

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 22 July 2010 at 10 am in The Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

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

MPA Officers:

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Annabel Adams (Deputy Treasurer) and Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive).

MPS Officers:

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

In the absence of Kit Malthouse, the Vice Chairman, Reshard Auladin, took the Chair for this meeting.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Good morning. It is 10am. We are going to make a start. Can we start with apologies for absence? We have had apologies from Kit Malthouse, John Biggs, Neil Johnson and Graham Speed. Any other apologies? When Kirsten [Hearn] arrives we will go round the table.

Jenny Jones (AM): Could I ask how many meetings can people miss before they are kicked off? Some people regularly do not turn up which is a bit irritating when they make decisions as well.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): There are provisions in standing orders. It would be imprudent of me to try to recite them from memory but I could circulate them to Members after the meeting if that is going to be helpful?

Jenny Jones (AM): I would very much welcome that.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Three consecutive months.

Tony Arbour (AM): Of course there are some people who do turn up but are not recorded.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): We will make sure everybody who has turned up today is recorded. We are now going to go round the table. Kirsten [Hearn] has arrived. I am Reshard Auladin.

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

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

Faith Boardman (AM): Faith Boardman.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Jennette Arnold.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Chris Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Victoria Borwick.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Val Shawcross.

Clive Lawton (AM): Clive Lawton.

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

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

Annabel Adams (Deputy Treasurer, MPA): Annabel Adams.

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

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

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Cindy [Butts] arrived.

Cindy Butts (AM): I am between Faith [Boardman] and Tim [Godwin].

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Can I just take the opportunity to mention the Authority's annual have your say on policing consultation programme which is, at the moment, happening? So far it has got off to a very good start. About 200 Londoners have completed the full online questionnaire and about 400 at community events have started putting in their views. We would encourage all of us to promote participation in the consultation at every opportunity. It is easily accessible on the MPA website and it can also be provided in hard copy form. Thank you.

Item two which is Members' declarations of interests.

Three. Minutes of the meeting on 29 June 2010. Are you happy for me to sign those? Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I raise, on page 12 at 8.7, in the debate about the new model for recruitment it says that Members were generally supportive of the proposals. That was not what I remembered from the meeting.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think it is missing 'unsupportive'. U N in front of supportive.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You could say there were mixed views.

Jenny Jones (AM): Even that is a bit generous.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Had concerns about.

Jenny Jones (AM): Massive concerns about.

Joanne McCartney (AM): There were at least half the Members present that were not supportive of the proposals without further reassurances.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Could we make sure that these concerns are reflected in the minutes? Thank you. 8.7. We will look at (inaudible). OK.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chair, just a small matter on page 18, the list of memberships of sub-committees. I have to say my memory does not serve me well but there were some unfilled vacancies, in particular I was aware of a vacancy on the Olympics Paralympic Sub-Committee. I do not know if this represents that there are seven places, one yet unfilled, or six places and one of them was filled along the way. I do not know the answer to that.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): I understood Kit [Malthouse] to say at the last meeting that he did not want to fill any of the vacant places pending the new Member of the Authority taking up their position, and that is what I said to the Olympic Sub-Committee. I am pretty certain that is what he said but the tape will confirm it.

Clive Lawton (AM): So there are actually seven places on that Committee - one being held open?

Dee Doocey (AM): There is one vacant at the moment which will be filled, as I understand it, when the new person has an opportunity. I think the idea was that you cannot have a new Member and say anything nobody else wants to do that new Member can have. It was to give the new Member the ability to say, "I would be interested in doing X, rather than Y".

Clive Lawton (AM): That I fully understood. It was only then I was confused on page 150 when it referred to the suggestion that Victoria [Borwick] was appointed to the Olympic Sub-Committee, but Victoria [Borwick] now tells me she has been on the Sub-Committee all the time.

Dee Doocey (AM): She has, yes.

Clive Lawton (AM): I just became confused completely --

Dee Doocey (AM): No, Victoria [Borwick] has always been on the Sub-Committee, and a very good Member she is too.

Clive Lawton (AM): Page 150 which does not seem to make any sense.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Chair, it might be helpful to remind Members that the final interviews for the new Independent Member are taking place next Monday, so it ought to be possible to return to this in the September Full Authority meeting.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): OK. Any other matters arising out of the minutes? No.

Item four which is a petition. Can we invite Ken Livingstone to present his petition? Over to you, Ken [Livingstone].

Ken Livingstone (Mayor of London 2000-2008): Thank you very much, Chair. Can I say that I think the question of policing in this city over the last decade has been a success story? The increase in numbers from under 26,000 a decade ago to 32,000, and of course the 4,000 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), has been a big factor in the reduction in crime, which has been consistently coming down since 2002, both under myself and my successor.

As well, the rolling out of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, I think, has been a contributing factor to a reduction in fear of crime; that people begin to see a policing presence on their streets.

The reason we were able to make those significant changes and increases - and in each year for eight years I increased the precept in order to pay for more police on the street - was that we gave an undertaking at the start of this exercise ten years ago - I did - both to the then Commissioner, Sir John Stevens, and to the Assembly and also to the Police Federation that every penny we found from savings and reorganisation within the force would go into extra police in order to tackle crime. I think, initially under the chairmanship of Toby Harris, we identified about £25 million or more, and that went up to over £75 million or more. All those savings and changes in the way we managed policing were switched into extra police that people started to see.

Not initially. We initially, I think, put 300 extra police on duties solving murders. Very much in the period from 2004 on we started the roll out of neighbourhood teams which have been both popular and successful. I can well remember I think not a single instance where an Assembly Member from any party said anything other than, "How soon will my district have its entire complement of neighbourhood teams?"

This was not some idea I had had off the top of my head. We stole most of this from Mayor Giuliani [Mayor of New York 1994-2001]. My first visit as Mayor in January 2001 was to meet Mayor Giuliani to see what we could learn from that. I remember his Commissioner saying that, from the high point of crime to that point in January 2001, there had been a 63% reduction in crime in New York City. That is what we wanted to replicate here. We have not got 63% yet but we have made a good start in achieving a dramatic reduction.

Crime, as I understand it, continues to fall, and the fear of crime still continues to fall. I think we both assume we still have some way to go. In particular, seeing that teenage deaths, once again, seem to be starting to pick up, I think the majority of Londoners would take the view that this is not a time to reduce police numbers. If we find a better way of using police time that is all well and good, but the police released from less productive duties could be well used to supplement policing on the streets. In particular, to look at, perhaps, what I envisage as the next stage in the development of Safer Neighbourhood Teams; extending the hours much more into the evening and up towards midnight.

The success of this was so clear that when, during the last election, my old friend, Richard Barnes, made a comment that could have been interpreted - and was by some - as being less than supportive of neighbourhood police teams he immediately disappeared and was bundled off into a darkened room for the rest of the campaign. I was struck, going through the last election, how whatever I said on policing Boris [Johnson] (Mayor of London) offered to match it and, usually, to exceed it. I think there was, therefore, an absolute assumption, however people voted at the last election, that policing in this city would be protected and, hopefully, would continue to expand.

I think it is, therefore important, that this represents the first time police that have been identified and reallocated are not actually going into providing more reassurance and support on the streets. I think the majority of Londoners, who pay through their council tax - something like 80% of the precept that comes into this building goes to pay for crucial services like policing and the Fire Authority - this is the one thing that, I think, they value above all others and it is the one thing that must be protected.

I would hope the consensus that was cross party and unanimous in the eight years after 2000 to increase policing and to get it back on the streets would be one that the Assembly and the Mayor could continue to hold to in what are going to be very difficult years to come.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you very much. I am now going to invite the Chief Executive to respond.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Thank you, Chair. The decision to streamline the staffing of custody suites throughout the Metropolitan Police, releasing 550 police officers from administrative duties and replacing them with designated detention officers, was discussed several times by Members during 2008, and the final decision to go ahead was confirmed by the Coordination and Policing Committee chaired by Len Duvall, then Chair of the Authority. The savings that accrued from this change were built into the budget approved by the then Mayor and the Assembly for 2010, and subsequently.

The history of the reforms stem from the 2004 Service Improvement Review into custody capacity which identified significant inefficiencies and risks to the safety of detainees.

The net effect of the custody reforms is the availability of an extra 550 police officers for front line duties. The linked reduction of 455 in overall policing numbers must be measured against the increased hours of duty on the streets of London.

The decision by the previous Authority to take this step was judged by the current Chair and membership to be sensible, and the savings that accrue will continue to be reflected in the budget.

On the subject of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, the MPA, the current Chair, Kit Malthouse, and, indeed, the Commissioner have consistently made it clear that neighbourhood policing is the bedrock of local crime fighting and must remain so. Given the need to achieve substantial savings across all public sector budgets, the Authority cannot rule out examining the case for greater efficiencies in the provision of neighbourhood policing, but the intention is to continue to operate the Safer Neighbourhood Teams across London.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): You have got a couple of minutes, Ken [Livingstone], if you wish to come back?

Ken Livingstone (Mayor of London 2000-2008): Starting out ten years ago with Toby Harris we made several substantial changes in the way the Metropolitan Police Service was operating to release people into a more efficient use of police time. No one is going to disagree with that. This is the first time in a decade where that headline number is coming down.

There are no points of disagreement between myself and what was just said, except that I would just question, generally, the increased use of overtime rather than creating new jobs. There are two things: One we face a real problem with increasing unemployment in years to come. Also, I do think we rely too much on people working longer and longer hours which might have no disbenefit to those receiving the service on the street but it, increasingly, puts strain on family life, and it is not a direction I think has been a welcome one over the last 20 or 30 years as people work longer and longer hours and spend less and less time with their families.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. We have got Valerie [Shawcross] next who wants to make a comment.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you, Chair. I am sorry; I am not too sure of the procedures so, forgive me, if I am slightly getting it wrong.

I felt that the important part of this petition is actually the second half where it says, "Guarantee the future of London's dedicated 630 Safer Neighbourhood Police Teams" because, as later on we will go on to discuss, on page 148 Anne McMeel did say at the last meeting - and it is here in the minutes - over the next three years there will be a budget gap growing up to £444 million.

I just felt that Catherine's [Crawford] rebuttal - for want of a better word - there of the petition where she said there is the intention to continue safer neighbourhood policing, I think we need to say that very much more strongly because a £444 million budget gap is, obviously, going to be a fundamental challenge to the ability of these organisations to provide policing adequately in London. It seems to me that almost everything would be under threat by a £444 million budget gap.

I just want to put on record that my community groups and the people I meet - I recently had all of my Safer Neighbourhood Panel Chairs from Southwark in for a meeting - absolutely strongly support the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. They are seen as the heart of the success of preventative policing in London. I think that we should be recognising in this petition a huge and important future debate about the nature of policing in London.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Steve [O'Connell]?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you very much, Chair. It is generally discourteous of me to be electioneering and making strong political points but as that precedent has already been set by Mr Livingstone - which was clearly an electioneering piece in the

auspice of presenting a petition. That is fine and dandy but that puts a context about the debate that may possibly follow.

First of all let us put a context around why the Authority - and I speak as the Chair of the Finance Committee - has to find these cuts. It is because of the mismanagement of the economy by the previous Labour Government, which was supported by Mr Livingstone and Ms Shawcross earlier. That is one piece of context to place into it. People are shaking their heads but this is the debate that has been started by Mr Livingstone, and I will presume to continue it.

As has been pointed out in the response by the Chief Executive, Operation Herald was brought into being by Mr Livingstone. It was his policy. Chaired by Mr Duvall - who is not with us today - early in 2008. So the fact of the matter is, Mr Livingstone seems to be objecting a petition against his own policy. How odd. I shall let that rest.

Tony Arbour (AM): No, not odd.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Mr Arbour, I do not have the experience of Mr Livingstone that you have but, to me, it seems very odd. The fact of the matter is the support for the safer neighbourhood concept is ubiquitous amongst us. We all support the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. We are pleased they came into being. The fact of the matter is that we need to look at them in the way that they work and get more efficiency out of them. I think that is a debate that we need to work on.

The point is, therefore, through you, Chair, that we have a petition here against an individual who is petitioning against his own policy, led by his own Chair and led by his own party. In the previous couple of years when I have been here, Labour Members and others have voted very much for Operation Herald, which has been pointed out by the Chair releases 550 officers on to the beat which is what we are on about in this group. Again, I cannot really understand some pieces around that.

I do not know whether we are asked to support the petition or otherwise. Clearly I cannot support the petition though, clearly, I do support Safer Neighbourhood Teams going forward. All I would say is that this is an unfortunate piece of electioneering by Mr Livingstone. If this, indeed, is his first salvo in an election campaign, I think it is ill judged. I wish him the best in his campaign to become the Labour nomination because, clearly, everybody in the areas that we support in outer London would welcome Mr Livingstone to be the Labour candidate. Hurrah to that. I would say this is an ill thought out, ill conceived and political petition that is inappropriate to this Committee and I would have to resist it. Thank you, Chair.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): I think we are asked just to receive the petition; I do not think we are debating it, although we are asked to support it. We are getting comments from Members and I am happy to do that. I think next is Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you, Chair. Probably more than anyone else round this table I have raised the issue of police numbers *ad nauseum* at this Committee so many times. I do not think there is any doubt that there have got to be cuts and that the cuts are going to be quite significant. We all know that. I think the issue is where the axe is going to fall. I feel very strongly that it must not be on front line policing and there are lots of other areas where substantial cuts can be made; and I would suggest that they should be at the top of the MPS, rather than at the bottom.

I suppose what I am looking for from you, Chair, is a categorical assurance that, when it is decided where the axe is going to fall, every Member of this Authority will be brought in at a much earlier stage than is normally the case so that we can all feed in to how money can be saved - because there is a necessity to save money - rather than normally what happens which is that the elite few on the MPA decide to look at a variety of scenarios and then come to us with proposals. I would actually like to be able to see the proposals in great detail to begin with and I think everyone on this Authority should be given that opportunity so that we can safeguard front line policing.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): I will come back to that in a moment if I may. Joanne [McCartney] next?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Two or three points if I may. I think as a response to Steve [O'Connell] no one is arguing with Operation Herald about getting civilians in to do jobs that should be best done by civilians and police officers on the street. The petition says that, in total, the number of police officers is being cut. That is the difference between what was initially proposed under the previous Authority and this one.

We had reports out this week from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) with Sir Denis O'Connor [Chief Inspector of Constabulary] saying that if the 25% cuts go ahead, "Police leaders will be left with a stark choice of whether to cut into neighbourhood policing or specialised services such as counter terrorism". One of the top Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) officers is saying this a serious issue and Safer Neighbourhood Teams are under threat.

Those of us that speak to our community groups; people are aware that they are under threat. We may have a hub left of Safer Neighbourhood Teams but whether they are going to be in the same numbers or doing the same jobs with the same engagement and whether we have the time to do that is something that is going to preoccupy us. I think this petition does highlight those very grave issues that we are going to have to deal with.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Any other points? Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): Chair, I think it is really important that we avoid symbolic issues and stick with the key issues. It seems to me that the key issue, clearly, is police effectiveness. Police numbers - and I think there is a decent argument, no doubt about it - are a part of effectiveness, but they may not be the whole part, and it may not be

specifically police officers as against PCSOs and other police staff and so on and so forth. I am still committed to effectiveness and efficiency, rather than some symbolic line in the sand about numbers of this or quantities of that. That seems to me to be a very reactionary position which prevents change and development.

On the second matter that Valerie [Shawcross] wished to accentuate relating to the Safer Neighbourhood Police Teams, I think, as has already been said, support for the safer neighbourhood concept and system is fully agreed, but whether 630 teams is the right number, or 950, or 270, or 16 amalgamated teams, or anything else is the right number and the right distribution of people and so on and so forth, I do not know. We have just undertaken to start a scrutiny of the arrangements of Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Not the principle or the existence of such a thing, but whether it works at its most efficient model and back to that effectiveness issue.

I think that if people wish to make a general statement about maintaining police effectiveness and keeping safer neighbourhoods front and centre **I fall square(?)** with that, but if they want to get caught up with 455 and 630, I just do not think we have got enough evidence to confirm that that has to be the only way of proceeding.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chair. I do not intend to go into the substance of the petition because that has already been discussed. I have more of a concern over the procedure that we are witnessing here. It is fairly obvious to anyone except the most naïve observer what the real driving force behind this petition is. I apologise for my late arrival so I missed the total number of petitioners. I wonder if you could clarify how many names are on the petition?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): It is in the papers, James [Cleverly]. It is about 400.

James Cleverly (AM): About 400. It strikes me we have had a larger number of people signing up to petitions about the removal of bus stops than this particular issue. It concerns me that if, between now and the Mayoral elections in 2012, we are going to have a string of members of the public who wish to use these meetings as an opportunity to get a bit of press exposure, we are in a difficult position. I would just urge caution on this because there are serious issues that we are going to have to address in this body over the next few years with regard to the budgetary restraint on London policing. That is a serious issue and needs to be taken seriously. I think that if we allow ourselves to be distracted by, potentially, a constant stream of people who bring forward petitions of relatively modest numbers of a very party political nature, we are going to get ourselves into a lot of difficulty.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chair, point of order?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Can I just bring in the Chief Executive to answer that point because that may actually deal with your point of order?

Jennette Arnold (AM): I have raised a point of order and I want to respond and say to James [Cleverly] look back at the notes. Since 2000 when this Authority was formed, Members of Parliament (MPs), prospective MPs, local councillors, prospective local councillors - using the generic term - any citizen of London has known about the ability to come with a petition and to be received. There was no statement on number. There is no bar on any political --

James Cleverly (AM): I am questioning that. Sorry, I cannot see this is a point of order?

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is a point of order --

James Cleverly (AM): I cannot see this is a point of order. I have asked a question about procedure --

Jennette Arnold (AM): No, it is not a procedure matter --

James Cleverly (AM): What is your point of order?

Jennette Arnold (AM): The point of order is --

Dee Doocey (AM): Who is chairing this?!

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Hang on a second.

James Cleverly (AM): Chair, what is the point of order that is being addressed?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Let me just bring in the Chief Executive please.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): We have standing orders that control the presentation of petitions. They provide that any person may present a petition to the full Authority or appropriate Committee provided it contains a minimum of 100 signatures from people who live or work in the Metropolitan Police District and is relevant to the Authority's business functions or responsibilities. The hapless Chief Executive then has discretion to determine whether the petition is appropriate for the Full Authority or should be presented to a Committee. So the standing orders are fairly clear. I would suggest that if Members wish to revisit standing orders we have a mechanism for doing that.

James Cleverly (AM): I think we should. I think a fresh --

Jennette Arnold (AM): Speak to the petition.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): That is not for today. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): As an old style Stalinist, when the standing orders of this Authority were first discussed, I was against allowing people to present deputations partly because bitter experience told me that this was not always terribly useful.

However I do think that the debate we have started today is actually quite an interesting and quite an important one. It is actually the forerunner of a series of discussions and debates that we are going to have because the reality is that, of course, you must, all the time, analyse the way in which police officers are used. Where there are functions that non-warranted staff could fulfil and, therefore, release police officers back to more traditional policing duties or to proper policing duties, then that has to be beneficial.

The context we are in at the moment is one which is changing quite rapidly because, first of all, we are not talking about releasing police officers back into the community in the same way. We are also talking about a situation in which there is going to be a very substantial squeeze on resources and one of the things that is going to happen is that it will be easier to get rid of police staff, because of the way the regulations work, than police officers, so you are going to get a sort of double squeeze on this. The danger is that Operation Herald may be the last occasion when police officers will be replaced by civil staff and what we are going to see in the future is more and more police officers doing functions which could be properly carried out by police staff.

I think it is actually a very important set of debates that have been raised today and I suspect we are going to keep returning to them. Whether or not we should do it by means of petitions, as I say, I am an old style Stalinist and I would purge the lot.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Kirsten [Hearn]?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): I was just wondering whether we should just receive this petition now and get on with the business?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): This is what we are doing. We have received the petition. People have had a chance to comment about it. Can I just put in my tuppence worth? I share Clive's [Lawton] view - and I have been consistent about this - I think, with police numbers, we do a disservice to members of the public when we concentrate on police numbers alone. I think all political parties have done this over the years. It has been a measure of their commitment to policing.

The research in the United States is very mixed. I know Ken [Livingstone] has talked about what happened in New York but there are some other places, for example, Kansas City, where the deployment of patrols did not reduce crime at all.

In 2000 we had 25,000 police officers. We now have about 33,000. If you add the 4,000 PCSOs, for example, we have got about 40% more uniformed officers on the streets of London. We could argue that we do not have a 40% commensurate increase in performance or cut of overtime and so on and so forth.

I absolutely agree with Clive [Lawton] that it is about effectiveness, it is about performance and it is about the policing model that is required to deliver the type of policing that serves Londoners. That is my personal view. Sorry, Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): I am sorry but since you mentioned all the political parties I have never ever advocated more police officers. Ever.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): I stand to be corrected.

Jenny Jones (AM): Please do not include me with all these other political parties that do.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you very much. We will swiftly move on to item five which is the Commissioner's report. Thank you, Mr Livingstone. Commissioner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you, Chair. You have my report in front of you. I was going to start off what I said today by just touching on the budget but I am not too sure I want to at this moment in time! I know we are going to come back to it, Joanne [McCartney], because you have got a tabled question.

Just on the issue, we have recently briefed the Business Management Group from the Police Authority and shared with the Business Management Group all our papers around what we have been working on, trying to work through in what is a very uncertain situation, as to how we are making preparations for what might face us when we get the definitive information, which will be more around October, when we know the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

What I did say to them - and I will say it again now - is interesting from the previous debate; I remain absolutely committed to doing everything we can to maintaining operational capability, delivering efficient and effective support services at the lowest possible cost, and getting the most out of our resources.

Our approach to this, as you would expect it to be, is looking at systems, processes, what can we do to reduce our costs, our procurement costs and what can we do to reduce management own costs? We are going to do everything we can to maintain that operational capability.

It is interesting; there does need to be a series of very important debates about what does that mean and what is the balance? I will say it again; safer neighbourhood policing is a hugely important part of policing this city and the benefits we have had out of safer neighbourhood policing have been, in my opinion, provable and tangible and not something that we would ever want to lightly give up.

Of course we are facing something that we have never faced before. I do not think there has been any Police Authority - or certainly any Commissioner in modern times - that has been facing figures - and we do not yet know - of 25%. We have to weigh up the outcome of what does that mean to us because we do not know if that is going to apply to the Home Office and we do not know how the Home Office might then divvy it up between police forces. We then do not know what is going to happen to specific grants beyond that 25%, or whatever figure it is. We then do not know what is going to happen in terms of how the GLA decide to then distribute that finance. Neither do we yet know what is the effect on other agencies to whom we effectively supply services and get paid, which puts more officers out there. In that there is Transport for London (TfL) and various local authorities. There is a lot yet to be defined. The one thing we do know is it is not very good news. That is simply the issue.

The other thing we have just got to get in our minds is it is something like - and I will confirm the figure and there are various figures quoted - around about 78%/80% of our budget is on pay line. Anne [McMeel], something like that? So if we are talking about figures of around 25% - if we are - or more, or less, but something around that, then a quarter - and that has to yet pan out because that is central government grant which is 60% odd of what we get - of the total out of the 20% remaining, without touching people, would be an absurd notion.

I did say at the last Police Authority the one thing I am fairly confident of is, whatever this means, the MPS will shrink, if that is the scale of the cuts. Now I will not do shroud waving because I do not think it is helpful at all. We are going to have to make some very seriously important decisions of balancing the importance of neighbourhood policing - and we see it as a prime importance - with many other things, that this Authority has discussed, that we do that are, also, of huge importance. Including the rape commands, what we do on child protection and how we investigate homicide and actually make sure these streets are safe. All those things are part and parcel of the discussion that we have got to have in what is a very important discussion.

There might be various political discussions going on but I suspect the Authority and the MPS want to get together and have those discussions that make very important decisions for the future of Londoners. I will come back to that and probably say the same sort of things in a moment, Joanne [McCartney], but we will have further discussion.

Can I move on? I generally go through what is loosely termed as performance. You will have seen the release of the crime statistics nationally. It is encouraging that police reported crime is continuing to fall nationally in line with our observed fall in police reported crime here in London. You have got the key performance indicators (KPIs) attached to the report as you requested last time. That is the same public data that went to Strategic and Operational Policing (SOP), I think, at the beginning of this month. What I will now do is I will take it on for the first three months of this year - that is April, May and June - so the additional figures I always try to do as up to date as possible.

At this moment in time - this is for the first three months of this financial year - total notifiable offences continue to fall, but marginally down, by 0.8%. That is just over 1,600 fewer offences, but it is down.

There has been a large amount of public attention on the recent announcement by the Home Office to abolish the policing pledge and the national confidence measure. I have got to be clear; I welcome any removal of central targets. I think that is really helpful. The idea that that means confidence is not important would just be utterly absurd. I say time and time again that, as far as I am concerned, my priorities are - and it is very much in line with what you have set for the MPS - about safety, confidence and value for money. It is our mission to make communities more and more confident in us that we are doing what they want in a way that makes sense to them. Confidence remains hugely important. Things such as how long it takes us to turn up incidents and things like that will continue to be very important measures for us to decide are we getting there or not and do they contribute or not as to whether London is becoming ever more confident in us?

I have said this before; the absence of a target does not, in any way, downgrade the importance of the issue. Confidence will continue to be central to everything we do.

The latest British crime survey confidence results are now in. They show that the percentage of people who agree - and remember this is a measure that we always disagreed with - that police and local councils are dealing with anti-social behaviour - that is we, the MPS -- I think it is too broad a measure. I have always thought it was too broad a measure. It should be about police and not police and local councils. I have said that before. Nevertheless, on that measure, it rose to 54.7% for the financial year ending 2009/10. That is from a figure of 49.3% in 2008/09. That is a seven percentage point increase. We were on course to reach the target - which is no longer there - by March 2011. I welcome them moving the target but we have made progress and I am really pleased about that. Much more work left to do.

We are also placed at number one in our most similar forces' comparison. You will recall these are the other major metropolitan forces. The recent Home Office report Crime in England and Wales 2009/10 states that London had a statistically significantly higher confidence than the rest of England and Wales. That is not to say it is high enough, but it is higher than elsewhere and it has been improving. I think that we should recognise that.

The latest user satisfaction survey results are also modestly pleasing. Overall satisfaction rose to 79.1% for the first quarter of this financial year. That is up from 78.1%. Again, I am pleased that is moving up.

In respect of satisfaction of both black and minority ethnic (BME) victims and white victims both showed an improvement in the first quarter but, of course, we have discussed the gap on a number of occasions, most recently at the last Authority.

Interestingly, some of the things we are going to have to decide upon around what represents value for money in policing in London include the way in which we maintain and continue to on various buildings and aspects of buildings. I think we had a discussion at the last Authority of how it is the case that members of the BME communities, more than other communities, use our inquiry desks. We know our inquiry desks are part of the worst part of the service we deliver because it costs lots to upgrade them and do them differently. We are going to have to have some very important discussions, which are uncomfortable, about how many of these things can we afford to keep open and what quality and how do we make sure the public can access policing in a way that is fitting for the 21st century and actually matches their needs. I think we are going to have some very difficult discussions around our building stock. Much wider than just the number of police officers.

That gap remains and we are trying to reduce the gap. The increase in satisfaction is going up for both groups, but the gap is still there.

We continue to work very hard to improve satisfaction overall with lots of initiative such as Street a Week campaign, building on what we are doing on public briefings and, of course, I noticed there is Government coalition interest in street briefings. That is something I think I am right in saying that the MPS started through the safer neighbourhood programme a number of years ago. Building on that and doing the Street a Week campaign actually looks like a very good idea. Sutton and Bexley are rolling out so that every street is getting further services, or further contact.

Just moving on from that, overall serious acquisitive crime is down by 1.5%. Residential burglary continues to improve. That is down by 9.8%. Unlike total notifiable offences, this now represents the lowest level of offences we have seen for this period since 1998.

Motor vehicle crime, interestingly, is up slightly; 0.6%. Of course this Authority is used to seeing, month on month, quarter on quarter, year on year, falls in vehicle crime. Actually that has been very useful in terms of the overall crime rate. I think I mentioned this last time; this is the first time we are seeing that slight flattening off and now just a marginal rise in vehicle crime.

I was at Redbridge yesterday and I was talking to the borough commander and various people out there. We should never speculate but I am going to speculate a little. They are looking at what they see as an increase in pick up trucks hooking up older vehicles and towing them away. I never thought I would ever talk about the European Federation of Irish Steel Prices at the Police Authority so it is an opportunity to just be a bit adventurous here! I am looking at that chart and the rise in scrap metal prices since about December of last year. Actually it has risen significantly to a peak at April. Whilst not a direct correlation, the opportunity for the nicking of old vehicles and actually going and using it for scrap, as the scrap price increases, may just be a coincidence or may not. It is something we are looking at. That gives us other opportunities. That was a first for me and I quite enjoyed the European Federation of Irish Steel Prices!

Toby Harris (AM): (several inaudible words)

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think I will stick to being Commissioner!

More serious violence, one of our key priorities, down by over 20%. Well ahead of our target. Of this a large part can be attributed to a reduction in more serious crime where a knife is used. That is down by 14.3%.

Overall gun crime is down by 3%, however, we have got to be honest about this; 3% is good and I am pleased it is down, but these are small numbers and that is 25 fewer offences. When you have small numbers the percentage up and down is very dynamic. 3% I am pleased about and I am pleased there are 25 fewer offences, but they are small numbers.

Gun enabled robberies are down by 5.7%. I make the point there are 26 fewer. Whilst that reduction is pleasing, the challenge remains to reduce it further but, in particular, have a bigger impact upon discharge of firearms because that is up. That is up by over 10%, which is 19 additional offences. That represents a challenge to us. I am delighted gun offences overall are down. If discharge of guns is up, that has got to be a concern to us, and we are working very hard on that.

Domestic violence I mentioned at last month's Full Authority. We have seen a reduction in the number of reported domestic violence offences over the same period compared with 2009. I am pleased that trend is continuing but I am always very cautious because we do know this is one of the most under reported areas of crime. The MPS has concentrated huge attention on this in recent years and we talked, I think last month, of the contribution this made to the reduction in homicide in this city. That remains the case. The trend is certainly down at this moment in time. It is lower for the same period last year and in 2008 and it continues the progress that seems to be made.

We did anticipate a peak in reported offences due to factors such as the World Cup. Of course there is some evidence in the past that major football tournaments start and domestic violence goes up. Associated with alcohol and warm weather etc. However, relatively low levels of reported domestic violence were seen around that time, which was encouraging. Why? It might be partly down to our awareness campaign. We would like to think so. It might also be down to our participation in the World Cup being somewhat shorter than many of us had hoped for. Nevertheless it was, thankfully, down. We have got to continue to work on it.

Other reported hate crimes similar comments there. We do know under reporting exists here. They have also fallen when compared over the same three months last year. I have got the figures here but I will not go into all the figures. They are down.

Challenging areas. Whilst I am pleased that most serious violence offences with knife are down and offences where a knife has been used to injure, importantly, is down by

5.9%, overall knife crime is still under pressure and that is up by just over 4%. That represents a broader range of knife crimes than just where knives have been used to injure, which is down, but, nevertheless, those offences are up. Some of that might be down to productivity but we have got to be concerned about that.

It continues to be driven, largely, by knife enabled robberies. We are seeing that very real parallel. The increase in knife crime we are seeing as absolutely concerned with the increase in knife enabled robberies. Interestingly, other knife crimes, with robberies removed, have shown a reduction, so it is robbery and knife enabled crime that are parallel and one and the same as we see it. It remains a very clear area of concern and robbery is up by about 5.8% at this moment in time. We are concentrating a lot of attention on it both from the Serious Crime Directorate and from Territorial Policing.

We have had a number of initiatives; Blunt 2. There are some operational initiatives ongoing that are sensitive at this moment in time that we hope will bring further impacts there, both on robbery and on gang related violence in this city. A lot of attention there. Also things like the recent Lay it Down music event at schools in Hackney and Stoke Newington, and Carry a Basketball; Not a Blade sports events in Newham, which are all about getting that level of engagement. We do know the real issue here is getting a level of engagement with young people to try to make sure young people have the ability to make the right choices and go to the right places.

Last month we held our Junior Citizen event at White Heart Lane where we joined forces with colleagues from a number of partners; Haringey Council, TfL, London Fire Brigade and London Ambulance Service. That is continuing on a long tradition of running that event.

Despite the success of all those events, knife crime, in my opinion and I am sure in everybody else's opinion, remains a long term battle for London. Knife crime and, of course, youth crime. I will end with this particular area, as I always do. Over recent weeks we have seen some further shocking examples of serious youth violence, which remains up by about 5.5% at this moment in time. That is concerning. Coming together in our operations are the issues of knife crime, violence, youth and gangs. Gangs are not the whole answer but we have a significant gang problem in this city. Our operations are targeting these things and trying to pick out elements of it but, actually, this is the focus of our attention. It is the focus of our attention from where we have spare asset and Territorial Policing (TP) running operations, but also the Serious Crime Directorate is heavily involved in trying to make an impact. As I say, we have some sensitive operations ongoing at this moment in time regarding gangs.

Since the last time we met two further young men have tragically lost their lives to violence and that brings the total, so far this year, to 14. I always say I am always worried about talking about figures around young people dying but the figures are this - and we need to get this into some sort of context. For the calendar year, if we compare the last four years, that is 1 January up to 22 July, for 2007/08 the total was 17, 2008/09 the total was 22, in 2009/10 the total was 11 and in 2010/11 the total is 14. On the

financial year, last year was abnormally low at 4, but we are at 10 which compares with 11 and 9 the other years. The bottom line on all these figures is there are still too many. It is volatile because it is small numbers but there are just too many.

I will end, as I always do, and say we are doing huge amounts and we can always do more. We can always do more but it is sensitive what we are doing. We have got to make sure we continue and carry community support. This is never about trying to evade our responsibilities but I always say a lot of our activity is at the back end of this continuum, or near the back end. It is about suppression. The real issue here is how we do things much earlier in the cycle, much earlier in children's lives, right the way from the age of zero. A lot of it is about social policy issues and that is what I want to see being addressed across political parties, and it goes longer than one election cycle. They are the critical issues as far as I am concerned but I do not, at all, evade my responsibilities; we have got to constantly do more and more around this area. Thank you, Chair.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you, Commissioner. Any questions on the report itself? We will come to the notified questions and other questions in a minute, but on the report itself any questions? No. Thank you. In which case we then go on to questions that have already been received from Members. Chris [Boothman] is the first question. I think we all have the questions. Would it be OK if the Commissioner goes into answering those, rather than reading the questions? We all have the questions in front of us?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Chris [Boothman], the issue of training, I am not entirely sure the issue of training covers it but I will touch on it. It is important. I think we have got to focus on what we are doing. That is why we have launched the new Diversity Strategy and the Action Plan and - it is right to say it; despite the recent difficulties over the years - working incredibly closely with the Black Police Association (BPA) and recognising some of the stuff that it is doing. Examples would include Voice Of the Youth and Genuine Empowerment (VOYAGE) and it includes the accredited training programme of young leaders for safer cities and black positive advocates. Really, really good work by the BPA that we are supporting. Helping support black families who have suffered from violent crime and problem solving workshops.

Going back to the issue of training, Chris [Boothman], the Management Board has all received race relation training in recent years. Anybody can receive the training; it is what you do with it. More recently we have participated in various leadership programmes run by the Leadership Academy and diversity is included in every one of the individual PDR objectives of the Management Board, which is reviewed individually as part of annual and half annual PDR processes which, of course, is managed through the Chair of the Police Authority.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Any other questions on that particular aspect? Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): Thank you. I have heard repeatedly - and I fully understand this - how exceptionally difficult it is, in so complicated a service as the police, for any key messages to filter all the way down to everybody straightaway and it has been put to me, perhaps not least if not especially, so complex a thing as diversity with all of its different dimensions.

I have been struck over the last few weeks, at various visits to various different police environments and speaking to police officers and police staff, how powerfully and readily people have received your five Ps. It seems to me that police officers on the beat seem to know them and it seems to have caught their attention and they have responded to those issues.

I wonder whether, in this field of diversity, I might suggest a sixth P that you might wish to promote alongside the other five. The sixth P is diversity. You will notice it does not begin with a P! That is because that is the nature of diversity; it does not always fit systems. If you were able to add diversity to your five Ps I think that this would make an extremely strong statement across the police service of it being a primary value alongside those other five values, with all the authority of the Commissioner behind it and with all the simplicity of an asserted learnable concept, which then officers and staff would need to work with at every level.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thanks for the feedback on the five Ps, Clive [Lawton]. I am just delighted somebody is listening to me out there then! Actually I hear what you say but there have been lots of suggestions extending it. In truth it is absolutely essential to all the Ps but, in particular - and I do it on every gig that I do. Every time I do the various large audiences, which is very frequent and regular. It is essential to the professionalism. You cannot be professional and actually not understand the issues of diversity anywhere in policing, but particularly here in London. You just cannot do it. I make that point on every occasion.

To try to separate it out from professionalism, I think, would be entirely improper and loses the power of the message. You cannot be a professional and ignore this issue. You just cannot do it. So I think it would almost dilute the message, but I hear the point and I will make sure that in - and I do already. I do it in the gigs I do with all the various stuff around.

The real issue is actually making the Diversity Strategy and Action Plan live and breath and produce results around it, instead of warm wash words. We have got to be honest about it; a lot of strategies we have had in the past, both here and in wider policing, become warm wash words. We intend to make that a different approach this time. We intend to achieve what it says on the tin.

In terms of your reminder to me that it should be an important part of my central message, it already is but I take the reminder.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Kirsten [Hearn] is next. Can I ask you to read your question, Kirsten [Hearn], mainly because it has just been pointed out to me others in the room may not have the questions, as well as people listening to the broadcast will not know what the questions are? Thank you.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Perhaps, Chair, it would be easier if you read Kirsten's [Hearn] question?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Would you like me to do that? Shall I read --

Kirsten Hearn (AM): It is about a recent story about the MPS backing children cycling on pavements. According to press reports the police take a more relaxed view of children riding on the pavements and that Sir Paul Stephenson backs this change. First I would like to ask Sir Paul [Stephenson] whether it is true that you back this change and, if so, what do you feel might be the equality implications of this change? Has an equality impact assessment been done on this? If so, could we see a copy? If not, will one be done before the policy change takes effect?

I just want to say that pavements are a hazardous place and an **obstructive(?)** place for many pedestrians. In particular older, disabled people and those carrying heavy shopping or pushing buggies find it quite difficult. I am concerned that children riding their bicycles will intimidate - accidentally or deliberately - older, disabled and encumbered pedestrians.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you, Kirsten [Hearn]. In truth this is not a change to MPS policy. The policy has always stated - and I am quoting now from policy - "When dealing with youths cycling on the footway, taking account of age and cycling behaviours, riders may be asked to dismount and push their cycle. In the interests of road safety, young persons should not be told to ride on the road".

Let me tell you how this came about. The Mayor did ask me about what would we do about young children riding bikes on pavements and I gave an immediate response that I do not want to see police officers pushing young children, at tender age, out on to the road. I think it is too dangerous and it would worry me to do that. However, I do want my officers to use discretion and if there is some tearaway who is cycling recklessly and endangering people, then I expect them to take action.

I do not expect us to start pushing young people out on to the road when, actually, by cycling on the pavement responsibly - whatever that means - we might start teaching young people how to engage on the roads, how to be better at it and how to develop some skills whilst minimising the danger. I am deeply concerned that we do not increase the danger on our roads because, despite the reductions in casualties in this city, there are still far too many and, certainly, far too many cyclists being killed on our roads.

I think it is about balance, Kirsten [Hearn]. I think you are absolutely right; we have got to be very careful that our officers just do not ignore people cycling on the pavements,

because pavements are for walking on and there are a whole bunch of people who could be intimidated. All this is about is common sense and making sure officers use their discretion. I certainly do not want to see young people being pushed on to the roads because I think that would be, frankly, reprehensible. We have got to make sure young people behave responsibly.

So that I why I have not done an impact assessment; because there is no change there.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Chair, I had an additional question which was a late question. Can I ask it now or do I wait until later?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Please go ahead. I do not have it in front of me but please.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Thank you very much. I do not know if you have seen this one actually, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. The Public Order Act 1986 makes it an offence to publish material that is likely to start racial hatred and this may include websites as well. There is a new website by the Treasury which asks for ideas about how to save money. This website contains (inaudible) suggestions which I fear may be illegal. They start hatred against particular communities like Somali people and many of the suggestions target particular groups. I am wondering what action will the MPS take to advise the Treasury on this website because, clearly, it could start racial hatred?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Again, thanks, Kirsten [Hearn]. We have been made aware of the website and I have been made aware of your question today. As you have outlined, there have been a small number of malicious posts on that website and the Treasury has now suspended this feature of that website to stop this happening further.

This is a bit adventurous again; I guess it is part and parcel of a much more dynamic world that we now occupy with websites and Facebook and all these things that are available that suddenly people under some sort of almost cloak of anonymity can post the most offensive things, whether they are legal or illegal. I know I made some comment in response to a reporter who asked me a question on some of the things that were said about the incident up in Northumbria and some people seemed to be supporting what seemed to me some most dreadful actions. It is part and parcel of modern day life. What we have got to do is make sure we work with people who are providing these websites to try to remove that opportunity as soon as possible. People cause such offence. My understanding is the Treasury has taken that aspect of the website down.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK. Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Valerie [Shawcross], I think you have a supplementary on the cycle question?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Can I just do a supplementary on the cycling question? I think anybody would support your desire for common sense but I think there is great danger in lack of clarity on policies and rules and regulations. When is a young child not a young child? I do not think anybody would complain about somebody having their five year old or six year old on the pavement for safety reasons. Of course you would think that is sensible. People need to know what the rules are and if you are a 13 year old, or a 14 year old or a 15 year old, you need to know whether or not that applies to you.

I think that drifting into a significant policy change about rights of pedestrians on the pavement, without actually having some clarity, could generate danger and confusion. It is not fair on people not to know what the rules of the pavement are, as well as the rules of the road. I think that would be my concern. Yes, we want to protect young children but, actually, I also feel that there are plenty of elderly people with osteoporosis and zimmer frames who are terrorised by people on bicycles on the pavements. Young people do not quite know what it feels like to be 70, 80 or 90. I do think we need a bit of clarity on this in the interests of everybody.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I hear your concern, Valerie [Shawcross], but we are not drifting in to any policy change because we have not made any policy change. It is about common sense and discretion. I hear what you say about 15 year olds. Of course it is the case that below the age of ten is below the age of criminal responsibility anyway, in terms of any prosecution. We have always advised officers to use their discretion within a common sense framework.

I am afraid it seems to me what you are asking for in this clarity might actually suggest - there are some 13 year olds, 14 year olds who are actually far more vulnerable than other 13 or 14 year olds. If we start to give some clear defined guidance that says, "If they are 13 or if they are 14 they should be prosecuted" then that would be, equally, frankly, silly. What we should be doing is giving the right principles and the right advice for officers to use their discretion. That is what we did in the previous policy and there is no change.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Is it not against natural justice for people not to know whether or not they are breaking the rules or not? If you are a young person on a pavement, you do not know what discretion that police officer is going to operate until they have operated it, so do you not need to know whether or not what you are doing is deemed to be reasonable by society or not?

I am more concerned that there is a slightly confusing message for people there anywhere and if it goes out through the media and it is even more confusing, you end up with a situation where more people think it is OK and acceptable to ride on the pavement than it actually is. I just think this needs a little bit clearer thinking. It seems to me to be dangerous to be so fuzzy about these things.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, we will have to disagree on this one. I do not think it is fuzzy at all. There has been no change in the policy. It has worked for some time and I expect officers to use discretion. When you say people

should have the right to know, of course, it still remains an offence - at the minor end - to cycle on the pavement. It is not my role to change the law. It has always been the role of police officers to use discretion in how they apply the law.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): So are you issuing some guidelines so that we can all see what the parameters of that discretion would be?

Jenny Jones (AM): Could I come in please?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Can I say, I have given the guidelines --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I am sorry but this is quite important to some people in my community to know.

James Cleverly (AM): (inaudible) as to whether the child is wearing short or long trousers!

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): With cycle training in schools children are told exactly how to behave on pavements and there is a cut off point of ten. I agree with the Commissioner here; it is not fuzzy at all, it is actually well documented. I saw a boy cycling on the pavement the other day and I said, "Get off on the road" and he said, "It's OK, I am under 10". Kids know.

You could be right that perhaps adults do not know. At some point it might be worth --

Tony Arbour (AM): Streetwise.

Dee Dooney (AM): Did you say it in that caring way, Jenny [Jones]?!

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Shall we move on to the next question?

Clive Lawton (AM): A nine year old cycling down the pavement like a maniac has a right to be expected to be stopped by a police officer and ticked off. I do think there is a distinction here, Sir Paul [Stephenson], between what you are saying about giving instructions to police officers and what Valerie [Shawcross] is seeking about clarity to the public. I think that is where the difficulty lies.

I do not think it is your role to tell the public necessarily what makes good sense or not in these matters, but I do think that there is something about children using the pavements in a play manner, as it were, and people using the pavements as commuter tracks at whatever age they are. There is something there which needs to be clarified but I do not think that is by the police service; I think that is by guidance given by - maybe the Mayor would like to say something useful on this?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Valerie [Brasse] I think is next. Valerie [Brasse], your question please?

Valerie Brasse (AM): Thank you. I want to talk about safeguarding vulnerable adults if I may. I know that the MPA introduced its Safeguarding Adults at Risk policy last year, yet at the last **SOP**(?) meeting we were told that for the whole of London and for 2009/10 there were something like 700 reported incidents of abuse, of which 490 were recorded as crimes. I have no idea what the sanction detection rate would be around any of that but, by any stretch of the imagination, that must be woeful under reporting.

So my question to you, Commissioner, is really who in the **Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT)**(?) is responsible for handling vulnerable adults and what are the performance and governance arrangements around this? I suppose really what I am getting at is are vulnerable adults on your radar and if you were to tell me what success looks like this time next year, what would you be saying to me? What do we hold you to account for?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The Deputy can answer that question.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Stand up, Tim [Godwin]!

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. To be fair, this came out of the tragedies of cases such as Pilkington in Leicestershire and made Territorial Policing review are our systems and processes in place to prevent events like that occurring? Hence we have the Safeguarding Adults at Risk policy that was developed by the MPS in June 2009.

The difficulty that we have here is that, unlike things like Every Child Matters, there is no legislative base for it in terms of information sharing etc. In reality, because it has been something that has flown below the radar up until the high profile cases, there is a lack of awareness around the citizens generally and ourselves.

The lead for it is Territorial Policing. Commander Steve Rodhouse, with his role as Crime and Neighbourhoods, is the one that is actually picking up the portfolio of responsibility for it. We have been working very closely with the Department of Health, using its policy of no secrets and, at the same time, setting out clear guidance against our own policies.

We do flag crimes that come forward in order to monitor those investigations and they are checked by the service delivery desks in the boroughs. Yes, it would appear to be an under reporting as a result. Information packs have been prepared to go to support groups, community centres and doctors surgeries which explains how to report by a third party as well.

We have approached the Association of Chief Police Officers and it is looking at one of the common crimes we perceive will probably be committed, that of financial crime and fraud, and we are asking it to come up with guidance to help us, working with the City

institutions and experts. Neighbourhood teams and respond teams are the ones that will need to identify as well and they have been given a toolkit to assist them. Early doors.

What does success look like? Far greater awareness and, additionally, avoiding tragedies where the potential for them to occur exists.

Valerie Brasse (AM): There is a whole other hidden care sector, for example, around the elderly which I suspect we are not tapping into at all. For me it is what role do the police take in moving some of that agenda and your concern, the fact that it is on your radar and that you will be asking Steve Rodhouse to make sure that he is reporting and that you are satisfied with what is coming forward? That is the bit that I want the assurance around.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Hopefully I have just given you that assurance that this is on our radar very firmly now. We now have policies. We are approaching our community groups that support vulnerable adults and, as a result of that, the awareness will be raised and the lessons actually learned. It is early doors and I think the journey will be one that we keep the conversation going.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Any other questions? No. Thank you. Dee [Doocey] is next?

Dee Doocey (AM): You want me to read it out?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Yes, please.

Dee Doocey (AM): Are you confident that your officers are aware of the law when it comes to members of the public taking photographs in a public place?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): I think Victoria's [Borwick] question is exactly the same so we will take the two together.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am very happy that Dee [Doocey] should just take the lead on that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It is a statement of fact and public record we did go through a period where there was a spate of these types of incidents. I admit I could not be confident, at that time, because they were happening and it was a matter, occasionally, of **moaning**(?) despair on what we were doing around it. The problem is of course getting all 33,000 plus police officers and all 4,000 plus PCSOs to exercise their judgement at 9am, then exercise with a degree more time and less conflict on occasions.

As a result of that, I think as you are aware, Dee [Doocey], we did issue very clear guidelines to officers. Did an awful lot there. The guidelines were issued by John Yates [Assistant Commissioner and Head of Specialist Operations, Metropolitan Police Service] because that was when we were doing the Section 44 and reining back. I think

we reduced Section 44s - stop and searches - by about 75%. Obviously, now, reined back a lot more since the Home Secretary's statement.

We said at the time to everyone - and we did a huge amount to get this message out because it was causing such a disproportionate amount of loss of reputation for us - that there is no restriction on people taking photographs in public places or any other building, other than in very exceptional circumstances. I think I made the public comment, here and in various other places, people come to London to photograph it, so it is crazy not to do that. There is no prohibition on photographing front line uniform staff and the act of taking a photograph itself is not, usually, sufficient to carry out a stop. We promulgated those guidelines but I cannot guarantee you that those guidelines will be interpreted in the way that I or you or anybody else would want them to be on every occasion, amongst all 37,000 plus uniformed officers.

I am aware of the recent incident on this that is reported; Armed Forces Day in Romford. We do keep reiterating these instructions and we do try to get that level of discretion used correctly, but sometimes the level of discretion is not always right. I know, in that incident, whilst we have not received any official complaint at this time, the officers have received words of advice.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK. I suppose that is one of the things that worries me a bit; the officers have received words of advice. I do not know if you have actually listened to the recording but it is eight minutes of two of your officers intimidating somebody and at one stage they say that they do not need a law to stop them photographing, but much more worrying, that they do not need a law to take them away. In my view it is so serious that I do not think it should be somebody giving them words of advice.

I do not, also, agree with you that it is a question of officers using their discretion. This was very black and white. Two of your officers who, despite the fact that I know you have given the guidelines because I have got a copy of it, totally disregarded it and were either so completely ignorant of the law or decided to ignore the law and they were just going to try to say that they knew the law better than the person they were talking to and they were very seriously intimidating. I find that quite worrying that I do not think you are taking that quite as seriously as I think you should be.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think you are being a little unfair about what I have just said, Dee [Doocey], because I made my comments about discretion in answer to your general question, "Am I confident generally?" and I said, obviously, we are trying to give people the guidelines to use their discretion. I am not, in any way, suggesting that they used their discretion appropriately on this occasion.

I take your comments about what you feel about this incident and I will review it.

Dee Doocey (AM): My comments are basically about the idea 'words of advice' because when we have done some of the scrutinies we are told that when officers did not have

their numerals on, no disciplinary action would be taken. I just see this as part of an ongoing problem.

On the wider front a friend of mine is a very keen amateur photographer and he tells me that most of the bulletin boards are just full of - not incidents of anything like as serious as this - officers basically stopping and generally just not seeming to understand the law. I just wonder if you would look again at this. I do not know how you communicate with officers, or how John Yates does, but, clearly, whatever communication there was has not actually got through to quite a lot of people. I think you just need to review it.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am very happy to review it. I do not think it is the case that clearly it has not got through. I am quite happy if you ask your friend to come and speak to us and we will look at what he has got. I yet do not know what he has got, what officers he is talking about and what part of the city. I am not entirely sure I accept it clearly has not got through but I am quite happy to review it.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK. Fine. And the next question?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Your next question, Dee [Doocey], yes please.

Dee Doocey (AM): The next question is in your speech to the Police Federation you talked about the devastating impact that organised crime has on the economy and the problems that you have in tackling this problem. I think it is regrettable that we need to read about this in the press. Do you not think that it is an important issue which would have been appropriate to discuss with Members of the MPA at the Full Authority?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly it was an honour to be asked to give the 2010 John Harris Memorial Lecture and I do think it was an opportunity for the Commissioner to make a contribution to a national debate around policing. It is a national debate. I think it was my professional responsibility to accept that invitation. I am also grateful for the very significant positive feedback I have had.

There should not be a surprise around this because we do discuss, around this Authority, many issues of serious organised crime, as a regular part of business. We have discussed it at (inaudible). People trafficking. I remember significant debates. All these issues that we, in the MPS, are trying to grapple with.

Of course I was making a speech about a national issue and I was making a speech that nationally I do not think the police service, or the Association of Police Authorities or successive governments, have made sufficient progress since I made comments on this back in 2003 and made recommendations there. Those recommendations and those comments should come as no surprise to this Police Authority because I know I included it in my application to get this job and my Deputy Commissioner's job and I know they were discussed - the recommendations and the comments I made - on those interviews. I have discussed those things with this Authority in getting the jobs.

The totality of organised crime, individual elements we regularly discuss here because it is part and parcel to your business of monitoring performance. The speech was about a national matter about nationally the police service has not done what it should do.

I also answered one of the questions - I think the following day on the radio - of saying, whilst I am not complacent about London, London is in a different position because we are of the size and capacity and capability that I was suggesting back in 2003 should be effective in the rest of the country, so that we do have a capability to do something about this very serious challenge.

I do not think I did anything improper. I think I did what was my professional responsibility; gave a lecture about something that is very much in the public domain and has been something this Authority knows I have had an interest in for many years.

Dee Doocey (AM): I did not mean to make you so defensive. I did not think for a second --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I was not being defensive; I was giving you the answer, Dee [Doocey].

Dee Doocey (AM): It sounded defensive. Sorry. I certainly was not suggesting you had done anything improper. I was absolutely fascinated by the article. I thought it was very good. But, to me, it raised issues that I was not aware of. I was aware of bits and bobs but I think, unless one were to sit on every single committee of the MPA, it is sometimes difficult to get an in the round view. I was just suggesting that, in future when you do your reports to this Authority, if something that has real substance like that, that you feel strongly about - and I thought was excellent and very, very informative - it might be helpful for you to include that?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think it would be had it been relevant for me to do so, Dee [Doocey]. I do not think it was relevant because I was talking about a national issue that applied more nationally than it did in London.

Dee Doocey (AM): That is your view. My view is it was very relevant. We will agree to differ. Not for the first time, Commissioner!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We will have to agree to differ. We shall do that.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Valerie [Shawcross], on that point, yes?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): It was on the previous question, Chair, if I may, just quickly? This point about taking photographs and the public. Did the guidance that was issued, or the words of advice that were given, Commissioner, apply also to television (TV) companies? I think we are all aware that reputable TV organisations have had severe difficulties as well on occasions.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We gave the guidance - and we actually gave guidance coming out of G20 as well - about what we should be doing and what we should not be doing with accredited journalists. Again, I am happy to pick it up outside.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): So TV cameras are covered by the guidance that you have given?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Any cameras. Absolutely any cameras.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): That is fine.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We should not be stopping legitimate activity and it is the case we have done.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I agree. Absolutely. No, that is fine. I was just asking.

Just about congruence of advice because, of course, in London you can be stopped by three different types of police officers. I have seen it happen with the British Transport Police (BTP) whom I know you are not responsible for at all. Would you be sharing that advice with the BTP and the City Corporation so that people get treated the same wherever they are?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We cannot guarantee people are treated the same but you are absolutely right. When John [Yates] gave that advice he actually gave that advice nationally as well because he was leading for, what is called, ACPO (inaudible) and allied matters, and this matter fell under that at the time.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you.

Toby Harris (AM): Specific issues about (inaudible) on the Tube of course.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Question from Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes. What criteria does the MPS use when deciding whether or not to support calls for an inquest?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The decision of whether or not to open an inquest, as you know, rests with the coroner. We take individual cases on their merits. Therefore, we do not have criteria; it is a judgement against the individual cases.

We have got to remember what the purpose of an inquest is. I do not wish to lecture you but it is just useful to remind ourselves. The purpose of an inquest is to establish the identity of the deceased person, when and where they died and how they came to their death. Where there have been criminal prosecutions and these questions have been answered coroners can determine - can determine - that an inquest hearing is not

required. Alternatively they can take a wider public interest perspective of how they came by their deaths and a coroner might exercise discretion and hold an inquest. That is a matter for the coroner.

At a pre-inquest hearing at the North London Coroners' Court on Wednesday, 25 April 2010 the relevant coroner we are talking about here invited properly interested persons to give their views on a number of issues, including whether there should be an inquest or not. We responded to that invite and the MPS, along with a number of other agencies, made submissions questioning whether there was sufficient cause, given the extensive investigations and the extensive inquiries and public inquiries.

So we responded to an invite. It is entirely a matter for the coroner. We did it completely openly. It is not within the power - indeed, we would not suggest that we should act in any way improperly - of trying to stop an inquest. In responding to the invite we were just saying there have been very significant investigation, a lot of public inquiries into this matter, a lot of discovery, a lot of learning and a lot of action taken by a lot of agencies. We are just questioning will that inquest serve a purpose of adding to that and, then, that is a matter for the coroner.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I think it is rather disingenuous to say there has already been a huge scrutiny and public examination. Let us face it; most of it has been done in private. This is regarding the tragic case of Baby Peter which the SOP Committee, particularly, has taken a huge interest in. Even our discussions at SOP have been limited because, for example, the HMIC report was totally confidential and we were not allowed to discuss issues from that in public. In fact it was rather difficult to even get a copy of that report. I think, through Catherine [Crawford] in the end I was able to take away a copy, rather than have to sit in a room and read it over at the Police Authority.

I think it is wrong that you are suggesting that there has already been a public examination. More and more is coming out on this case from all agencies. I would have thought the MPS would want to support having this public inquest so that we can actually see, in public, what has gone wrong and how Baby Peter actually came to his tragic death, and to get the full story and facts out in the open so that there can be learning across all the agencies in the future. I am surprised.

Did you actually, personally, make that decision; that the MPS would not support this, or was it taken at a different level and would you, maybe, review it now?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly there is no suggestion, certainly not by us, that we wish to avoid public scrutiny on this because, actually, we have had significant public scrutiny, not least in this Authority, which is its role.

The issues you raise are considerations that the coroner will make as to whether he should hold an inquest or not. I think it is legitimate for us to respond to an invite and make a balanced response.

Did I make that decision? No, but I take responsibility for it.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I just wondered whether you might want to reconsider the MPS's position, given the serious concerns expressed in the press and by many commentators? Given I am expressing, certainly, as a Member of this Authority, my concern about the decision, whether you might reconsider it?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am very confident the coroner is in a position that the coroner can make his decision and no doubt will consider anything that you or this Authority wants to submit.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I also put a similar question asking you to comment and you have covered some of the issues that I raised. I was quite perturbed by the way this had been reported in the press and on television reports. If I can just quote one crime correspondent that stated that the MPS had written to the North London coroner saying, "There is little public interest in holding the inquest" which struck me as a rather strong thing for the MPS to be saying, that there is little public interest, when, quite clearly, there has been a great deal of public interest. I would like to ask you is that actually the terms of the words that we used in the letter that was sent?

I am also struck by Deborah Coles of the organisation INQUEST who says that the preventative role of an inquest is an important function. We know there are failings but we cannot look at them in a joined up way.

I am aware that two reports are due to be published, I believe, this week into this so we will see a lot more information in the public domain. We heard last week that Great Ormond Street has just released documents on a TV news bulletin. Looking at this last week we were informed that there was a 15 year old girl in the property at the time and that fact has not become public as well. There do seem to be issues that have not yet come into the public domain.

My concern is that if the MPS is saying there is little public interest, I would like to just have your view on that and what exactly has the MPS said to the coroner?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think all the matters that you say have come to light are matters that the coroner can, and will undoubtedly, take account of when coming to his decision.

All the MPS did - and I cannot guarantee the way in which the media report things, as you well know - is respond to an invite, quite openly. We are not lobbying. We are not trying to persuade. We responded to an invite and, based on the information to us at that time, that seemed, on balance, the right judgement.

Use of the word public interest. I think sometimes we do get into legalese. I think that should be properly interpreted now. What we are simply saying is, "From our perspective, from what we can see, would this add to the body of knowledge?" Now it is a matter for the coroner to decide if it would add to the body of knowledge. If he does, of course, we will fully cooperate and service the coroner as we would in anything else. In responding to an invite I do not think that was fully brought out in the press coverage.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Thank you. Your next question, Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): My next question is on budget cuts. I have asked you to update us with regards to any discussion the MPS has had with the Government in respect of budget cuts. What is the scale of the cuts looking like, are there any specific grants likely to be cut and what representations are you making to Government?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): As this is on finance, can I suggest we take Steve's [O'Connell] question at the same time which is on the cost of policing public order events, as well as Jenny's [Jones] which is on the reduction of overtime?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I have some supplementaries to mine before we move on to the others? Is that OK?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): OK.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Otherwise we will get lost. Thank you.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We have covered some of this already, Joanne [McCartney]. I do think that the debate we had earlier on on the petition, between Ken [Livingstone] and yourselves, is a forerunner to a number of important debates that this Authority and the MPS are going to have to have.

It is stating the blindingly obvious. I would be a very foolish Commissioner if I were not very concerned about what is facing us. The one thing I will say we will not do is shroud waving. We have not done any shroud waving, including John Yates did not engage in any shroud waving, despite what was said. He spoke to a private audience and took some effort to actually remove all media from that audience. I think the reporting of his comments - calling shroud waving - was very unfortunate. We are not going to do it. There is no point in shroud waving. We know we are in a real problem here. We certainly know that, whatever the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review, this is not good news for us. I have said before I am very clear that the MPS will shrink as a result of this.

I have already said - and I will repeat again - we are doing everything we can to maintain operational capability across that broad range of policing services, which is very much about safer neighbourhood policing and the benefits we get for it, but is also about the

things this Authority holds dear to itself. Things such as people trafficking, child protection, murder and Trident. That balance of policing is going to be the very difficult debate we are going to have.

We are determined to deliver efficient, effective support services so we are taking the approach of looking at systems, processes, procedures, procurement and property. Those things that have been difficult decisions in the past that maybe we have not made, either in the MPS or within this Authority, that have been very difficult, we are now going to have to reconsider because we know this really is a case, if it is as bad as it is looking, of making very clear decisions of do we want the police out there or do we want them in here? Do we want them doing paperwork or do we want them delivering operational service to London? I think there are a number of things we have discussed in the past and perhaps made the right decision for the right time we are now going to have revisit.

We are absolutely determined to make better use of our operational assets. We need to do much more. Things such as single patrol are very much about making better use of what we have got out there. Actually increasing our visibility on the street by using the same number of officers much more smartly. So that is the process we are going through.

I have already said I think we will shrink and I have already said it is very uncertain as to what the final ask is going to be. At the risk of repeating myself, that will depend on the Home Office success in its submission to Treasury on the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR). It will then depend on how the Home Office decides its share of the budget cuts are shared between policing and non-policing service in the Home Office. It will then come to what is the share between police forces?

Then, in addition to that, there are the specific grants. In answer to that part of your question we do not know what the issue is going to be around specific grants. We do not yet know about those cuts. That adds to the complexity. The other complex part for us is we get significant amounts from the taxpayers of London in terms of the rates. Then, of course, there is TfL, local authorities and the various people that we sell policing services to, which increases the number of uniformed officers on the street.

We are a long way off knowing the final figure, but it is not good. We are working, at this moment - and I think it is responsible they do so - on the likelihood of a 25% reduction in central government grant. That is what we are working our figures on because, by the time we get the real knowledge around this, it is going to be too late to do all the various options around it.

If we work on a 25% reduction in general government grant - and that is outwith all those other considerations - in 2011/12 that will lead to a budget gap of £160.2 million. This is cash. This is not about efficiency savings. This is straight cash. I am just checking I am reading from the right figures here, Anne [McMeel]. Yes? 2012/13 rising to £287.4 million. 2013/14 £444.2 million. 2014/15 £580.9 million. These are not inconsiderable figures. Now I believe we can make further reductions. We can save money. 25%, if it pans out at that, when 80%, or something like that, of our entire budget

is pay line, you have got to come to a very obvious conclusion there, no matter how successful we are at streamlining processes.

I have said we will not engage in shroud waving and we will not. As you would expect I have had a number of discussions with officials and ministers to make sure I get as much clarity as we can around what is likely to happen, and you have got the amount of clarity that I have now. Make sure they understand what are the constraints on us.

Actually I think Toby [Harris] was referring to something before. We have some very real difficulties here. Firstly, there is a very limited ability to reduce numbers of police officers anyway. Wastage we know has slowed right down, and why wouldn't it, in terms of the economy outside policing. I think it is just over 3% at this moment in time. So the sort of figures we are talking about here, wastage would not cut it.

We have had a difficulty recently regarding the **Public and Commercial Services Union (PCS)**(?) and the Government being in dispute in the Appeal Courts over voluntary or other redundancy factors. So there are a lot of things to play in here that even if we find the schemes to make these reductions - and we will, and we are well on the way for next year and we have already given the papers to the Police Authority on that and now we are into the discussion of what is the right and wrong way forward on it.

Even if we cannot on the figures, what are the mechanisms and changes that need to take place at Government level. What are the rules and regulations that give us, and this Authority, more ability to actually deal with our financial future? Is it right that certain parts of our general grant budget are still ring fenced? The worst thing you can do to a body, when they are actually in such a difficult position to have to make difficult decisions, is ring fence part of the budget which reduces the opportunity of this Authority to make those decisions. There are a lot of things we are saying to central government, "These are the things that you need to consider if this Authority and the MPS are going to be able to make the best of what is a very uncomfortable position".

Those are the figures we have got at this moment in time and we have had very significant discussions but we await, eagerly, more information from the Comprehensive Spending Review.

Of course, yes, I do lobby on this because I think London is different and it is not shroud waving to talk about the Olympics. It is the biggest operational challenge. It is the biggest event on the globe. There are separate discussions that Dee [Doocey] is aware of around budgets and how we afford that. We already know that, even on the current budget into the Olympics, there will be an effect on business as usual. We are working very hard, with the relevant Police Authority Committee here, to minimise that effect. Any reduction in policing increases the percentage effect on what is left to police London. We are very concerned about this. It is my expectation that, in addition to what I am doing - and I am sure this is happening - that this Authority, the Chair of this Authority and the Mayor of London will be working very hard to make the special case for London and policing in London to ensure that whatever is our share - and I accept we

have to have a significant share of this because we understand we live in the real world. We are working very hard to get an acceptable settlement for London.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I quoted earlier on Sir Denis O'Connor with the HMIC report and that his view is that police chiefs will, at best, be able to reduce spending by 12% before they have to start cutting into front line officer numbers. It may be shroud waving but he does say that it is a stark choice between cuts to neighbourhood policing or specialist services. The balance is between child protection, vulnerable adults, counter terrorism and safer neighbourhoods. Is that 12% that you can cut without front line services one that you think applies to the MPS?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Right. Firstly I support much of what Denis [O'Connor] has said in that report. This is very challenging. Just a point on that report; I am really concerned that the whole debate around that report is very much about visibility. That is hugely important. As you know, presence is one of the five Ps and we have increased the amount of foot patrol and cover by doing certain things in London. I am passionate about uniformed governance of the street. Visibility is not the only thing that happens in policing. It is not the only thing that this Committee discusses. This Committee discusses, more often than not, protective services. All those things that are not visible. So I am concerned the debate is settling around just visible policing and the balanced policing model is much wider than that. That does concern me.

Do I think we can do the 12.5%? It is not the best negotiating tactic to say publicly to the people who are going to give a settlement what we think we can do or not, but I am not trying to be difficult there. I think we can --

Joanne McCartney (AM): I just want to know whether that picture was reflective of the MPS as opposed to a nationwide picture.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will not commit myself to a percentage, Joanne [McCartney], but I think we can make significant further savings here in London and in the MPS, providing we free up some of the rules and regulations and processes that allow us to do it. I think we can streamline some of our activities. We can streamline more processes. We can do things around procurement. We can do things around vehicle fleet. We can take difficult decisions around catering and various other things that will reduce the budget.

I still come back to the fact, if we are talking in the order of 25% - and that is the if and that is why I yet do not know because the specific grants might make a difference and what happens elsewhere might make a difference. If we are, then anybody can do the maths, and the maths is 80%, or something like that, goes on payroll and the rest is what we are talking about before we get to payroll. Can we make reductions? Yes. Will I commit myself to 12.5%? No, I think that would be unwise. I think the reductions we can make are significant, but not of the order of 25% without the MPS shrinking.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I want to make a plea for what Dee [Doocey] said earlier about being involved early on in this Authority about where you are thinking of making cuts. I think it is fine saying the Business Management Group (BMG) has been given some idea, but I think the rest of us would like early warning of what is happening.

I want to pick up one point you said earlier about youth crime going up and gangs. You said that you are using your spare asset at the moment to deal with that. In the future you are going to have very little spare asset so I want to know, as you go through the process, you are looking at the nice to do things you would do if you had got time and assets in the round, because they are, as I see it, now part of your mainstream policing function, as opposed to just something that you use spare asset on?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If I used the phrase spare asset I regret it. There is not a lot of spare asset around actually and you are quite right to mention that. What we are talking about is removing the ability to make different decisions. I think we can free up people and I think my job is to do everything I can to maintain operational capability. We are determined to do that. I have not yet given up on it, but the ask at 25% is very, very significant.

Tim [Godwin] wants to add something.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): One of the other pieces around this - and it is a very challenging piece - but youth violence/youth homicide is one of our core priorities so we have got a lot of asset against it. It does give us an opportunity now to challenge, once again, things like our crime recording standing requirements and the bureaucracies that have been imposed upon us that we are asking to be shifted. We want some low level crimes being removed from the notifiable offences list. That is 1.2 million crimes a year across England and Wales etc. Equally, changes in the way the Criminal Justice System operates.

Those are the things that will actually, hopefully, mitigate some of the losses that will come because, at the point of actually taking those cuts, we do have to change the processes, and a lot of those processes we do not own so we have to go to the owners of those processes to change them. This does give us an opportunity to clear some of that baggage that we have saddled round us.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If I can add to that? It would be foolish to think that this is all good news but, actually, the difficult financial position we find ourselves in will make, not just us, but gives us the ability to revisit some of the things we have been saying to Government for some considerable time. We have been discussing with Government for some considerable time the need to change the way in which we record crime so that we ensure that we invest the maximum amount of our capability investigating it, and reduce the amount of time we spend administering it. The current system actually does not do that.

Now we have been unsuccessful in influencing that. I am rather hoping we will be more successful in the future because people now realise decisions have to be made.

I have just been reminded by Anne [McMeel] - I think it is important - that the figures I have given in terms of the reductions year on year, the figures quoted, are before we deal with specific and other income streams. So, in other words, that will add to the ask so that is just on the basis of an assumed 25% general grant from Government.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. I am taking from this that there is a real concern about operational capability, if we go to the 45%.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, there is one other thing. Sorry to be rude, Chair. It is something that, actually, Toby [Harris] raised when we did speak to the Police Authority Business Group. Of course we have shared all our papers with the Police Authority on that and it is a matter for the Police Authority how it engages with the business group and how it engages with the wider membership.

We are engaging a lot of potential change here and we have got to do that to actually cope with what we are facing. There is also an issue of how much change can you cope with and, particularly, how much change can you cope with when what we want to do is have a stable platform for at least 12 months out, leading into the Olympics? The one thing you never want to do, operationally, is go into one of the biggest operational challenges you can ever have, with a very unstable organisation and unstable platform. That is a particular challenge for London and might be part and parcel of the discussion that I expect the Mayor, the Chair of the Authority and this Authority to have with Government as to how it looks for London over the four year period.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Jennette [Arnold], a supplementary on this point?

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is a supplementary on this point and I think it is something that Sir Paul [Stephenson] has just touched on in the note that Anne [McMeel] passed over. I would just ask for us to get in front of that piece of work as soon as possible. By that I mean so much of the protective services at local level are linked with partnership funding. Those organisations are already working on their 25% reductions. I am just a little bit twitched that we are spending a lot of time, quite rightly - and I am sure the Chair of Finance is on top of this but I just wanted to bring this into the open debate we are having.

If we just focus on the grant then we are going to feel the sting at the local level because it is when it will be reported in the local papers when we have these huge gaps and when we have no support services that are working with young people because they are being withdrawn because they were commissioned by local authorities and their funding has been cut that we will feel the real pinch of this.

So I am seeking assurance that, as soon as possible, we will stop talking just about the central grant and that we will get a sense of where we are in terms of loss of revenue from partnership funding and from specific funding.

One of the partnerships that I sit on for the MPA has just commissioned this mapping last week. I do not know if any of the other partnerships have done that. The other question is is there is a conversation going on with local government and the head of the strategic partnerships so that the mapping exercise can be done so that everybody can see the total extent of the impact on the service at a local level?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): As it happens I am seeing the chief executives this afternoon to have those conversations. We have been having those conversations with them but getting them all together this afternoon to say, “What is it looking like for you?”

When we say we are concentrating on the general grant, that is because that is the only public pronouncement we have got. We are working hard to try to model and extrapolate what might happen but we really are without any clarity at this moment in time, even on the general grant let alone the specific grants. Trying to get an idea of what other partners’ positions are going to be for two reasons. One, because we need to do that because they actually pay us money and buy services. That is the first thing. We do need to concentrate first on what are we going to do within this Authority and the MPS but, two, you are absolutely right, some of the successes we have had in recent years have been because of partnership and things that other people are doing. If they withdraw some of those services we are not going to be in a position to move in and do it.

In the past the police service and the MPS - whatever else our failings - we are kind of can do and we move into a gap in the market and do things when sometimes other agencies are not doing it. We are not going to be in a position to do that anymore, so that, in itself, will add to the impact for London, if not the impact on our budget. If some of those things that other people currently fund stop being funded that add value to the overall crime reduction and social responsibility and safety picture here in London, then that adds to that very turbulent and difficult picture that we all face.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can I just come back and say that the situation is that it is those - whether you want to call it 10 or 14 - challenging boroughs that that is more critical in? It is not widespread across London because every partnership has their own funding programmes and stuff like that. It is those critical - we used to call them inner London boroughs but, of course they are not, because they go to Zone 6 if necessary with the boundaries. It is so important for those X number of challenging boroughs that we are on the front foot in terms of the partnership funding that we may be losing and the direct impact on those boroughs of those services will be felt immediately.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I share the concern. We have two central issues for the discussion with chief executives this afternoon. One, are you going to carry on giving us the money?! Two, what is the impact on you and what parts those impacts

will actually have (inaudible) on what is our main mission in life and that is to make London safer?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Three more Members with supplementary questions. I am aware of the time. Can I just ask you to be brief please? Valerie [Brasse], next?

Valerie Brasse (AM): I was just thinking about the opportunities that come from working in partnership, not now at the borough level but thinking about how we reshape processes, almost a structural reengineering of what we do. If you have the opportunity to talk through, for example, with criminal justice partners, the end to end processing that Tim [Godwin] and I have had a conversation - **there is an issue that seem(?)** possible to be able to shake things up in such a way that we do not necessarily take as much pain as we might otherwise have thought, as long as we can do this alongside our partners and reshape some of that.

It just struck me that if we have those conversations and you can share some of those ideas more broadly with MPA Members, that the MPA has a role in helping drive some of this forward, and I would like to encourage that debate to happen.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I hear that. We have been making the point that the real savings are, more often, in end to end cross agency as opposed to individual agencies. It is when you get the various agencies working together, within a system, that you can then unleash real power, real creativity and real opportunity. I have to say --

Valerie Brasse (AM): So my plea is that we get more of that discussion through the (inaudible).

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Happily we will do that. In particular the stuff that Tim [Godwin] has been leading on in trying to drive change in the criminal justice is significant. We hope we will win the battle. If you want to bring more of that here and we can get more help; delighted.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): I was just picking up on the Commissioner's response to Jennette's [Arnold] question which I wholeheartedly agree with and I am pleased that you are doing the mapping and talking to the local authorities. It prompted me to think of the partners whom we should be talking about beyond just our statutory partners such as the local authority. I had in mind in particular the support that we know we get from the Football Association and football clubs around important, key, successful initiatives such as the Kickz programme which, all too often, we talk about the problems that exist in relation to gun crime and, in particular, knife crime, but somehow it is so difficult for us to be able to capture, as bad as the position is, my gosh what would it be like without the key work that the MPS does and our partners do as well? So it is about trying to extend that discussion that you are having with partners beyond just the statutory.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Cindy [Butts], I absolutely take that point. As bad as the position is, actually, comparative to many major cities in the world, we are still pretty successful, but it is not good enough. It is a hugely important point. We are having those discussions but we need to make sure we try to cover them off. We do not talk about the successes enough. I am as guilty of that as well as other people. We have mentioned Kickz. When you look at what Kickz does in taking kids off the street it is just breathtakingly good. That is the sort of thing that we do need to protect. On Kickz, whether the World Cup campaign has any effect on that, I do not know. Certainly that sort of thing we do need to do. I take the point.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Val [Shawcross]?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I would have thought, surely, part of the case for a relative protection of the MPS is that, as a service covering a city of 7.5 million people, we have already got great economies of scale. I am not saying that there is not more to be saved because I can see some of it but, in terms of big institutional administrative savings, do you not think the case is really about regionalising some of these smaller squiddly services elsewhere in the country? I think I would say that I regret very much the previous Government backed off regionalising both the police and the fire service and I hope that that is one of the things that ought to be taken into account.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Commissioner, be brave!

Valerie Shawcross (AM): The economies of scale are already here in a city of this size, but one sees some very small services which must have a great deal of difficulty funding specialist services.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Now you are trying to tempt me out. Toby [Harris] tried to tempt me out on this only the other night --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): But it is true and obvious and it is time that that case was made.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): What you might not know, back in 1993, I made the recommendations to amalgamate police forces across the country. I believed then the reason for it was to better enable them to deal with serious organised crime, but I do think there are some economies of scale. That is the debate that went and it failed. That may well still be my position but I have got to recognise the real policy. It is for you to do the politics. I do not do it. That was not the direction of travel of the last Government, once it failed --

Valerie Shawcross (AM): And I regret that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): It does not appear to be the direction of travel of the current Government. If that is the case I am not going to do gun boat

diplomacy around this. I just need to know what is the direction of travel and then make recommendations which (inaudible) lecture about, within those constraints, what is the best thing we can do to build organised crime capability?

There is an issue. Firstly, I would take out the rather small and beautiful other parts of London because even when I made the recommendation for the amalgamation of police forces round the rest of the country, I never ever imagined that we needed to do anything around the MPS, the City or BTP. I never did. I was always quite explicit about that. The reason being there might be an answer in London from BTP but there is no answer outside London. I have to tell you, if I was the Chief Constable of Lancashire still - grateful to be here - and someone offered me the limited asset that BTP would be running across my territory with the risk, I would be saying, "Thanks, but no thanks". That would be an unacceptable transfer of risk. So there is not an answer on BTP. I happen to think what BTP has been doing in recent years is very good. The City of London is a niche organisation and doing quite a good job.

The one thing I would give you some reassurance on; the level of cross working between ourselves and the other two major forces in London is exceptionally good, and the collaboration. If we had got that right the way across the country that would be superb. I still would turn round and say that there is a danger that some people might see the argument - and I think there was a retired Chief Constable making this argument on Radio 4 and irritating me only the other day - that actually it is easier to make savings in big organisations than little organisations. It is a statement of the blindingly obvious; there are more economies of scale.

It would be, of course, wholly unacceptable for London ratepayers to pick up the price of whichever government's failure to not put in place what would be a sustainable police service structure across the country in the light of future funding.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Toby [Harris]?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): That is as brave as I am going to be on it!

Toby Harris (AM): I am tempted to ask you whether you agree with your predecessor who, when asked what he would do if he was put in charge of the City of London police, said he would put a Sergeant in charge of them!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Don't ask me, Toby [Harris]!

Toby Harris (AM): My question actually related to the decision which has been announced while we have been sitting here about the Tomlinson case and the decision of the Crown Prosecution Service not to proceed with prosecution. What I think would be helpful, for the record, is if you just stated what learning you feel that the service has so

far gained from what happened at G20 demonstrations and the things that you have put in place. I think it would just be helpful for the record today.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Before you answer that though, can I just say we have got three more questions to go, we have got about five or ten minutes to go in terms of timing, we have the Race and Faith Inquiry report as well as another paper. I am in your hands. We are looking at probably 12.30pm before we finish here. On this matter of Tomlinson the Commissioner will speak for himself but I think we need to be very careful. Although the CPS has made its decision, there are issues of discipline and misconduct proceedings, or the possibility of those, and I think it would be wrong for us to make any comments because that could be construed as an abuse of process later on. Commissioner, do you want to say anything else?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If that is the decision coming through, on the basis of that, I am happy to make a very brief statement - taking your lead on caution on this - and then, quickly, go directly to your question, Toby [Harris], around what have we learnt.

Ian Tomlinson's death was a very tragic event. Of course we all regret it and our sympathies remain with the family. I said at the time - and I am happy to repeat now - that I was concerned at some of the video footage - or whatever word to describe it - and I believed then, and I continue to believe, it was right that that was independently and robustly investigated and that we would cooperate fully with that investigation, and we have. That was a matter for the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). It is then right and proper that the IPCC referred the matter to the Director of Public Prosecutions. It has done and it is a matter for the Director of Public Prosecutions to make judgements on these matters, not for me. I think it would be entirely inappropriate for me to comment any further on that decision, particularly as there is now the issue of what the coroner - we have just had a discussion around coroners - decides to do and the process of the coroner's inquest into this matter.

I am not prepared to comment further other than it is a matter for the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). You are telling me that is the judgement that has just come out. I do not have any device with me at this moment in time around that. I note the judgement. There is, presumably, a coroner's inquest to come.

If I come on to the learning, Toby [Harris], as you recall, I commissioned Her Majesty's Inspectorate's (HMI) report into these matters and I think that was heavily discussed around here. There has been very real learning. It was not without real pain, if you recall, in this Chamber. A lot of learning about communication, about the whole issue about making sure we properly document the considerations around human rights and the various things around peaceful protests and proper lawful protest. The stuff that Victoria's [Borwick] Committee had led on in terms of civil rights. I think there has been a huge amount coming out of that. The vast majority of all those recommendations - I cannot remember the precise number now - have been accepted and have either been

implemented or we are on with. There has been a great deal of learning coming out of that process.

I still go back and say it was a tragic event and we all have got to regret the loss of a life there and my sympathies go out to the family.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Right. We have got three more questions. Very quickly. Steve's [O'Connell] question is on public order costs. Do you want to briefly read your question, or are you happy for the Commissioner to answer?

Steve O'Connell (AM): If I can quickly, through you, Chair, make a process point because I think it is a little bit to be regretted if you run out of time for the people who are good enough to submit questions at the beginning, because there are so many supplementaries afterwards and we need to make sure that there is time, within our scope, that all questions get answered, particularly those that did go to the trouble of submitting them already. Jenny [Jones] had one and she is not around and that sort of stuff.

My question is particularly around the point that one of the considerable contributory factors of going over budget was the higher policing costs of protests last year and I would like to explore what the service is doing around improvements to reduce the costs? I have got one or two supplementary points but I will listen to Paul's [Stephenson] comments first if I may.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We have done an awful lot to reduce the costs and the way to start off by reducing the costs is reducing the actual call on police officers to attend events in central London. The figure I have been given is there has been a 34% reduction in officers providing central aid on the rolling 12 month figure to May 2010, compared to four years ago. So that is a very significant reduction.

If you remember - some were not here - going back a number of years, to when I certainly was not Commissioner, and the previous people around the Management Board table, there was a concerted effort then. In one year I think we reduced the amount of aid by - I am trying to recall a figure - 12%. (inaudible) was doing something around that.

34% is a considerable reduction but, of course, London is a hugely popular place for demonstrations and it is part and parcel of what we do down here. So we will continue to look at reducing the amount of aid necessary, through the professionalisation of training, use of special constabularies, and saying to event organisers to pay for their own stewarding, to get tougher around that. I know there has been extensive discussion in your Committee, Steve [O'Connell] around finances, particularly on football, and I know it is something that your Committee is progressing.

It is in several parts. It is about reducing the amount of aid we call in by professionalizing our service, better risk management and ensuring that we only call in what we absolutely need, although that, in itself, can be tricky on occasions; if we get it wrong and we are caught short that can lead to serious consequences.

There are three issues. The second issue is how do we get event organisers to be responsible in the way they run those events, to reduce the need for our aid. The third issue is, where appropriate, within the policies that this Authority sets, how do we recover costs?

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you. The theme of this morning is around savings and choices around savings. You detailed earlier some piece of work that the MPS does that we really should see as a priority. I think, really, we need to be thinking the unthinkable - and Jenny [Jones] is not here today - and my question is partly linked to her last question which is around overtime - because there is a strong feeling around some Members that there is too much overtime and we should cut it to balance the budget. A little bit of an intellectually lazy argument but I can see the point.

Should we not be considering whether, actually, we could continue offering the service to police these demonstrations? Should we not have a situation where we get to the stage, which local authorities are having to do - where, if the funding is not there to provide the service, we should be having a conversation with some of the organisers saying, "You cannot have your event because we do not have the resources to fund it". If you ask residents out there about their priorities in this time of difficult challenges, they would have priorities around youth violence, safety, trafficking and a whole range of measures. In the new era of political responsibility and responsibility to our residents and voters, would policing demonstrations be up the top of their priorities? I pose that question.

The point I am making here is, in the new era of very difficult financial choices, are we able to continue with the luxury of allowing demonstrations to go forward, in a very liberal manner, and to commit the sort of costs that we have done in the past? I do not believe we can afford to go forward in the way we have done in the past. These may be questions that are more political Sir Paul [Stephenson] than you may wish to be able to answer. I think it is a fair debate to be had. Can we go forward, as we have in the past, around policing demonstrations?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Right. You are right; there is a whole deal of politics in there that I am not going to go anywhere near, Steve [O'Connell]!

Toby Harris (AM): Ever so slightly.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Put that one up the flag! (several inaudible words), Toby [Harris].

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Secondly it is within the context of the significant discussions we have had in this Authority coming out of G20 when, of course, there was a very strong opinion in this Authority supporting the way through that actually said that our job - I am trying to remember the precise wording so forgive me - is to facilitate peaceful protest, with less accent on the lawful, and take a more proportionate

view in response to the interpretation of the Human Rights' Act. So it is a diametrically opposed view to the one you are proposing now.

The bottom line is we will operate within the law and on the advice and guidance of how that law should be interpreted. That is what we do. It is not for us to step outside that law.

It is a point, that I think this city is very proud of - and this is as far as I will go - the way in which the vast - it is one of the few cities in the world where demonstrations can happen and, overwhelmingly, they are peaceful events with minimal cost. I think the figure I am thinking of is something like 4,500 major demonstrations in this city alone. It is a tiny handful where anything ever goes wrong.

The issue of cost recovery has to be within the law and has to be within the policies of this Authority. I would always like to get more money back from these events and, when we are allowed to charge for events, we do factor the overtime in.

The one thing I would say, Steve [O'Connell], on overtime - and Jenny [Jones] is not here to hear this - the average cost of overtime per eligible police officer - and that is sergeants and constables - has fallen by 19.2%, just short of 20%, since 2005/06 and total costs have fallen by 13.6%. So we have reduced the bill of overtime but I think, as you would recognise, we have to rely on overtime in operational policing. The idea that we could get rid of it completely operationally is just wholly unacceptable.

So we are reducing overtime and we would like to charge out as much as possible but the debate that you want to have, I suspect, is a debate for a different place, or even in this place but without me, because it is my job to comply with the law and the guidance on that law.

Steve O'Connell (AM): I understand.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Next question. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chair. When the police are burdened with guidelines containing advice such as, "Missile throwing could certainly constitute threatening behaviour", is it not time to call for a reduction in the number of standard operating procedures, and give police back their power of discretion? Obviously we touched upon this earlier with regard to young people cycling on the pavement.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I did. I will not go back on that! It is an issue. A number of professional organisations are - I think I am right in this - getting rid of their detailed standing operation procedures which run to volumes, sort of Tolstoy's War and Peace volumes, that people rarely read, only at times when they have got it wrong and then look at it to defend themselves. That is the nature of how most standing orders come about; they are generally a list of mistakes that were once made,

and **we then build cost in**(?) to make sure we never make that cost again, instead of the learning that is part of the professional ethic.

A number of organisations are going more towards principles and they are giving people the discretion to act professionally and train properly around and within those principles, as opposed to standard operation procedures (SOPs).

I entirely agree; it is absolutely time - and Denis O'Connor has mentioned this in the past - that we do look at the welter of guidance, procedures and advice that, frankly, people could not read in a lifetime.

I am not criticising any individual body. HMIC itself has been guilty of this. MPIA has been guilty of this. ACPO, the organisation I belong to, guilty. The MPS has been guilty of this. I suspect, on the very rare occasion, this Authority has been guilty of it.

I have got to say; I think the financial difficulties we are now in will actually properly force us down the line to say, "That is nice to do, but where is the need to do?" because every time we do more advice, can we use discretion, does it necessarily improve the professional outcome and it has a cost to it? It really has a cost to it. It is getting the right balance.

Tim [Godwin] and I were having a discussion on the way in here about what would it mean for the MPS and this Authority if we started developing what is developing in other professions now, this notion of principles, rather than this detailed guidance? I cannot remember the detail. I think some guidance came out a few months ago. Could have been for the MPIA or someone like that. I think it was around mental health? Hugely important issue but it ran to hundreds of pages. Which operational officer, with all honesty, is going to read those hundreds of pages? They are not. It is just silly, frankly, and we have been guilty of doing that for some considerable time.

So I am entirely in agreement with the thrust of your question. It is time we put the foot on this ball and concentrated on the most important issues, and time that we actually concentrated on principles and not this detailed guidance that makes us all feel good but, actually, to the night duty officer out there and the cop that is out there at 2am, is not a lot of help to them.

James Cleverly (AM): I am very, very, very pleased to hear that response as you can imagine, which leads me on to the next question which is, if there is an agreement that the many thousands of pages of guidance now have created a level of background noise which means that, potentially - and we were talking earlier on about your instructions about photography not reaching the psyche of officers on the beat, that it might be something to do with the general background noise of the thousands of pages of guidance. I am more than happy to support any attempts that you make to strip away that micro management. I have got examples, which I will not go through here today, which are insultingly monkey see monkey do. I am very happy to support you.

So the question I am asking is what can we, at this Authority, do to help you? I know a number of these guidance lines do not come from either the MPS or this Authority. So what can we do to help you fight those battles with some of the other initiators of this guidance?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Firstly, I think we have got to take some responsibility ourselves. The MPS is not averse to burying itself in its own guidance. This Authority, on occasions, is not averse to being a little more bureaucratic than perhaps it could be. ACPO is taking the lead on it actually. Hugh Orde [President, ACPO] has got it absolutely right when he is talking about getting rid of the amount of guidance coming out of ACPO. He is trying to do it now through ACPO Cabinet, of which Tim [Godwin] and a number of other MPS senior officers are members of. I think ACPO is now on board reducing this complete plethora of guidance.

Perhaps we go away and think about this issue of principles and see how we should be applying it in the MPS. Maybe it is a discussion we should have and come back to you with some sort of report. A discussion. At the right Committee. To see how we might take it forward. Certainly I think we should because we are burying people, operational people, police staff and police officers, with guidance that, even if you are a speed reader, you would be struggling to read it all. We will come back to you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Tony [Arbour]?

Tony Arbour (AM): Can I just stick to the first part of the question? What was the contribution that the MPS made to the Raoul Moat hunt in Northumbria?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): In total I am informed, Tony [Arbour], 63 officers we provided. I would not comment on the operation itself at all --

Tony Arbour (AM): That is why I did not ask (inaudible).

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We have provided 63 officers and, in doing so, I think it was the right thing to do. It was a small number of officers for a short period of time and, of course, we rely on mutual aid from other forces on occasions. They first came to our assistance on 7/7 and they certainly will be doing the Olympics. 63 officers it was, Tony [Arbour].

Tony Arbour (AM): I wonder if you can run past me the procedure. What happens? Does the phone go at Scotland Yard and somebody says, "This is the Northumbrian Constabulary. We have got a man running amok here with a shotgun. Please send 63 officers?" How did you decide to send 63 officers, given that it was just one person? As an aside, it does not sound like a small number of officers. I bet, in my borough as we speak, there are not 63 officers on active duty.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): As I suspect you already know, I did not decide. I had nothing to do with it. We would encourage ACPO and ACPO did put what

was called the Police National Information Centre (PNIC) in place to try to make sensible requests on behalf of the force that is under great difficulty of the skills that they needed. They look around the country and they try to equalise those requests so no force is being asked to do too much. It is about skills.

So how do we decide? We get a request - I do not know if it came from PNIC or Northumbria - of the skills they require. We looked at what skills we had. We looked at what we could spare for a short period of time, using overtime and rearranging training, because we know we will rely on other people to come to our aid in the future. We then supply that on the basis of the appropriate cost recovery.

They did speak to me about it though.

Tony Arbour (AM): OK. Did it not seem to you to be quite a lot of resources which were being called in just to capture one man with a shotgun?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Now you are asking your previous question of course by different means! It is not for me to comment on their operations. Let us be honest about it; I will not add to the huge ill informed comment that has been going around about that operation. The IPCC is investigating it. So it should. Let us let it do it.

Tony Arbour (AM): Fine. I tried!

Toby Harris (AM): We do not want you to add to the ill informed comments; he just wants you to add to the informed comment!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I have not heard a great deal, Toby [Harris]!

James Cleverly (AM): If you could start some informed comment it might be ...

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): The last question was from Jenny Jones. You have already touched on that. I think we could send her a written note of what you have said. I am very keen to move on unless people have a very burning question they wish to ask the Commissioner.

Can we then move on to item six which is the Race and Faith Inquiry?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Chair, I do not think I need to say very much in introducing this item. I would remind Members that this was an independent panel report, so (inaudible) of the MPA is to receive it and then to consider what processes it needs to put in place to ensure that the recommendations are properly considered. Some of them are specific to the MPA, some specific to the MPS and some more general. I think that there will be a general acceptance that we need to have some processes in place to look at implementation and taking the work forward.

I know Cindy [Butts] will want to say something, as Chair of the Panel. I think the one thing I wanted to highlight was that there are a couple of references that the Panel regretted that, perhaps, there had not been enough opportunity to concentrate on both sides of the remit and there may be further papers that need to come to the Authority in terms of helping that aspect of the work of the Panel. Let me not steal your thunder, Cindy [Butts].

Cindy Butts (AM): No, it is absolutely fine. What an irony, hey! We waited so long to get this report and it finally arrives and we have got about 15 minutes to discuss it.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Ten!

Cindy Butts (AM): Ten! OK. I sincerely hope --

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): This is not the last chance to discuss it.

Cindy Butts (AM): No, that is what I was going to say. I really do hope that this is not the last chance to have this discussion. As a consequence of the time, I will not go through what I was going to go through originally, and I will just boil it down to the bare and essential elements.

The first thing that I would want to say is that, for those of us around the table, we will know how far the MPS has come in ten years. For those of us who have been around since the inception of the Authority, I think we know more than ever just how much the organisation has moved on. In 2000 the organisation was, it would be fair to say, a rather dire place where fear, suspicion and, yes, racism, were all too prevalent. The organisation has moved on tremendously and we pay testament to this fact within the report.

Now I know that some people are not happy at the fact that we have not picked the MPS up and put it in a nice, neat, tidy box labelled institutional racism. The reason why we did not do that is because of something that I said very clearly when the emerging findings report was presented to you all. That was, yes, the MPS has problems. Racism exists within the service. I am in no doubt about that at all. However, what also sits within the organisation - quite uncomfortably so - is innovation, good practice, creativity and commitment. I think there is many a public service out there who will be quite envious of all that the MPS has done.

That said, problems and difficulties of course still remain and those are the areas that we sought to examine in greater detail, specifically around recruitment, retention and progression. Progression became a massive issue from the very outset. We were very much confronted with individuals - and I have got to say both from a BME background but also white officers and staff as well - who very much felt that the promotion processes within the service were not fair, not transparent and needed improvement. We have sought to deliver practical recommendations that we believe will address some of

those concerns because it was our intention from the very outset that, while the inquiry is focused on race and faith, to be confronted with bad practices and policies and to only make BME staff fare better within bad practices and policies means that you are still left with bad policies and practices. We wanted to deliver positive changes to BME staff and officers as well as the entire organisation, and I believe we have done that.

Our emerging findings. As you know, we recommended a number of changes which the organisation, quite rightly, went ahead with, just accepted and got on with. Issues such as leadership, making sure that the Deputy Commissioner became the lead senior office for equalities in diversity. That has been done. Moving diversity and citizens focus away from being a TP resource and into the centre of the organisation. So the inquiry has already delivered and the MPS is already ahead of the game. That said, you will see within the report a number of new and fresh recommendations which I sincerely hope that Members around this table will support.

If I can just pick out two or three of those? They do mainly relate to promotion. The issue of the way in which acting and temporary promotions are carried out within the organisation needs to change. People do not trust it. They do not feel that it is fair. In addition to that, senior managers have the absolute right to veto whether or not a member of staff can apply for a promotion was one of the most contentious issues we heard, not just from BME staff and officers but from the entire organisation. We saw no comparable system elsewhere and we, therefore, thought that this was so divisive that it needs to change.

In addition to that, we believe that the Diversity and Citizens Focus Directorate is of such importance. It is the guardian, if you like, of equalities and diversity. We, therefore, feel that it should be strengthened by way of resources and expertise, but we also believe that it should be given additional powers and ability to influence the organisation. We, therefore, believe that it should become an internal inspectorate type model where it can dip into the organisation where concerns exist but, equally, where good practice is as well, it can go in and grab that good practice and try to share it amongst the rest of the organisation.

One other really quick thing - I know I said I would not say much but this has been my life for way too long! - is that we firmly believe that the organisation should explore the issue of **multi point**(?) entry. We really do think it is time that the organisation, both the MPA and the MPS, explored this because we believe it will bring benefits to the organisation, not just in terms of diversity but far and wide beyond that, and you will see some of the rationale for that within the report.

The only other thing I want to say is there is no one around this table who is not more disappointed at the fact that we did not report sooner than we did, than myself. For that I am sorry. There are a number of reasons why that happened. I apologise to Members for that. Hey - I did not take the country to war! It is not that bad, but, nevertheless, I am sorry. I hope you welcome the report and I hope you will back the recommendations. Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Before I take questions can I just ask the Commissioner if he has got anything to say about the report?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Not a lot really. I note and thank Cindy [Butts] for the narrative (inaudible) actually. It is one that I entirely agree with. It is one that I have said right from the start of being Commissioner and I think we have made very good progress, but there is much more yet to do. I think that is the powerful message. It is now what do we do about it to do the much more.

We have only just received the report but, in essence, I think Cindy [Butts] is right; there is much that has already been either done or in being, but there is some stuff we need to consider and further unpick to say, “What precisely do you mean around this?” Figures mean nothing really but 40 recommendations implemented, 9 in the process of being implemented, 9 further consideration, 13 recommendations (inaudible). I think it is in train. There are things being done already. I think it was absolutely right.

I hope I am not revealing confidences, Cindy [Butt], but even before your interim report I remember we had a meeting - myself, you and Tim [Godwin] - about things that we felt we needed to get on with, and actually got your support for that, to get on with some things and get doing some things.

Nothing more to add. We will bring back a fuller account in due course as to what is our progress against all the recommendations, but many of them are either done or in progress, and you cannot do these things overnight. Some we have got still some questions about and will come back and have a discussion, but we will have discussion and then come back.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chair. Less of a question really. More of a statement. I welcome this report. You say that you are sorry that it has taken a while but it is quite clear you have a very thorough report. I think the tone of the report is really important. Any organisation, particularly an organisation like a police force, when it feels it is being attacked, its natural reaction is to defend itself, and when people are defending themselves quite often they stop listening. I think the tone of this report is really, really important. The fact that the Commissioner is able to run off a list of recommendations that have already been implemented and are in the process of being implemented, I think, is incredibly powerful.

I think there is a broader lesson to be learnt here about how sometimes non-executive bodies or scrutiny bodies like ours interact with the organisations that they work with. I think there was a long period in this organisation’s history where our instinctive position was to attack the MPS, and the MPS’s instinctive position was to defend itself. I think this report really shows that what our position now is is to work with the MPS to generate improvement in the policing of London and I think the MPS’s reaction to this body and

this report in particular is to listen to what is being said, to have an open mind about what is being said. Not inherently to agree with everything that is being said but that is not, I think, necessarily the point. It is to engage, it is to listen, it is to take on board the easy wins - and I am really glad that that is already happening - and then to look seriously at some of the more challenging recommendations. I imagine there is probably going to be some heated discussions about some of the recommendations in the report, and that is no bad thing either.

I want to put on record my congratulations to you and the rest of the team - because I know it is not a solo effort - for putting this forward. I would also like to put on record my congratulations to the MPS for the distance it has travelled over the last few years and, actually, the attitude it has taken from private discussions, the interim report and, now, this formal report.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Kirsten [Hearn] please?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Yes. I am really pleased to have this report at last and well done to your leadership, Cindy [Butts], in **getting it down on to the staff and helping you do it(?)**.

The question I want to ask of you, and actually of Paul [Stephenson], there are two questions. One is actually for you, Cindy [Butts]. If there was one thing that the MPS could do to make a difference and to deliver most of the vision that you have actually tried to lead us in this report, what would that be? To Paul [Stephenson], what do you think is the most difficult thing for the MPS to do that has been recommended?

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): I do not think there is just one thing. I think one of the really, really key things is - and I think Clive [Lawton] may have touched on this earlier in one of his questions - is around leadership. I think there has been way too much confusion of late about who is leading the equalities and diversity. As much as there are good things and bad things about this, the organisation is hierarchical. They listen to the people at the top and what they say and what they believe. What they endorse and what they are passionate about is often what they become passionate about too. I think leadership is absolutely crucial and I am pleased that Tim [Godwin] is now leading. It also requires the Commissioner side by side with Tim [Godwin] doing and acting in the same coordinated way.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will answer on two levels really, responding to Cindy's [Butts] and the leadership issue. Hopefully I have demonstrated commitment through the professionalism bit. Actually I just think it is central to everything and you cannot deal with professionalism without dealing with this.

In terms of what do I see - if I can reinterpret your question if I have got it right, Kirsten [Hearn] - as the challenge? Actually it is the financial challenge we have just been talking about.

What is going through our minds at this moment in time is, if the organisation has to shrink - and that is what I think it is going to have to do. Again, that is very brave and we have got to make the best of that and make sure we deliver an even better service out of this if we can. If we do that, what parts of the organisation will shrink? Some areas where we can cut services are some areas where we employ some of our poorest paid staff and some of our greatest proportions from BME communities. What challenge is that going to bring to the organisation? That bothers me enormously. We are going to have to think our way through that.

More so in terms of the police officers. The reality is we have to stop recruiting because you cannot carry on recruiting when you do not have the money to pay. If you stop recruiting, how do we make the progress in an organisation that then gets pickled in aspic for a number of years because you do not recruit and promotion prospects dry up? That is the reality of what we are facing. So how do we - and here is the real challenge - set the challenge that whatever savings we can make you almost want to go beyond those savings so you can do some trickle recruiting and so you can do some promotion. When you talk about these figures, that is extraordinarily difficult.

My worry is the financial position brings us to a point where some of the things that we know we have to do and we need some through put in turnover, actually will stop us changing the organisation in the way that I think we all want to change it. You have got to recognise that is a challenge because if you do not recognise the problem you do not do anything about the problem. That is something that bothers us greatly out of the current financial issue.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Jennette [Arnold] is next?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chair, I have got a number of comments to make. Can I just start by saying to Cindy [Butts] that I really appreciate the work that she has led on this and that it seems to me that one of the things we should highlight is the difference between this report and all the other reports. One of the differences that I can identify is that this report is looking specifically at the internal attitudes to race and faith. If you look at this versus, say, the Macpherson report, one of the strong things about Macpherson was that it gave us that understanding about external relationships with the police. I do not think it should be lumped together with all the other reports because, if it is, then, in a sense, it does not really inspire as much as it could do if it is seen for specifically what it is about.

I think one of the good things that it brings to the table is the discussions that were had about the term institutional racism. I think there is a way to go. I certainly do not fully support the report's view that somehow or the other we should go around with an eraser and stop this term being used because that is impossible. I would like us to be looking

towards a time, hopefully in the near future, when, say, the MPS, the Black Police Association and all the other associations and faith organisations within the MPS can actually come forward and say, "From our experience of this organisation, we can put our hand up and say that, in terms of our experiences with regard to disciplining action and with regard to promotion, we feel we have an organisation that this term is no longer applicable for". I would like to wait for those organisations representing the people in the organisations to tell me when the organisation is in that place.

I do not support the idea about the term that the organisation is no longer institutionally racist because the evidence is there to show a different picture.

I do think that we have to welcome the fairly obvious Human Resource (HR) practices which we hear have been implemented, as they clearly make good sense.

Again, we are two years on from when the Mayor, who was then the Chair, set up this report. So one of the things I would like to know is what is the Mayor's response to the report, especially as he is now, clearly, the elected one for the Authority? I would like to know what feedback there has been from the Mayor of London, because I think he has a real key leadership role to play in it.

Then I look forward to seeing how the recommendations that are in there are going to be monitored and seeing their implementation over the next, what I would imagine, two years or so.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Shall we take Chris [Boothman] and then you can come back? Chris [Boothman]?

Chris Boothman (AM): Just want to make some brief comments, Chair. I would, firstly, like to welcome some of the recommendations, especially the ones that were mentioned.

What I would like to do is, in a sense, go back a bit and look at the issue of how much work has been done since Macpherson, how much money has been spent on diversity since Macpherson and, for me, the question is has all that resource and all that money produced what we wanted it to produce? Have we moved as far as we should have moved in relation to the investment? My feeling is that we have not. So I think that we have to deal with this issue in the same way that we are going to deal with the issue of police numbers, which is we have to look at value for money and efficiency - what some people call bang for buck. That is going to become harder and harder in the current financial crisis.

So what I would like to see - as has already been mentioned - more leadership. That was partly why I asked my earlier question because, in a sense, what the rank and file in the organisation think about an issue depends on what they see senior officers doing. So if they see senior officers taking things like diversity training seriously, they will think, "This is serious". If they see senior officers championing diversity issues they will see

that as important. I suppose, ultimately, what I would look for, at the end of the day, as opposed to organisations like the Black Police Association saying that everything is going fine, is actually to see a situation where they are no longer needed. A time when there is no work for them to do. For me, that is when we have done it.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Do you want to come back on comments?

Cindy Butts (AM): Thank you obviously for the comments that have been made. In terms of Jennette's [Arnold] point, everyone can decide on their own barometer or what they need to convince them that the organisation is not institutionally racist. All I had was the evidence that was given to us and, actually, the evidence that was given to us was a very mixed picture.

Yes, on the one hand there was the Black Police Association (BPA) who was saying that the organisation was institutionally racist. On the other hand there were black and minority ethnic officers and staff - who, by the way, not all of them are members of the BPA - who were saying that their experience within the service was great, they enjoyed their time in the service and they did not feel discriminated against. It was a really mixed bag.

I knew when I started this process that there would be some people who, if I did not say that every sinew, nook and cranny was riddled with racism, they would be unhappy. Equally, there were those who, if I did not say all was well and rosy in the garden, would be unhappy too. It was not about trying to keep people happy; it was trying to be fair. As I have said before, there are processes and practices that are not fair in the organisation and that need to be tackled. Are there racist individuals? Of course there are.

I think that what we are saying is that the organisation has to take a much more mature approach. On the one hand what I do not want is the organisation to say something is institutionally racist and, therefore, remove individual culpability and responsibility. Equally, I do not want the organisation to say, "That is a bad apple. He is racist. Therefore the organisation does not take responsibility either". Actually it is much more sophisticated than that. Often it is both the individual and the organisation, hand in hand, where things actually need to change. We need a maturer, more sophisticated approach if we are going to take this agenda forward. What we cannot do is keep harping on back to the past because, actually, the past is not helpful in getting us where we need to be. Thank you.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Just one quick point from me if I may? I think it is about recommendation one where you say continuing to build and develop the relationship between the MPS and the Metropolitan Black Police Association. I do think we need to be careful here. There are other staff associations who would argue that they have worked extremely hard in changing the values and the culture of the MPS. In a sense they, too, need to have some sort of recognition in terms of relationship. It is a minor point but it is a very important one for them.

Cindy Butts (AM): If I may, Chair, can I just say something about that? Firstly it was as a result of the very difficult relationship that had emerged between the BPA and the senior leadership. Equally, if you read the report, what we have said is the MPS needs to now rebalance the way it interacts with staff support associations. There is too much of a hierarchy. The BPA is seen to be getting it all at the expense of other staff associations who do vital and important work, just as much as the BPA do. We call for a much more balanced relationship with all the staff support associations.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Yes. I just think we need to be absolutely clear (inaudible).

The two recommendations we have here are to receive the report, which I think we have done, and the second one is to endorse the plans for monitoring the implementation of the report. Agreed? Thank you.

The next item here is the MPA and the MPS community engagement commitment. Again, this is for approval by Members.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): This has been back to several Committees, Chair. Reverting to the earlier conversation, I think one of the interesting aspects of it is that it sets out a series of principles, rather than detailed guidelines involving hurling (inaudible) at people. The main point is that this has been extensively considered and is now a(?) finalised route(?) report, which I recommend to Members.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Any questions? Are we happy to --

Clive Lawton (AM): Chair, just very quickly. I certainly want to commend this. I think it is an excellent approach. The Commissioner may notice that its six items may be called the six Is, apart from the fact that two of them begin with P and F but, nevertheless, there they are.

I noted the absence, I think, of any direct statement about how this commitment was going to be disseminated and, as a minimum, I would hope that it goes to every Borough Community and Police Engagement Group (CPEG) with an expectation that it will be raised and discussed, and its implications discussed, at their next meeting. There may be lots of other places in which that might happen, but I think that is our organisation and we should make sure that it gets out there and is taken on board in that way.

Cindy Butts (AM): We do actually have a mini engagement type public relations (PR) process that is going to sit alongside this and CPEGs and various other major partners of ours will be informed.

Clive Lawton (AM): My point is not just that they should receive it, the Chair gets it and sticks it on a shelf, but that we get a report from CPEGs about the outcome of the discussion or the next steps and what they liked about it or whatever it may be, so a genuine dialogue emerges, and it is noticed and not just received.

Victoria Borwick (AM): What happens as a result of it.

Clive Lawton (AM): Yes.

Cindy Butts (AM): I will make sure that happens. Can I just say that I really do think this is a good piece of work? It has been through **SEP(?)** a number of different times. I just want to pay tribute to (inaudible), who has been around for quite some time, and she consistently delivers good quality work, so thank you very much.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Are we happy to approve? Yes?

Item eight. Reports from Committees. There is one recommendation here which is Members are asked to endorse the amendments to the terms of reference for (inaudible) and Sub-Committees. Do we endorse those? It is page 143.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Could I just make a comment on page 143? I thought the Home Secretary was female.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I believe the Home Secretary at the time was probably male, although it is not the same Home Secretary. I am not suggesting anything of that nature.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I just do not want you to think that no one is reading these sheets of paper.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): It was a him at the time.

Victoria Borwick (AM): It was a him at the time.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): To be fair, this was the Home Secretary a number of years ago who did not sign off within the timeframe, and that was a he.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Perhaps a little clarity then to make it clear to us.

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): We would have assumed a secretary was female but now we do not, of course.

On pages 148 and 149 I am very pleased that Nigel Lawton was present at these meetings and I hope he contributed well. You have not recorded the fact that I was also there!

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Apologies. There are those who have called me Cindy Crawford in the past but I have always taken that as a compliment!

Reshard Auladin (Chair, MPA): Item nine. Any other urgent business. None. Thank you very much. Sorry we did not manage to finish at 12.30pm.

Meeting concluded at 12.38pm.