

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 24 June 2010 at 10 am in Committee Room 5, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chairman), Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
Tony Arbour, Jennette Arnold, John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Chris Boothman,
Victoria Borwick, Valerie Brasse, Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey,
Kirsten Hearn, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell,
Caroline Pidgeon, Valerie Shawcross and Graham Speed.

MPA Officers:

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive) and
Bob Atkins (Treasurer).

MPS Officers:

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner), Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner),
Martin Tiplady (Director of Human Resources) and Anne McMeel (Director of
Resources).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to our temporary bunker. Can we start by placing ourselves in the room? Kit Malthouse.

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

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

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): Reshard Auladin.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

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

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Toby Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

Chris Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Clive Lawton (AM): Clive Lawton.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Jennette Arnold.

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Cindy Butts (AM): Cindy Butts.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Valerie Shawcross.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

Graham Speed (AM): Graham Speed.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): Anne McMeel.

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Martin Tiplady.

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

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

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good. Welcome all. And ...?

James Cleverly (AM): James Cleverly.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Just arriving. Thank you very much. There are two parts of today's meeting, ladies and gentlemen. We have to start with our Annual General Meeting, which I hope we can despatch quite quickly, and then we will go into the full meeting proper.

So our Annual General Meeting (AGM) to start with. Catherine [Crawford], I think it says invite you to introduce the report but I will if you like. Chairman and Vice Chairman. The Mayor has confirmed the appointment of both me and Reshard [Auladin] as Chairman and Vice Chairman for the coming year. A copy of the confirmation letter is available if you would like to see it.

In terms of Chairs and Deputy Chairs of all the Committee bar Corporate Governance - which has not had a volunteer for its Deputy Chair - there has only been one nomination for all those positions. I am looking for Chairs and Vice Chairs of the main Committees,

so, unless anybody has any other nominations for any of those positions today, I was proposing to take them all on the nod at once. Yes?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I would like to be on the Professional Standards. I am at the moment but my name, somehow, did not go forward.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): This is just for Chairs and Vice Chairs so members of the Committees we can do in a minute. Chairs and Vice Chairs; is everybody happy?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Take all those as agreed. Thank you very much. We have got one vacancy which is the Vice Chair of Corporate Governance. If nobody wants to volunteer today then what I suggest we do is refer that to the Committee itself to deal with at its first meeting next time around, if that is all right. OK?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Now membership of Committees. We have had various expressions of interest, I think, basically all of which we are happy with. There are some vacancies and, rather than attempt to fill the vacancies today, I am conscious that, within the next month, we will have a new Independent Member who, no doubt, will be keen and eager and looking for lots of work to do. What I was proposing to do was to leave some of those vacancies until that Independent Member has come on and expressed an interest about what they want to do. In terms of main Committee, I was going to try to push that person, since we have advertised for specific skills, towards Finance and Resources. If that is all right with everybody? OK with that?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good. I should note also that Richard Tracey has obviously now left the Authority. We are very grateful for his work over the couple of years that he has been on the Authority. We have been joined, as a replacement, by Val Shawcross. Val [Shawcross] has, very round shoulderedly, volunteered to be on Finance and Resources which, no doubt, will boost our skill set, in particular.

The other issue, just on membership, on Finance and Resources was Chris [Boothman]. You are on Finance and Resources but did not express an interest. You no longer wish to be on that?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Without putting Chris [Boothman] on the spot we just had a quick conversation and - this is up to you, buddy, but we are pretty well staffed --

Chris Boothman (AM): I am relaxed. If you are full staffed then I will stay away from it, to be honest. I am fully loaded elsewhere!

Steve O’Connell (AM): He is a busy guy elsewhere, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. All right. The other thing we have to do is the Standards Committee which is we need to approve the membership and the appointment of Independent Members on the Standards Committee. Is that right, Catherine [Crawford]?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): That is right, Chairman. There was an extensive selection process with some really high calibre candidates. The recommendation is that the Mayor make a (several inaudible words).

Chris Boothman (AM): Sorry, Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes?

Chris Boothman (AM): I have just been informed that I probably need to be on Finance because I am on the Olympic Sub-Committee.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Fine. You are on.

Steve O’Connell (AM): Welcome!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Joanne [McCartney] wants to stay on Professional Standards as well. What I suggest is we leave the other gaps for the new Independent Member to pick and choose and then we can decide where we need to (inaudible).

Are you happy to take the recommendation on the Independent Members of the Standards Panel? Yes?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Good.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Sorry, Chairman? I am just wondering when would be an appropriate point to thank the outgoing Chair of the Standards Committee who is retiring. She is an Independent Member.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Is that right? Sorry, I was not aware of that.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): She has done two terms so she has to stand down.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): She has to stand down. OK. We are very grateful to her. I will be writing to her to say thank you. Sorry about that.

Then, outside bodies. You should have a list of outside bodies. We have some vacancies on there. I am not proposing to necessarily fill them here in this meeting but if you could give some consideration, particularly on the Association of Police Authorities (MPA) Council where we have three vacancies which would be good to fill, not least because the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) is obviously going to be at the forefront of the coming debates around police governance so we need to have a good and proper representation there. If you would give consideration to that that would be great.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, just on that - I am not volunteering myself. You have got three outstanding people already there. In your own judgement, how necessary is it to have six? It is not about voting power is it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It actually is about voting power, yes.

Clive Lawton (AM): Given the whole size of the thing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I think it is good for the MPA to have a solid presence there.

Clive Lawton (AM): It is solid. Three extra people.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): If they show up.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): We do actually pay for six places.

Clive Lawton (AM): There might be a different answer to that problem then.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There is a value for money issue there.

The other thing we have to do is note the attendance record which is Paper 3A.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I think the point to make there, Chairman, is that attendance at the formal meetings is not a full picture of the amount of time that Members devote to the work of the Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Happy to note that?

All: Noted.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I think that is us done on the AGM. OK. Good. That is the business done --

Tony Arbour (AM): Chairman, can I raise one thing?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes.

Tony Arbour (AM): I am at the Local Government Association (LGA) in any event and, since we are paying to be there, if I see there is a vacancy I can exercise our votes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good. Thank you. OK. That is all the process dealt with.

Right, we now start with the meeting proper if we can, ladies and gentlemen. Apologies for absence. I have had Toby Harris and Neil Johnson. Anybody else? No.

Declarations of interests. Does anybody have any interests to declare? No. Thanks.

Minutes of the last meeting. Does anybody have any comments on the minutes of the last meeting? No. Can I sign those as a true record?

All: Agreed.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Chairman, could I reassure Members that, although we are in an unusual place, the full arrangements are in place to have this webcast and a full transcript of this meeting to be available as well. The change of location has not (inaudible).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Great. Thanks very much.

All right. Chairman's update. I want to start this morning by congratulating those Members of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) who were recognised in the Queen's Birthday Honours List. In particular, very gratifying to see Orders of the British Empire: Officer (OBEs) for Martin Tiplady, who is here today, Chief Superintendent Dal Babu, who is the Borough Commander in Harrow, and, of course, our own Chief Executive, Catherine Crawford. Thank you.

Also I would like to congratulate three new Commanders who were selected to join the MPS earlier this month. The Panel interviewed eight candidates and we chose one from the MPS, which was Detective Chief Superintendent Christine Jones, and two from external forces, Chief Superintendent Steve Rodhouse and Chief Superintendent Jim Webster. All three, we understand, will be taking up roles in territorial policing.

Since the last meeting of the Authority I have attended 58 meetings including three Joint Engagement Meetings (JEMs), the first of the next round of JEMs that we kicked off. I have also led three crime and safety roadshows in the south, east and north west of London where we are bringing together local authority practitioners, councillors and members from the local community to promote and talk about some of the work that we are doing here and at City Hall on serious youth violence and other crime types. We are doing three more in other parts of the city, one of which is here at City Hall so if any of you would like to attend - I know some of you have already - please do.

We have also completed the first round of Member assessment interviews. Found these two way discussions very useful. Hopefully the feedback and the action points coming out of those assessments will go towards improving our day to day operation.

I have had, as Members would expect, a number of meetings with new Ministers, including the Home Secretary, and had discussions on the coalition's plans for changes to police accountability and governance structures, planning for the Olympics, counter terrorism and, of course, the budget. The picture is, as yet, unclear on what the budget implications are going to be for us but, undoubtedly, whatever happens, it is going to be challenging and we have got several follow up meetings, as you would expect, planned to talk to them about how we are going to address that.

I would just like to highlight one particularly noble contribution towards our budget savings this year and thereafter, and that is the recent decision of the Commissioner and his Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) team to forego their bonuses this year, which I think was a welcome and, indeed, very community spirited indication of their commitment towards dealing with some of the problems that the country faces and making their own personal contribution. We are very grateful to them for that support.

Finally in my report, Jenny [Jones], you have submitted a question to me on dip sampling. The short answer to your question is, yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Great.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): More than happy to look at how we can better use dip sampling across the piece to address some of the issues that you have raised. Not least around rape although I would say, obviously, there is significant work taking place under the Commissioner in SED2 around the no crime (inaudible) and, to a certain extent, early indications are that some of the recent rise since the transfer has been down to a reduction in no crimeing, but I know that Sir Paul [Stephenson] wants to talk about that later on. What we will do is, at the MPA, bring forward a paper for you to look at around how we can weave dip sampling into some of the work on MPS standards that we are going to do in Met Forward.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you very much.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Not at all. OK. That is everything from me unless anybody has any questions. Yes, Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): I am sorry. I did not know we had to submit written questions to you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You do not have to.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Oh. Thank God for that because I have got two! Firstly, I would like to add my congratulations personally to those who have received an OBE and just to say to them have a fabulous day at the Palace.

Then, more seriously, Chairman, I was at your meeting in north east Stratford --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): At Stratford. Yes.

Jennette Arnold (AM): And, although well attended, I was aware that certainly I could identify boroughs that were not there, or the representation was not as high as it could have been. So, firstly, can you look at the attendance list and then send it out to those boroughs again and invite them to the one that is coming up here at City Hall? I say that because it was very informative. I have had some questions raised with me since that meeting.

One of them was - and I was not able to answer - you talked about a review in the autumn and you talked about the plethora of groups and boards and all the panels that there were around. I might have missed it, and I apologise if I have, but can you give me a clarity about that because it has caused concerns for those people who give up their valuable time? We have got to manage their relationship with us on this because we have seen, in the past, that if we do not actually (inaudible) the information from the start so that they know what this is about, what we end up with is our idea of what it should be and then we have people really quite distressed. Are you able to give more clarity? Is it every panel board? What will be the timescale? What will be Members' involvement, if any? What is the communication strategy to those people who have given their valuable time, have been giving it for years and, on the whole, do a tremendous job?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): On the first part of your question on the roadshow meetings, everybody has been invited to every meeting, so you do not have to go to your regional one. In fact, the City Hall one - there is one here centrally for people to go to before they go to where it will be sold out or whatever. We have invited - every borough in London has had five or six invitations fired out by email.

I think one of the issues we need to look at is whether breakfast is a good time to do it. I think it is because I am up early and think it shows workmanlike - rather than doing it at the end of the day when everybody is tired. We are getting good attendance. We will do another --

Jennette Arnold (AM): Carers. People who have children to take to school.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We will do another cycle later in the year and we will probably do those in the evening.

In terms of engagement structure, we did flag that we would be reviewing the engagement structures through Met Forward. I do not know, Cindy [Butts], if it is in the workplan for your Committee to look at the engagement structure generally, but there is a

project to do that later this year. I have had conversations with The London Communities Police Partnership (LCP2) - which is the organisation that represents **CPPGs(?)** across the city - to flag to them that we are interested in looking at how we can do things better and more efficiently with them.

I do not know, Cindy [Butts], what the timescale is on when you are going to kick that review off?

Cindy Butts (AM): Sorry, kick what off?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The review of engagement structures. Is that going through the Committee?

Cindy Butts (AM): It is still in discussion.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. So we suspect that will probably start in the autumn. We will work up a communications plan over the summer, I guess, to make sure that everybody knows exactly what is happening.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Chairman, can I just raise one question in relation to Jenny's [Jones] point about the dip sampling, to say that any paper that does come back to the Authority - whether it is to Strategic and Operational Policing (SOP) or full Authority - picks up with the work with domestic and sexual violence, what we are already doing in this area, because we monitor this very closely. It is high variable. The ratio of no crime to crimed incidents. Interestingly, the corollary of that is - guess what - sanction detection rates look a lot better where the crime to no crime is low. Obviously all other things being equal. So, the MPS has already promised to do some work around dip sampling in racial and domestic violence and serious sexual violence, but it is a really variable feast across boroughs and it is very difficult to understand why it is so different. Just to raise that point.

The other question was around JEMs. We have started the second round of JEMs. We have done three, I think, number twos, as it were. Part of that was to look at progress since the first round. What is your take on that? The progress?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is, as I say, hard to draw a pattern so far. We have done Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Hammersmith and Fulham. There has been progress in all three, not least generally around crime performance things are improving and I think that comes out in the figures that we have been getting every month from Sir Paul [Stephenson]. There is definitely a greater focus, in all the organisations, not just the MPS but local authorities as well, on serious youth violence, which was the last round.

Interestingly, because they have been through the process before, local authorities in particular are turning up much better prepared for these meetings, with many more plans in place to take things forward. Some of them had specific challenges during the year but, nevertheless, the focus now on shared intelligence - on which there is a push, generally, from both sides now, from the MPS and from local authorities - I think it is bearing fruit.

Those three boroughs in particular have always been very closely working together in any event. We will see as we get towards the others on the fringes whether we have had an effect or not. Val [Shawcross]?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you, Chairman. You mentioned, in passing I think, that you had a meeting with the Home Secretary and you were discussing the future of, basically, the corporate governance around the police service. What were you told about what the process and timetable would be from here on in terms of decision making? Will there be a green paper? Will there be a white paper? When will we expect to see draft legislation?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): To be honest the picture was not entirely clear because, at the stage I had my meeting, I do not think any (inaudible) had been decided but I was told that, within a year or so, year to 14 months, ie next summer, there would be legislation on the statute book and they intended to move very quickly on the Policing Bill, in particular, as part of that.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): So we do not expect a green paper? It will be straight into draft legislation?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): As far as I am aware. I have not been told that there will be anything significantly different. In fact, I know there have been a lot of conversations with the police and professional (inaudible) ACPO, as well about it so that (inaudible) as fast as they can. The rest of the country obviously wants to have elections for these directly elected individuals. My expectation is that they will be wanting to have them either in the autumn of 2011 or spring of 2012. So if you think that, to prepare for those, you need to work back six months, effectively, to get the legislation in place to have the election, that would point to something in the summer of next year, in terms of legislation. Is my guess. As I say, no specific timetable has yet been laid out.

I think to a certain extent, to be fair, some of the options are still open, absent this broad principle that the coalition wants to embed, which is that the democratic control of policing is a vital part of the way the country should run. Beyond that, I think some of the plans are still being formed up. I will expect them to be formed up within the next two or three months and draft legislation to be published, probably, at the end of the summer.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): OK. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes, Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): In your introductory comments you referred to the fact that the Commissioner and others had forgone their bonuses. I certainly also appreciate that action. I think you couched it as if it were, essentially, a fiscal or financial contribution to the Authority's budget situation. I had understood it also to be a philosophical stance. I just want to applaud that, if I am correct; a challenge to the bonus culture and those things. Clearly it makes a contribution financially but I think it also makes a very important statement on other levels as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is right. The Commissioner can speak for himself but it is well known that he has had a longstanding personal commitment to not taking a bonus for some years now. I do not know if Sir Paul [Stephenson] wants to add anything?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Exactly true. I think my position is well known on bonuses and does not need further rehearsal here. I think the reasons why I take that position are well known. However, it is also fair to say that bonuses were negotiated as part of a payment package for a lot of other people.

By the way, I am not the only person that has taken that principled position in the MPS over a long period of time. It was always legitimate for other people to avail themselves of any bonus awarded.

I think the real praise should go right the way across the senior levels of the MPS; the ACPO officers and the senior staff. This was not a series of negotiations with pressure being put on. Actually I was incredibly pleased and proud of the senior leadership and the way they saw the situation and quickly came to a position. Whatever our position on this and whatever our negotiating position is for the future in terms of the Staff Association, at this moment in time, it is an appropriate (inaudible).

Clive Lawton (AM): Appreciate that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thanks for that. Any more questions before we move on to the Commissioner's report? No? OK. Commissioner, if you would like to introduce your report?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. You have got the report which, obviously, is slightly behind the performance figures that I always have in trying to (inaudible) because the report gives you up until April - which is just four weeks. I will give you some information for the first two months - April and May - but, again, we have got to take a note of caution with any figures I give you, particularly where it is good news, because it is only two months data. So we have got to view it with caution. The current situation, up until the end of May, is that total notifiable offences are marginally down. In essence, it is flat. It is about 0.2% down. Just under 500 fewer offences. So, in overall terms, more or less flat.

Overall serious acquisitive crime - I will give you where I think the figures are looking very good at this moment in time, albeit over two months - continues to fall. Down by just over 2%; 2.3%. 750 plus offences. The good news is residential burglary continues to improve. You will recall the position from last year right the way through to September; very concerned at the considerable rise in burglary in London. I think we got over 10% at one point. We took action and it started to reduce in December, and it has been reducing ever since December. For a whole host of reasons but I do think activity by boroughs has been very, very significant in doing something about bringing burglaries down, not least something rather (inaudible) and that is arresting burglars. That is down by 9.2% over those **extra two**(?) months and that is consistent with the trend since December. I think that is good news. Of course, over the last six years, we have reduced the number of residential burglary in the city by some 10.8% so, again, we are getting back on track to where we were previously, and we needed to do that.

Motor vehicle crime down. If you remember motor vehicle crime was plummeting in last year's figures. It is still down over the first two months but a much lower percentage. It is down by 1.3%. Over 200 offences, but it is still down.

More senior violence which, I think, is the most important part in this discussion and something we have focused on significantly in recent months, is down by over 23%. Over 500 fewer offences in the same period as last year. Of that reduction, a large part can be treated as a reduction in most serious violence where knives have been used. That is down by over 50%. So we have a reduction in most serious violence and the biggest contributor of the categories to that is a reduction in more serious violence where knives have been used. I will come back to knife crime because it is not all good news, but that is good news.

Domestic violence. We have had this discussion so many times before. I never know whether to be pleased, cautious or worried whenever we do iceberg crime figures and domestic violence is one of them. That has seen a slight decrease in reporting domestic violence. It is down by about 1.5%. We have just got to recognise it is so under reported and that a lot of our push has been to get more reporting, so it is very difficult to talk figures and performance on domestic violence. We continue to be very concerned about domestic violence in the city.

Last week we launched a new advertising campaign with quite a powerful call to action, and reminded the public they can play a vital part, under a strap line, "You make the call. We'll make it stop". It points out that victims do not need to come forward themselves. We can take action on third party reporting. Certainly that has been major progress over recent years between ourselves and, to be fair, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). I think the CPS has stepped up to the plate as well. Still a difficult area.

Just remind you where we came from on domestic violence in this city. Last year domestic violence accounted for one in five of our murders. We had the lowest homicide rate we have had, I think, since 1978 but for a long time anyway, but it still accounted for

one in five of our murders. In the last five years the approach we have taken has seen domestic homicide reduce from 43 in 2004 to 24 in 2009. We know domestic violence contributes the most serious areas of our crime. We have got to continue to be concerned about it. We have got to be cautious about seeing a reduction as improvement because you never know whether there is some reason why suddenly there is a lack of confidence. Everything we have seen has been an increase in reporting domestic violence because of the way in which the service has (inaudible) nationally and (inaudible) and the MPS has responded to that crime, which we did not deal well with way back in the past 10, 20 years ago.

It is similar, other reported hate crimes, have fallen against the same time last year. Race and religious crime down by 182 offences. Because they are small numbers it is a big percentage reduction of 10%. Homophobic crime it says is down by 18.6%, which sounds dramatic - it is down by 40 offences. Again, the other iceberg crimes, as I call them, keep reducing. We have got to be very cautious using those figures as performance, but I report them to you because you should know about the figures.

The challenging areas remain. Knife crime continues to come under pressure. That is overall knife crime. That is up by 4.6%, just 101 offences. I mentioned earlier the more serious offences where knife use is down. Actually, I think it is particularly good news here; offences where a knife has been used to injure are down by 6.9%. That is down by 56 crimes. The rise in knife crime - I have reported this before - is largely, if not wholly, attributable to the knife enabled robberies. That still remains problematic to us. Knife enabled robberies are, where we see any increase, we are seeing the overlap of knife crime and knife enabled robberies. Injuries by knife are down but knife enabled robberies remain a problematic area for us.

Over the first two months of the financial year 141 more offences, which, small numbers, equates to 12%. Although we are only two months into the financial year that continues to trouble me and action is being taken around that. I am sorry to give you all these statistics but, if we had taken out other knife crime with robbery out of the statistics, knife crime would have shown a 4% decrease. So it is just showing you the scale of knife enabled robberies within the figures. That is somewhere we are taking a lot of action.

Gun crime. Up by 16. 16 more offences. As with knife crime there is an overlap between gun enabled robberies and knife crime. However, the good news on gun enabled gun offences is I can give you the last two weeks' figures - a lot of action being taken around there - and that is starting to show, in the last two weeks - I will not call it a trend because that would be absurd - for the first time, we are able to see reductions - down by 2.3%. That is as recent as it gets and we should, again, always be cautious about short term figures, but that is the current picture on violence around knife crime and gun crime.

Serious youth violence and teenage homicide. Well, of course, since the last Authority meeting in May we have had another teenager who has sadly lost his life in a violent way. Samuel Ogunro. A gun homicide. Over the calendar year so far this year we have had 11 young people lose their life through violence in the city. That compares with the

previous year of ten. Again, we have said it before, it feels obscene talking about figures around such tragedy, but it is on a par with the numbers. The numbers are just still too much. Remember we brought it down last year.

Serious youth violence up by 118 offences. Of course, as I have said before, a major part of dealing with the violence around youth is about the prevention issue. We are doing lots and lots round suppression with all sorts of tactics. The real issue is prevention with long term work. We have been engaging in joint education programmes to target and inform young people of the consequences and do all the things to try to persuade them out of crime recently. I am pleased to say we have spoken to over 2,000 young people in recent months, with a heavy schedule of additional visits planned during the summer break, because the summer break is always a concern to us. A lot of work (inaudible) right the way across London and, of course, you have got your own strategies and there is the Mayoral strategy as well around youth crime.

In terms of performance I want to finish on the discussion that was taking place before with, Jenny [Jones], your question to the Chairman and the additional information from you, Victoria [Borwick]. We have undertaken to do more work around rape. It continues to be a cause for real concern. The figures. What is of real concern is, again, what does it mean? What do the figures really mean to us? Rape is significantly up again in terms of recorded offences. We are confident that part of it is due to increased reporting. Yes, undoubtedly, there will be a (inaudible), because that is what happens whenever you centralise a function. It is a natural part of a rationalisation of function. I think we have got to be very cautious before we explain away all of the rise down to those factors. I just do not know. It would be misleading of me to say, "There has not been an increase in rape; there has just been a different way of recording it". I just do not know. That is why we continue to have to do more and more work. We continue to focus our resources and make sure that we do focus on what are the best outcomes we can deliver around this heinous offence. Of course we have got a very close eye to the Stirling Report and various other reports that actually talk about the issue being the victims' outcomes. I know there is further work promised around this with the Authority and it is right that we do further work around it.

I am not saying there are more offences going on out there. What I am saying is I think I am pretty confident there are things that can explain at least part of that rise, but I do not know whether it is whole or part. We should not be complacent about it and, even if it was coming down, there would be still far too many offences, and it is something we should do something about.

Moving on from performance and just touching on the budget, which you have already touched on, Chairman. Very difficult for us to say what the Chancellor's announcements mean to us, other than it is not good news. Whichever way you cut it, it is not good news. Everything that has been said since the Chancellor gave his budget has done nothing to cheer me up any more. The Home Office is a **unprotected(?)** Department. It has got to make decisions on whatever share of the cuts it is going to take with Government, and then it has got to make decisions with the Home Office what is the

share of the police service, and then decisions have got to be taken as to what is the distribution of that share between police forces.

I would say at this Authority, bearing in mind the nature of London, the challenges of London, the Olympics and everything else, I would be looking for the Mayor and the Authority, along with myself, to be making the case for London of why we do have some special considerations here that must be taken into account whenever that distribution takes place. I think that is a joint enterprise. It is very, very difficult.

As you know, we already have additional cuts in year that we have got to come up with this year, in addition to the £100 million we had already planned to take out of the budget this year, and we have got another £35 million with the counter terrorism (CT) to take out in year. That is incredibly challenging. We are looking as to those plans we already had because, as you know, we do a lot of planning and we were going to bring proposals forward, through the normal budget process we discussed at the last Authority, as to how we are going to manage this very difficult financial future with you. Now we have got to try to bring some of those plans forward to deal with a most unwelcome additional £35 million. £28 million and something of that is revenue for the capital.

Then there is our share of the CT grant. We hope (inaudible) do that very quickly. We think we can manage that in year but not without great difficulty. The real issue for us is what it means for the future. Of course what it means for the future is we have to carry on with our ambition to maintain, wherever possible, our operational capability, whatever that means. I am determined that we do that. I am determined that, wherever we can, we slim down (several inaudible words) we can. I think that is my responsibility and that is what you would expect me to do. So slimming down our processes, which we have got some work ongoing to do. Of course (inaudible) is difficult but, thank goodness, we took the decision three, four years ago to do something around staffing and human resources (HR).

Also we are going to have to take additional action and you cannot avoid the likelihood, in my opinion, at this moment in time, taking everything into account, when you see that 78% of our budget is bare line. When we are talking about the sort of cuts we are looking at the numbers are significant. I cannot imagine this organisation is not going to shrink in some way. It is for me to minimise how that has an effect on any operational capability.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thanks. Just to add three things on that. On what Sir Paul [Stephenson] was saying about rape, we, yesterday at the **BMG**(?) approved some terms of reference, for a research project with the MPS into some of the drivers of the numbers of rapes, so we can get a clearer picture about what the drivers are and where the solution might be.

The second thing is on finance. Just so you know I have already made the point to Ministers and the Home Secretary on finance that there needs a bit of a look at the funding formula across the UK just to make sure that it is properly addressing risk. I have written to the Home Secretary to make a few salient points about that. For instance,

there is, within the current funding formula, a weighting for sparsity. That means if you get an area of the country where there is nobody living there they get more money for policing! (inaudible) some of those drivers in the formula, which are counter intuitive would be the polite way to look at it, to show that you have really got to focus your money where the crime is rather than where the (inaudible) which seems to be the way the current formula goes.

Then the final issue, just to stress what Sir Paul [Stephenson] said about short periods, although, obviously, we are reporting the crime figures, it is after a very, very short period and it often depends which side of the line Easter falls as to whether you can draw any conclusions good or bad from those figures. While some look promising and some look less promising, it is almost too early to say (inaudible) those figures.

That is it from us.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): One thing, Chairman, to state the blindingly obvious, whilst I mentioned the Olympics in passing, of course we have had discussions at this Authority - and I know detailed discussions in the Sub-Committee around the Olympics Board - about how we are going to manage the Olympics and working within the envelope. It is all our responsibility to minimise the cost of the Olympics and that is what we should be doing at all times. Of course, if we end up with a shrinking organisation, we all know that the Olympics is going to have an impact on business as usual for many, many, many agencies. The money that has been provided is additionality. The smaller the organisation, the bigger the impact.

I would be concerned about two effects; any reduction in budget for the Olympic which increases the risk and, secondly, any reduction in the size of the organisation which increases the effect on business as usual (several inaudible words) of how we are going to support the Olympics without the additional funding. Dee [Doocey], I am sure you would be well aware of that through your Committee.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thanks very much. Right. **Let us go to(?)** submitted questions --

John Biggs (AM): Can I ask a house keeping question which is why the usual summary table with red, ambers and greens is not attached to the Commissioner's report?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am sorry. I thought it was.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It should be.

Dee Doocey (AM): It is not. I was going to ask the same question.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right. Can we get some copies quickly run off and then we can circulate the thing? We have had some migration issues from the old report to the new report so we will see if we can get some from that.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): We did not receive it, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We did not receive it. Oh, right.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If I may say so? Remember that that is for the April only figures and I have given you April and May.

John Biggs (AM): OK.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right. We have had some submitted questions. What I am going to do this time is take the submitted question and then take any supplementary questions around that so we do not get a slightly backwards and forwards conversation, if that is all right. The first question was from John Biggs. If you would not mind asking your question, for the record?

John Biggs (AM): You would like me to ask it for the record? OK.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): So the people on camera watching this can --

John Biggs (AM): I am a little bashful that this turns out to be the lead question! It is actually quite an important matter and the question is as follows; is the Commissioner happy with arrangements for the purchase of small items or the requisitioning of repairs by Borough Operational Command Units (BOCUs), or indeed other Operational Command Units (OCUs)? Both the bureaucracy and the cost in small purchases appears unreasonable. I am happy to add to that but perhaps I will hear an answer first.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Fire away.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If we ever needed to demonstrate the need to take tight control of money then the recent budget has demonstrated that to us, John [Biggs]. We all know that by going towards a tighter control of how we spend money, we can get better deals on contracts and we can get better compliance with all the things we are supposed to comply with. This Authority has been critical of the MPS in the past of failure of compliance around these sorts of issues. I do understand the real frustration because I have been there as a borough commander and sub-divisional commander. Out there, away from the centre, I got really irritated when I could go down to any company that sells information technology (IT) and buy myself a computer for £200. Why can't the centre do it for the same price? Actually, because £200 does not buy the support and everything else we need to know. That is the message we are trying to get through to people. We can demonstrate that by going towards these centralised controls we are saving money. What we should be doing is listening to our staff where they are saying, "But you are still not good enough" and actually revisiting those contracts. That is what I think.

Anne [McMeel], is there anything you want to add around this? Anne [McMeel] has done a huge amount of work, with (inaudible) staff, to try to get better control so we can save money by that centralised purchase, but it can be very irritating. It can result, in occasions, on almost bizarre outcomes, and I think that is what we have got to look at.

John Biggs (AM): Can I come back on that and then, if Anne [McMeel] needs to come in? I am aware that I am, potentially, a raging hypocrite because I am a member of the Finance Committee and the Corporate Committee and we do need to make sure the controls are in place, but I am reporting a frustration - not from one of my borough commanders I must say. I know you have asked them all and it was not one of them! It is the usual stuff that, for example, the kettle breaks and rather than going down to Currys and getting one you have to put a requisition in and not only does it take a long time and it is bureaucratic but it costs £200 instead of £29.50. The world is full of such anecdotes of minor repair.

I am aware that we have to have controls and I am aware that there are issues of European Union (EU) procurement where all the kettles are accumulated. You might find yourself in a European Court if every borough commander bought a kettle because you had not tendered it properly. All that sort of stuff.

I am aware, also, that the new Government has said that it supports a more French, if you like, interpretation of EU procurement rules than the British have traditionally had. In no way am I **belittling**(?) the French in saying that. That does suggest that we may have some greater discretion. I know this is a thorn in the side of a lot of people but there is a lot of bad practice underneath it. I am simply expressing that frustration.

With careful chairing you will not allow any supplementaries because I am sure the room will fill with anecdotes about this!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I was going to say I, like you, have reams of stories of, "I could have gone and bought that from IKEA for £5 instead of £350".

John Biggs (AM): I guess it is a problem maybe through the Commissioner's Office, through Anne [McMeel] and through the Committee system. We can look at whether we can find ways of twiddling this in a way that makes people's lives easier whilst maintaining control.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I think, also, that particular contract has been re-let or is just going to be re-let.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Before Anne [McMeel] comes in can I just say a proper answer to your question because your question is, "Am I happy?" I am happy that we are a lot better than we were. You cannot be happy if this (inaudible) is met. I think it is fair to Anne [McMeel] to come in because, actually, there has been real progress about saving money by going to certain purchase systems. Anne [McMeel]?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): Chairman, what I would say is am I happy with the current system? As the Commissioner says, I am happier in terms of how it is now versus how it was, and I understand what you are saying about the French compliance with EU regulations. As soon as the Authority takes the same view about it then we can look at what we are doing internally as well because, clearly, these are Authority contracts that we need to ensure that we are complaint with.

What we are trying to do - and I think in an organisation this big - we, at the centre, can start looking at better contracts and better terms. The Chairman is quite right; the FM(?) kit type contract we have just re-let to get better prices because the contract that we had before was not a good contract, in my view, in terms of value for money for the MPS. It was one of the older contracts that we had.

Also, what you do get, is a lot of local practice coming in, which is not necessarily part of the corporate system. In an organisation as large as ours that is quite difficult to help the people out there understand how they can do it as easily as possible and as cheaply as possible.

We have been tackling it from two ends. One is that we have been looking at the corporate contracts and I think it is fair to say that, on the FM contracts, that we have put in place they have saved over £6 million for the organisation, corporately, but what you then get is their pick and mix prices will look to local people to be high prices in some areas because we have got a bigger benefit on some of their bigger items for the organisation as a whole. So we are working with the organisation on those issues.

What we are now trying to do is put procurement people out into the boroughs to actually help the boroughs look at what are the issues around some of those small local arrangements. What we are looking at is our different types of payment methods in terms of through our main systems, our call off contracts, or through procurement cards etc to make sure that we have now got the right balance on those issues, given the work that we have done on compliance over the last couple of years.

It is not that it is set in stone, John [Biggs]. We are looking at it and we are looking at how we can make it as easy as possible for the boroughs but making sure that we benefit from the major savings on these contracts and least trouble to the people who are actually calling them down in terms of getting best value for money locally.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Great. Thank you very much. Just before we move on to the next question we have had a telephone call from a man in a Travel Lodge in Swansea saying your mobile phones are interfering with the feed on the cameras so if you can turn your phones off; for some reason it interferes more down here than it does up in the Chamber. That would be great.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Can I raise just a very quick one on that point?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): If you must, yes.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am sure each of us who have been on tours and visits know that it is one of the frustrations that they feel not trusted to buy, as you say, a kettle, a light bulb, a cooker, which they know they could buy for £100 or less. I think the point is no one is disputing that if you are doing a contract for major items central procurement is probably right, but not to be able to trust our guys to actually have some way of purchasing something that could be bought for even less than £50 in some instances, when they tell you what the total cost we have actually spent - and we are here to monitor that. I think it just needs a bit of flexibility.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We do need to look sensibly at it. I do not want to prolong but, again, it is not quite that simple because then you have got to employ a person to deal with those expenses claims, that has got to go through approval process and by the time you add up everything else up it is about the same. We could give them all a credit card but we know where that will lead!

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am just backing up what John [Biggs] said. I think some flexibility is needed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right. Next question was Jenny Jones?

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. My question is a bit long and dense so I will paraphrase it. What I am trying to get at is the total cost of protecting Very Important Persons (VIPs) and how much of that burden is paid for by the Government and how much the burden is paid for by London taxpayers? Your last answer just said we do not discuss security arrangements. I do not want any details. I just want total figures.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I have your detailed question here, Jenny [Jones]. In answering it, firstly, to make it clear that dedicated security **forces**(?) are not paid from the national and capital city functions' grant; it is a separate grant that we get. There is a relevance in saying that. The relevance is, if you are asking - and you are asking - does some of this cost improperly fall on London taxpayers as opposed to being fully funded from the Government? I am on record as saying I have always been unhappy about the amount of money we get and I think we should get more to properly fund our force. That has been an ongoing debate for a number of years. Regrettably, some of the detail of that debate got leaked in a letter that I sent going way back in December but, nevertheless, I think this Committee has always been aware that both I and my predecessor - certainly I - have been very unhappy that we do not get sufficient monies on that.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am on your side on this.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I know you are. I think everybody is. We all want more money from (inaudible). I also agree, Jenny [Jones], we should be engaging with the Authority about the total spend on these sorts of things, and we do. The level of detail you are asking me for is supplied to this Authority and discussed with

the Counter Terrorism Protective Services Sub-Committee which is chaired by Toby [Harris] and which I think, Reshard [Auladin], you sit on. Toby [Harris] has confirmed to me this morning - I have spoken to him. Reshard [Auladin] I have only had the briefest conversation with you so I will not try to put words in your mouth. Toby [Harris] has confirmed that the Sub-Committee received the information you are seeking, on behalf of the MPA, and that is a secure mechanism to discuss it by the people that you nominate who should discuss it with us, and we are giving it to that Sub-Committee. I think that is a proper position.

Certainly the position of not discussing in public costings around security is supported by the (inaudible) Committee that make the decisions. Actually we are supplying that information to your colleague Members on this Authority.

Jenny Jones (AM): So the sort of figure I could have in confidence but not openly? Or I have to sit on the Committee!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think that is a matter for you to --

Dee Doocey (AM): We are not allowed to. Security.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): They are vetted. This Committee made the decision to have some people vetted who could ask questions and receive information that could not be received otherwise, to satisfy you that things are being done properly. That, I think, has to be a debate between you and your representatives.

Jenny Jones (AM): Do you not take my point that it is illogical not to know overall figures and that there is no security implication about knowing the overall figures?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I actually take the point that as soon as we start discussing the overall figures we will discuss further details. It seems to me it is entirely legitimate for this Authority to satisfy itself round these issues and decide where they are concerned. You have come to a process by nominating some of your Members to do precisely that and we supply that information to satisfy this Authority. I think it is a discussion you have to have with the Members you have nominated.

Jenny Jones (AM): I just cannot see the security risk that is all. Anyway, thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Any other questions on this? No? All right. Victoria [Borwick]?

Victoria Borwick (AM): My question concerned air support units. I understand they have recently carried out very successful raids on organised drug crime and I want to know what efficiency savings have you made by tackling crime - not just drug crime - using the air support units (ASUs)?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thanks, Victoria [Borwick]. I think I have made the comment here before, when we were talking about our helicopters - I know that is not the (inaudible) of your question - but, actually, helicopters are just a 21st century piece of kit for 20th century policing, and the officers on the ground value the support that those pieces of equipment bring enormously.

Just to give you one small anecdote that, hopefully, people will hear more about in the future, there was an incident at the weekend where an officer was shot at. I do not want to go into more detail. There has been an arrest made on that. Again, the air support was critical in bringing that into a satisfactory conclusion, certainly in terms of making sure that officers did not get further injured.

It does add considerable value to a wide range of policing. A unique perspective. It provides image **with respect to(?)** briefing. Proper resources. Delivers high quality evidence and intelligence. I can give you some examples. When the ASU is involved in a search, it can quickly clear - I am told - around 95% of any area, allowing the ground resources to be more effectively deployed to the 5% that it cannot clear. It is very efficient in that way. 6% of all ASU tasks were search related. That is suspect, vulnerable persons or security. So 6% of everything we do is search related.

Another example where the ASU is deployed to high risk situations is pursuits, firearms incidents, roof tops, railway searches and that sort of thing. It provides, through its live video feed to ground receivers, effective tactical information, (inaudible) direction.

It is just something that, I guess, a number of more mature members of the force would have liked to have had when we were cops on the ground. I was not looking at you!

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): You were looking at me and I chose to look the other way!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): (inaudible) position. In 2009/10 the ASU completed over 8,000 tasks, flying for 3,000 hours. In 2009 the ASU identified 160 residential premises as cannabis factories. 113 provided to be hydroponic cannabis factories. Estimated cannabis crops with a street value of £13.5 million taken off the streets as a result. The figures go on. The ASU provides this highly visible effective deterrent. It is a very effective piece of kit. It is a 21st century piece of kit.

I come back to where I started. The thing that makes me so proud and pleased about what they do is the value that cops on the ground get in the way in which it supports them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Reshard [Auladin]?

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): Thank you, Chairman. Just to say that Members had a very useful briefing last week from the Air Support Unit. The presentation I think we have asked to be emailed to all Members. All those figures that

the Commissioner has just mentioned are actually in the briefing pack. Very useful indeed and I think, if Members want to learn a little bit more, we have also got a contact number that people can ring just to get a bit more information. I think, without any doubt, from what we saw, there was added value from ASU in terms of tackling all sorts of crime in the city.

Just a slight concern about what is the possibility of, I understand, a national air support function of some sort which we have not been involved with and I think there is a bit of work to be done about what the implications are for us.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): There has been an ongoing debate for a number of years about creating a national air support unit. You do have to accept that, if we can save money throughout policing across the United Kingdom that does not harm our operational capability, and can save us money, then we should be looking at joint procurements across policing. That is a logical thing to search out in order to reduce money. Our concern is to make sure that, whatever we do, we do not lose our operational benefit(?) or, indeed, our (inaudible) into what happens to London.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Yes?

Graham Speed (AM): Can I just pick up on that last point again, following on from Reshard's [Auladin] point? I think we would all be in favour of joint procurement and the savings that can result from that, but I think the impression very much was that we are substantially ahead of the game from the others and the danger of entering into such an arrangement is that we would be going backwards and they would be moving forwards, and there would be a potential loss of the valuable resource that we have just talked about earlier.

My second point is, if we are looking at the value and the economies and the efficiencies that derive from the use of the ASU, again, recognising the comments earlier about the finance and budget, I have some concerns about the potential reduction in the number of flying hours that the ASU has available to it. Nothing is immune from cost savings, but it was just saying, OK, if we have invested in the capital that we have here, we ought to be looking very carefully at any potential reduction in flying hours because that is, effectively, a wasting of capital resource, as I see it.

To follow on from Reshard's [Auladin] point, I think we need to be fairly robust about any form of national air service.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Right. Can I just quickly answer? Firstly, point well taken about reducing the hours but, of course, nothing can be sacrosanct and we have invested in many, many, many areas of the MPS and I am afraid we are going to have to take, policing wide and jointly, some very tough decisions very quickly. I do not think anything can be off the table.

Secondly, I am incredibly proud of the MPS and I am incredibly proud of the way the MPS leads in many areas. I think we have just got to be a little careful about being a little too isolated on occasions and maybe just a tad arrogant on occasion when we say we are ahead in everything. I could turn round and say that some of the air support units that are taking place around the country are very effective air support units. I am enormously proud of mine - ours - but I think we have got to be careful of denigrating the rest, and there could be some benefits. Robust in protecting our interests but not closing our eyes to the potential benefits.

Graham Speed (AM): Good. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Victoria [Borwick], do you want to ask your next question please?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Fine. Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner. Crime figures for Harrow last year were the best in the borough's history. What lessons can be learned, by the MPS, from this success to tackle similar problems that are on the increase around London?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Of course my staff officer is very interested in my answer to this because, of course, he was the borough commander the year before and he does not want me to go --

Victoria Borwick (AM): I think it is an opportunity for you to complement him!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It did enjoy a significant reduction in crime last year and I am pleased to see that it looks like it is continuing this year. So far Harrow has seen a 23% plus reduction in gun crime offences. Over 21% reduction in residential burglary. Over a 45% reduction in hate crime. It has got, actually, some very, very good figures in Harrow. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), with us, is looking at Harrow to see, in detail, is there something it is doing differently that we can learn from and spread, because that is what a responsible organisation does.

Of course it is not exclusive to Harrow. There are some other good performing boroughs as well. Significant reductions last year; Bexley, Islington, Greenwich and some others. We had a good year in many boroughs and we should learn from all of those boroughs.

I think it is down to really hard work by local officers. Whilst we can get smart and learn from them, actually, at the end of the day, I think very much it is about intrusive supervision, gathering intelligence and directing resources and being robust about what represents good performance and what does not, and making sure we do not skewed by the wrong figures very often.

I think it is about learning. Within TP there is a robust programme to allow not just HMIC, (inaudible) and all the other people to learn and spread better practice within TP and their own structures - they are regularly, through their command structures and their

meetings, looking for best practice and trying to spread it. Best practice is always one of those difficult things because you have always got to overcome, “Yes, but it’s not quite invented here” syndrome. There are lots of different best practice but, actually, I think Harrow has done extremely well and we should congratulate it.

Victoria Borwick (AM): A good team all round, both on the politics and on the policing.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I actually think it is about partnership and do not think anybody at Harrow would claim that the good figures it has had are about Harrow policing alone. I think they would say it is about Harrow policing along with some very good partners doing some very, very good work. We know that sustainable improvements can never be sustained by one agency on its own.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): You talked about some of the reasons why Harrow had good performance. What you did not talk about was things that were out of their control so what you have done is attributed good plans, efficient use of resources and all the rest of it. I wondered how then do you acknowledge those who are doing really well? How does the service do that? I am still unsure as to how people are thanked and acknowledge good performance and encouraged, obviously without making everyone else feel ... How do you do that?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is actually the function of good leadership. It is the basic requirement of leadership to choose the right people, develop the right people, reward the right people and sanction the right people. They are the basic requirements of good leadership. If you get (inaudible) in place it takes place.

How do we do it? Through a whole series of functions. We have commendations. We have things like that which actually is visible recognition. We have assistant commissioners’ commendations, borough commanders’ commendations, commissioner’s commendations at every level. The basic way you encourage good performance is identifying who is performing well and just say thank you to them. That is the basic way you do it. You say thank you to them regularly. To do that you have to be intrusively supervising to find out where it is good and where it is not, and make sure you are thanking the right people.

That is basically it. There is no magic function. There is no system. There is no consultant who is going to come in and teach good leadership. It is developing people who understand how to motivate, because I think that is what you are talking about. It is motivational. It is about identifying the right people and saying thank you and then adding the other things on top. There is a whole range of commendations.

Of course some people would say you can do it with finance. I do not believe you can in policing. I do not think it brings additional productivity and I do not think it adds to leadership. But there are, within policing, bonus arrangements at various levels right the way down to superintendent (inaudible). I do not think that is the way to do it.

Cindy Butts (AM): No, I agree with that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Funnily enough, in April I went to Harrow and handed out a lot of presentations and commendations at exactly that kind of ceremony.

Cindy Butts (AM): But no **kite(?)** marks!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): James [Cleverly], your next question. Will you ask both your questions together?

James Cleverly (AM): I was about to say actually, re-reading them, I rather suspect they are probably so interwoven that, individually, they are not that useful. Question three is what measures are in place to measure the work and success rates of Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) and to ensure that local people's concerns are specifically met by SNTs? Leading on from that, what can be done to ensure that SNTs fully fulfil their roles? I am particularly making reference to the unfortunate situation in Bromley and what lessons can be learned from that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Chairman, it might be best if Tim [Godwin] answer this one for two reasons: one, from memory Tim [Godwin] was the person who brought SNTs and made it the success it is; and secondly, he currently has professional standards responsibilities. Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Two-part question. We had, and still have, a thing called Epic, which I know is made available to some committees when that has been asked for in relation to returns from Safer Neighbourhood Teams in terms of what the priorities are that was set for them locally by local Safer Neighbourhood Committees and Panels, etc, and then what they have been doing about that in terms of resolving those problems and what the outcomes are in terms of their work rates. That continues. That is all part of the review going on in TP as to where the next phase of neighbourhood policing is, how we actually develop that and how we actually monitor it and report it.

The Bromley situation that you referred to, which many members will probably be aware of, where there is a professional standards investigation going into one specific Neighbourhood Team, obviously, because that is an ongoing investigation and some of it does relate to files that will be submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), I cannot actually talk about that particular investigation at this time. What that does, however, show is the need to have what the Commissioner has said we have got to demand, which is intrusive supervision. However much we get reports and report records coming in, there is still the need to make sure that that is accurate, that truly reflects what

is occurring and that is about inquiring, that is about contact and that is about conversation between supervisors and staff. The lessons from that will be promulgated across the force. I guess we will always have the odd occasion where some people will let us down and it is about how quick we identify that and deal with it. We should actually make sure that the intrusive supervision that we want is robust and rolled out.

James Cleverly (AM): To be fair I think it is worth recognising that this came to light through an internal investigation rather than a newspaper sting operation or anything like that. I am also pleased to see that the borough commander has taken steps to make sure that there is a replacement put in place and that this has not been swept under the carpet. So, I do recognise that.

I do have some concerns that this highlights as to how easy it is, particularly in physically large boroughs, to be able to implement what I agree is a necessary move towards that intrusive supervision. Are there lessons that we could learn from other regional forces that have larger geographical areas, whether there is anything that we could pull from that or from ACs?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Again, I have got to be careful that I do not want to prejudge an outcome of an investigation. It is hard to respond to what you have just said. All I would say is that historically police officers who go out singly, which is our desire, can end up spending a lot of time drinking tea if they so desire to. Historically, the vast majority of the police officers in the Metropolitan Police Service do not. They go out, do their job, they do it very bravely and they do the right things. That has to be a bit of a trust between us and them because they are motivated about making a difference. There is a need. Sergeants always used to come and catch you on the beat and find out what you were doing, they have a look at pocket book, where you have been and etc. That was just routine supervision which is something that obviously we are keen to make sure still exists. There are other things we are looking at around technology around the position location system linked to radios so we know who is out and who is in. That is actually an asset resource requirement so we can see what is going on, have we got enough people around, etc.

I think the key is, and we can go to every force to find out, about supervisors supervising and making sure the work is being done. I do have confidence that the vast majority of the men and women of MPS actually go out there, do a very good job and work very hard.

James Cleverly (AM): I think I would welcome a wrap up once the process has been flushed through because obviously there was a fair bit of local disquiet and it does very much go to the heart. I would like to be able to show evidence that we are on top of this. I think that would be a useful thing once the process has done its course and we can highlight to people that that supervisory framework is in place and functioning.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Well, as I understand it there is going to be a piece of work by **Department of Public Safety (DPS)**(?) around what lessons can be learned

from the indicators that performance give you around what is actually going on. I am sure once that comes through we can pass that on.

Dee [Doocey], I am keen to crack on, would you mind asking your three questions together?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. I would like to help by saying that I would like to, with your permission, withdraw question three because I think, on reflection, it should go to the MPA, so I would like you to answer it next time. I just wondered if we could have an officer paper just showing the number of late papers since, perhaps, the beginning of this Mayoralty.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you. My first question is: at a time when the Government is axing cars for ministers and Boris Johnson believes that the taxpayer should not pay for state-sponsored cars, how can you justify the fleet of cars the MPS have for use by senior officers? I would prefer to have an answer to that before I go on to the next one which is a totally different question.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Dee [Doocey], we have debated this on a number of occasions at this Authority. As you know, the provision of vehicles for ACPO-rank officers is part of the terms and conditions of the contract - that is the first thing. ACPO officers are on call - we have debated that previously; we may have a different view but we have debated it - and they are regularly called to operational incidents. The on-call workload should not be underestimated for ACPO officers. Some ACPO officers occupy roles that are, by way of security assessment, at personal risk and such posts, we believe, have a case for being provided with additional security and transport.

I understand a paper was submitted to HR and Remuneration Committee last week which proposed changes to the future of the provision of those entitlements. Those changes include, with the exception of those clearly defined ACPO security posts, officers will no longer have dedicated drivers. I think I am right in saying the pool was 30 drivers and it will be reduced to 19 as a result of that. I think HR and Remuneration Committee has asked that we revisit the security assessments around those seven to ensure that that remains valid, and I think we are committed to doing that.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK. I will be very brief. Firstly, as you know, Commissioner, I have never, at any stage, argued that officers who need cars for security purposes should be included in my idea of getting rid of limousines and chauffeurs, so I think that is a red herring with great respect.

Secondly, everybody is on call; doctors, midwives, nurses are on call and they manage to do it without chauffeurs and limousines. The Mayor of London has a very important job, he is making very big decisions all the time, he manages on a bicycle. So, I wonder what is the justification for senior police having to have chauffeurs and limousines. I just think it is totally unjustified. I absolutely accept that it is currently part of ACPO's terms and conditions but so, I believe, is getting bonuses and I just wonder if you had ever thought of getting your top team together and asking them voluntarily to forego their drivers and their limousines. I do not really think reducing it to 19 cars is even a step in the right direction.

So, I think we do need to agree to differ but I am very disappointed that at a time of such austerity when Londoners are having to take the most draconian cuts - and you yourself are on record time and time again saying how concerned you are about the police budget - that you are not doing more to get rid of what I consider to be a quite disgraceful perk.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Dee [Doocey], I note your comments. We will have to agree to differ but I think there is an issue where people have voluntarily made sure they are not making themselves available for potentially up to 15% of income. This leadership of the organisation has shown a leadership that others may wish to match. Secondly, of course, the Mayor on his bicycle does not quite get called out to the same incidents that the ACPO officers would do. We just need to differ on it.

Dee Doocey (AM): Fine, we will differ. Absolutely.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Next question?

Dee Doocey (AM): My next question is: there have been some press reports recently about police officers, some quite senior, having second job, can you clarify what the rules are surrounding these?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Business interests of police officers are regulated by Regulation 7(8) of the Police Regulations 2003, supported by our own business interest policy. Those are the formal regulations. All members of the MPS have got to identify any business interests; secondary employment; directorship; shareholding of a company; they or their civil partner or spouse, or any family relative living with them may have - so it is wider than the individual. Essentially, if there is an element of profit you have got to declare it.

MPS policy states that any officer of ACPO or a member of the senior police staff - those are senior pay bands - must not engage in any other occupation, professional business or work, paid or unpaid without the written permission of the Chief Executive of this Authority. There are three ACPO officers with registered business interests at this moment in time.

As at 17 June 2010, right the way across the MPS, the total percentage of officers with business interests is 8.61%. I find it difficult to believe but 8.5% of the total number of officers. The reality is that a quarter of all business interests relate to the renting or leasing of properties. To date 37 business interests have been refused, of which 1 was overturned by the Home Office on appeal.

If some are in a business interest SOP, an officer has to make a written application to Martin [Tiplady] giving details of job activities; location of activity; average hours per week to be worked; declare that their work will not impact on their health and obviously for their job as a police officer; ensure all earnings are declared; work a maximum of 20 hours per month; 16 hours if a driving business interest; must seek authority to continue with a senior officer when on sick leave or recuperative duties; and no business interests activities can take place during duty time or may use MPS facilities or equipment. Monitoring is conducted by both the officer's line manager and their senior management team. A review is required of those business interests on an annual basis.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you very much. You have definitely blinded me with science so with your permission I would like to take this offline because I would like to actually be able to understand at least some of the detail, none of which I was able to in that short space of time.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I did not intend to blind you with science.

Dee Doocey (AM): I am sure you did not.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Those are the rules.

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I know you have not asked the other question, Dee [Doocey], but you mentioned late reports. Just to assist on that I have asked for information of how many of our reports have been late this year and based on my information it is around about 10%. Whilst that is intensely irritating, the one thing I would say is the MPS does not hold this Authority in contempt and 90% accuracy would indicate real irritation - I can understand that we need to improve - but it does not indicate contempt.

Dee Doocey (AM): My view is that it is actually the fault of the Chairs of the individual Committees who allow you to put forward late papers, and if they did not then we would not have this problem. We will have the debate next time.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is my fault I am sure. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes, I have a question. Do you have any concerns over the Mayor's proposals for the future of the Metropolitan Police Authority in the governance of the MPS?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly, I genuinely do believe that somebody in oversight is an essential strength of British policing because I think senior police officers actually do need that oversight. I have said many times around this question, which essentially goes to the Mayor's declaration and the issue of elected Commissioners, the starting point for any debate on this matter for me - not for you perhaps or not for politicians either - is not what form the Government should take but what I care most about, what is my bottom line and what is my red line. That is the maintenance of proper operational independence. That is the critical issue for me. If I get that then the issue of governance - I might have an opinion and I might add to the debate - is not for me to decide.

Now I understand on my bottom line that all three major political parties before the election made it clear that they support operational independence whatever the Government's arrangements - whether they stay the same or whether they are changed. My understanding is this Authority supports that, but that is a matter for you, but certainly my understanding is that the Mayor supports that and I do not see anything in his proposals that would change that position.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I think we all might have a different view on what operational independence actually means in practice and that might come up later on. The thing I am wondering is do you think that the MPS will perhaps have an easier time by having a smaller appointed board by the Mayor or do you think that you are still going to have rigorous scrutiny? Are you more concerned that actually scrutiny will come to the Assembly, if that does go ahead, and that your officers will be becoming before the Assembly in a very political arena? Does that worry you at all?

James Cleverly (AM): Not a leading question at all!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): (inaudible) Caroline [Pidgeon].

James Cleverly (AM): As opposed to the political arena here then, yes?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, the relative of that is I do think that there is an issue. The governance of community safety arrangements in London are more layered and more complex than anywhere else I have worked. We have said that before; and actually my predecessor has said that before. So, there might be an opportunity to streamline the structure, to make sure we do seize opportunities to take out any bureaucracy and make sure that you get the information you need in a timely fashion, but actually no more than you need because that is overload and make sure you can then do the scrutiny job - you or whom so ever it should be.

On the issue of scrutiny, I do not get up in the morning and go, "Whoopie, I am going to be scrutinised today," but actually I think it is incredibly important.

James Cleverly (AM): You should!

Dee Doocey (AM): Shame on you!

James Cleverly (AM): Sort it out!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I would not want to be in a police service in the United Kingdom that did not have that civilian oversight and scrutiny because actually I think we can give a blooming good answer to all of these that gets the message out to the public. There is nothing that I am seeing that suggests that there is going to be any desire not to scrutinise. I think the issue is who scrutinises, how many layers do you need to do it and what is the cost because we have got to have a careful eye on the fact that, as I have already said, this organisation that you have oversight of is going to be facing the most difficult financial times it has ever faced and we are looking like we might have to shrink. Therefore, it is in all our interests and everybody's responsibility if something can be performed better and cheaper than it should be.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Thank you

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK, thanks. We had a couple of questions after the deadline but I am feeling indulgent so, Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): You are so kind to me! I would like to take my second question first. I know it is the Deputy Commissioner who is going to answer the second one, but I would like to say that I know that this was an issue that was on the Strategic & Operational Policing Committee at its last meeting. We are putting that in the public domain so I do not want an answer that this was discussed because I do think that this is a forum where the MPS can just be clear and make some brief statements about this.

In the light of the European Court of Human Rights' ruling in its report 'Stop and Think', against the use of Section 44 stop and search, the recent findings about the extent to which stop and searches have been used illegally - and that is their term - and recent Government figures underline the fact that proportions of stop and search that affect people from ethnic groups have increased every year for the past five years. My question is, will the MPS' response that was required by the ECHR be made public so that we can see what action the MPS is proposing and that we can then be clear that proposed action will be different to actions that have been proposed in the past?

It seems to me there is a response that says, "Oh, well, in Hackney BMEs are now the majority community so we should have greater numbers of stop and search." That is totally wrong because that is working on the premise that because a particular crime type is showing that BMEs have a disproportionate link to them, then that population then should be subject to disproportional searches. That is not the case if it is truly intelligence-led. So, I just want us to be clear what your proposals are to the ECHR.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I would just like to follow on directly from that because it does link to something that I wanted to raise. As Jennette [Arnold] says, the MPS has been put

on notice by the Authority and, if you look at your report in paragraph 26, we are seeing a substantial increase in activity. Level of stop and search 125 a day to over 400 and this includes an increase in Section 60 activity by over 40%. So, I suppose my question is: what has gone out from the centre now that looks different that you would satisfy the concerns raised by the Equality Commission? It is not even about going forward, it is since you have been put on notice there has been this increase in activity and I wonder what messages come out from the centre that would satisfy their concerns?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK. I will ask Tim [Godwin] to come in in a moment. We have got to be careful we do not confuse Section 44 with some other stop/ searches.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I am talking about Section 66.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, but the original question from Jennette [Arnold] was Section 44. Of course, it is the case that between April 2009 and April 2010 on Section 44 stop/searches, searches of the black population have reduced from 1,351 to 265 and of the Asian heritage population from 1,916 to 431. There has been a very significant reduction in Section 44. There are different views as to whether is an appropriate power or not. You talk about the European legislation; my promise to you is we will comply with legislation and any amendments made by UK Government and that is our job to do so.

At this moment in time Section 44 is still there and I think, as I have said before, we have made significant changes to Section 44 over the last 18 months, both in terms of how it is authorised and deployed. We have reviewed it and the recommendation fully implemented at the end of 2009. The impact of that is the number of searches have been reduced by about 60%. I think you know, and I have said it again to this Authority, that my belief is we increased Section 44 following the Haymarket incident and the subsequent Glasgow incident.

I believe that we ended up in a situation that I do not think was right and we ended up using it too indiscriminately. I have said on a number of occasions Section 44 is a power that we used to create a hostile environment for any terrorist who might wish to come and do their surveillance, etc, and we know that happens. I have said we will lose it if we use it too indiscriminately. As a result of that we have massively reduced our use. The changes were Section 44 now only applies in designated areas and decisions are to be made around about 10% of London. There are new Authority posters in place and every single stop is checked and evaluated against robust Q&A assessment.

I know that Lord Carlisle is doing a speech tonight on Section 44 which no doubt will add to the debate and we will have to see what the current coalition Government want to do about Section 44 in response to the European ruling. We have already reduced it significantly and I want to make sure that as long as we have that power we are using it in a more discerning manner.

I think there is a wider issue of stop and search, which I think you referred to and, Valerie [Brasse], you brought in. I hear what you say, Jennette [Arnold], and I am going to ask Tim [Godwin] to come in in a moment because he has had discussions with people in the Equality Commission around this matter. I have said it on a number of occasions publicly so it will not be new, and I have said it to ethnic minority media and actually got quite a good response from them.

My duty is to be proportionate, but I have to be proportionate to the problems that we face. Valerie [Brasse], you asked the question what have we said and what have we done. Well, actually, I have done exactly what I have said to this Authority on a number of occasions. We had a massive increase in kids killing kids. I believe we were neglecting our duty by not being out there and properly implementing the powers we have and actually responding to many inquiries we got from communities and parents of actually doing something to discourage kids carrying knives. Our strategy has never changed, we intend to get the message through to young people, "If you carry a knife there is a good chance you are going to be stopped. If you get stopped you will likely get charged and go to court," and that has happened.

We can say, and I know there is a lot of debate about this, that when we implement those search procedures and it has been a huge increase, we have seen reductions in the most serious forms of violence. We relate to the local communities. We could not have done this in the past before we had the Safer Neighbourhood Teams in place, negotiated with local communities and actually taken them out on some of our stop and search operations. We make those operations open to many people to come and look at what we are doing. I have always said this is an intrusive tactic and it is one that we have got to be very delicate around. We do know it is more often how you do than what you do, but we have local monitoring arrangements in place but I need to be proportionate to the problem. Just being proportionate to population in itself is neglectful in policing.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Is that the message going back to the Equality Commission?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, and Tim [Godwin] has had a long discussion with the Equality Commission and we will be robust in our response. Tim [Godwin]?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Just to clarify what is actually ongoing at the moment with the ECHR, is that they, quite rightly, monitor our use of police powers.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Absolutely.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): They monitor our use of police powers, as other things, against generic populations in London and, of course, geographically crime is not proportionate across the whole of London. In different pockets we have greater crime areas, that is where more cops are operating, times of day, times of night, etc.

To be fair to the Equality and Human Rights Commission, they have identified in their letter to us asking us to explain our use of the powers in terms of their proportionate or disproportionate use against that generic population. They have acknowledged in that that this is a complex area for which we can have legitimate reasons to explain. One of the

Jennette Arnold (AM): (overspeaking) the question.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, there were two questions and there was a follow up as well. As a result of that we have been asked to give our justifications in terms of how we use stop and search. The other thing that is in there is the requirement to actually show it against our intelligence-led, it is also to show how we hold ourselves accountable at borough level, in terms of that with local monitoring. I know Jennette [Arnold] you were at an IAG the other day that was setting up that monitoring committee.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Not before time!

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): The bid around that for us is we believe, as the Commissioner said, in democratic accountability and to be held to account. This is part of that process. We will be explaining ourselves to the EHRC. They will make whatever judgment they make on the evidence that we give and there will be an ongoing process that we will then go through. The key for us is we have to explain in terms of what we are using stop/search for, what results we think we get from it, where we are using it and why that then creates the profiles that we have.

We are quite happy to do that. It is quite a big ask, but they have not asked us about Section 44, they have not asked us about Section 60. This is purely around Section 1 powers. In our answer we will actually probably give them more information about some of the other stuff as well in terms of sharing with them the overall picture of stop and search because often Section 1 is linked to the Section 60, which is where people walk way and as a result of that then get asked, "Why are you walking away?"

So, we will go through the process, it has been led by Lynne Owens in Territorial Policing - this is obviously a major piece of Territorial Policing operations - and we will be held accountable against our justification or not. That is where we are at.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Just for the public interest and for informing people under transparency, will your response to this report then be routed to a sub-committee so that it gets into the public domain?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Absolutely, in the sense that this is such a sensitive area because the bit for us is we have to have the confidence of the people that we police in how we are policing and that is where the neighbourhood teams and all the rest of it were key ways of actually increasing that connectivity, getting that feedback, holding to account. Because this is so important - this, to us, is as important as the

previous health and safety issues in relation to working above a certain period of height - as a result of that we will make everything open and transparent as we go through the process of explaining ourselves because we need people to understand it, we need people to challenge us but we do need support to actually try to make the streets of London safe.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you. Just on the record, Commissioner, I do not think I know anyone who has a problem against stop and search being an absolutely proper tactic of policing. The issue, as you have said, is the how and when it is clear when it gets to the point of discretion by officers without the appropriate guidance, monitoring and support, it is abused. That is a fact. So, it is about how we can monitor and how we can then understand whether or not it is been applied.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am always willing to discuss how we can monitor better and how we can be held to account better, we have been praised in the past for what has been placed in here in London with the support of the Authority in Operation Pennant of actually having local monitoring. If we can do more around that, fine, because Tim [Godwin] is right. We have got to make sure we have the support of communities in doing it but we have also got to make sure that we get the real message as to why we are doing it and what we are doing and accept that there will be people in any organisation who will actually do it wrong and we have got to be clear in our systems of how we find out where they are doing it wrong and make sure they do not do it again.

Jennette Arnold (AM): That is fine. I look forward to seeing the report.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Do you want to ask your next question?

Jennette Arnold (AM): I would then like to move on to question one. I would like to start by saying this thing about the tragic circumstance which Members will have read and will know about. I would just like to start by adding my, and I am sure all of our, condolences to the family and friends of the young police officer who tragically took her life. We are told that it is as a result of alleged homophobic bullying in the force. Really, I just want to ask the Commissioner to assure this Authority and London's population that any lessons to be learned from the internal investigation will be quickly disseminated throughout the force and all recommendations implemented. A 20-year-old woman has left us and clearly there was something wrong there - something went wrong.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly, stating the blindingly obvious but heartfelt condolences to the family for the horror that they are going through at this moment in time - I do not think can be imagined unless you have been those horrors. I think that is a terribly tragic circumstance. Whatever the reason this is a terrible, terrible tragedy. You can have an absolute assurance from me that it will be thoroughly investigated and in learning any lessons we will learn the lessons, but we have got to make sure it is properly investigated and we do not jump to any conclusions. That investigation is not going to bring this young lady back and I cannot think of any circumstance in life where you cannot learn some lessons from it. It is a terrible circumstance and we should not prejudge but our hearts go out to the family.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can the record show that although my question said that the woman was from Hackney, that the from is really that she died in the borough. I am not trying to disassociate or anything like that but factually speaking she was not a member of the Hackney borough team; she died in the borough.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. As I understand, Martin [Tiplady], you are picking off a group later and you are looking at suicides.

Martin Tiplady (MPS): We are looking from the information that we have on any suicides that have happened over the last five years and Eileen Cahill-Canning [Chief Medical Officer for the Metropolitan Police Service] is actually putting that work together in terms of lessons on each of those instances and actually launching some campaign alongside what we have taken out of that. I think that is due to be launched - and I think, Kit, you are involved in that launch - in September 2010.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK, thank you. Anything more on this? No? Graham [Speed]?

Graham Speed (AM): Apologies, the question was submitted late only because the matter of concern arose after the deadline date. It is a question regarding voluntary DNA profiles. There has been some very recent media coverage regarding the retention of voluntary DNA profiles on the national database. From my fairly detailed knowledge of the case in question and of the arrangements concerning the taking of these samples, it would seem that unfortunately the facts are misrepresented insofar as the destruction of those samples is concerned and the procedures that were followed.

As a result of that I am concerned that such misrepresentation and misunderstanding could potentially undermine any future cases where voluntary samples from the public may be required from elimination purposes. I wonder if the Commissioner could please comment on the background to this and confirm that where volunteers have requested that their DNA be destroyed post-conviction that this in fact taken place and that this has been communicated to those with a particular interest in this matter.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Tim [Godwin] can deal with this one.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. Yes, the case you refer to is the murder of Sally Anne Bowman [British model who was robbed, raped and murdered] and you were certainly on the Gold Group in relation to that. The taking of voluntary DNA in terms of what we call mass screenings in terms of pre-elimination is absolutely a crucial tool when tackling some of the most serious crimes that occur anywhere in the UK. As a result of that we certainly would not want people to have the lack in confidence in the systems that were in place. That is you have to volunteer to do it and you can then say whether you want to allow your DNA to be retained on the database or want it destroyed post the elimination of the investigation. This is overseen by the DNA ethics process, etc.

In relation to that particular case - and we do honour all those requirements and we do confirm it in writing - there were 1,633 men who volunteered to give their DNA through the buckle mouth swab to help eliminate an inquiry. Out of that 1,165 - and I have not brought my glasses - requested their DNA records to be destroyed following the elimination and 468 consented to their samples being retained.

As a result, the Forensic Science Service (FSS) confirmed that all those records of those 1,165 were destroyed between 13 May 2008 and 23 June 2008 and all the associated record with them were removed. That is the report from the Senior Investigating Officer (SIO). The 468 volunteers who allowed their DNA to be retained is retained. That is the way it will always work. There are very strict rules that we adhere to.

Graham Speed (AM): Quickly, just to follow on; could we just make sure that that is promoted because I think there is great danger that the public perception is that the police have pulled a fast one, they took the samples and did not eliminate them at the end. Clearly they were and I think it would be helpful if that could be promoted as widely as possible.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thanks. Right, non-submitted questions?

Victoria Borwick (AM): I would just like to make a quick point. Just to remind us, of course, it is 1 July 2010 next week and we will be have an open meeting here on DNA under the Civil Liberties Panel and I think that is a great opportunity if I may, Deputy Commissioner, have your answer available to the public and as we are there just to take people's questions and any other civil liberties groups and then we would obviously come back with some other questions after that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Great. Thank you. I am conscious of time. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes, I would like to ask the Commissioner about Territorial Policing. I ask this because I am hearing rumours and I am being asked questions locally about what is happening. Now, I am aware that we are having an informal briefing right at the end of July 2010, but I am being asked questions at the moment and I am being told that there are currently plans that response teams from boroughs are going to go into area clusters, that detective capability on boroughs again is going to area clusters, that there are going to be changes to the role of borough commanders, that they are going to be responsible operationally on the ground but all they are going to be left with really is going to be Safer Neighbourhood Teams. There are concerns about what is going to happen to that local figurehead who drives that and whether the new system of super area commanders, if you like, who are more responsible for performance is going to have new changes.

So, my question is: are these things on the table and what consultation is the Metropolitan Police Service planning to have with this Authority and partners, and what is the timescale for instituting any of these changes?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK, thanks, Joanne [McCartney]. You would expect any new CTP to come in, look at it and say, “What works? What’s good? What I think I can do better and how do I save some money?” because that is basically what we should be about. That is why you bring Territorial Policing from where it was and people from this Authority will remember how Territorial Policing was in this city going back to shortly after the year 2000 to where it got to and huge, huge improvements made. Then you get someone new with different experiences and they look to make how can they add value. So, I would expect that anyway, even if we were not in the most constrained of financial times.

Ian McPherson has been looking with his teams, with borough commanders and with a lot of people to see how we could actually improve matters or deal with what is coming down the track, and I expect him to do it. He has not yet made those proposals to me, but after those early outcomes of that he will be talking to me and the rest of the Management Board on 29 July, where we have a Management Board date, when not just him but every member of the business group is going to tell me how they see the future of their business group with the economic future and with the demands I am making of them, and this Authority is making of them, to actually deliver performance. That is what we are about. Once they have made those proposals we will have a look at them, I will decide which ones, we as an organisation, think is wise or not wise and then they will be subject to consultation and discussion.

That is the process. In that process I am also aware that Ian McPherson has been speaking to an awful lot of people. I know he has been across at the request of this Authority’s business group and gave an early heads-up of the sort of things he is looking at. Some of the things he is looking at may well be very radical, although it does not necessarily mean that it is going to happen. We have got to make sure we live within finances and we have got to make sure that we deliver the maximum performance, but we have also got to make sure that we have a sound and stable platform to deliver the Olympics, because there comes a certain point where radical change is not advisable when you are facing the biggest challenge the organisation has ever faced. So, they are all difficult balances to put in place. Proposals have been made and we will bring them back to this Authority - and it would have to be brought back as part of the process anyway. Ian [McPherson] has been speaking to people in getting a sense of where he thinks we will be going.

As for boroughs, firstly I am an absolute firm great supporter of, if you will, the area commander structure. That includes putting commanders in place to hold borough commanders to account. I am a firm supporter of that and that is what we are doing because I think it is about making sure that we spread benefits across boroughs and hold people to account. Secondly, I am a very, very firm supporter of co-terminosity between borough command and local authorities. It is not for me to decide how many local

authorities there are in London and I might wish there were a few less because it might make things a bit easier for me and cheaper, but the reality is the leverage we have got out of that co-terminosity cannot and should never be underestimated.

Now, you should constantly be asking questions of how you can do better, what can we do, do we need 32 of everything. We have asked those questions far too often and acted on it far too infrequently in my opinion for a whole host of reason. Now, actually the finances are going to make us look at which can take place in my opinion, but Ian [McPherson] is going to make a whole series of proposals back both for now and how we see things shaping up in the future, but he is not on his own. I expect Cressida Dick to do that, I expect Chris Allison to be doing that and I expect all the business groups to be doing that to bring that to our business group and then we will bring forward a whole series of proposals and discussions.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): As you said, there is going to be a briefing at the end of July 2010 for Members which then will have been through the Management Board and had some consideration, so you will get the emerging picture before it goes into the budget process in the autumn.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Are we looking at any changes to the TP structure in this next budget phase, if you will? So, this time next year we will --

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

Joanne McCartney (AM): OK.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Joanne [McCartney], I am not trying to be difficult it, actually I want to make sure I have a management board who feel absolutely open to challenge, be radical and we look for a way forward that is going to keep us making the improvements we are making and then further improvements in the most difficult financial circumstances over the next five years. I want a management board that actually is creative, but in doing t we then have to make sensible decisions as to which we think is the right thing to do at this moment in time, which we do not think is the right thing to do at this moment time because it does not fit with the levering that we know we have had out of co-terminosity in the past and on which things might need to be phased and delayed, and with a very careful eye on a secure platform to deliver improvements which is going to be tight trick.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Part of my concern –and I do not prejudge any proposals because we have obviously got to look at them when they emerge – is that I remember two or three years ago the mooted that perhaps boroughs could merge and we could have larger police boroughs and there was quite a lot of differing opinion across all partners. Are we going to be at that stage again? Is this super area commander structure a way of getting that without saying so? So, I welcome the commitment to co-terminosity but I think we do need to look at this. Given that I am being asked those questions locally, it is

already causing some concern. So, I think you certainly need to be engaging with those partners sooner rather than later.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I know you do, Joanne [McCartney], but actually to start building up those ideas and discuss it with people is inevitable and causes discussion of any change. There is no substitute around this. We are not going to introduce one thing with the intent to try to lever something else in. I believe we have had huge benefits out of co-terminosity but it does not mean to say you have always got to stay the same. There are some things round there I think could change and should change actually; there are some things we can brigade where we now need to brigade because of finance, but co-terminosity has brought us major benefits and that will be at the forefront of my mind.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. John [Biggs]?

John Biggs (AM): I wanted to reinforce what Joanne [McCartney] has said and I think she makes a very important point. There is an anxiety, regardless of what the Commissioner has just said, that there is a direction of travel which leads to borough commanders being billeted, you might say, even if they still exist.

I wanted to raise also what I think is a quite important constitutional question about the role of the Metropolitan Police Authority. I do understand both sides of the argument here and I have far more sympathy, I think, with your position, Sir Paul [Stephenson], than you might imagine from the question. I sense there is a fuzzy boundary between what is an operational policing decision and what is a constitutional decision for this Authority to get involved in in terms of policy making. I suppose we have already passed over the bit where we have **recruited**(?) our Chair and maybe this needs to come to a future Authority meeting, but I would be very happy to hear his response now, clearly the role of a Chair is to protect the sovereignty of the Authority and ensure that is properly considers matters of operational as against resource-deployment prioritisation which I think are very important. If a consequence of a serious operational decision was that the borough command principle which we are very firmly wedded to as an Authority was to be reduced, then that would be a matter of great concern to us. We need to make sure that the process is right by which you reach that point.

I suppose an observation would be that a consequence of having an appointed Chair of the Authority as against an elected Chair of the Authority and appointed Chair may have, if they choose to, less regard of the Authority than an elected Chair of the Authority. I am not suggesting for a second this current one does; I would leave other people to form their own conclusions on that. It is a concern and the Authority needs to be very firm about this in my view.

Sir Paul [Stephenson], do you recognise that potential conflict and how do you propose to deal with it in terms of holding yourself accountable to the Authority?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): John [Biggs], I have always recognised that potential conflict. I have been a Chief Officer since 1994 and that conflict has been around ever since I was a Chief Officer first in Merseyside. Just let me correct one thing about direction of travel. In terms of the MPS, not the Authority, there will be no direction of travel that I do not agree with and at this moment in time I have yet to have those discussions as to what we think. It is not just about me being a dictator, it is about the management --

John Biggs (AM): Not just about it!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): John [Biggs], you employed me to lead the MPS, that is what I intend to do, but I want to hear the views of some very senior people on the Management Board who have been about for a time who can add very wise counsel to make sure that we understand how to take things forward in London and specific to London. I want to have those debates but it will be a direction of travel I set on behalf of the Management Board that we then discuss with you.

How do I intend to deal with that conflict? Hopefully in the same way that I have always dealt with it. Whatever the Government's authority - be it this Authority, be it an elected Commissioner, be it by a vote; whatever it is, and it is no matter which way you try to define operational independence - I am passionate about operational independence and passionate about the idea that 50,000-odd people think I am leading the MPS and I think I am too. I am passionate about that but I have always recognised it is something of a moving feast and the best way to deal with it, and I suspect we will come to this in a moment, is recognise, whether I think it is for me to make the final decision or you think it is for you to make the final decision, there are many areas where it would be completely mad to move forward without getting consensus on it and without me seeking your support. I think that is the most mature way of dealing with that - as you have described it - fuzzy area in the middle. I think I have done that and can demonstrate I have done that in a number of occasions and one of them is **Taser(?)**.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Ultimately, of course, both Sir Paul [Stephenson] and I, have to try and get our budget through you lot and this will, in the end, be through the budget.

John Biggs (AM): So, if you can get away with it then that is the way you will do it! This does stray into potentially the next time but the example of this I guess was a written question from, I think, Joanne McCartney to the Mayor at the last Mayor's Question Time (MQT) asking whether Specials was to be the main point of recruitment for police officers into the future, to which there was a one-word answer, yes. Now, it may have passed me by but I was not aware that we had decided and considered that at the Full Authority, although the Mayor seems to have a set view, which I assume he means that you and the Chairman has a set view on this issue.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is part of the next issue and I know there is angst around it. I would just like to say again, and I think I can demonstrate it

both at this Authority and every authority I have worked with and for, that there are a number of areas where I think it is my final say. There are a number of areas where I think it should be my final say and you have got it, and one of them is recruiting the Chief Officer Team. I am very open about that and have been actually during the application process when I was interviewed for this job. Even where I think it is my final say and you disagree, on the big, heavy policy areas in contentious areas it is very difficult to define operational independence and nail it down because it is a moving feast. I will always seek to ensure that on those big areas I move forward with the support of governance, because at the end of the day if I do not do that my position becomes a tad tricky. As those examples mount then I start to lose the support that I need. On this next item that will be my answer.

Do I want to move forward on a change in recruiting? I personally think it is probably my final say, this Authority will think differently. My view is I would not want to move forward without hearing from this Authority, taking your advice and seeking your support. If I did not get it then working to try to get that support if I think it is the only way forward because of finances. In other words, working at the relationship. That is the way I have always tried to do it and that would be my answer to the next question and hopefully we can get on to the issues of substance within the question of why it might or might not be a good idea to use that special recruitment scheme.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): The proposals and this review of TP I think could potentially be very controversial and I support what Joanne [McCartney] and John [Biggs] have said. I think particularly it is the partnership work what I am concerned about if you are looking at removing some stuff from borough commanders and community confidence - obviously that is a key target for us and that will still will be a target. In terms of wanting the community to have confidence, that is what the borough commander and borough policing structure really supports.

In the proposals that come forward, because they could be seen as quite controversial, would you potentially look at piloting a couple of things in different parts of London to see what model might work best before blanketly rolling out something across the capital that may actually then not really deliver what we want? That might give us more confidence that you might pilot something first to see how it works.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Again, we should not jump to any conclusions as to what is going to happen here and I think we just need to manage --

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Well, when you talk to people in the boroughs they are told it is already happening, so it is unfortunate it is down to the communication.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Of course it is, because this is the chicken and the egg. You cannot actually, if you are the ACTP, work a set of proposals to deal with an extraordinarily difficult future, the like of which we have never seen, and not talk

to anybody. I know there have been discussions with a number of Chief Executives just to take advice. I know that has been taking place. Do not assume there are going to be radical changes but do not write them off. There will be no subterfuge. If we are thinking of doing something like that I will actually try to deal with it in the way I have given my answer to John [Biggs].

Piloting? I think it can be a very good way forward where you are doing something where you are not quite convinced but you think it might be essential or the right way forward. I am not against piloting at all, in fact I am a great fan of it. The only thing I would say is the MPS and some agencies sometimes pilot things to death when you have got the evidence. That is the one thing we should not be doing because sometimes that is just a way of putting off a difficult decision. If you do not need to pilot it you should not, but I am a great fan of piloting in certain areas. I think we have all got in mind the rumours we have heard of etc and etc. The Management Board will sit down and discuss with all Management Board leads the week after next what are their proposals for the future and we will come to a professional judgment and then we will work that professional judgment through as we have done with this Authority in the past including in the budget.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I agree with what my colleagues here have said about our concerns about decisions being taken without our input and so on. This is actually --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, Jenny [Jones], there have been no decision taken.

Jenny Jones (AM): I know, but we have the same problem here with the Mayor in City Hall when are where to pitch our views on what he is doing. So, it is a problem we experience a lot. It is really for the Chairman and I am sure we all trust the Chairman to make sure that we have --

John Biggs (AM): Can we take a vote on that?

Jenny Jones (AM): -- the opportunity to feed in our comments at the appropriate time so that decisions are not taken without our understanding.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Absolutely. This is why there is this briefing at the end of July 2010 --

Jenny Jones (AM): Well, I am not sure if that is enough to encapsulate our views.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, but then obviously proposals are developed over the summer, then there is the budget to come up through the process there that we

might have to look at. So, there are a number of areas. What I would say is if there are critical briefings like the one in July 2010, it is vital that people go.

Jenny Jones (AM): If they can.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): If we do not get enough attendance then maybe we will have to have another one at some point in August 2010, but part of the problem, if I am honest with you Jenny [Jones], is we do hold these briefings quite a lot in advance and then people do not show up. We will have three or four people and then people complain. They were more than happy to put them in but there comes a point at which you drag the thing to death, but we are trying to engage as much as possible on the basis that we do not actually know yet what is going to emerge..

Jenny Jones (AM): I suppose what I am saying is you, because of all your discussions with the MPS, will understand the appropriate moment to draw us in for our response.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes, I will. Yes, and that is what we will try to do. Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, I believe that this Authority ought to back the police in speculating as creatively, innovatively and radically as they wish on such matters. It is notoriously difficult to do in a public environment and the atmosphere becomes very febrile and rumours run very fast and everybody gets very scared. I think it is really important for Members of this Authority to confidently go back to folk who say, "Have you heard it is all going to be a catastrophe?" to be clear about the timetable, the process and to, in a sense, protect the leadership of the Metropolitan Police Service in going through this process. I would hope that everybody who has got responsibility for thinking about this, to use the old phrase, thinking the unthinkable and doing all that stuff and feeling able to do it. I would certainly want to stand by them doing that.

The territory that John [Biggs] described as the fuzzy territory between operational and where the Authority gets involved comes thereafter. I think that is the point that Sir Paul [Stephenson] has already made. It is at that point that we might become nervous about what the procedure is thereafter.

So I note, for example, that the meeting on 30 July 2010 is called, because we call them all that, the briefing. Now, briefing to me means we are going to be told stuff. Now, if that is what that meeting is about then I am bound to fear that effectively a decision has been made, the Commissioner feels that this is an operational thing and we are going to be told stuff. So, in order to be clear and to help us all in this process I think it is important for us to understand that that meeting is more along the lines of a briefing and a consultation on what sort of timetable or process might go forward in implementing the kinds of decisions, suggestions or proposals that are going to be made.

So, at that meeting are we going to hear proposals, are we going to hear decisions, are we going to hear pilot plans - those kinds of thing, because I think that would help me a lot in being confident that there is a rich process of consultation.

In the matter of operational as against other sides of things, I would want to support Caroline's [Pidgeon] comment about there is a huge amount here about community confidence and community engagement in whatever decisions are made. So, while I recognise that the Commissioner rightly insists on his right to operational independence, we all understand that policing is done by consent and that the role of the community in these decisions is important. Therefore, simply the brave statements about operational independence go hand-in-hand with approval, agreement, confidence and all those things too.

Around this area particularly of Territorial Policing, I think, which is so close to the community, so close to ordinary folk and ordinary folk's experience, I think the role of community engagement and consultation is critically important. So, I just think more clarity about the language about the process and the timetable would make everybody feel a little more confident feeling that decisions are being made, there is going to be a briefing and then we will move on from there.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you for many of your comments there, Clive [Lawton]. Just about this briefing, I think that is what you, the Authority, wanted. That is what you wanted. In terms of what will come forward, well, I will let you know after I have met with my people as a Management Board to say, "What do we think as a Management Board, as the professionals in policing, we need to do?" and there will be some things where we are very clear and very strong on we think we need to do this and there will be some things we are less clear on. Even on the very strong things we will want to consult, we will want to take advice, we want to go wider and there is nothing in my entire policing background that would disagree with your position that whilst I am passionate about operational independence, taking the community with you is the whole thing about how we police in this country. We police by consent and make a difference in the eyes of the public, and the policing with the public That is my mantra. So, I would never act against that.

When we get to this bit that John [Biggs] and I have discussed, and I think we have actually discussed it at the Authority before about this balance, there will always be an area of some operational independence. That is where we negotiate; that is where we maturely try to build and rely on our relationship that sees us through it that tries to get that consensus. I think we have been pretty successful in doing that in some tricky areas and I do not think we should have any lack of confidence that we will continue to try to do that through what is going to be the most challenging period this organisation has ever faced, operationally for the Olympics and financially.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Last question then. Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman (AM): My experience of leading large change programmes and large efficiency programmes is that we have to go through a phase of the type we are going through at the moment and I think it is important that we give you space to think creatively and do not try to box you off too much with our own gut prejudices. I include my own in that.

My experience also is that there is a need actually to take the decisions as quickly as can reasonable be done and that the uncertainty levels do affect morale and, therefore, delivery as well as causing political and media concern. So, the thing that I would like to understand --

My experience also is as quickly as can reasonably be done

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Reshard can explain

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): We are calling it a briefing

Victoria Borwick (AM):

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): the person knows

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Three quick things start exciting revolutionary to take part and actually we might be causing

The only thing I would say 1 April that we thought

Faith Boardman (AM): Indeed, that is part of my concern

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): You set a timetable

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Great. The other unknown of course the Mayor's enemies Project Herald

Valerie Shawcross (AM): If I may comment on that dialogue if we are coming up to a period of time

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Valerie Shawcross (AM):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No, that is fine. Secondly, you should not assume talking us into a situation

Valerie Shawcross (AM): So we are not

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I did not refer

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Can I just give you two last first we cannot we will not we actually understand

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): thank you sir Paul

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes, we will.

12.08

Can we move on to the next item please

Martin Tiplady (MPS): I would like to if I can, Chairman,

Essentially pretty unique, other than in the armed forces. Recruits them, trains them very few industries nurses do not do it armed forces and then pays for the training into the organisation.

Alongside that we have a very rich pool unique experience in patrol situations simply what we have done here is

I have to say the diversity issues of this

What are the benefits

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Questions. Jenny Jones

Jenny Jones (AM): I have two huge problems appear to leap out of this report

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am happy for the recommendation

Jenny Jones (AM): I just do not think we have enough information

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The discussion took place. I think we are

Jenny Jones (AM): Can I just clarify

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): That is not true at all.

Jenny Jones (AM): So we can vote

Dee Doocey (AM): Point of order

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You may as well do it now

Dee Doocey (AM): but wish to place on

Jenny Jones (AM):

Dee Doocey (AM): But I think

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Happy with that

Clive Lawton (AM): First of all I want to strongly endorse this idea creative and intelligent and helpful. I note the reassurances in it

I have two questions; one general and one specific. The general one is why now

The second thing relates to the BME side of things

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Can I deal with the first question the second one, Martin

Secondly, we are calling for creativity

Clive Lawton (AM): My question was

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We just thought of it

Clive Lawton (AM):

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Can I just repeat

Clive Lawton (AM):

Martin Tiplady (MPS): By the way, we do want to

Jenny Jones, if I could deal with the police not wanting to restrict people

Jenny Jones (AM): My point is

Martin Tiplady (MPS): It is now 200.

Jenny Jones (AM): So we will have

Martin Tiplady (MPS): No, no. The requirement

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Jenny Jones (AM):

Martin Tiplady (MPS): A person who becomes a special

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Can I come in on the

We thought that that would discriminate the £600 odd and, as a result of that,

The other thing and all the rest of it, dish out all the warrant cards I would see in there

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. I have now got nine Members

Victoria Borwick (AM): Perhaps this is probably 25,000

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Currently, of our workforce, 15% applicants 27% 28% so we are creating

Victoria Borwick (AM):

Martin Tiplady (MPS):

Victoria Borwick (AM): How many

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Half of our recruits

Clive Lawton (AM): Sorry

Martin Tiplady (MPS): PCSOs

Clive Lawton (AM): of our workforce

Martin Tiplady (MPS): 15% of our current

Clive Lawton (AM):

Victoria Borwick (AM): So the number is going up

Martin Tiplady (MPS): 61 specials

Victoria Borwick (AM): OK. So if we go ahead with these

Martin Tiplady (MPS): It depends entirely

Victoria Borwick (AM): So the 61

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Yes

Victoria Borwick (AM): I accept that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Just one very quick thing

Victoria Borwick (AM):

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Of which I am very conscious current moratorium

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Graham

Graham Speed (AM): A few points

I think we have got to be very clear

I do have some concerns

I think we are also going to have to

Finally, we are blessed at the moment

Finally, on the estates,

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thanks for that. Cindy Butts

Cindy Butts (AM): I wanted to start

Having said that, I do think there are still a number of

Firstly the whole issue of estates. The issue of the quality impact proposed. We are not entirely sure about the level of consultation

There is another issue on top of that professional standards plans for supervision.

In addition to that.

My final point is around, not just media management,

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Kirsten

Kirsten Hearn (AM): quality impact here. My big concern is there was a big discussion

Cindy Butts (AM): Can I just intervene on that point?

Faith Boardman (AM): Point of

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Tony Arbour

Tony Arbour (AM): I wanted to say cheaper and is better slays huge numbers of dragons with recruiting people

It does seem to me insufficient consultation

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Reshard

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): Can I just say I Tony's view. One is whether we accept in principle

Jenny Jones (AM): No

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA): I am not saying

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. That is a good suggestion

12.40

Jennette Arnold (AM): Much of what I wanted to say Cindy Butts that said it Martin can be clearer absolutely the cost relating to the

That is why I am in complete support of Dee Doocey's absolutely important based on fuller understanding would be useful clear a number of these things out. We were at the start of the discussion about specials. How can we improve Tim in a former role

I would also challenge the that is in the paper this number that we see of specials officers. Over the years it is my

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is their choice

Jennette Arnold (AM): Then that means the clarity

12.45

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Chairman, I

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Valerie

Valerie Brasse (AM): we have a really good story to tell. The reality is

Martin Tiplady (MPS): If I could try and deal

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes, go for it

Martin Tiplady (MPS): Look, this particular proposal

If I can work back with Jennette's questions. It did start

I want to assure you that the EIA several pages and several chapters

Denise

Jennette Arnold (AM): Martin

Martin Tiplady (MPS): if you take learn from it

Cindy Butts is right; does not reflect all. Therefore, Reshard

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Joanne McCartney

Joanne McCartney (AM): lots of raise some new ones if I may

If we are talking about the diversity coming in better for diversity than the specials

We have had debates over the years career progression

PCSOs are excluded so that chance does not. My is no that we are recruiting specials

Martin Tiplady (MPS): can I say that indicative number

Joanne McCartney (AM): If it is going to be higher than that

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is not a set figure

Joanne McCartney (AM): I had the specials joined for a host of reasons

On the EIA I have looked at that more work needs to be done

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Faith?

Faith Boardman (AM): It seems to me there are some very strong arguments I would agree with the arguments I have heard from them. Equally there are lots of new

There are clearly a lot of loose ends.

So, in practical terms, I cannot see an

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes.

Cindy Butts (AM): Can I just say SETH too big a decision come here. I would still be uncomfortable

In addition to that

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. The other thing we have to bear in mind £12 million

Cindy Butts (AM): if we do not do it now

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): getting our priorities for some time

Secondly, we know we are in a difficult financial envelope

1.00

In terms of the principle, as Reshard said, in principle I cannot see that there is any broad reason

Jenny Jones (AM): I am sorry, Chairman, yes go ahead. We have not done the thinking

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I think all we are doing

Jenny Jones (AM): I do not know

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Hold on

On the basis, frankly,

Jenny Jones (AM): Even more reason to get it right

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Victoria Borwick (AM): July

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): The amendment

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I thought

Steve O'Connell (AM): Note or agree

Dee Doocey (AM):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Dee Doocey (AM): yes, note the

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I read that as

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): coverage generated

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Caroline

Kirsten Hearn (AM): The bottom line for me is

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There is

Kirsten Hearn (AM): It has been given to us

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I would like to make a decision

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, but we have not

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I am going to propose a solution. Background briefings to meet any individual concerns.

Let us just get this straight. Officers do not have to hand questions arise discursive. What I think we can do individual members can be contacted

Jenny Jones (AM): No.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Hold on. Then, following that, September meeting we have been through everybody trying to fix a date is a nightmare bring a report back July September now we want to get on with it. I just do want to get a

Dee Doocey (AM): Point of order, Chairman

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Dee Doocey (AM): But my

Victoria Borwick (AM): other people could come

Dee Doocey (AM): We are nto available

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Victoria, I have proposed individual attention.

Dee Doocey (AM): Do not know enough to vote

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Dee Doocey (AM):

Steve O'Connell (AM): my person is in the process of becoming a special

Cindy Butts (AM): For you

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Do not assume

Jenny Jones (AM):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is just so direction of travel

Dee Doocey has put a recommendation everybody is happy with

Dee Doocey (AM): Can I be very clear

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Fine

Jenny Jones (AM): It is more than full consultation approval of

James Cleverly (AM): No

Jenny Jones (AM): This goes back to the deciding vote on this

Dee Doocey (AM): We would

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You have made

Jennette Arnold (AM): can I formally

Victoria Borwick (AM): No,

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Can we have a show of hands Those against

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, you commented that we would bring this back in July or September

I understand that there may be virtue in speed

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. OK. Can we move on to the next item?

Ladies and gentlemen

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): This is to get

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Audit

All: Agreed

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Item six. Delegated

All: Agreed

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):

Victoria Borwick (AM):

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is it. Just a word. I will not be here just a word to tell you on race and faith a launch date 7 July launch here in City Hall come to the July meeting

You will get a report shortly before