is being demonised. At our Crime and Disorder Partnership this week we unanimously passed a motion expressing concern about how this had all been handled. When we have got new borough commanders developing relationships with the wider community, this has been really quite damaging to them, so I would like to know what is being done, centrally, to help overcome that because there is a trust issue and they start to think, "Hang on, is the borough commander approving something we do not know about" So I said I would express their concerns today but I would like to know what, centrally, the MPS is doing to make sure that the whole community is reassured that this really is not practice?

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

Reshard Auladin (AM): Yes. My question, basically, is an extension of Dee's [Doocey], but I ask it wearing my professional standards hat. Should an accident occur during one of those operations it would be either you yourself, Commissioner, or your Deputy, in front of the cameras explaining what actually has happened. What Stockwell has taught us is that whoever is

there doing this explanation will be accused of either lying or various other things. As you are all aware, we had to investigate the previous Commissioner for that and so on and he was exonerated.

Nevertheless, the report did come out and say there was a fundamental flaw in the way things are communicated within the organisation, as a result of which the knowledge management centre was set up and so on. I understand that this centre still exists and it works for very big events within London but there are those very small unplanned events that actually lead into very big problems in the future. So can you tell us what it is that you are doing in terms of addressing that point that was made nearly two years ago now about better communication within your organisation, particularly in sharing of information with other Management Board members and yourself so that we do not see a repetition of this? At the end of the day it would be, again, careers of people being blighted as a result of lack of communication and proper management of information.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. I think that is a very clear point. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes, thank you, Chairman. Commissioner, thankfully I had the opportunity just before the meeting to pass on to you personally the grief and concern that has been expressed, certainly from members of the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) in Hackney, other community stakeholder groups working with the police there and, especially, the friends and supporters of Mr Harry Stanley who you will remember, Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, was mistakenly killed by members of CO19. The information that they received from their television (TV) about CO19 walking in their estate really sent that community into a really great deal of despair.

I thank you for the statement that you have made. You have made it absolutely clear and you then reclarified it from the question that Jenny [Jones] asked and, again, you have acknowledged that the trust that we, as members, and the public put in you is that we will be policed routinely by unarmed police officers and that any step away from that is not a step that any one person is authorised to take. I thank you for that.

I do then want to move on to Dee's [Doocey] point which was spot on as far as I am concerned in the sort of process and structure and whatever, I cannot get round my head how, I think you said, a borough superintendent or somebody at that level - or borough commander or what have you - made this decision. Somebody somewhere made this decision. I need - and I think Dee [Doocey] is saying - we need to just hear more about that - not today - but to understand how these officers are going to be brought into a room and for them to go through some sort of major training and for them to understand really they do not have authority.

It concerns me that we are talking about this as a cock up. Of course it is a word that we use. But the distress that it has caused people, I think, what we should just do is get as much information out there as possible. So that is my

last point. I had to, if you like, tear off bits of my copy of the note from you and circulate that to IAG members. That was late in the evening. Your statement had been circulated earlier that day to us by Catherine [Crawford] and I was just shocked that - picking up the point Caroline [Pidgeon] is making - a new borough superintendent, that we are all pleased to be working with, he was in that room and he did not have a copy of that to share with at least 20 members of an IAG. If we cannot be getting that sort of information immediately out to members of IAG who everybody likes to quote as having on board, then that does concern me. So there is an urgent need for this statement to go throughout the organisation and for it, somehow, to be posted in stations - I am not over-elaborating it - but for that message to get through, but also for that message to get through to individual members of the community who give their time and have invested their trust and their reputation in working with the MPS.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, Jennette [Arnold].
Valerie [Brasse]?

Valerie Brasse (AM): I too am obviously grateful for the assurance you have given but it struck me, when I was listening to you, Commissioner, that the two words "routine" and "pre-planned" kept coming up and I suddenly thought, at what point, does pre-planned become routine? Maybe that might have explained possibly the communication problem we were having with some person from the MPS being able to go out and say, "Well this is how it is going because, actually, there are going to be a lot more of them". So I suppose my question to you is do we all understand what we are talking about when we say "pre-planned" and "routine" and, in fact, are we talking about the same thing, that there are just going to be a lot more of them, so the creep that Clive [Lawton] was talking about is going to be evident on the streets?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Very succinctly put. Steve [O'Connell]?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you, Chairman. As you would expect, I will take a somewhat contrary view on this and seek some balance in this debate. Clearly the main issue around here is about process and I am assured by the Commissioner's comments that he will address that appropriately. I am always conscious that there is often a silent majority out there, on our estates and elsewhere, whose voices are not necessarily heard and it may well be that the use of appropriate armed operations, planned and consulted accordingly, give reassurance to our estates.

Will the Commissioner assure me, therefore, that, once this somewhat media feeding frenzy and cacophony of various shrill voices has dampened down, he will instruct his officers, appropriately, to use armed responses and armed patrols on our streets, in an appropriate way, and will he assure me that his officers also, and his lead officers, will not be, perhaps, shall I say, intimidated or unduly influenced by this unfortunate incident and, therefore, their judgement will be, perhaps, affected with a risk averse attitude because of, as I say, the media extent of this debate.

So I would thank him very much for the assurance he has given us. There clearly was an issue, and I think that has been addressed around process but will he assure me that, where it is appropriate that armed patrols are out there on our estates, they would continue?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Right. OK. Thanks, Steve [O'Connell], for injecting another point of view into this. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): Yes. I await with interest high noon in Haringey!

I think there are three points I want to pick up. The Commissioner talked about having given appropriate advice to those involved which, I understand, was a sort of mother and father of all bollockings! This is not so much about whatever happened in CO19 but there is an issue, quite a difficult issue, for the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner about trying to have an organisation where officers at a much more junior level are encouraged to be innovative and to do new things and, at the same time, having a system which enables, when those new things are going to be extraordinarily controversial or just plain stupid, that it is filtered up to an appropriate level. I do not think it is something for now but I think it would be useful for him to come back about how that process of ensuring that officers, often at quite a junior level, have got the sort of political nouse that enables them to say, "I think it is a good idea for these operational reasons but I need to check further up the line". I would be interested in that.

The other point I want to make about that is that some of this might have been averted had there been a little bit more MPA member involvement in some of this. You look round this room, with the possible exception of Steve [O'Connell], everyone is saying this was rather a controversial view to have taken. Now had there been a member or the Vice-Chairman or whoever involved at an earlier stage and saying, "Look, we are thinking of doing this, do you think it is a good idea?" I think those alarm bells would have rung very effectively and very loudly and that might have been a way of averting this problem. So a point about how to avoid these situations, not just in CO19 but everywhere else, because it could be anything else tomorrow; it could be while we are sitting here some officers are doing something highly innovative which will turn out to be a media disaster, although it was all done for the best of all possible reasons.

Part of what I assume happened in this is that I remember being asked when I was Chair, so this is years ago, about the principle of having armed response vehicles stationed in particular boroughs which were regarded as hot spots on the basis that they would be more able to respond quickly if an incident arose. Now I do wonder whether part of the analysis here has been, "Well these people are sitting here, doing nothing essentially, because an incident has not blown up. How can we use their time effectively?" I think, again, it would be interesting here, either now or at a later stage, what are armed response vehicles units doing in their down time and is there something which can be done which would be helpful and supportive to the people of London feeling well policed without necessarily producing this negative reaction?

The final point I wanted to make was that the Commissioner used the words, "No current necessity to change tactics". I can certainly foresee - a bit like Steve [O'Connell] although I am not quite so gung ho about it as he is - that there may well be circumstances in which there might need to be tactics in a particular area or following particular incidents, but I do think it is worth developing what would be the protocol in terms of local community consultation about that. We have got protocols now about Section 60 stop and search areas and so on and we have got protocols about a number of other areas. This is exactly the same, it is probably a rather more important one than some of those, and it is worth, probably, thinking well in advance, "What would be the minimum necessary, in terms of local consultation, to demonstrate that there would be local community support for such an action, were it to be necessary?"

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Good. Thanks Toby [Harris], very much. Chris [Boothman]?

Christopher Boothman (AM): I think Toby [Harris] has said a lot of what I wanted to say far more eloquently than I can say but I will throw this into the pot; a couple of months ago something similar occurred in relation to Carnival. Information reached me about the proposal to deploy tasers at Carnival. This information had not reached me by virtue of my membership of the MPA or, even, as the event organiser. When I checked, the information proved to be correct. Now what that incident and what this incident tells me is that there is a problem, and it is not a simple problem because it relates to the issue of consultation, communication and authorisation.

I accept entirely the need for armed operations - I do not think anyone is questioning the need for armed operations - and accept entirely that the management team cannot authorise every armed operation, but it does seem to me that, when there is a proposal to do something that is high profile and is really going to cause people to question whether or not that is the right thing, certain people need to know. It comes back to the level of communication and consultation with the MPA.

For me, it is actually all about judgement. I think this was mentioned before as well. Officers will have the authority to do certain things that lots of people will not like. We all have to live with that because that is the reality. But, for me, it is whether or not the people we employ to do this difficult job have the judgement that is required to make these decisions and actually to communicate with the people they should be communicating with. If we cannot do something about this then we leave ourselves in a situation where - - there was an interesting debate a few weeks ago which was about who is in charge of the MPS. It kind of brings us back to that debate because, on the strength of what has happened here, it is not the MPA and it is not the Commissioner.

John Biggs (AM): It is the Mayor I think.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I object to that. That is not (inaudible).

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Thank you, Chris [Boothman]. John Biggs?

John Biggs (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I tend to agree with the majority of opinion around this table but I think, before we beat ourselves up for being bleeding heart liberals or whatever and appearing to criticise the police, the proper role of the MPA is to hold the MPS to account and to ask these sorts of questions.

I was impressed by Steve O'Connell's intervention, not because I agree with it - indeed, I am very happy I do not live in Croydon or Sutton! - but because he does raise questions which I imagine quite a lot of Londoners would feel are legitimate questions to ask.

Toby [Harris] put it a bit better and I wanted to add to what Toby [Harris] said by looking at the internal workings of the MPS and the MPA and the decision making because there are a number of what if questions you might want to ask. I think most Londoners celebrate the fact that we do not have armed police service on our streets but would recognise that there is a niche of gun crime in London and there are areas where people will feel insecure from time to time and that we need to have proper protocols and decision making so that, if that eventuality arises, we can deal with it, we can escalate it, the decisions can be made promptly and the MPA, as appropriate, can be involved. Certainly I would expect the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the MPA, or other appropriate senior members, to be involved or to be informed if something like that is happening.

I am reminded, having sat on one or two quangos down the years, that there is very often a clause that talks about novel or contentious matters which should be brought to the attention of the civil service or the Management Board. I think this is a fairly novel or contentious matter which should be and so I am disappointed that you, as Chairman, and presumably, Kit [Malthouse], as Vice-Chairman, do not appear to have been informed about this as it went on.

I do not expect a full reply on this today but, clearly, there are questions about the management controls. We need to give people discretion, and this is a challenge, but senior officers throughout the MPS should be aware of and sensitive to the contentious nature of a decision like this and it is disappointing that they were not.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, John [Biggs]. Obviously it is going to be difficult for members of the MPA to be aware of variations in policy when they have not been, as the Commissioner pointed out, escalated up the line. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chairman. It was actually on that very

point that I wanted to put forward a question. At borough level, with link members and community engagement forums and various other vehicles, there is an established pattern of the MPS tapping into the mood and the opinions of the people that they operate amongst. It strikes me that this is an example where, perhaps, some of the more centralised and specialist functions are not quite as tuned in to the public mood. We keep talking about a junior officer making the decision.

My understanding is that this decision was made at Chief Superintendent level. That is not a junior rank; that is an experienced police officer. However, it would strike me that perhaps that judgement call, made with the best of intentions, did not quite capture the mood perhaps of a lot of people in London.

So the question that I would like to have explored, not necessarily in the here and now, is what mechanisms could we put in place to get better engagement of the non-borough based bits of the job? That does not necessarily mean to say that every specialist branch needs to have its own IAG necessarily or its own consultative group, but there has got to be some way, particularly where a central operation is going to be located very specifically on boroughs, that the link members for those boroughs, for example, are consulted with.

It strikes me that the main problem here was not a problem with management. I think comments indicating that somehow the Management Board is not in control of the MPS are completely inappropriate because the MPS is about enabling experienced police officers to use their judgement in doing what they do. However, if a judgement call is made wrongly, I think it is appropriate that officers are informed of the displeasure of the management, but I think that this could have been avoided if there were better connections with link members from the non-borough based bits of the MPS so I would like to explore how we could maybe put that in place.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you, James [Cleverly]. Well, Commissioner, you have a host of, actually I think, quite good and serious searching questions there; how did it happen, how are we going to stop it happening again, what exactly did happen, the presentation. Those are the areas in which you were being asked. I appreciate you have already given a very full account of this but I hope you will be able to satisfy members. Can I just say that, after the Commissioner has given his answer, can I propose that members only come back if they have specific points of fact that they think need elucidating? Will that be OK? Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK, thank you, Chairman. Actually what I recognise in the questions is, obviously, a sense of clear dissatisfaction. I think a number of the questions have already been addressed by what I have said. I still will go through each of the questions, do my best, but, actually, I have addressed the what happened, the how it happened and what I think about what happened. What I am picking up is, what I know is there, a clear sense of dissatisfaction.

In trying to address each question where there is a very clear question to be addressed if I can start with you, Chris [Boothman], and if I can start with where I do not agree. Your example of Carnival is just the wrong example. That is an example where it worked extremely well because, whatever you have been told, that was a sensitive issue that was properly recognised as sensitive within the MPS, was escalated in the appropriate way, it was escalated to my level and the Deputy's level and we amended it. That is exactly how it should work. So the sensitivity was there, the right escalation took place and the right result, in my opinion, was put in place with our authority. Yet that could have been a minor tactical issue that was properly recognised by those concerned that it does need a greater level of consideration at a more senior level. So I do not agree that Carnival is, actually, another example of what happened on this occasion. I think it is the opposite. Had that happened on this occasion, we would not be sat here discussing it. Carnival worked and I think the escalation took place so I do not accept that it is one and the same and, therefore, I do not accept your conclusion either around who is in charge.

Dee [Doocey], if I can come to you? Actually you are expressing exactly what I have expressed. How could this happen? Well I think I have told you how it happened. I think there was an error of judgement. The Inspector that was put there, I think he was unfairly exposed. There is an issue, of course, and I guess it goes to the cultural issue of people with guns and do not have guns, the people who carry guns on a daily basis, according to them -- and we have got to be much more sensitive of how and who we expose to the media because people who carry guns on a daily basis, to them, it is routine and they do not see the same point as non.

That is not a criticism of armed officers; it is actually we have got to be cleverer of how we actually expose people. I do not think the Inspector should have been exposed in that way. I think that was unfair on him and I think we just got that wrong. A mistake was made. Because of that, what clearly came across to me -- I do not think that Inspector should have been exposed to that interview; we should have not done that in that way. The actual language that was used was wrong. It gave the wrong impression because you have got an armed officer who in his -- "What's the big deal?" because, to him or her, it is routine.

It should have been escalated. I cannot go beyond saying there was an error of judgement that that should have been escalated. I think we have got to get that into a context. Has it led to significant repercussions? Yes, it has. But we should judge the error of judgement on the basis of what was the person thinking of, did they act outrageously and were they trying to do their best? There was an error of judgement that led to these rather dramatic consequences for which I am sat here, uncomfortably, answering all your questions today.

Sometimes you cannot go beyond an error of judgement and as, Clive [Lawton], you mentioned what is happening on discipline, nothing is happening regarding discipline. I have no intention of disciplining anybody.

There have been words of advice given and we have sent out very clear messages to the boroughs, on Friday, of what the briefing is, what will happen, what will not happen and there is very, very tight grip and control of 32 borough commanders that has taken place from within territorial policing (TP). So I think there was a very clear communication.

Right. Clive [Lawton], if I can just go a little further, you are saying what is happening regarding the culture. You just have to know there has been a debate as long as I have been in policing, which is 34 years, that some cops believe that we should be permanently armed. Some do not. That is perfectly legitimate and that has always gone on. I do not think there has been any change in the culture. I think the last time a poll was done of police officers, and I think MPS officers - I could have got this wrong - actually most police officers are still in favour of being unarmed. I am completely in favour of being unarmed. So I do not think there is a change of culture.

I think I have gone some way to try to address your question of how it went wrong. We exposed the wrong person to address an issue and the sensitivity was not seen, as a result of which it was not escalated and, had it been escalated, we would have done what we did in Carnival and we would not be sitting here discussing it today. We would have got it right.

How have we communicated this? How are we going to stop it happening again? Well we have communicated it to all borough commanders, we have communicated it through Central Operations (CO), we have given the appropriate advice and we will go back and look again. I think the critical issue is has the message got through to those communities that feel, actually, "This has been a really, really bad thing to happen and made me feel unsafe"? Now I have got to take that back and say, "Well, have we done that?" and, if we have not, how do we better do that? I actually think the best way of doing it is through borough commanders because borough commanders are the people who regularly liaise, who have that trust, who have that confidence and we need to make sure that the message they have got is getting out into communities, and I undertake to do that.

Jenny [Jones], I think you said - and correct me if I have got this wrong - are we going to have any *ad hoc* proactive armed foot patrols? Is that it? Well, we do not have *ad hoc* firearms operations. They are all authorised. There are some people who are permanently armed - people who do protection, people who do patrols around embassies - but it is all reviewed. There is no such thing as *ad hocery* in firearms. The actual command and control of these operations; there is no criticism of them. They carried it out with very good control according to the way in which it was authorised - it just should not have been blimin' well been authorised and I think I have gone into that.

Caroline [Pidgeon], what is being done centrally to make sure the whole community is reassured? I think that is the answer I have just given. We have sent the message out and it is very clear to borough commanders, but I will go back and actually look at is there something more that should be done and how do we ensure that all 32 borough commanders are getting the right

message to their communities and I have to say, Steve [O'Connell], picking up your point, a balanced message. What we should not do is send out a message that, because of this, we are now going to say, "My goodness, we can never take a gun out again and we cannot have firearms operations" because that would be, frankly, silly and we do not want to scare the rest of our community to death that we will not be there policing them, as we have always done, and providing the armed support. So we have to make sure that balanced message gets out. So hopefully that takes care of, to an extent, your question, Steve [O'Connell].

Reshard [Auladin], what if an accident occurred? Well, actually, that is always the danger in policing and I think you, as much as anyone here, are aware of that. There is no criticism of the command and control of the actual operation. I do not think you are saying that.

The learning out of Stockwell? I think you know the learning out of Stockwell has been huge. Of course it is because the sensitivity of this was not seen the idea that we would then set up the knowledge management centre for this would not occur, because we could not set up the knowledge management centre for 1,500 authorised operations that have already taken place this year. So you go back to what was the mistake and the mistake was the absence of that critical sensitivity and exposing the wrong people; not the fact that I criticise them individually.

Better communication? Absolutely. I have said, quite clearly, I do not think we handled the communication of this well. It is obvious that we did not, otherwise we would not be sat here having this discussion. Had we been as clear in what we have said now right at the start, then I think we might have prevented some of the unfortunate headlines and some of the angst and issues that communities suffered. That is just learning. That is a learning point. Part of the problem, when this thing came up, was actually the MPS has learned not to go out and make statements unless it is absolutely sure of the facts. That is learning from Stockwell and it is a bit like G20. So, therefore, you do not make a statement until you find out what on earth is going on and we have to ask that question because this has not been escalated in the way that Carnival was and, therefore, it takes time to make sure we are sure of the facts.

That sometimes makes us look as though well who is running the MPS? I would rather be in that position than having to defend accusations of misleading the media, misleading this Authority and misleading the public. We have been there before and I refuse to go there again. That has consequences on occasions. I think you and I would probably find common ground on that, Reshard [Auladin].

Jennette [Arnold], I tried to take yours but I think the heart of your question, can you have an assurance that our communities will be policed routinely in the way that you and I understand routine? Yes. I made it quite clear in my statement I am incredibly proud of the tradition of an unarmed police service that is supported by a small number of highly trained specialised firearms

officers who, when they are deployed - unless they are armed response vehicles (ARVs) which are permanently armed - deploy on the basis of actual authorities.

Valerie [Brasse], I think I have gone to that issue because you raised that very interesting issue that suddenly occurred to me and that is people who do carry firearms, to them, that is their routine day job. It goes back to the answer I gave earlier, who do you expose to give these interviews, when they are particularly sensitive about suggesting a change in style? It is a kind of catch 22. Unless you recognise it is sensitive and it is going to lead to the perception of a change in style, then you do not make that judgement. I go back to where we made the original mistake and the original mistake was not being sensitive.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Can I just clarify? Pre-planned becomes routine. Of course if you ramp up the number of pre-planned they will become routine. It is the creep seen on the street and it is trying to square that one off.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is a really difficult issue. I am not swinging the blue lamp here but 34 years ago I did not see the number of firearms officers that are on the streets today. There has been no increase in firearms officers on the streets. There has been no increase of firearms. There has been a slight change on eight occasions in the way we have used them. So we have not increased the number of guns, we have changed in the way we have deployed them on eight small occasions, which has led to this consequence.

I do agree with you; we do monitor the number of firearms authorities. We are still that unarmed police service. We have managed to maintain it with a highly trained, centrally controlled specialist department. We will maintain that but, as we see a difference in the criminal community, as we see a difference in the threat, as we see threats to our own officers, then we have to respond to that. So we have got to monitor that carefully so that it does not become routine. It is not routine at this moment in time. On this occasion we allowed a perception that we were going towards that sort of style. That was a mistake. We should not have done that. It is as simple as that. But I do think it is an issue, when do you get to that critical tipping point? That is something that we are acutely conscious of if we are going to maintain this very fine tradition that sets policing apart in this country than virtually any other country in the world apart from, I think, New Zealand, in terms of western countries, and they have a different problem, I am sure, than we have.

Steve [O'Connell], I think I have addressed your issue. Sometimes a reaction like this causes you to go back into your shell, "My goodness, we should not do anything". Well we will work very hard to avoid that. Nobody wants to be macho about this but we have an absolute need to have these people doing what they have traditionally done and doing it in a very professional way which, overwhelmingly, they do. Supported by this Authority. So we have got to work hard to make sure that does not happen. I do not think it will happen. It did not happen, actually, on the end of some dramatic and terrible mistakes

that we have made. It did not happen then. So I have no reason to think it would happen now.

Toby [Harris], the balance of innovation I have put with wisdom. Yes, you are absolutely right. I think it is a tricky one. How do you encourage and empower junior people - which we want to do because unless we do that we do not get the benefit of the good people recruiting, the intelligence and their enthusiasm - but how do you then make sure they do not make such a mistake as to cause cataclysmic consequences? I think one of the things is we have got to take the risk sometimes. The idea that we would suddenly roll back on empowering people would mean this organisation becomes utterly sterile and the public would lose because the vast majority of innovation, by our young cops out there and police support staff, is so overwhelmingly good for London communities.

If you empower people in a large organisation it will, occasionally, go wrong. When it goes wrong for the best of all reason then I guess the answer is people like me have got to sit and take the consequences and not visit those consequences on those individuals in any disciplinary format.

But I do think there is an issue of how we train them and how do we sensitise them to the what are the current issues of the day and, by the way, if you are going to do that, that is really dangerous territory, refer it up the chain because there might need to be a degree of additional wisdom, experience and consultation, not just with the MPA, but with, actually, other people. Now I know, when they were developing this option, they did have a lot of discussion with other people. They missed the MPA. They just did not see that significance. So I do think there is an issue of how do we properly make sure that you recognise the sensitive issue and then get the wise counsel in a way that will not lead to these deleterious outcomes. You have suggested it is one to take away and I think it is actually.

Toby [Harris], I think you went on to say how do we use ARVs productively? That is a debate that has gone on in every police force because you just do not want people sat there doing nothing. We do use them very productively in ANPR operations and in support of lots of things but also, on this occasion, part of the issue was, when ARV officers get out of the car with side arms, it looks incredibly different than when you get out of the car with long arms. The idea we have got sub machine guns. They are single shot. Those ARV officers will go across pavements and they will talk to the community. They always have done. How do we maximise that benefit without creating the idea we are going towards routine foot patrol? I do not want to go further than we are doing at this moment in time but it is something we need to ensure that, as we get more economically constrained, we get maximum productivity without changing the policing style. Again, you have suggested we should take it away and I accept your invite to do so.

John [Biggs], internal working. Disappointed the Mayor's not told. I am not entirely sure I can add anything. The reason the Mayor and this Authority was not told is because it was not escalated, it was a mistake, they should have

been told and I should have been told but, then again, had I been told, there would have been no need to do it because we would not have done it anyway. It is that kind of circular argument. It would not have happened. Simply that.

John Biggs (AM): But would you have picked up the phone routinely to the Chairman and talked it over with him?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): At such a significant change in policing style I would not have just picked up a -- if I had thought it was necessary to go to, as the reporting suggested because we allowed it to suggest it because we led it that way, by mistake. If I thought we had to go towards routine armed foot patrol in our estates I would have done more than picked up the phone to the Chairman, I would actually have raised it with this Authority because, whilst it might be an operational tactic, it is a bit like tasers. I have said it before, it might be an operational decision as to who I issue tasers too, but I would not want to extend tasers without the support of this Authority because there are certain things you have just got to realise are so sensitive and so central to your role, it is about the policing style.

John Biggs (AM): Would you have given him or us a veto then?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No. Of course that goes to the point of the relationship, John [Biggs]. No, I would not. I am being honest about it.

John Biggs (AM): I do understand that but, without treading over the old coals, it does raise interesting questions about control and accountability.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It does but also it does raise interesting issues of who is going to stand accountable in the courts.

John Biggs (AM): Yes. Absolutely.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): James [Cleverly], there was one last one. Specialist firearms function. Not as sensitive as borough based. Interestingly, that was what CO19, to be fair to them, were trying to recognise by creating this small number of people who went out to boroughs proactively to have the discussion with them of, "How best can we better support?" We missed the **train(?)**, James [Cleverly].

Boris Johnson (Chairman): OK. Good. Listen. I think the Commissioner has given a very, very full series of answers. I think he has been about as clear as he possibly can be about the genesis of this event and the steps he is putting in place to make sure that, in future, this body is properly informed if there are to be any variations in the policy. I really do think we have had an adequate discussion of that. I hope you agree because I do not think there are any significant points of fact that I can think of that the Commissioner could bring up. I propose to go now --

Christopher Boothman (AM): Chairman?

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Sorry, Chris [Boothman]?

Christopher Boothman (AM): Just one slight thing that is outstanding and I do not think has been raised before. There is a suggestion of officers on motorbikes with ...

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Yes, I heard that from Dee [Doocey] I think.

Christopher Boothman (AM): Is there any basis ...?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Listen, Chris [Boothman], the one thing I can assure you is, if any of this particular small extension was ever to go further, then I would know about it and, if I thought it was necessary, I would come back.

Boris Johnson (Chairman): Thank you very much. Let us go now to Kirsten's [Hearn] question which was about the LGBT community and policing in London. Kirsten [Hearn]?

Appendix 2

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES

<u>Committee</u>	<u>As Chairman</u>	<u>As Vice Chairman</u>
Strategic and Operational Policing Committee	Reshard Auladin	Toby Harris
Finance and Resources Committee	Steve O'Connell	Faith Boardman
Communities, Equalities and People Committee	Cindy Butts	Victoria Borwick
Corporate Governance Committee	Toby Harris	

Sub-Committee chair and vice chairs will be agreed at the first meeting of sub-committees following this meeting

**MPA COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP — UP UNTIL ANNUAL MEETING JUNE
2010**

Strategic and Operational Policing.

1. Reshard Auladin (as Chairman)
2. Jennette Arnold
3. Christopher Boothman
4. Cindy Butts (Chair of Communities, Equalities and People Committee)
5. Toby Harris
6. Jenny Jones
7. Kit Malthouse (MPA Vice-Chairman)
8. Joanne McCartney
9. Steve O'Connell (Chair of Finance and Resources Committee)
10. Caroline Pidgeon
11. Deborah Regal
12. Richard Tracey

Finance and Resources Committee.

1. Steve O'Connell (as Chair)
2. Reshard Auladin (Chairman of Strategic and Operational Policing)
3. John Biggs
4. Cindy Butts (Chair of Communities, Equalities and People Committee)
5. Faith Boardman
6. Chris Boothman
7. Dee Doocey
8. Neil Johnson
9. Kit Malthouse (MPA Vice-Chairman)
10. Graham Speed

Communities, Equalities and People Committee.

- 1.
2. Cindy Butts (as chair)
3. Reshard Auladin (Chairman of Strategic and Operational Policing)
4. Faith Boardman
5. Victoria Borwick
6. Valerie Brasse
7. Kirsten Hearn
8. Clive Lawton
9. Kit Malthouse (MPA Vice-Chairman)
10. Steve O'Connell (Chairman of Finance and Resources Committee)

Corporate Governance Committee.

1. Toby Harris (as Chair)
2. John Biggs
3. Valerie Brasse
4. Neil Johnson
5. Joanne McCartney
6. Caroline Pidgeon

Standards Committee.

1. Jennette Arnold
2. Christopher Boothman
3. Toby Harris
4. Kirsten Hearn
5. Deborah Regal
6. Richard Tracey

Stephanie Caplan and Anne Dickens (non authority) independent members

SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

CT and Protective Services Sub-Committee

1. Reshard Auladin
2. James Cleverly
3. Toby Harris
4. Neil Johnson

Olympic/Paralympic Sub-Committee

1. Jennette Arnold
2. Christopher Boothman
3. Victoria Borwick
4. Dee Doocey
5. Toby Harris
6. Kirsten Hearn
7. Neil Johnson
8. Richard Tracey

Professional Standards Cases Sub-Committee

1. Reshard Auladin
2. Christopher Boothman
3. Valerie Brasse
4. James Cleverly

5. Joanne McCartney
6. Richard Tracey

Resources and Productivity Sub Committee

(New sub-committee of Finance and Resources Sub-Committee)

1. Reshard Auladin
2. John Biggs
3. Faith Boardman
4. Valerie Brasse
5. Graham Speed

Citizen Focus and Community Engagement Sub-Committee

1. Victoria Borwick
2. Valerie Brasse
3. Cindy Butts
4. Clive Lawton
5. Joanne McCartney

Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee

1. Cindy Butts
2. Kirsten Hearn
3. Clive Lawton

HR and Remuneration Sub-Committee

(Current membership 4)

1. Reshard Auladin
2. Faith Boardman
3. Cindy Butts

OUTSIDE AND OTHER BODIES 2009/10

Organisation	Appointments June 09	Expression of interest
<u>Association of Police Authorities (APA)</u>		
APA Council (formally Plenary) (6)		
	Faith Boardman	Faith Boardman
	Kit Malthouse	Kit Malthouse
	Reshard Auladin	Reshard Auladin
	Clive Lawton	
	Chris Boothman	
	Deborah Regal	
APA Board (formally Executive)		
	Kit Malthouse	Kit Malthouse
APA policy groups:		
People Policy Network (1)		
<i>(Covers HR, training H&S and professional Standards</i>		
	Cindy Butts	Faith Boardman Cindy Butts
Business/Corporate Policy Network (1)		
<i>(Covers corp, finance, authority processes and performance)</i>		
	Richard Tracey (Resigned Jan 2009)	
Strategic Policy Network (1)		
<i>(Covers CT and protective services)</i>		
	Reshard Auladin	Reshard Auladin
Citizen Focus Policy Network (1)		
<i>(Covers neighbourhood policing, local partnerships and public engagement)</i>		
	Steve O'Connell	
APA Liaison Networks		
Black & Minority Ethnic Support network (1)		
	Deborah Regal	
<u>London Councils Leader's Committee</u> (1)		
	Kit Malthouse	Kit Malthouse
Panels:		
Crime and Public Protection Forum		
	Vacant	
<u>Local Government Association</u>		

General Assembly (4)	Kit Malthouse James Cleverly Steve O'Connell Richard Tracey	Kit Malthouse James Cleverly Richard Tracey
Police Authorities in Corporate Membership Group (3)	Kit Malthouse	Kit Malthouse
Policy Review Groups:		
Social Inclusion (3)	Watching brief	
LGA Urban Commission (1)	Vacant	
London Health Commission (1)	Clive Lawton	Clive Lawton
<u>Home Office groups</u>		
BME Retention and Progression Group (1)	Cindy Butts	Cindy Butts
BME Trust and Confidence Group (1)	Clive Lawton	Clive Lawton
Other meeting MPA are represented on:		
Airwave Programme Board (1)	Catherine Crawford	Catherine Crawford
Police Advisory Board (1)	Faith Boardman	
Police Negotiating Board (1)	Faith Boardman	
Crime stoppers (1)	Victoria Borwick	Victoria Borwick
Safer London Foundation (1)	Cindy Butts	Cindy Butts
MPA Domestic Violence Board (<i>open to all members</i>)	Cindy Butts Kirsten Hearn Valerie Brasse Clive Lawton	Cindy Butts Kirsten Hearn Valerie Brasse
London Criminal Justice Board (1)	Reshard Auladin	Reshard Auladin

London Community Safety Partnership (1)	Kit Malthouse Martin Davis (officer)	Kit Malthouse
---	---	---------------

London Fraud Forum (1)	Toby Harris	Toby Harris
------------------------	-------------	-------------