

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on 29 October 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, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris,  
Kirsten Hearn, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell,  
Caroline Pidgeon and Deborah Regal.

**MPA Officers:**

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive) and Annabel Adams (Acting Treasurer).

**MPS Officers:**

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

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can I ask everybody to assume the place they propose to stay in for the duration of this meeting? Thank you very much. Welcome members of the Metropolitan Police Authority. Thank you. We seem to have slightly depleted ranks today. Half term. There you go. Some of us could have taken holidays but did not. Could I ask everybody to identify themselves please, starting with Catherine [Crawford] on my left?

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

**Annabel Adams (Acting Treasurer):** Annabel Adams.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Clive Lawton.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Valerie Brasse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am Boris Johnson and I would like to tell you we have had apologies for absence from Neil Johnson, Richard Tracey and Graham Speed.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** And Cindy Butts.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** And Cindy Butts.

I would like members to declare any interests they may have. All as agreed.

The minutes have been circulated for your approval, members of the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA). Joanne McCartney?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Yes. Can I refer members to page 17, paragraphs 26 to 29? This is a question I raised last time about whether the town centre patrols had had any displacement activity into nearby wards within the borough. After the meeting the Commissioner provided extra information which is what this refers to. The heading of that is what I asked, which is, "To provide analysis to show if town centre patrols have simply displaced crime to elsewhere in the borough" but the information that has been given refers only to Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) averages across the entire piece which is not what I asked for. So could I perhaps investigate?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** You were looking for borough breakdowns?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The heading that the MPS is provided does state that, but the information provided with it, does not.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Right. I am sure that can be attended to. Thank you, Joanne [McCartney]. Any other questions on the minutes? Yes, Caroline [Pidgeon] and Dee [Doocey]?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I just wanted to flag I do not understand the consistency in the minutes because some things have named members raising things and others just say members. So anything I raised just says members generally but I do not recall anyone else raising it, but some others have their names. I think if you are going to do it you need to put the names for everyone or no one.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Right. I am sure that point will be registered by the minute takers --

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** It has been noted.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, Chairman. Again I want to raise with the Commissioner the problem of how the figures are set out for the number of officers. I did ask two meetings ago and got an assurance from the Commissioner that recruits would be shown separately, as they are in the MPS budget. The Commissioner said last time, "Sorry, it should have been done and has not been done". It still has not been done. What do I need to do in order to get this done?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Nothing more.

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

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Your point is registered, Dee [Doocey]. Thank you. Any other questions on the minutes? There being none I go to my own report.

Before that I want to begin by congratulating Sergeants Paul Young and Michael Atkinson, who are with us today. Two CO19 officers who won the Police Review's Diversity in Action Award 2009 last night. I am sure we would want to show our ... [round of applause]. I am sure we do not want to detain them for very long do we. Thank you very much for coming anyway. We should tell you what they do; they spend their time visiting schools, community centres and youth offending teams to deliver tailor-made presentations designed to provide youngsters with the information they need to make the right decisions about guns.

Since September we have met in various guises. Kit [Malthouse] and I attended the excellent launch of Bumblebee the other day on behalf of the MPA. There have been joint engagement meetings (JEM) meetings on anti-social behaviour with Tower Hamlets and Kingston and the National Counter Terrorism Oversight Group, chaired by Toby [Harris], met on 13 October 2009 at the MPA.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the appointment of Ian McPherson, Chief Constable of Norfolk Constabulary, as Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing. This excellent appointment was made by the Authority and the Commissioner yesterday and I, like all members, look forward to working with him in the years ahead.

I would like to remind members, indeed those joining us in the public gallery today, that the MPA consultation, "Have Your Say in Policing in London" runs until 30 November 2009. It has had an excellent response so far and the important views of Londoners will feed directly in to the Police in London business plan. So please take this opportunity to get your views across.

Finally, on morning of 5 November 2009 the Civil Liberties Panel is holding an open meeting on public order policing following the G20 protests. It is the perfect opportunity for Londoners who have views about this matter, as of course there are many, to come along and voice those views on the three main themes that we have identified in this body; police planning for the day, policing the event and communications before, during and after the event.

I want to say one further thing which relates to something that has been of concern to members of the MPA over the last few months and that is, not just the statistical increase in the incidents of homophobic attacks, but also the absolutely appalling event that took place recently in Trafalgar Square and I am sure that we will want to hear a little bit from the Commissioner this morning about what the Metropolitan Police Service is doing to address that issue.

So that concludes my report. I would like the Chief Executive to introduce a report, I believe, about human trafficking. Is that right, Catherine [Crawford]?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Yes, Chairman. This is a motion from Jenny Jones. I do not know, Jenny [Jones], if you want to read out your motion or whether, since it has been circulated, you are just happy to have a reply to that?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes. I did not quite understand the procedure because I was not quite sure why the Chief Executive would be answering it.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I think that the intention is that I give you a formal response and that then there is an opportunity to debate both your motion and the response that has come formally which, effectively, is on behalf of the Commissioner.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** So there will be an opportunity then, Chairman, for members to join in the discussion.

**Toby Harris (AM):** This is a new procedure.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** A new procedure.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I believe it is the procedure that has always been as standing orders, it is just that we have not very often had a motion.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Anyway, rather than getting down bogged down in procedure, do I understand that we are to have a discussion about this motion? Is that the idea?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I just think it might be better at the end of the Commissioner's report.

**Kit Malthouse (AM):** I was going to say do you want to shift it and do both at the end of the meeting?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Let us do that. I think that is absolutely fine. Commissioner, can I ask you to make your report?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Chairman. If I can start with the good news. Statistics for the first six months of this year are revealing that crime in London is at its lowest level for ten years. There are 5,000 less offences and, whilst it does not exactly equate, it goes towards something like the same number of reduction in victims, which is good news. As I reported previously, we are maintaining progress in significant reductions, notably in youth violence - our priority - knife crime and homicide.

To be fair, in recent Authority meetings I think I have often quickly turned to what are the challenges? But sometimes that just brushes over what it is that people in the MPS are doing, along with partnerships, and ignoring some of the achievements. So, if I may, I will just talk a little bit more about some of those achievements. As you know, Operation Blunt 2 has been running since May 2008 and, just relating to that operation alone, since then we have arrested 2,393 people, carried out over 90,000 searches - largely with good support - seized some 550 knives, 20 guns and over 150 other weapons. I think that is quite significant in terms of what we are seeing in terms of the reduction of youth crime and, I have said before, I am on the suppression end of the business.

In terms of real outcomes. Performance this year - and that is April 2009 to September 2009 - there have been five victims of homicide between the age of 10 to 19. That is just five too many and we would all say that. That is almost a third in the same period last year and less than half compared with 2007/08. So we are seeing very significant reductions in numbers. Got to be very careful around this and any youth homicide is to be hugely regretted and we have got to try to eradicate them all. But some real progress.

Within homicide itself - and I will come back to the overall figure which is very encouraging - homicide victims killed by firearms is slightly higher during this performance this year compared to last year, but we are talking about nine victims during this performance year compared to seven in the same period last year. It is lower than 2007/08 and I will, of course, come back to the issue of guns - as you would expect me to - later.

Homicide victims overall killed by sharp instruments have fallen sharply compared to the same six months last year and there are now currently some 28 homicide victims from April 2009 to September 2009. Again, every one of those is a tragedy and every one we would want to prevent, but that compares to 47 over the same period.

Overall, homicide is now at its lowest level in the last ten years and it is still down by a significant margin on last year, some 30 fewer offences overall.

The MPS is often compared with other major iconic cities in the world and one we are often compared with is New York. Very often I object to that comparison because we are not comparing - and we use the word apples for New York - apples with apples but, on homicide, actually it is pretty straightforward, the numbers. Whatever the recording methods -- and our recording methods differ massively over most crime than it does in America. I rather prefer theirs to ours but that is another matter. On homicide it is pretty straightforward. It is not difficult to work out how many homicides there are. In New York that is consistently higher than London, between three and four times the rate per 100,000 of the population.

It is interesting to note there has been much discussion of late about Baltimore, a much smaller city of course, a city of some 640,000 people. Baltimore had a murder rate of 224 homicides. Let me put this into a context. In London the homicide rate is 2 per 100,000 of the population. In New York it is between 6 and 7. In Baltimore it is 35. I just thought it was necessary, in view of some of the reporting, to put some context around this. I still regret it is 2 per 100,000 of the population but we do need to have sensible discussions when we are making these comparisons. Other people use those comparisons so I wanted to put the figures into some sort of context.

Recent targeted activity to tackle youth and gang related violence, under Blunt 2 umbrella - and I think I mentioned previously Operation Hawk - has resulted in 257 people arrested, numerous knives, guns, sawn off shotgun, rounds of ammunition, two dangerous dogs, drugs and cash, 91 people charged and a significant number of goods disposals now.

But the critical issue for us is capturing the learning from Operation Blunt 2 because what we have got to do, as we enter into more strained financial times, we have got to capture that learning and maintain it, without it being a special operation. That is what we are doing at this moment in time.

Turning to forthcoming activity, I think, as members around this table will know, Halloween, in recent years, has been an extraordinarily difficult period for London and it has, historically, seen a real increase in youth crime and youth violence in particular. Historically, robbery, assault and anti-social behaviour have increased quite significantly over Halloween. Last year, as a result of a significant effort across the MPS that Tim [Godwin], as Assistant Commissioner Territorial Policing (ACTP), led a very significant operation that saw real results and decreasing robbery and violence. But it was not without massive effort and huge deployment.

We are trying to repeat the same this year. It is called Operation Autumn Nights. We do like our operational names! We have organised significant activity across all 32 boroughs but very heavily in partnership with local government and the London Fire Brigade and local businesses to reduce violence and anti-social behaviour, trying to get ahead of what is going to be another challenging period. Our safer neighbourhood teams are working late into the evenings to support communities and we have learned from last year's operation.

What sort of things will we be doing? Well visible stop search operations with community observers including screening arches, ground searches, time through risk periods, prevention of retail sale theft, fireworks and knives, very much heavy liaison with local and small businesses, free sweeps of unauthorised rubbish and combustible sites to make sure there are no weapons there, visits to licensed premises being stepped up and deployments to late night economy CCTV staffing and just an enhanced presence. This year we will be deploying over 1,800 officers and 1,900 police community support officers (PCSOs) plus enhanced coverage from our Special Constabulary which is now at a much higher rate than we have had it previously.

So it is a big operation and it is one that we intend to try to repeat the success of last year, but it is right I mention it to you because Halloween is a big night for London in a way that I have not seen in other parts of the country that I have policed. Halloween is always a tricky night but not quite in the same way that London has been historically. So we are mounting quite a large operation there.

I mentioned the Special Constabulary. As you know we have a target of achieving some two million hours of quality policing by the MPS Special Constabulary by 2012. We have currently just under 2,800 specials and, on Sunday, just as a matter of interest, we are holding the biggest attestation ceremony at Hendon we have had, where there are 80 new specials being sworn in. So I think that is genuinely good news and I think we do intend to take the Special Constabulary much, much further, and we should celebrate, as I was doing this week, with the Awards for Special Constables.

All that said, as we know some challenges remain. Burglary I have talked at length on on previous occasions and you are aware of the launch of Operation Bumblebee. I am not going to go into many more details there but we have already seen the launch of various activities there and, whilst it is very early days, recent operations in Hillingdon borough have provided positive results. Last week Sutton had no residential burglaries for a four

day period. We have got to be careful we do not over claim these things. Richmond and Tower Hamlets have both had 24 hour periods where there are no residential burglaries. That is quite significant. That has been the result of the reintroduction, I think, of a technique known as strong box, which we have used before. It is a very heavily intelligence-led operation. It is very much about, as I said last time at this Authority, increasing our forensic yield and doing everything we can to make sure we capture those people who are suspected and get proper interviews.

We have in place a monitoring process to continually **define**(?) what we are doing under Bumblebee but we hope to repeat those successes across the MPS as strong box rolls across the MPS.

If I can turn to gun crime? The first six months of this performance year has seen a rise of 17%. That is actually 252 offences in gun crime compared to the same periods from last year. I do not want to claim success at this moment in time, you cannot do when you are looking at that figure. Levels have flattened out since June 2009. Whilst we are seeing these rises - and I genuinely say - and not being complacent and taking them very seriously - and I have made that comment before at the Authority - I think we should also put these rises into a longer term context.

There was a significant decrease in gun crime last year. It was actually a decrease of 25.8% over the full year reported at the end of March and we are working against that historically low figure. Data based on current definition of gun crime is only available since April 2008 because there was a change of definition. Surprise surprise! But we have developed a proxy measure, which we think is pretty reliable, which tracks the new definition to try to put the whole performance in context. Based on that proxy measure, which we think is a good measure, gun crime looks like it has dropped by some 29% plus, compared to the same six month period in 2006 and, even with the 17% rise, we are still at the second lowest level for gun crime in the last five years.

Now I do not say that to be complacent because it is still too high, in my opinion, and what I am determined to do is get back to the successful figures of last year, but I do think we need to put it into context of the long term trend in firearm offences in this city. Actually, it is part of the comment I made earlier about comments about New York and Baltimore to try to get some sense around what are we actually talking about here, make sure we realise this is a problem, it is a problem we should take seriously, but let us not get the context wrong in terms of comparing it with elsewhere or, indeed, comparing it with our recent history over the last five years.

Current activity to impact upon this year's rise? Intelligence-led operations such as Argon, which we have reported on before, looking at firearms offences associated with licensed premises, Operations Neons which utilise automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) technology to identify and stop vehicles associated with gun crime and Operation **Essens**(?), which are covert operations and very much about people identified with firearms. We have extended all those operations until January 2010 which is



evidence that we are far from complacent, despite what I have just said, about the second best figures in five years, but it is still too much, in our opinion.

As you are aware, Trident campaigned under the strap line, "Hide his gun and you help commit the crime". The campaign features radio, cinema and billboard advertisements aimed at the 15 to 19 year old age range for young women. Campaign targeting six priority boroughs is a response to a rise in the number of young women being arrested and convicted for possessing weapons. It has been a concern. We are still not talking about huge numbers but that rise has been of concern and we have seen a significant increase of the number of women, over this six months of this year, when we compare it back with year on year on year. Now some of that is about pressure, some of that is about misplaced loyalty but, actually, we need to get the message through to young women the seriousness of what they are doing and the consequences if you do it and you get caught, and that is what the campaign is about.

I am going to turn to the CO19 deployments in a moment but, before I do, as you rightly say, I think I should address some comments around homophobic crime. We have seen an increase in reported homophobic crime of some 99 offences on this performance year from April compared with the same period last year. That clearly is, and should be, of concern to us. Members will be aware of the dreadful homicide of Ian Baynham, aged 62 years, which took place in September and I think we all just share sincere condolences to the people who know Ian [Baynham] and were related to him. Horrible offence but I cannot go further because three people are charged so I cannot discuss the details of that, nor should I, and it would breach *sub judice*.

What I would like to talk about are the measures we are taking to ensure we take this seriously. I have said this before - I always caveat what I am going to say now - but some of the rise may be due to an increase in reporting as a result of increasing confidence. Certainly we have had other people commenting on that. However, I am always nervous about celebrating a rise in crime but, actually, we are always in that difficult bit; we know there is significant under reporting of homophobic offences. We know that. We know there is significant under reporting of hate crime offences. So we are always in that difficult position of balancing out, is a rise good news or bad news? As far as I am concerned it is both. I want to get the full picture and when I see the rise it gives me the full picture that tells me that there is too much of it and we should be doing more about it. So I think I try to take both positions, if that is not schizophrenic.

We are increasing our own staff awareness and an improvement in our recording systems. Partners such as Stonewall are of the view that homophobic crime is significantly reported and it welcomes the increase, but I do not think it actually welcomes an increase in crime and I would not say that.

Whilst acknowledging that reported crime has increased we are improving our sanction detection rate for this offence. There has been an additional 84 sanction detections this year, for the financial year. The majority of the increase in homophobic offences is accounted for in the categories of common assault and harassment. Hideous,

nevertheless, but it is in that sort of range. There has been no increase in the high end violence range of grievous bodily harm. That has not seen an increase.

We have conducted awareness raising activities to assist victims to identify that they have experienced hate crime and, actually, it is worth reporting because we do take this seriously, as our improvement in our detection rate is telling us.

The activities that we have taken including multi-agency partnership working, engagement with safer neighbourhood teams, reporting protocols with third party organisations such as Gallop, media campaigns, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) press publications and radio programmes. Whilst I am not saying that is the end of it - we have got to keep redoubling our efforts - we are making that real effort to increase the awareness of our staff and sensitivity towards these crimes and increasingly aware to the community that it is worth reporting it to us.

Whilst on this subject I think I ought to address the issue raised by a number of agencies in relation to the MPS' LGBT liaison officers. It is worth noting we have got over 200 of such officers, liaison officers, in the MPS at this moment in time. Now they are predominantly part time, not full time, but there are a handful of full time working in boroughs and specialist units. The MPS has no plans for boroughs to lose the role performed by LGBT liaison officers because, genuinely, because of what I have just said, we recognise the vital role in building confidence and expertise around this subject. However members would expect that we continue to work on how we can improve that service to communities, consequently some boroughs have been reviewing their provisions and I believe that there has been some rumour about it that the MPS is moving out of this area - well we are not. Regrettably this had led to some suggestions we are looking to remove the role. We are not looking to remove the role. We are looking to work out how we can further develop this role with communities and with partners to increase the reporting and then improve our response.

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 nous 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) by **Lynne**(?) actually. 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]?

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Yes. Thanks very much for your answers so far, Commissioner, to my questions. I just want to come back on a couple of points and some things that I do not think I already heard.

Stonewall's research recently showed that 75% of LGBT people in London did not feel comfortable to report hate crimes to the police and that is significant and very interesting I think. I did not really hear you speak much about the connection with the community about how to deal with that issue. I welcome the comments you made about the awareness raising amongst the police and I am wondering, in one way really, how you can get the message out of all the good things that are you doing to raise the issue amongst the police to give people more confidence.

I would like to hear what else you think that the MPS needs to do to increase the confidence of the LGBT community and being fairly policed, especially around hate crimes, given the current situation at the moment with the recent murder in Trafalgar Square and the fact that there is a vigil tomorrow night. I believe, actually, there are going to be a number of vigils across the country now as a result of hate crimes elsewhere, including the tragic attack of a gay police officer in Liverpool. I would like to know really will any senior police officers be represented at that thing tomorrow night because, I think, that might help with the confidence boosting? What message of reassurance can you give to those attending about how seriously the MPS takes issues around homophobic hate crime?

I would just like to comment a little bit on what you said about the majority of hate crimes are low level. Indeed that is true but I think we all know that things start small and escalate. Things can happen with name calling and the end of that line is actually murder so even the slightest of incidents need to be taken seriously. Part of the problem, I think, we have in relation to the confidence of the LGBT community and the MPS is

that the reception of reporting of those lesser incidents is often not taken seriously by those they are being reported to. Indeed, the community itself may often feel that being called a faggot once or twice is unpleasant and not very nice and may not, themselves, recognise its escalation but, actually, the next time it might be a more violent thing. I think there is something that we need to do to reach out to the LGBT community to reassure them that we are serious about this and that we are doing something about it.

I welcome your reassurances about the LGBT liaison officers. I think they have been incredibly effective. I do think that the majority of them being very part time does have some challenges about how much time and energy they can devote to working with the community. I do know that where there have been full time officer or officers who have been able to go out there quite a lot, it has actually made a difference to the reporting of hate crime and the lower level incidents at the lower end of those, in particular, which have helped the community's confidence.

So I would like to hear a little more, from you, about how you are going to get the message out about the good things that are being done and how you can work better with the community to stamp out this hate crime.

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

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thanks, Kirsten [Hearn]. How do we get the message out? Firstly, whatever we are doing, I am more than happy to receive any additional suggestions to add to it. What are we doing? Targeted communications with the appropriate media that will be read by people within the gay community. Increasing third party reporting.

How do we improve the confidence? We can do a lot in the media. We can do a lot of sending messages out but it is what we do that counts in the end. That is the critical thing that will see long term sustainable increase in confidence and giving people the faith to actually come forward and report it. So it is what we do. So increasing and improving our response.

I have made the statements regarding the liaison officers in boroughs.

Actually I believe arresting and bringing to the courts more of those people who are perpetrators rather than seeing - and I have spoken before about - the increasing dependence in policing on a diversion culture instead of putting people in front of the courts.

You asked me would any senior police officer be attending tomorrow night's event? I have no idea but I will go away and find out, Kirsten [Hearn], and raise that and try to arrange that.

You said you were concerned I said the majority of hate crime is low level. Actually, I did not say that. What I said was that the reported rise is in common assault and

harassment, not in the high end. I also said, however, hideous nonetheless. I have previously spoken at this Authority - and I think there is a corollary here - of how the occurrence of domestic violence, which sometimes can be seen as low level, was so significant in homicides and the work we did around domestic violence with this Authority, actually did a huge amount for us to better understand those homicides and do something about it. I think exactly the same is true here with the wider hate crime.

So I would welcome any further suggestions of how we get the message out. I am keen to do that to increase the confidence but I think the critical issue, Kirsten [Hearn], is also -- getting the message out is one thing but it is how we respond to it. We are responding better to it than we have ever done before, hence I can quote the increase in detection rates, but we are never at the end of the road and we should always be looking to improve our game. I welcome any further suggestions.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Can I just come back just to add? It is noticed that a lot of the incidents and attacks may have quite a strong youth element to them. Obviously on recent cases we cannot comment any further about that to some extent. I am wondering what is happening to go into schools and to connect with young people about LGBT issues from a police point of view. I know that there is some successful work being done around some issues around knives and guns in particular around young people. I am wondering what else can be done to connect with young people from the police of view around the whole issue of homophobic hate crimes.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Kirsten [Hearn], I think what I would say there - again I will take that away - do not forget we have a very successful deployment of safer schools officers in London that have seen significant opportunities taken to build a relationship with young people and actually for us to play our part in building a better civic society with young people. So I will take that away to see is there anything more we should be doing with our safer schools officers but also, as I think you would recognise, whilst we should play our part, I think there is a much, much wider issue of what part other agencies should be playing to ensure that, whatever efforts we are making and redoubling, are not just efforts on their own.

**Kirsten Hearn (AM):** Just finally it would be really helpful if you could issue some kind of statement outlining some of the things you have said here today in the light of tomorrow evening's vigils across the country which will be a message to the community about what we are doing to make a difference.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will take that away and look at it and see if we can develop something, Kirsten [Hearn].

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Commissioner. Kirsten [Hearn], you should perhaps note of course that Richard Barnes is going from the GLA to the vigil tomorrow night in Trafalgar Square.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am sure we are represented.



**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Christopher [Boothman]?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Just briefly to underline one of the points that Kirsten [Hearn] made. I think that it is really important to focus on the fact that many of the incidents that develop into serious incidents generally start from something quite minor which might be name calling, it might be something else, someone objects to it and, next thing you know, people are using violence.

I think that two of the things that the MPS could do to try to improve the situation, not only for lesbian and gay people, but for victims of hate crime generally, is to look at the response at the front counter and also when people phone up. In a sense it is part of the general work of the MPS in relation to treatment of victims. There are particular groups of victims who, disproportionately, under report. In my experience it has sometimes been about the reception they get at front counter or they get when they ring up. So I think that can be looked at.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Again, we will do that, Chris [Boothman]. I think we have improved our response to the community and I think there is a lot of evidence to that but there is always more we can do. Particularly we have tried to improve it on the telephone. I think we have discussed at this Authority before the problems we have around front counter, no matter what your problem is when you come into that front counter. The customer experience is not always the best and sometimes that is to do with an environment that does not allow for the proper confidentiality etc and it is part and parcel of our long term aim to trade out of the estate we have got and make improvements. We know the problems we have got around estate but I will pick that up, Chris [Boothman].

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Thank you very much, Commissioner. I propose that we now go to the subject of human trafficking because Jenny [Jones] tabled a motion on this. I think that this will probably be the best context in which to bring it up.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Yes, Chairman. If I can just add something? I have taken some further advice on the procedural points and it is best if this is dealt with as a motion in the normal way people understand that. So Jenny [Jones] will move it and seek to have it seconded and then there can be a discussion.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am going to assume this is a question.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Do standing orders say I have to stand?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Or are they sitting orders? OK. Fine. I do not think, generally, there is much dispute around this table that trafficking is a problem here in London. We are not sure of the scale but it is a problem and likely to increase in the build up to the

Olympics. I understand what the MPS is doing, that it thinks, I think, that what it is going to do will improve the situation for trafficked people. The MPS' reorganizational proposals are to close the specialist human trafficking team and that this should go to clubs and vice, CO14, with enhanced resources for CO14 and then other trafficking remains in the Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD). I think that is what the MPS is proposing so that awareness and victim identification can be mainstreamed across the borough.

Now I am arguing that this is actually the opposite of what is being done with other forms of violence, that actually specialist teams are seen to be the best place to deal with something that is so particular and where you need particular skills. For the Olympics clubs and vice has been given an extra £600,000 to fund additional work but non-governmental organisations (NGOs) at the moment feel that labour trafficking - for the catering, the cleaning, the construction and all that - is actually a big part of the trafficking problem. It is not only sexual exploitation. So in moving this particular topic of trafficking to clubs and vice it is removing this other element of trafficking which is so important.

At the moment, in the specialist team, there are 11 officers and it costs £870,000. It has been in existence for two and a half years and it has passed 250 advice files to the boroughs and it has been credited with actually disrupting 19 organised crime networks. Now I think this is a very good record and I am very concerned that, if the MPS makes these changes, that expertise is going to be lost. Basically, the human trafficking team is a success story. It actually does the job it was designed for. It has very positive engagement with all sorts of third sector organisations who give it information, intelligence and that sort of thing.

I just do not think mainstreaming is the answer. It is not what the MPS is doing with other serious crimes of violence and it seems to me that this is closing down opportunities. Plus, of course, the resources that are being moved to clubs and vice do not, in any way, replicate the resources that are being closed down. Clubs and vice is getting extra money for the Olympics but it is only getting a few of these specialist staff moved out of the human trafficking team. I think there is work at the moment -- it is doing something on debt bondage, which I do not fully understand, but I think is very, very valuable. This is not within the remit of CO14 so all sorts of aspects of trafficking will be lost if the team is closed down.

So my motion just asks that it is kept open, particularly for the period of the Olympics. We always knew the money was not forthcoming from the Government. This was a clear commitment from the Government and I just think we have got to find the extra money. Now I know how much people hate other people being unrealistic and saying, "No, no, no, we have got to keep this, however much it costs". I am going to suggest that we can find this money by doing less work on some of the databases that have been proved to infringe human rights so I think that we should be giving less attention to those and I think we can recover quite a lot of money and keep this particular unit open. So I propose the motion.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Seconded by Joanne [McCartney]. Commissioner, do you have any comments?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Does Joanne [McCartney] wish to speak?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** No, she is seconding it I think.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I am happy for the Commissioner to speak if I can speak afterwards, and I can reserve my right.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Commissioner? Jenny [Jones] is basically saying do not close the human trafficking team and I think what she wants to hear is why this step has been taken and why it will not injure the cause of combating human trafficking.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** No, no, I want to hear, "All right, we won't close it"! I think I know why --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think we should be clear, it is not within the powers of this Authority today to countermand that decision. I think what would be more fruitful would be if we heard from the Commissioner about the reasons behind that decision.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am going to ask Tim Godwin to address the question but saying that we should take the money from this element and put it into that element is not quite the right way of doing things. Things are not hypothecated in that way. Of course you will know, Jenny [Jones], that we have a view around the evidence gathering teams at events is a useful thing to do. We have got to comply with the recent judgement and make sure we comply with the conditions and criteria for that retention. You will note today there is publicity from the press release of yesterday to find 66 perpetrators of violence in the West Ham football match. That is the sort of use we put this too. You will notice we had a very significant discussion at this Authority last month about the rise of right wing extremism and the concern around that --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I think you are answering my database question which we are going to come on to presumably --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will come back to that but you conflated the issues, Jenny [Jones], and I am trying to say why we would not automatically pick the money from that to keep this team going. I will now pass over to Tim [Godwin] about the team.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Firstly can I say that we do take human trafficking extremely seriously and, as you described yourself, Jenny [Jones], it involves a multitude of different crimes that can be occurring, not just sexual exploitation but other crime as well and, as a result, it touches quite a bit of what we do as a police service.

With the extent of what is going on 11 individuals cannot actually cope with the actual amount of activity that is undertaken. It breaks into things like Operation Swale, where we are working with the Immigration Service and the Border Agency in relation to human trafficking offences and to reduce harm. CO14 has been doing a lot in relation to sexual exploitation human trafficking crime as well as the human trafficking unit. As a result of that it is time to review and it is time to actually rationalise it and time to give it a **locus**(?). At the moment the proposals are being developed to put it within the CO14 infrastructure. That is going to be discussed at Management Board in November and that will then form part of the business plan process so we are going through that decision making process as we speak.

It is true that the Government has ceased the funding as of the next financial year. It actually ceased it the year before but we managed to secure some additional funding to keep it going whilst we undertook this review between the Serious Crime Directorate, Territorial Policing and Central Operations. We have secured an additional £600,000, as you say. We are currently awaiting an outcome of a bid for another £1.2 million so, in that sense, the asset base, if we win that bid, will actually be slightly increased as opposed to reduced, it is just where does the unit sit, what is its **locus**(?), what is its focus and how does it link up with the other agencies etc, and that work is ongoing. It will be brought back to the Authority through the planning process as we go through what our business plan is but, at this moment in time, we await it to come to the Management Board.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Tim [Godwin]. Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I am seconding the motion and I am seconding it because I think to have a discrete unit that is focused on the human trafficking is important and vital and this unit is regularly cited as international best practice and it is something that other countries look to the MPS to attempt to replicate and are starting to replicate across other parts of the world, so I think to give that up is sending the wrong signal not only domestically but also with those agencies and other forces we have to work with on an international basis where this trafficking occurs.

I am not going to repeat anything that Jenny [Jones] said but I think there is certainly concern across a wide range of organisations about this potential move. Interpol recognises the issue of human trafficking as the third largest crime after drugs and arms trafficking so it is an extremely high volume and extremely sensitive issue that is extremely complex. I think that is the key to lots of the concerns that have expressed; that it is a complex area. The officers in the MPS' trafficking team have developed, over the last few years, very good links across the piece with other partners, they have developed expertise which only comes with a lot of time working in this area and the concern is, if these officers who are highly regarded are placed or are dispersed across the piece, that that expertise and that focus will be lost.

I did not quite get the idea, Tim [Godwin], that, if this does move to CO14, the unit is going to be kept as a discrete unit, albeit in a larger one, so I would like some reassurance of that because, if the officers are going to be kept together the work is going to continue as it is but within a larger unit, then that is one thing. But if what we have been informed is that those officers are going to be dispersed and that expertise is going to be lost, then that is another thing.

I think the other thing we have to be aware of is that we have the Olympics coming up and certainly I know Germany, during the World Cup, experienced a 63% rise in women coming into the country for prostitution and that was only the increase that was known about. As Jenny [Jones] has said there are lots of other issues, for example, people being trafficked for servitude and London is the prime destination, I understand, for that in the country. We have talked about this before; that organised criminal networks go where the money is and if we have Interpol saying that this is the third largest category of volume crime in the world, then it tells us that that is where the money is and this actually feeds other crimes as well across the piece.

So I have not been reassured this morning by what has been said and I would like some more reassurance. I would also like other members' views as well. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Joanne [McCartney]. I think Kit [Malthouse] wants to come in.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Yes. As some of you may know, trafficking for the purposes of the sex industry has been a personal **hark**(?) that I have been campaigning on for ten years but I completely disagree with your approach. I think that there is a strong possibility that the current structure within the MPS and, indeed, other organisations that are looking at this actually hampers the work, rather than enhances it, and I think, given that trafficking of all its sources is currently looked at in five different pots, some within the MPS and some outside the MPS, screams out for putting them all together so that they can work in a much more coordinated way and that the sum of the parts, as a whole, will be much more valuable and they can leverage off each other.

At the moment there is no guarantee that, while the MPS is working on one particular network, that UK borders are not similarly working on the same network. I do think that it is incumbent upon us as an organisation, and I encourage the MPS to continue to do this with all parts of its business, to occasionally scratch its head and say, "Are we doing this in the right way and can we do it in a better way? Can we leverage more resource out, by putting units together, and get a much more coordinated approach, while preserving some of the expertise that is required?" I do not think there is any danger in putting units together and I think, actually, having small siloed units off in other buildings and other parts of the organisation doing their own thing can hamper the effort, rather than enhance it. So I support them in having a look at whether they can do it in a better way.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Obviously this is not the last word on this matter. As I understand it, the Management Board has not yet taken a final decision on this and, indeed, the Authority will be able to look at this during the budget and business plan later on so this is not the end of this particular matter. But I see several people wanting to come in. Clive [Lawton] and Valerie [Brasse] and then Dee [Doocey].

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I find I do not really have enough information in the end. There are lots of different kinds of trafficking I guess but the two major kinds which would be prostitution and sex workers on the one hand and debt bondage and illegal workers and that kind of arrangement. I recognise, on the face of it, clearly clubs and vice is less likely to be able to deal with the other side of things.

What I do not know is whether the human trafficking team, in its disruption of programmes over the last two and a half years, has, in its experience, predominantly dealt with prostitution and sex workers, in which case putting them predominantly there seems, to me, a reasonable kind of management decision, or whether, in fact, half of its work has devoted itself to other things, in which case what is going to happen there? How many human trafficking activities have been disrupted by groups other than the human trafficking unit, that is they have been discovered on boroughs and picked up by boroughs and so on, so we can have some confidence that they do know about this or can deal with this?

I find here that I am being called to consider something, in principle, without having any knowledge of the real --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** There will be plenty of time to acquaint yourselves of the facts in the course of the next couple of months because this is not the end of this story. Valerie [Brasse]?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I just wanted to clarify after what you had said, Kit [Malthouse], because my understanding was that it was not about putting a unit within another unit, but it was about disbanding a unit. So can I be quite clear? I got the impression that part of it was going to go into CO14 and the rest would be dispersed on to the boroughs which I think is what Joanne [McCartney] was trying to clarify. So what are we talking about? Are we talking about taking this unit, putting it wholesome into CO14 so it operates in an aggregated bigger unit, from which the leverage with other partners - I absolutely accept what you say - is very valuable. The more you disaggregate the unit, of course, the less likely that is going to happen. So I am now confused as to what is being proposed and what is on the table.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thanks, Valerie [Brasse]. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes. This has been raised on a number of occasions, both informally and formally, as an Olympics issue because, obviously, there is the possibility that it will increase dramatically for the Olympics. Like Clive [Lawton] and Valerie [Brasse] I am now totally confused. Normally I would be very keen on voting for

this motion basically because it appears to me, from what has been said, that a lot of officers who have built up real expertise in this area, we are going to lose them if they are dispersed. However, if these officers are going to be part of a larger team which might add to it as Kit [Malthouse] has said, then I would take a totally different view. So I do not know what to say.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I would withdraw the motion immediately if that were true because then there would be no need for the motion.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It is pretty obvious to me that the thinking of the MPS is evolving on this and this is not something that is set in stone and I think that all the contributions that we have heard this morning have been very useful and, I am sure, will inform the process of coming to a conclusion. Tim [Godwin], do you want to come back on that?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Very briefly. We do not throw away skills and knowledge where we have got them and we reinforce those and we actually utilise them.

This is about rationalising. It is about looking at all the different elements. It is about looking at what we do with the UK Border Agency (BA). It is taking the point that Clive [Lawton] made actually which is to look at everything that we do and where is the best fit to actually get the best thing that we can in terms of combating this type of criminality.

I think, for me, it is a little bit in advance of our deliberations in the sense of the papers that come through to Management Board where all that will be discussed and we will then make a decision and then it will be reported through. But there is a reassurance issue - I can see that - with members here that we will actually not only do as well, but better.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That seems to be the key thing. I think it has been very clear from everybody's contributions. It is something that members think is very, very important and they are going to want to see the steps in the logic that show that whatever you come up with will actually deliver better results in terms of combating human trafficking. Jenny [Jones], final word on this?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well my information is that you are, actually, only going to send four of these specialist staff to CO14. Now if you are not sending 11 then I think you are losing those skills because those skills will not be best used if they are not in a well resourced unit.

There is also the fact that, I think you said, 11 people cannot cope with what is happening at the moment. Well, in that case, we desperately need those 11 people, and we need others. It is not a case of diminishing the resource but actually increasing it and that is what this motion is based on; that the MPS intends to diminish the resource.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think, in terms of one small unit, some of the things that happens in the psyche of police services is that, if you have a small unit that says on it “human trafficking” then it is their problem, not ours. Sometimes that can actually distract in terms of --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** But you have just moved rape.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Hold on.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Why? Because it did not work.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Hold on. So you have to make those judgements on the basis of what the evidence tells you in terms of what is best to be done. So it can distract, it can add value, but you need to review it.

In terms of where we are now and how many individuals are coming across and all the rest of it? I honestly do not know; that will be up for the debate in the Management Board review. What you have told us will inform that debate, undoubtedly, and we will make sure that we keep you in the loop as to what we are doing.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that is the vital thing. I think the contributions we have heard this morning are very useful but I think we can only really comment on the proposals when we see what the final proposals really are.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is something obviously people are concerned about. Could we have a report here on the plans before it gets finalised because, otherwise, then we are just going to be moaning about it and not being able to contribute our advice?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Jenny [Jones], we will make a commitment to bring a report once we have taken it through our own Management Board but, to have a debate here, before we have had the chance at our own Management Board to discuss it, is, frankly --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Well I hope this debate has informed it. I am happy to withdraw the motion.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sure it has been extremely useful. Thank you very much, Jenny [Jones], for it and for bringing that subject up.

I would like now to go to Valerie’s [Brasse] question which was a pre-tabled question about the MPS figures for the proportion of violent incidents.



**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Yes, I am just trying to remember whether I remember what I put in! I know it was in relation to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) report and I was specifically interested, obviously, in the quality of recording and the accuracy. I suppose my concerns were about the quality assurance job that gets done and how the serious violence crime is recorded, what proportion of those figures are no crime and how that compares with most similar forces and, also, what is the position in regard of where that classification has been done wrongly? In other words, how do we rate in terms of wrong classifications and where do we stand *vis-à-vis* the other most similar forces? Actually, following on from things that Kirsten [Hearn] has been saying, is there any disproportionality about where those are wrongly classified as no crimes in relation to disabilities, LGBT or whatever else? So I think I would like some more information about that and be assured about how we monitor that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Valerie [Brasse]. I think Tim [Godwin] is going to answer.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes. In relation to the interpretation of what HMIC said, the HMIC has, in fact, contacted the newspaper concerned and pointed out that he did not say what he is reported as saying and I know that is a debate that is ongoing at the moment.

In terms of where we are with no crime rates, currently our no crime rate, in terms of most serious violence -- the issue that came out was that we got a 78% accuracy rate in relation to most serious violence and that was because we over record most serious violence. Can I reiterate that for anyone here? Over record it. By 22%. So we are recording violent crimes as serious violence when Her Majesty's Inspectorate thinks we should be recording it as not serious violence. Now we are content with over recording because it does, in terms, make sure that we deal with it appropriately, and we are not entirely convinced that the definitions that have been used in that particular survey are the ones that we want to adopt here. We would rather treat it seriously than not.

In terms of no criming, which was a specific bit that got mixed up with the reason why we got the 78% and the 78% was because we were over recording, is actually 3%. So 3% of our current crimes are no crimed. Can I just say that, in terms of the most serious violence, very hard to do it on that because the measure is for all violence that we actually monitor the no crime rate. I will take you through the no crime rates and how they compare to most similar forces and national averages.

The overall no crime rate in the MPS is 2.7%. In terms of our most similar force average that stands at 3.2% so we are below our most similar force average. The national average of all police forces is 4.1% so we are below the national average as well.

In terms of violence, which is the bit that we monitor as a piece, because the piece that HMIC looked at, which is why it was not published in there, was a very small number so, for example, for us, it was only 42 crimes out of a significant number. In some of the other forces it was only ten crimes. So too small to make too much judgement.

But in terms of overall violence against the person we have a no crime rate of 2.38% which is lower than the national average of 3.51%. Our most similar force average, which I have here which I need to just check because it seems very high, is that on other similar forces, the average is 7.7% no crime rate, whereas ours is 2.38%.

In terms of how do we monitor it? We have a whole crime registrar process. Because of our history in terms of some of this we do constantly review.

You asked about variation between different boroughs and, at the moment, we go from 2% in some boroughs, in terms of some of the no crime rates, up to 6% in others.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Is that serious violence or across all?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** That is across all assault with injury. We do pick those out. That is dealt with by the area commanders. We then go and have a look where the **outlines(?)** are. It is an ongoing process constantly to make sure we are complying with the rules.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you, Tim [Godwin]. I saw John [Biggs] and Jennette [Arnold].

**John Biggs (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I am so numerate it frightens me but I did not really follow that. I would not mind seeing a more detailed briefing note which explains it in greater detail because, of course, it can sound like a very tedious and lifeless question about statistics but it does strike at the heart of public confidence and recorded levels of crime and whether we have got it right.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** No reflection on your performance, Tim [Godwin]!

**John Biggs (AM):** OK. We could debate this longer but I would like to see a longer note. Suffice to say that ...

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that is entirely reasonable.

**John Biggs (AM):** Suffice to say that, on the one hand we are praising ourselves for over recording but, on the other hand, we cannot -- I am in the politics business. Quite a few of round this table are and we never go through an election period without people contending whether things are over or under recorded. It is a very contentious political matter and the reason is because the public are very sensitive about this. So a longer, more detailed note, maybe a longer debate, at this Authority or at the Operational Committee, would be very helpful.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thanks, John [Biggs]. Tim [Godwin]?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Can I just say that with some of these statistics around crime figures, we are in the same camp in terms of trying to get your head round all the different changes and nuances and subjective judgements. In every action there are often three or four crimes so which one do you call it? The rules of actually which ones you call it sometimes defy logic! As a result of that, we are working very hard to try to get it changed. The bit that we have now managed to get a concession on is that we should just look at violence as violence. Unfortunately, because of the review against most serious violence, the question is totally appropriate, but it is pretty unhelpful because what that does give us is a category against a question mark as to how serious is it and that is often a subjective view in terms of the mind of the victim and all the rest of it. It is not helpful. What we would like to get back to is violence, acquisitive crime theft etc and actually come up with those sorts of (inaudible) and gives them more appropriate information.

But I am more than happy to have a debate about statistics at some point.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** I would remind members, actually, that we do have our own MPA crime statistics on the MPA website, the definitions of which we have pledged will not change. One of the problems we have with those is extracting them from the ever-changing statistics that the MPS is subjected to. What we hope is, over time, those non-changing statistics, for all your might disagree with the initial definition of them, that the trend will then be undisputable either way.

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

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Kit Malthouse has touched on the point I was going to raise about statistics and it is something that jumped out at me from the Commissioner's report because, in that report, there was a paragraph about recent operations around a man with extreme right wing views who had been arrested. That came under the heading of counter terrorism capability. I thought to myself, "Well how would this be classified because would this not start off as a hate crime, given the motives, it seems to me?" I am not knowing enough about it but if the intention was race hate, would that not be one of those areas where you would want to double count it, in fact, so that we could get, if you like, the sense that there was race hate involved in that crime.

I only say this because I am receiving more and more complaints about people have just been receiving more racial abuse in their everyday getting off the Tube at London Bridge and stuff like that and maybe there is this climate now where people feel that it is OK to start with the words and, as Kirsten [Hearn] reminded us, later then get physical about things. So I think there is an issue about how your statistics match with the statistics that are available, especially around the hate crime piece on the MPA site, because that is the one that I would use because it is easily accessible and then I would refer people to the MPA site.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Great. Any points you wish to come back on on that?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Just to say that, in terms of race hate crime, there will often be something like an assault (inaudible) bodily harm, grievous bodily harm, it may be words and behaviour - which is still an assault - or it may be something else. So it can be a range of crimes but each of them then get a flag to show that it is actually racial motivated or it has got a racial base. That then is made so that it goes through to court so the court can know that that particular crime -- so it would go in as an assault, but with racial motivation.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** So in that case you would get a double ...?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** You would monitor the two. Yes.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Yes. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you so much. I think we should now go to Dee's [Doocey] question which was about senior officers and their cars I believe.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Could I just preface it by making it clear that I am not talking about senior officers who need cars for protection and my question basically is do you really think it is right to spend £2 million a year on providing chauffeurs and cars for senior officers when that money could be spent on providing an extra 30 front line police officers?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** OK. You say you do not - and I know you are not - targeting issues around security but that adds to the figure. So, basically --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** No. I have excluded those from my figures.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** But actually it is right that I give a full answer as to why it is officers get cars, and drivers. The first one is security which you quite properly identify and we would not discuss here who etc but there are a number of Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) officers who do get cars and drivers for security. You people need to know that.

Secondly, it is for operational reasons. ACPO officers, many of whom are operational - some are not and therefore do not get drivers - and therefore do require that level of transport.

Thirdly - and I do understand the current context in which we live within this constrained financial position - but it is the case that, as part of the remuneration package offered by this Authority to ACPO officers, they do get certain things; cars and drivers - some of them. That is all done within this Authority's scheme.

There is an issue - and whilst I accept the context within which this debate is now taking place and the different financial situation we are now in - and I think it has been referred to by Kit [Malthouse] in the past in some media that, when we do go out for

advertisement for ACPO officers here, whilst I am delighted with what we have, we have to work very hard to actually get a level of application. Part of the problem - and maybe we are pointing to a national problem here - is what has been referred to in the past as off book payments that are made to other officers, that are not done by this Authority, that make it very difficult to attract people to come to the MPS. The MPS does have additional financial issues for people who want to come and live down here who do not have premises down here.

Also the MPS carries with it - whilst it is an extraordinarily exciting and rewarding place to work - a significant level of risk. When people look at the difficulties of moving down to London and working here, with some of the risks etc, we do need to have attractive packages that we can attract the best. I understand the context of the current debate. Those are, basically, the three reasons.

The choice and type of vehicle is, again, strictly controlled under a scheme that the Authority is fully aware of. For your information, I think you are probably aware of this, all bar two ACPO officers have cars; two actually receive a cash equivalent which, again, is under the scheme. We are currently reviewing the procurement arrangements around those cars to see whether we can improve it and, if we can improve it, let us improve it. Why would we not want to save money?

There are issues around when we fit the various equipment that ACPO cars have that are operational because it is actually much cheaper to do that as a factory fit than retro fit, which actually goes against second hand cars and all the rest of it. But if we can find a better way, we will.

I think there is an issue around the provision of drivers for the cars and we are already reviewing the provision of drivers. You have already taken the security issue. There is an issue around operational and there is the issue about what is in people's terms and conditions of contract. We are reviewing those drivers to see whether we can reduce the cost and that is a very robust review that is ongoing and I will bring that back to this Authority.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Could I just respond very quickly to those? The fact that it is terms and conditions, yes, well the Mayor has said that any incoming Government ought to be looking at provision of cars and drivers for senior civil servants and ministers so, presumably, I am sure he has got lots of ideas as to how we can get round the terms and conditions because the same would apply to those people --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I did say, Dee [Doocey], I am fully aware of the new context --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Indeed. The second thing was operational. Well of course senior police officers have got to be on call - I understand that - and they have got to get from A

to B very quickly, but then so do midwives and doctors and nurses and they do not have chauffeur driven limousines --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** They are not chauffeur driven limousines. I do not accept that term, Dee [Doocey].

**Dee Doocey (AM):** OK. Cars with drivers provided to take them to and from their place of work which, after hours, are then for their own personal use --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** No. Which during the journey they are engaged in operational matters.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Fine. So are midwives and doctors and nurses --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Not in the same way, Dee [Doocey].

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I think the third point that you make about trying to get the best officers, I think everyone would endorse that. I have no problem, in principle, with saying that people should be paid the rate for the job but you yourself, Commissioner, have gone on record a number of times saying how important it is that the MPS relates to the people it is serving and the fact that we serve with a consent of the people. I really do not think it helps the them and us perception, certainly in some parts of society, that the MPS is one of us, if they see senior police officers being driven round London. I think it would actually help the MPS enormously to dispel this them and us if senior police officers were to go on the Tubes and the buses like everyone else.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Dee [Doocey], it is right that, where you say something that I think is, perhaps - not intentionally - but misleading in terms of how those cars are used, that I state my case, which I have done.

Secondly, as you will already note, I have said I recognise the change in context in which we are working.

Thirdly, I am already saying we are reviewing the provision of drivers. One of the things we are looking for is what opportunity -- and it already happens in parts of the MPS because this is not person to person marking. There are not the same numbers of drivers as there are officers. There are a significant number of ACPO officers who do not have drivers --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I have all the figures, Commissioner.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, and I am looking at, can we reduce that further and can we do better pooling? But I still have to turn round to you and say that the operational use of a vehicle by ACPO officers is very different in terms of the demand than midwives and doctors.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I think they might disagree with you.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** They might --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I do not want to prolong this. I just want to say, finally, that I welcome the fact that you are going to look at drivers. I just hope that you will actually take action to get rid of them. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. I think that that is obviously one that is going to run and run. I would just point out, Dee [Doocey], you say the Tube and the bus. Of course that does not exhaust the possibilities; you can get around on a bicycle and, I may point out, it is not illegal to talk --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Bicycle would be fine.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** -- on your mobile 'phone on a bicycle so you can continue to ...

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Not advisable.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It is not illegal! Right. Any other questions?

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

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Not on this topic.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** You have got one about which MPA members are members of Crimint?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Not members of it! How many members of the MPA are actually on all these databases for domestic terrorists? It is a pity Kirsten [Hearn] has gone; I am sure she is on it.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Sorry, can you say it again?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I put in a question, "Which MPA members are on the National Public Order Intelligence Unit (NPIOU), CO11 and Crimint databases?"

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Jenny [Jones]. The Data Protection Act does not permit me to discuss with MPA members in public! However, should individual members, which includes you, Jenny [Jones], wish to have provided, on an individual basis, information that we hold about you, then you can make an individual request under the Subject Access Provisions of the Data Provision Act. You are able to

do so. Exemptions may be applicable to any or all of that data, should the release prejudice prevention and/or detection of crime --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Is Boris [Johnson] on there?!

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** -- judged on a case by case basis. The normal fee is £10. Application forms are available on the MPS website. I look forward to receiving your £10!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Not exactly a helpful answer but it is a full answer! I think that is about as far as we are going to get on that today if I can be so bold. I think we --

**Toby Harris (AM):** Sorry, had Jenny [Jones] phrase her question as to, "Were there any?" that would not have been a breach of the Data Protection Act would it?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Are there any? Thank you so much.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It would have been, yes, I think is the short answer.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Absolutely, because people would be able to identify through the very fact of the numbers.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes. OK. Listen. I think we have had a long --

**Toby Harris (AM):** There are 24 of us. Clearly if there were 23 of us on there then that would be --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Very good, Toby [Harris]. We have had a long discussion on all of these matters now. I propose that, therefore, we go to the Chief Executive who is going to --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** I just have one thing to say.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Kit [Malthouse]. Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** I just have one short thing to say. I realise that this is routinely now falling to me to say this but I did actually want to congratulate you, Commissioners, on the quite extraordinary performance on homicide this year. We all seem to have skated over that. But the fact that you have reduced the number of murders in this city, by a little over the number of people sitting round this table, is something that, in other countries, would have been coast to coast headline news, particularly in the United States. So I think the parallels you drew earlier are good ones and I am just said that this, frankly, brilliant performance will, I am pretty sure, not be reported anywhere.



**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well I do not know. I think we should be optimistic and we should --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** But anyway, I just wanted to say ...

**Jenny Jones (AM):** We can twitter. You can twitter it for us.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that the Commissioner's opening presentation put that up in lights, as it deserves to be. Thank you very, very much.

OK. Catherine [Crawford]?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Chairman, if we are moving to item seven --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** We are moving to item seven. Do we need to discuss it at all?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I fear we may have to --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Why?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** -- spend some little time on it. I realise that this is an unwelcome interjection on my part. Because we do have some --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Does the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner need to stay for this because I think they can be excused if not? I do not think they need to stay for this. We are much obliged to you --

**John Biggs (AM):** Limousines are waiting outside.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** -- both. Thank you very much. Thank you. Sorry, Catherine [Crawford]?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I am sure that they will take the opportunity to watch the remainder of the process on the webcast because, of course, as part of the accountability structure, it is important that they take into account the Authority's business --

**John Biggs (AM):** They can probably watch it on the televisions in their cars actually.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I do not want to labour this, Chairman, but we do have some appointments that have to be made to committees and there are a number of recommendations. The best way might be to work through the recommendations and then look at the membership --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Well hang on a minute. Everyone will have seen the recommendations and will have seen the membership of the committees. Can we not just agree them?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** No, because there are some people who are not happy with what we want to do. Some I think can be agreed very quickly so recommendation one, the current committee structure --

**John Biggs (AM):** Can we put you on some committees, Chairman? Put the Chairman on a committee or two? Do you not think you should be on all the committees, Chairman?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Sorry. Go on Catherine [Crawford]!

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I was hoping that we could work through the recommendations on page 43. Recommendation one is that the current structure be confirmed, subject to merging the Resources Sub-Committee and Productivity and Performance Sub-Committees. If that was agreed that would be helpful?

**All:** Agreed.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Then there are recommendations to the chairs and vice-chairs of the committees. There are two possibilities for vice-chairs to be nominated.

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** Toby Harris for the Strategic and Operational Policing (SOP) committee as Vice-Chair.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** I will second that.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Then a Vice-Chair for Corporate Governance. I do not know if we have a ...

**Toby Harris (AM):** I have managed without in the past but I am quite happy to --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** A Vice-Chair for Corporate Governance?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Can you hobble through without one?

**Toby Harris (AM):** I do not mind.

**All:** Agreed.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Then we do come to the rather more knotty question of the membership of committees. I do not know, Kit [Malthouse], if you want to take that point?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Basically, if you remember, a year ago we said that we would review the committee memberships a year later, ie now, and we would rotate people off one committee on to another. Obviously everybody on Strategic and Operational Policing wants to stay on there, with the exception of James Cleverly, who has agreed to rotate off, but we have got two requests from members to go on to that committee and we are falling very, very short now on Finance. Finance is now down, I think, to only six people, which is just not a fair division of the workload and that means, basically, we need some volunteers to come off Strategic and Operational Policing for a year, and to go on to Finance and to shoulder their share of the burden. We have not, after canvassing, had any volunteers so the only thing we are left with to do is to --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Volunteer someone.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** I suggest that we run a ballot and just draw a name out of the hat. I guess I am seeking permission from the Authority to do it that way because, at the moment, everyone is sitting on their hands.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Can I just come in? It is out of a position of fairness that we did say, a year on, there would be some rotation. It just happens to be that two of those good people are rotating out of my committee and so, clearly, there needs to be some rotation towards Finance and Resources (F&R) --

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Presumably James [Cleverly] could go on it.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** -- because that is the whole way we are playing the game.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** It is a really good committee.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Chairman, if I could say so, as Chief Executive, I regard it as very high risk for the Authority that we do not have enough people on that because it is a crucial executive decision making ...

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Who is on this committee?

**John Biggs (AM):** You are not. I am not.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** John [Biggs], you are on it are you?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** John [Biggs] is on it. Yes. John [Biggs] is on.

**John Biggs (AM):** I am on Finance, yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** John [Biggs] is OK.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Yes. John [Biggs] is top class.

**John Biggs (AM):** Why do we not put Boris [Johnson] on to it?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Well that would not solve our problem. We would still be light on the committee.

**John Biggs (AM):** He would never turn up!

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** So I guess what I am asking for is permission to pick a name out of a hat.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Hang on, Kit [Malthouse], you cannot just do that without looking at the balance of what everyone is doing on other committees of various kinds because that could make it impossible --

**John Biggs (AM):** Indeed.

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** There are some things that we are on, for example, that do not count as committees like, for example, the Domestic and Sexual Violence Board. There are other things that we are doing and you have got to make sure that the balance is right and the workloads are fairly --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Yes, but nothing would change. We would substitute one committee for another committee so the overall balance would not change.

**Toby Harris (AM):** There is also another complication in that there is a limit on the number of members of Finance and Resources that can also serve on Corporate Governance and I think most of the members of Corporate Governance serve on SOP.

**John Biggs (AM):** Chairman?

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

**John Biggs (AM):** I really think you are going about this the wrong way, or your Deputy is. I do not have any problem with having every member on SOP, apart from me, and maybe it is more a question of us looking more persuasively at getting more people to go onto Finance.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can I propose, I do not think that the formula that --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** We have already tried to do that but people will not.

**John Biggs (AM):** I do not have evidence that Finance is not --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can everybody just ...? Reshard [Auladin]?

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** One way, perhaps, of dealing with it would be to get someone who is sitting on SOP to also do Finance, not to come off SOP, but also do Finance, and it does mean that we will then have James [Cleverly] on Finance, if he is going there, plus another one and then we can have the other two on SOP. It means one more member --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** James [Cleverly] is rotating off but not on to Finance.

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** OK. Well we could have two members of SOP doing Finance --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can I say I really think that this is a complete waste of a Plenary session of the Authority, to be going through minutiae of who sits on which committee now --

**Dee Doocoy (AM):** It has not been sorted out in advance.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Well we tried to but people will not respond. People are playing a game.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I think this is indicative of a different problem which is that, certainly when I came on to the Authority, not being quite clear which committee looked more or less interesting and so on, but it seems to me that, when I look at the agenda of SOP, there is a kind of a mission creep. SOP is becoming the place where everything happens and, therefore, I think this is indicative of the fact that everybody on the Authority thinks, "Best to be there because that is where everything happens". Now I think that is what it is indicating. Therefore I think there is a need to review terms of reference in order to move some of the stuff out of SOP and put it elsewhere --

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

**Clive Lawton (AM):** -- because if that were to happen I think you would be less exposed to this problem of everybody wanting to sit there.

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** No. This is rubbish, Clive [Lawton]. No. You would still have the problem of a committee that does --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Sorry, Kit [Malthouse] --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** I am allowed to speak.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can I just say I do not think that we are going to solve this question of the representation of members on the committees here and now. It is perfectly obvious to me that there is substantial disagreement about the way to do this. I propose, therefore, that we remit this question to further consideration elsewhere --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Where?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** By you with the relevant members so that we, basically, just sort this out.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, just a moment. I am sure that Kit [Malthouse] is trying to be as fair as possible.

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

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Picking a name out of a hat would not actually be fair --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** We agree with that. We understand. That point has been accepted.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** So we have moved away from that.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** That point has been accepted.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I just do not understand why you do not think of other committees going to Finance. I did not understand why you just said SOP to Finance and why not other committees to --

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Chairman, would it help if I came off the main --

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** It might well do, Chris [Boothman], but I do not propose that we solve this now.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Chairman, please hear Chris [Boothman] out. With the greatest respect.

**John Biggs (AM):** Can I agree with everything you have said, Chairman, for the first time, possibly the last time ever, and --

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Chris [Boothman] was speaking John [Biggs]. Let Chris [Boothman] --

**John Biggs (AM):** Why do we not invite Kit Malthouse to bring the answer to the next meeting of the full Authority and deal with it then?

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

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** I was going to propose coming off the main Communities, Equalities and People Committee (CEPC) and going on to Finance.

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

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I think that might very well be a great solution. I am obliged to you, Chris [Boothman], for proposing that. Is that all you need?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Yes. Solved. That is solved.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Is that done? OK. Good. Finance.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Well done. You will not regret that decision!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** What is the next committee? Thank you, Chris [Boothman]. What is the next one?

**Deborah Regal (AM):** That has not solved who is on SOP; it has solved who is on Finance. Now you have got the two on Finance that you wanted but it has not changed the membership of SOP so it is not solved.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Well it has solved my issue. I have two --

**Deborah Regal (AM):** The reason why we cannot move it away from this meeting is because SOP will be taking place and Finance will be taking place before the next full Authority. We do not have the back up of meetings without full membership.

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** I think we have solved the membership of ...

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Sorry. Reshard [Auladin]?

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** We have solved the membership of SOP now. We have got James [Cleverly] coming off and then we have you and Richard Tracey joining. So we will have one --

**Deborah Regal (AM):** So extending the membership of SOP to an uneven number. That is fine.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Brilliant. Are we all content with that? Fantastic. What is the next one?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** I think that we are probably all right on the next ones. We have various other people joining sub-committees. I am particularly

grateful to Valerie [Brasse] and Joanne [McCartney] who have expressed an interest in joining Professional Standards. That will be very helpful.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** So those can be confirmed at recommendation three. We need to reconfirm that the borough link members remain as they are. I do not think there are any changes --

**Toby Harris (AM):** Sorry, Chairman, there is an issue about the CT and Protective Services Sub-Committee. Whilst I have nothing against Clive [Lawton] joining, there is a limit to the number of people who can usefully go through the **develop**(?) vetting process and sit on that body and be privy to the highly exciting things that are not actually discussed there!

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Sorry. What is your point, Toby [Harris], that you do not think --

**Toby Harris (AM):** We cannot just keep adding to the CT and Protective Services Sub-Committee.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** The proposal is that we leave that as the four existing members.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Clive [Lawton], are you content with that?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I do not want to put anybody under pressure.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Can you live with that? You can live with that?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** I am sorry. OK. Fantastic. Anything else?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Chairman?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes, Victoria [Borwick]?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I am on the committee that Richard [Tracey] is just about to leave, which is the community one - and I have raised this separately - whether we could collapse one or two of the underneath committees, which only have a poor attendance, into the broader committee, again to make it more interesting, back to the suggestion that somebody had said --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** That is a question for the committee itself. You would have to discuss that with Cindy [Butts] and agree that at your next --



**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Maybe you could just flag up that that, perhaps, could be discussed again, is really what I am saying.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Just wanted, Chairman, what is happening to the Estates Panel and the Civil Liberties Panel? Are they being reconstituted as they are?

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** Yes. Same as they are.

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** They are not formal --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** No, I know that, but if they are not mentioned --

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** There are no proposals to change them.

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

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Chairman, one very quick thing on link membership?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Yes. Steve [O'Connell]?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** I am fully aware that elected representative members are link members for their boroughs. I have an additional one, being Greenwich, which is fine, but is it fair to say that all members of the MPA have two --

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, three.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** I have got three. If you listen actively that is what I am saying. The point I am making is are there any members with one borough?

**Reshard Auladin (AM):** Yes. Most of the (inaudible) members --

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Right. Is that built in statute because I am conscious I --

**Kit Malthouse (Vice-Chairman):** No, it is just by arrangement. There are some members with no boroughs.

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Right. OK. Away from agenda, I would like a discussion with those who might like to support Greenwich because I feel that I am not giving the support that they deserve. We can do that off --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I live there. I am happy to help.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** OK. Terrific. What else? Are we there on the commitology?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** We are almost there. We have got the external appointments. If there are any vacancies not filled we can take those at SOP but we do need to consider the Chair of the Domestic Violence Board and the recommendation is that there be Co-Chairs, Valerie Brasse and Kirsten Hearn.

**All:** Agreed.

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

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** This is all effective until 2010, the next annual general meeting (AGM), Chairman, which you can put in your diary as something to look forward to.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Fantastic. Thank you so much.

Is there any other urgent business? No. Thank you very much --

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** There is another item of non-urgent business, Chairman, which is item eight, the reports from the committees. The only thing I would ask members to confirm is that they are content with the protocol on confidentiality?

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Are we happy with the protocol on confidentiality? Everybody is happy with the protocol of --

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive):** Victoria [Borwick] has got something.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Victoria's [Borwick] got a question.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** A quick question just to remind everybody that the auspicious date of 5 November 2009 when anarchy rules and everybody is invited to the Civil Liberties Panel open meeting.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you very much, Victoria [Borwick]. If you had been here at the beginning you would have heard me say that very thing.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you very much. My humble apologies.

**Boris Johnson (Chairman):** Thank you. No, no. Fantastic to see you here. Well done members of the MPA. Well done. Marathon session.

The meeting closed at 12.27 p.m.