

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 31 March 2011 at 10 am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.**

**Present:**

**Members:**

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

**MPA Officers:**

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

**MPS Officers:**

Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner), John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner),  
Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations) and Anne McMeel  
(Director of Resources).

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Members, good morning. Thank you very much. Kirsten [Hearn] has given her apologies, along with Faith [Boardman] and the Commissioner, whom you will be pleased to know goes from strength to strength and should be back with us relatively soon. Kirsten's absence means we do not need to go round the room. Are there any other apologies? No? OK. Thank you.

Declarations of interests? Does anybody have any interests to declare other than those that are on the paper? No? Thanks very much.

Minutes of the meeting of 24 February 2011. Anybody have anything on accuracy? Any matters arising? Yes, Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, Chair. I asked for a list of meetings between senior MPS officers and News International and, indeed, I received the list. What I would like to ask the Deputy Commissioner is why the list did not include four lunches and dinners that Andy Hayman [former Assistant Commissioner, MPS] had had with News International in 2006, which the MPS was certainly aware of because it published it in a Freedom of Information request that it had received from a member of the public two weeks previous to that. So two weeks previous to the information you gave me you had included, on a Freedom of Information request, a dinner on 25 April 2006 and three lunches in the same year, that Andy Hayman had had, but it is not on my list.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** The only thing I can say to that, Chair, is that it must be an oversight because obviously we have published it before. I will pick that up with the person who put the list together.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** OK. I wonder if I could ask the Deputy Commissioner if, at the same time, he would look and see if there are any other oversights because I am a bit concerned that that is quite a big oversight; four meetings in a year all with the same person so somebody maybe has not been as thorough as they need to be?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I am sure it will just be an oversight but I will get them to check.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thanks very much. Is there anything else on the minutes? Can I sign them as a true declaration? Thank you very much.

Chairman's update. Hopefully you have got a copy of my report. The first thing I would like to do is congratulate Mark Simmons and Steve Kavanagh on their promotion to Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC). Those of us who were on the interview panel were impressed with all the candidates but particularly with those two and we look forward to their contribution to the higher echelons of the management of the organisation.

A couple of thanks and acknowledgements. In particular I would like to thank those staff and congratulate the MPS on its call handling support during the Japanese earthquake and tsunami operation. MPS staff dealt with 850 calls over a period of 51 hours from concerned friends and relatives.

As usual there have been a number of awards and commendations which I would like to mention. In particular I would like to note that a Trident Family Liaison Officer was awarded Family Liaison Officer (FLO) of the Year recently in recognition of efforts to support the family of a south London murder victim. I particularly wanted to mention that in the light of the appalling shooting two days ago in Lambeth that took place. No doubt the FLOs will be doing their valuable work as part of that investigation.

A number of Special Constables were also recognised by senior officers for having shown exceptional dedication and achievement at a recent ceremony in Heroes Week which took place just after the last Full Authority meeting. Commissioner's certificates and Royal Humane Society certificates were awarded to officers and members of the public who showed extreme bravery in their actions to protect the public and save the lives of the people of London.

I have provided you with a list of the number of meetings that I have had and that should be in the appendix.

The Police and Social Responsibility Bill report stage and third reading are happening this week and being monitored by the MPA. I have attended a number of ministerial meetings to deal with that and try to help the passage and transition of the Authority alongside the development of the Bill.

We are talking about the budget later on.

We have had a series of Joint Engagement Meetings on violent crime over the last month. Hounslow, Wandsworth and Newham the most recently yesterday.

We have had some training on equality which I attended and I would commend Members as part of that.

We had a meeting of the new London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) in early March 2011 and the minutes of that Board are available to you.

Just a couple of final things from me. First of all a word about Saturday's demonstration. During the afternoon I was out and about observing on the ground the demonstration itself but also in the control room for part of the afternoon. It was an extremely difficult and tricky situation, about which we will talk about later no doubt, but, from my observation, the command team and the officers on the ground did a pretty outstanding job in the face of very difficult circumstances in piloting a huge demonstration through London while, at the same time, dealing with a small number of thugs, essentially, who were intent on violence. Having met that gang myself on Piccadilly at about 4pm I could attest to its desire and willingness to perpetrate violence wherever and whenever they could in the afternoon. Given that, I wanted to offer my congratulations for the way, what was a very difficult and large operation, went.

Finally, yesterday morning - and, again, particularly pertinent in the light of the shooting in Stockwell two days ago - I observed at 4.30am an extremely effective raid in Wandsworth that was part of a coordinated set of raids across the capital against violent gang leaders and drug dealers as part of the new Operation Connect, which is a pan-London coordinated attempt with local authorities and other partners to address systematically the gang and drug dealing issue in the capital.

I was both impressed by the efficiency and professionalism of the rapid entry team, whom I was relatively quite a long way behind for obvious reasons but, nevertheless, they were very impressive in apprehending allegedly an extremely unpleasant individual, but also impressed by the work that went on afterwards during the day in the local community and for the local authority swinging in behind the police operation to try to divert some of that particular person's lieutenants away from the same path of life.

We will see more of Connect in the future and I would urge you, as Members, to take an interest in its progress. It is going to be an interesting operation which should, in time, have a serious effect on violence in many of the areas that are blighted across the capital.

I wanted to offer my particular thanks to the officers involved but also congratulate you, Acting Commissioner, on the instigation of that operation.

That is it from me. Any particular questions? Yes, Dee?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I noticed that you had a meeting on 24 March 2011 with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) President to discuss the MPA's subscription. Could I live in hope that you are going to tell us that you have abolished it?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** That is a decision which we will be discussing and taking, collectively, under the budget item.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Any other questions? Yes, Toby?

**Toby Harris (AM):** I was wanting to check that when you go on these raids with the police that you are adequately protected. Do you wear a stab vest?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I do not.

**Toby Harris (AM):** What would happen if somebody made for you specifically or are you so far back that this is not an issue? I am concerned that we would not want to lose your leadership at this sensitive time for the Authority. I am sure the police would not want to lose your leadership either.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I am sure that the officers there make an adequate risk assessment around the protection of observers who are on the operation. I have been offered a stab vest and declined --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Well that is wrong.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** -- on the basis that none of the other people who are in and around the area during the time of the operation are protected so I should not be either. Having said that, I can be quite swift on my feet when needed to be, contrary to expectation.

Thank you very much. We are moving on to the Acting Commissioner's report. There are a number of important items that I wanted to deal with but, in particular, we have the family of Daniel Morgan here today following the collapse of that case. I am going to ask the Acting Commissioner to make a statement first if we may and then we will move on to some of the other business in the report.

(interruption from public gallery)

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Excuse me. Chair, could we clarify the rules about members of the public interrupting these meetings because I think we are going to have a big problem if that continues.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I was about to say something. We operate a rule here in this Assembly that we do not take heckling from the floor. If you continue to heckle then I will have to ask you to leave the Chamber. We have got a lot of business to get through today and we do not want interruptions from the floor thank you very much. Jenny?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** There is a member of the Smiley Culture family here today.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I was not aware of that fact but they are obviously welcome too. No doubt there will be questions about that incident as well as we get to it. Having said that, please no more interruptions from the floor. Cindy, you wanted to say something?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I was going to make the point that there is not just family but representatives. I think it is fair that we acknowledge that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Fine. I am happy to acknowledge them once I am made aware of them. Thank you. Tim?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** In starting, there have been a number of events that have occurred since we last met and certainly the events in Stockwell involving a five year old girl and a 35 year old man are very poignant about some of the challenges that we currently face. Additionally there are two families here. I have spoken to both families prior to the meeting occurring but the one I would like to start with is that of Daniel Morgan.

As many Members here will be aware, back in 1987 Daniel was murdered and, as a result, over 24 years the MPS has failed to achieve justice for the family and for Daniel. This culminated in the recent acquittal of one Jonathan Rees and others following a trial that went on for some time and was based around events of disclosure and other factors. As a result I have written to the family to express my concerns and my apologies for our failure and I would like to read part of that letter.

*“I am deeply sorry that the MPS has failed to bring to justice those responsible for the murder of Daniel. The MPS has accepted that police corruption, in the original investigation, was a significant factor in this failure. As you know, corruption in its various forms formed a major line of inquiry in the most recent investigation.*

*I recognise how important this is to both you and your family and that this is acknowledged publicly. You are entitled to an apology not only for this failure but also for the repeated failure of the MPS, my organisation, over the many years following Daniel’s murder to accept that corruption had played such a part in*

*failing to bring those responsible to justice. Furthermore I am also very sorry that, for many years, your concerns regarding the failure of the MPS to bring those persons to justice were not properly addressed, and they were not. I recognise that this apology cannot alter the deep sense of loss, frustration, anger and distress that you and your family experience and have suffered since Daniel's murder.*

*The MPS is a very different organisation now to the one it was at the time of Daniel's murder. That said, we accept that there are lessons to be learned arising from the discontinuance of this latest trial. To this end, and together with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), we are now engaged in a joint review to ensure that relevant issues, particularly in relation to disclosure and the handling of tainted witnesses, are understood and addressed as soon as possible. Above all, we recognise the consequences of the repeated failure of the MPS over the years to confront the role played by police corruption in protecting those responsible for the murder to be brought to justice."*

As Members will be aware, in October 2009, the Serious Crime Directorate (SCD) took responsibility for the investigation and resulted in this recent trial and subsequent acquittal.

I would want to say that I, once again, am deeply sorry for our failure. You have my sympathies. I do not know that they offer any comfort but they are honestly given and truly meant. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Before we move on to the rest of the report I am going to take questions on this. I know, Jennette, you tabled some questions?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chair, it has been arranged before my questions that I read on to the record of this meeting a statement on behalf of the Morgan family and I do hope that Members will bear with me.

*"Twenty four years after Daniel's murder the MPS has finally admitted that its first investigation of this crime was crippled by police corruption. We were aware of this within three weeks of the murder. We said so then and we have been saying so ever since. Through two decades and more of police protest, meeting with police officers at the highest ranks, lobbying of politicians and pleas to the media we have found ourselves lied to, fobbed off, bullied, degraded and let down time and time again. What we have been required to endure has been nothing short of torture.*

*When we last came to the MPA in 2005 [and many Members sitting round this table will remember when I raised this matter on behalf of the family then] we had been told by the MPS that we could not look to the criminal justice for anything more after four failed investigations. We had also been told by the Home Office that we could not look to them for any scrutiny of what had taken place. We then approached the MPA to seek support for our call for a judicial inquiry into the handling of Daniel's murder by the MPS. The response of the MPA, at that stage,*

*was, to its credit, for the first time in two decades, we found persons in authority who were not afraid of taking responsibility for the implications of the police corruption that had blighted our lives. It was in that context that the MPS announced that it had decided to reopen the case and, after much hesitation, we again offered it our full trust and support.*

*Six years later after a collapsed prosecution and millions spent from the public purse a full judicial inquiry into the handling of this case by the MPS is even more urgently required. The family therefore calls upon the MPA and returns to this body again today to seek support for their call for a full judicial inquiry. Mindful of the words uttered by Assistant Commissioner John Yates at a meeting with Kit Malthouse, our Chairman, and Mayor Boris Johnson in February 2009 [and I was there to witness this statement], “This case is one of the most deplorable episodes in the entire history of the MPS. This family has been treated disgracefully”.*

Commissioner, can you tell us, what are the next steps? Will you be supporting this family’s call for a judicial inquiry?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** What is currently started is a full review from the Crown Prosecution Service and ourselves. We are a different organisation and, while some may detract from that, we are truly a different organisation. I think it shows great credit to Daniel’s family that they actually included that things had changed in terms of the way it was picked up in our recent past. Far too late and it is one of the shameful episodes that we have in our history.

Sometimes public inquiries and judicial events can slow down processes, rather than speed them up. I am not sure whether that would be the appropriate route to go. There does need to be learning and there does need to be an inquiry review and that is ongoing. We will make sure that, whatever those reviews are, the family will be involved and kept informed of what we find and what we learn.

The matter as to inquiries is a matter for the Home Secretary and not mine. Obviously it will be a matter for her to consider. At the moment we will review it with the Crown Prosecution Service and others and we will learn the lessons.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Can I say to the Chair I thank him for his support to date to the family and I know that we have got a meeting with him later? I am not wishing to put him on the spot but, from what I have said, it was this body that gave this family hope and that gave this family support when everybody else said, “Go away. There is no case to answer”. It was this body that led that charge. Are you still committed to supporting this family so that Isobel, the mother of Daniel, can find some peace in the remaining years of her life?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Absolutely, Jennette. I am more than happy to give that confirmation. As you said we have a meeting immediately after this with the family

and they will want to explore what they want to achieve next, how we can do that most quickly and as swiftly as we possibly can and then assist them to get the conclusions that they want to reach. Whether that is through an inquiry or through other means we will have to discuss but you have my commitment to support the family as much as I humanely can.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Reshard, you had a question?

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA):** Thank you, Chairman, for expressing that support. I have heard what the Acting Commissioner has had to say in terms of an inquiry possibly slowing down the process of finding out what has gone wrong but this matter has been going on for more than two decades. I think we owe it to the family to support their call for a judicial inquiry and I think we should do so today.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Clive?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, it is clearly horrible and embarrassing and everybody has said that this is disgraceful. I do not want to impute any negative intent in the undertakings that have been made hereafter and I want to applaud the dignity and forbearance of the family in the manner in which they have expressed themselves.

I am just slightly concerned - and I do not think it is intended - by the nature of the undertakings made so far. Whether a public inquiry or whatever it is is the right procedure - and I think you are right that we want to do this quickly rather than slowly - the critical issue here is the public nature of it. At the very least the public findings of it. I have heard in both the Acting Commissioner's and in your statements undertakings to ensure that the family is happy, the family understands and the family knows.

I think that is entirely right but I think that there is a greater desire - and I assume that this is also underpinned by the family's request for such an inquiry - that the findings are made very public and that they are not merely found and told and shared and so on, but they are made very public. That has got to be a key part of the undertakings made.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Absolutely. The conclusions that come out of both the inquiries by the CPS and by the (inaudible) will have to be made public. That is absolutely right.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** If I may, Chair? One of the things in terms of learning over the last decade is the willingness of the MPS to be open and transparent about things and be honest, even where it has failed, is the most appropriate thing in terms of providing the sort of service that Londoners expect from us and we want to do that. We have the mechanism to do it through this body, or whatever replaces this body, in terms of bringing those products in terms of what we have learned and what we



have found but, at the same time, it is absolutely appropriate that the family is involved in all that as we go forward.

It is just that I feel that that would be the swiftest and most efficient way of achieving those objectives that we can do, rather than if you put it into a bureaucratic process and there is a whole series of governance arrangements, you end up with lots of lawyers and sometimes you cannot quite get to the truth through that process. I will take it on advisement and we will have the family involved in that decision making but I would like to move forward and do what we can to identify those lessons and identify those issues that we are permitted to, and then move on.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Cindy?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Reshard made a very useful suggestion and it is one that we ought to consider making today. The reason why I say that is because Jennette has fully articulated the fact that the family is clear about what they want. For having such a long period in which officials and statutory bodies tell the family what they think is best I think that needs to now stop and that we can, as a last gesture, try to meet what it is they are requesting. I think it is a good suggestion and one that I am almost certain that Members around this table will be keen to adopt and support.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Valerie?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I wanted to endorse exactly what Cindy has just said. From my perspective, given the scale and nature of the time and money and the personal pain for this family, this is what they have said they wanted and we, as an Authority, have an obligation to see that justice is properly done. My view is that we support their request.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Dee?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Cindy has said exactly what I was going to say.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Toby?

**Toby Harris (AM):** I think we have to acknowledge that not only has this been going on for a very long time but that, despite what I believe are, finally, the best efforts of the MPS, the MPS failed in this instance to deliver the outcome that the family was looking for. We also have to acknowledge that, again despite the very best efforts of this Authority in terms of seeking the reopening of this matter, we also have failed. Therefore, whatever happens now, it is no longer something that we can initiate or the MPS can initiate; it really does have to be something from outside looking at that, which is why the family's request for some sort of independent judicially overseen inquiry is what is required. I think we should be quite clear, not shilly shally around and say that is what we want to see happen, and make those representations to the Home Secretary.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Is that the general conclusion of Members?

**All:** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Fine. Then that is what we will do.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Chairman, would it be helpful if you had a vote and it was unanimous; just to help you going to the Home Secretary?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** On a show of hands is everybody happy to support that? I will write - I think it is actually to the Attorney General. I will do so as quickly as I can.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Are there any other questions on this item? No? Thank you very much. We move on to --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** If I can, on that note, move on to the death of David Emmanuel. I have spoken to his nephew here today and I have explained that, because there is an ongoing independent investigation, I am unable to say very much about it. That is because the independence of that investigation and the integrity of that investigation are paramount so I should not express views and opinions that can influence that in any way and we await the outcome of that investigation.

The point that was made to me earlier, quite forcefully, was the fact that, in my view, we have come a long way in terms of our relationship with communities and the trust that we now have with communities that we might not have had before. We must not, though, take that trust and confidence for granted as we have seen what happens in the earlier piece in relation to Daniel [Morgan].

What I need to ensure is that we do everything we can to keep people informed as to the progress of the investigation and the fact that it is very wrong to jump to judgement, either way, until we see the evidence that is produced. My sympathies are extended to the family and friends and I hope that the investigation will be thorough and speedy and will be open to scrutiny at the end.

That is all I can say about that and I now need to move on to another major investigation if I may?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Just before you do that, Tim, I think it is probably appropriate that we take some questions. Jenny?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. I understand you cannot talk about the case and it is clear that it has been made obvious to you that the black community is very worried about this case. Are you satisfied with the links you have or are you exploring new ways of communicating?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** We have got the experience of using advisory group members and reaching out to communities' contact points etc. I need to now, having had a conversation, assure myself that those things are all in place. It would be hard to answer that at the moment but I do know that our history is that we are far better now than we were before in relation to having that connectivity and those conversations, but I just need to make sure.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. A second question. I understand that there were briefings made about Smiley Culture after his death. I do not know where they came from and the implication was that those briefings were from the police at some level. I am concerned that you are aware of them and that if you find out that they came from the MPS that you will condemn them and do something about it?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I am not sure what briefings you are referring to and, as a result of that, you need to have a conversation with me afterwards.

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

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** All right.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Val?

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Thank you very much. Can I support Jenny's concerns there? Over the years the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group has been an incredibly effective and useful mechanism for bringing together the community and the police to have a proper and frank exchange on issues of this sort. It would be very much to be feared, Commissioner as you say, if this is the moment when the long built, hard built relationship of trust between the community and the police was to be breached and broken down. I would want to urge you to use the officers of the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group to bring together the police at a corporate level - not just locally - on this issue. If there are possibilities of either the Chairman or yourself going to meet with the community that would be very much a positive step and I know that the black community and the communities at large very much appreciated Mike Franklin from the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) coming to meet them.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Jennette?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, it follows on. I understand, as we would expect, that a Gold group has been established. Commissioner, are you aware that there are no members of the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group on that Gold group? Are you aware of that?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** That was one of the points I was referring to about the fact I need to reassure myself that the things are in place around the Gold

group. So, no, I was not aware of that but I am now. I will be having a conversation with the Gold Commander.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Cindy?

(interruption from public gallery)

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Hold on a minute. As you know, we have a rule about heckling in this Chamber. There are Members that want to continue to ask questions.

(interruption from public gallery)

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** If you continue to disrupt the meeting I will have you removed.

(interruption from public gallery)

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** If you allow the meeting to continue, rather than jump to conclusions. Cindy?

(interruption from public gallery)

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I am going to adjourn the meeting. I have adjourned the meeting for five minutes.

(interruption from public gallery)

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Shall we resume the meeting? Thank you very much. Cindy, you were going to ask a question about this?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** A couple of things really. I am the first person to acknowledge exactly what Tim Godwin said; the MPS has travelled a huge journey. I have been on this table for ten years and I have been saying the same thing over and over and over again. This organisation needs to get better. It needs to get better at engagement and it needs to understand the links. There is a really, really strong link between the way in which the black community is policed and the kinds of demonstrations we see today. You cannot disassociate the two. There is a reason why the level of anger erupts like this; because the day to day experiences do not give people confidence.

I am the first person to say that we need enforcement when we deal with gun and knife crime. Of course we do. But that has to go hand in hand with support and with prevention work. Chairman, when you talk about having gone to observe Connect, that is fine. Go to Connect. Let's do more of Connect. Let's clamp down on the gangs. Let's

do the enforcement. But enforcement alone will not work. You cannot disassociate Smiley Culture's death from the fact that we have a young girl that is laying in hospital fighting for her life having been shot in that very same locality. You cannot disassociate that. You cannot disassociate the shooting in the Kentucky when you talk about a stab vest. When that man took off that stab vest do you know how many times he was stabbed? You cannot disassociate them.

I do fear that this organisation has not heeded the lessons of the past when the Acting Commissioner has to say that he has to reassure himself that there is a member of the community on that Gold group. When he says that he has to reassure himself about the level of community support. We have to say, "Where are the lessons of the past?" Thirty years since the Brixton riots. A lot has changed but we have so much more to do.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the Gold groups there are specific things that are in all the Gold groups that we do. It is only since Jennette has said that she does not think there is anyone on there that I need to go and check because I had assumed there would be.

In terms of the other issues around outreach, in terms of all the things we have done from Project Voyage, all the things that we have done in relation to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the connectivity, all the stuff we have done around police consultation forums, all the stuff we have done around stop and search monitoring forums, all the stuff we have done to facilitate setting up Somali youth forums, the various bits that we have put in place, the fact that we have independent advisers that we never had before, the fact that they are mainstreamed as part of our organisation, the fact that we constantly monitor all those issues and events.

Every now and again tragedies will occur where people will form a view that we cannot, because of the nature of the investigation - Cindy, I can sense your frustration and I understand that but you have been part of the journey we have been through and we are - we truly are - a different organisation to the one we were in the 1990s. What we have to do is constantly revisit and constantly challenge ourselves and you, yourself, have done that through this body and that is the place that we are at.

Will we ever be able to satisfy all those that will have concerns about what occurred in various events and tragedies? Probably not, but we have got to try and the first thing we have to do is to be open about it.

In terms of the investigation of course we, the MPS, are not investigating anything in relation to this. I would have loved to have answered that.

In terms of the letter of condolence that is an issue. I have got to think about that. That is a fair challenge in the sense of where are with that. Why not?

The reality is we are a different organisation, we have learnt a lot and, whilst this was a distressing event, we still must not decry all the efforts that have gone on by some very

good people to change things, and things are - trust me, from my perspective - totally different.

In terms of going to do public meetings and that, I have been there before myself - and Cindy has been there with me - when it has been very heated and very emotive and very passionate, as it should be, and where you definitely feel, as a senior police officer, to be held to account. I am not afraid of that and I certainly will not be afraid of that in the future. I can understand frustration and anger from people who have lost loved ones. I can understand that and I can understand that it boils over and I can understand that that may result in the events that we saw. What I have to do is make sure that we are doing everything that we can to work with communities, whomever they may be, in reassuring people that we are - I am passionately proud of the fact that the vast majority of the men and women of this organisation are honest, brave, loyal and are here to make London safer for the people who live and work here. That is what drives them forward. They are not here to do anyone down or to hurt anyone. As a result of that, we need to make sure we get that message across.

**Clarence Thompson MBE (from public gallery):** Chairman, let me introduce myself. I am the Chair of the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group (CPCG) and I would like to help.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I am sorry, sir. I am more than happy to talk to you afterwards. Absolutely.

**Clarence Thompson MBE (from public gallery):** That is what I am saying.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Great. Dee?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I find what we have just seen very, very distressing, particularly the guy in the white suit who I think he said was the brother of the person who was killed. I equally have worked with Tim Godwin for a number of years and I know that he is somebody who deeply cares and everything he said I absolutely buy into.

There has just got to be a better way. Saying to people, "I cannot comment because there is an ongoing investigation" is like a red rag to a bull because people simply do not understand the legal niceties of it - and why should they? God forbid. If anyone round the table had lost a loved one they are not interested in, "There is an inquiry going on and if I say something I'll prejudice this, that and the other". I think that we need to set up some sort of mechanism where, in a case like this, you could have had an informal chat before the meeting to try to explain in more everyday language.

It bothers me that I do not think that all of the people in the audience today - and I will not name names but I do not think all of the people in the audience today had come here because they were grief stricken; I think there were people that were stoking it up and using people's grief in the most disgraceful way. This is regrettable but the fact is that when people are grieving they just want somebody to help them, they want a shoulder to

cry on and they are going to be, inadvertently used, and this is dreadful but we have got to find a better way of dealing with this. That was heartbreaking. I never want to see anything like that again. Ever. It was dreadful.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I did go and have a chat before the meeting with the nephew and with Lee [Jasper](?), who were the two that were here. I have not met the brother before and I have not been introduced to the brother. I did explain the problems because the investigation is not ours. For obvious reasons they will not share anything with me and nor would I embarrass them by asking that investigation to share anything with me. There should, however, be a family liaison officer allocated by the investigating force on the IPCC to support the family to do that very thing that you are saying. Certainly, with Daniel's Morgan family, the FLO was here with them in terms of that responsibility.

I know the criticism here. I do not know who is briefing and all the rest of it. That is because I am hoping that nobody is briefing from my end in terms of those sorts of events. I know there was a newspaper article the other day which was actually as a result of a court hearing in relation to a bail application where specific questions were asked by the court. In terms of briefings, we would not be giving briefings. It is not our role to give briefings. We are not the investigators. We would be significantly challenged if we did.

Sometimes it is painful because you want to be able to say a lot more but history dictates that you do that at your peril and it is wrong. Sometimes you have to take the outpouring of anger and have to hear it, you have to try to work and try to resolve it and you do need to try to ask others as to how we can reassure communities such as the gentleman in the audience. It is difficult and I cannot tell you how frustrating it is sitting here sometimes when you cannot.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Toby?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Can I make two points? The first is just what you said about briefings. I think we have to acknowledge that the MPS has form on briefings following incidents of this sort. Too often in the past - and I would like to think it was just in the past - when there have been some dreadful incidents, whatever the nature of it, briefings have gone on which have attacked the character or the background of the person who has perhaps died or whatever else has happened. I have no idea whether that happened in this case. I just hope that that previous form of the MPS has changed.

The other point I want to make is that, yes, that was distressing and we were also aware of the raw emotions of the Morgan family earlier. One of the things that I think we need to consider - certainly, you, Chairman, need to consider - is what is going to be the substitute for the visible answerability of the MPS to those sorts of often distressing cases in the future because a private meeting does not hack it? There are one or two individuals I am sure who are looking forward to the television pictures of them walking out of the meeting. That is fine. I understand that. That is also part of what goes on. It

is the visible answerability. The fact that senior officers of the MPS have to sit there and, frankly, take some of the things that are being said and some of the things that are being raised.

One of the difficulties about the Government's proposals are that, with the disappearance of this Authority, there is no automatic substitute. There is no way in which the Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime, in its one to one relationship with the Commissioner of the MPS, is going to be able to have that visible answerability. There will not be an audience or, if there is an audience, it will be very artificial. That is something which we are going to lose because that is then going to mean that what we have just had is going to have to find another outlet and it will be a less satisfactory outlet in the sense that it will be taking place in somewhere where the MPS is not being held to account but needs a proxy for it. I think that is going to be both a disadvantage to the MPS but, more importantly, it is going to be a disadvantage to the people of London.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, I would hope that My Lord Harris will be making those very points when he gets the opportunity in the Upper House because I totally support what he has just said and I know that that has got a body of support across London.

Going back to the comments made, Chairman, and the Acting Commissioner confirmed it, if I can put it this way, the blood relative that we were introduced to was Merlin Emmanuel, the nephew, who has sat with dignity in this Chamber. I would ask that the meeting with him and the family is made as soon as possible.

Others were talking about being the brethren of Smiley Culture. We can tell you, from the black community, we are all brethren but our duty is to the family. I just want that on record because I do not want us to appear confused. It may well be that there is somebody who is not with that member of the family who came late but let's be clear about the language we are using.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Val Shawcross?

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Just to help with the constructive way forward on this and to support Toby's comments about the absolute importance of having structures in which these issues are debated and aired publicly, the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group is interested very much in the best sense of helping in this issue. The gentleman who made the comments from the side there - I know you cannot minute those comments because they are from the audience - so can I put them on to the record? Clarence Thompson is the Chair of the Lambeth Community Police Consultative Group who I think are well able to facilitate the full and proper airing of these issues and to give a good, democratic and open format for the police and the community to talk about these things. I would urge the Commissioner, through you, Chairman, to take up that offer.



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Clive?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** First of all I just want to echo Toby's comments that we have come to an interesting place whereby a proposal which was intended in some way to increase democratic accountability results in a decrease in democratic accountability on a day to day basis and that seems very unfortunate.

I made a comment while you left the Chamber and I was warned that the microphones were on. Therefore I want to be clear about the fact that I am not ashamed of that comment and I want to repeat it and really to endorse what Dee said. The family and friends are distressed and angry and do not behave in the best forms in a public environment on these occasions. It is entirely understandable and perhaps even salutary for people such as ourselves to hear and see that, however distressing it may be.

That there were others who were exploitative of that was also entirely clear and I want to differentiate, therefore, between the genuine distress, the posturing distress and the dignified, no doubt, distress and anger, for example of this gentleman who has remained here and sat throughout. I think it is really important that we do not assume that, because he has remained here, he does not care, whereas other people who stand about and wave their arms around do. It seems to me much more constructive that individuals such as this gentleman, who have a representative and formal function, play that part responsibly and none of us misunderstand that and suggest that he cares less whereas others who simply engage in demagoguery and exploitation are not seen to be of any practical use whatsoever in such situations.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. I am sorry that those who chose to exploit the situation did so because it meant that they were not here to hear the proper examination and the questions that are being asked about what is a very serious matter. They also were not here to hear what was always my intention which was to offer my condolences generally around the death of Mr Emmanuel. He was part of my youth as much as he was everybody else's and I was very shocked and perplexed to see his death reported.

Also to hear me say what I was going to say which is that I have regular meetings and a very good relationship with the IPCC and I would be pressing it, for community reassurance and other reasons but also for the family, to make sure that the investigation was conducted as quickly as it possibly could be, as I have done in many other cases where there have been distressing circumstances and where there are bereaved families.

It is unfortunate that, as you say, Clive, this situation was always going to happen, whatever we had done, because there were people here who were intent on exploiting the grief of others and the circumstances for their own ends and that is a pity. Nevertheless, you are right that we have to be focused on what is the most important thing, which is to reach the truth in this matter and then expose that to the satisfaction of the family and for the confidence of the public.

On your remarks, Cindy, right at the start, as you will know, I have been completely aligned with your view around these particular issues. With my hat on in this building that is exactly what we have been trying to do through some of the many programmes - not least the mentoring, the extra resources we are putting into the Voyage programme, some of the work we are doing in Feltham and elsewhere - is to break this idea that it is all about enforcement. When I mentioned me going on the raid with Connect one of the things that I am particularly keen about Connect is that it brings both sides together; that it brings the support and the diversion and the work with young people alongside the enforcement with those who would lead them away from the right path in life.

In that atmosphere, as I say, we will be pushing the IPCC for a swift conclusion to this and then, when the investigation is finished, we will be promoting that to others.

I have to say I would have gone to the public meetings that were held around this if I had been asked, and I was not asked. Following this I will be trying to identify who are the proper representatives and those who expressed grief and I will meet them, in the same way that I am more than happy to meet anybody who loses a family member in this city. to express my grief and support for any investigation that follows. I think I have been consistent in that over the last two or three years.

Jenny, you wanted to say something?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I was going to raise the issue of the IPCC Chair being involved but I am getting a little bit irritated that we are talking about people's motives. We do not know what people's motives are and I think everybody who was here today and who had the outburst had absolutely every right to be here. If somebody brought them for any of his own motives I do not care; the fact they were here was very important.

Policing is not an academic exercise. We all get a little bit divorced from the reality of what happens out there. I was very upset. I felt like crying too. I think several other people did here. I think it is really important that we saw that, whatever the reason, and we should accept that if things had been handled better then perhaps we would not have been exposed to it. I am very glad to hear you are going to speak to the family and at meetings. I think that is absolutely the right way forward. This is the result of lots of previous mistakes so we cannot just say, "It's people agitating". It is our collective fault as much as anybody else's.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I understand that but the purpose of this grouping is to examine these issues in a sober and serious way and that takes time and it takes thought. What I tried to say to those people who were in the audience was that if they would just wait, hear the other questions - if they had waited just another 30 seconds they would have heard Cindy's contribution, which was valuable, and the contribution of others.

I am sorry, Jenny, I disagree with you; I think there was one, possibly more, people in the audience who wanted to create a fight whatever happened. If they waited to the end they

might have heard some of the things they wanted to hear. Nevertheless, it does not lessen the anger and the grief that some people feel but we cannot operate in that atmosphere here; we have to have time and space and quiet to ask the serious questions that we need to ask about what is a very distressing event.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Chairman, we also have to be proportionate. Of course there were people who were intent on hijacking the situation. We know that. It is about proportionality in terms of our responses and our debate. Jenny is right to point to the relationship that the black community has had with the police over the years. You can have someone whom you have never ever met before in your entire life, you know nothing about them or their family, but that person dies in dubious circumstances where the police are involved and it becomes your issue as a member of the black community. That is just the way it works and it works that way because of our very difficult history. It is just acknowledging that.

When I am walking down Shepherd's Bush and I see a young black man being stopped. From day dot I was taught to stand by, it is your responsibility to stand by, and what happens. That is just the way it is. You have to acknowledge that the wider black community, regardless of where they were - there were people here I know today that were not even from London! From Manchester and from Nottingham. That is just the way the black community works. You cannot then make so much of an issue of the fact that there were two, maybe three - and one in particular - incredibly irresponsible person. You cannot make that the focus, but we still have to resolve the issues and debate them. That is all. Understanding the way the black community works is important.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** That is what we are trying to do and that is what we are going to do. The point I was trying to make is that we were prevented from doing that --

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I know. I know.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** That is the great pity because this is a matter that needs to be properly examined - as are all the deaths in the black community. There are lots of issues, particularly around youth violence, which you know have been concerning us significantly over the last three years which we need to tease out. That has to be done in a calm and sober atmosphere that takes these issues as seriously as we can and the practicalities of a meeting that go like that do not allow us to do that. That is the only issue I am making.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I know. I do think Dee's point earlier about how do we find a mechanism was a good point. We have the IPCC involvement. How do we, as the MPS or the new whatever it is, start to engage with those communities that are affected, even though we are constrained about what we can say? We need some form of mechanism.

I would say that there was a time when we actually had that and that is why I asked Tim [Godwin], when you go away and think about what has happened in this particular

circumstance, it is important to reflect upon did we do enough, have we learnt the lessons of the past and is there some learning for us as an organisation in how we engage and how we manage to let a situation just boil up when we could have done something to maybe have been a bit more proactive?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** All right. We will have a think about that. Were there any other questions on this item?

**Toby Harris (AM):** I am assuming that, given that some of the people have now left, what you said in terms of summing up the discussion is going to be issued as a press release and you will be trying to write to the family to outline that?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Absolutely. OK. Shall we move on to the rest of the report?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** One other event that I need to report is the sentencing of Delroy Grant for 27 years custodial service for a series of horrific offences against vulnerable victims in south London over a 17 year period. I would like to pay tribute to the courage of the victims of Delroy Grant, some of whom are, sadly, no longer with us and I hope that, to some extent, his conviction and sentence has brought some relief and comfort, having been finally brought to justice.

We identified when Delroy Grant was arrested that a mistake was made in the mid 1999 period where there was an opportunity to apprehend Grant. It came to light quite quickly after his arrest and we voluntarily referred the matter again to the IPCC. The IPCC investigated it and identified it as an error - that had tragic consequences - that required words of advice to be given to two officers. I know that the Commissioner, Sir Paul Stephenson, has said on many occasions, as have many of us, that the thing about police work is that relatively minor human errors can have massively significant consequences but we must not forget that they are minor human errors.

We still need to, once again, apologise and I know that Simon Foy on the steps of the court offered his apologies on behalf of the MPS, which I reinforce, in that, had we not made that mistake, then some victims may not have been subjected to the offences that they suffered.

Operation Minstead itself was one of the most extraordinarily protracted and difficult investigations carried out by the MPS and has been subject to much scrutiny by this body. We have had a dedicated team of detectives supported by borough detectives and specialist colleagues working for some years trying to catch Delroy Grant and bring him to justice. In 2009 we developed a new phase in terms of Delroy Grant's offending which gave us an opportunity and from that change in his behaviour we mounted a very large operation, resulting in his arrest in November 2009. Thousands of officers and staff from across the MPS have been involved in the case over many years and many of them have shown extreme dedication and commitment.

We persevered with those inquiries throughout long periods, sometimes running into years and years, as individuals, even where there were no apparent Minstead offences coming to light. I think it is also right that, whilst I apologise for the mistake in 1999, I also pay tribute to those that have been hunting Delroy Grant tenaciously for that period of time.

Operation Minstead, as everything else that we do, is now subject to a thorough debrief and the learning has been shared across both the MPS and the wider family of the police service.

In October 2009, as this Authority is aware, the Serious Crime Directorate took responsibility for all rape and sexual offence investigations, which had led to an improved consistency in standards of crime recording and supervision and there are now better trained dedicated teams committed to the investigation of rape.

Having dealt with Minstead I would like to move on to Saturday, if that is all right with Members, unless you want to break protocols and take questions?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I think we should take questions on this one too. Joanne, you had a written question?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I had a written question on that. My question was what went wrong - and I think you have identified that - and what lessons have been learned? I asked that because these were extremely horrific rapes and assaults on very vulnerable elderly residents over an extremely long period. Yet again we have a rape investigation, one of a number recently, which has shown failings. Often simple errors or simple oversights have had such dramatic consequences. Chances have been missed. I really want to know what reassurance can you give that this is the last of these historic investigations that we will be hearing about where these chances were missed and what are you going to do to reassure the public?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** As a police service we deal with 800,000 crimes a year. We deal with significantly more calls for assistance from members of the public. Police officers, as any other human being, are fallible and police officers will make mistakes. When I talk to new recruits I always point out to them, "You cannot have a bad day now. Now that you are a police officer you can never have a bad day because, if you do, the consequences of that can be significant".

Can I promise that out of the 32,000 police officers, the 4,500 Police Community Support Officers and all our police staff that they will never make a mistake? No, I cannot. Can I say that over the last 20, 25, 30 years' history of the MPS there are not people out there that have made mistakes that have had impacts that we will find out in the future? No, I cannot. Can I say that we try very hard to have the best trained officers in the world who have got the right values and who are focused on doing the right thing? Yes, we have got those I believe but we still need to do more and constantly do it. I am extremely proud of the people that we do have in this organisation.

I must confess that when Minstead went on and on - and a lot of it of course was burglary as opposed to consistency in terms of sexual offences - I was nervous about what we would find when he was in fact arrested, conscious that people do make mistakes over that period of time and the amount of people that might have come into contact with him. As a result there was a very quick review when he was in custody as to what had occurred and there was that one event in 1999 which was an opportunity for him to be arrested and was missed. It was an understandable mistake. It should not have happened, but it was an understandable mistake.

I do not know what more I can say other than we are committed - and a lot of people were committed - to catching Delroy Grant. We were passionate about catching Delroy Grant but, again, every now and again, a person in a day, a minute, five minutes, may make a mistake.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Valerie Shawcross?

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** I wanted to say something about Stockwell so perhaps not at this point. Later.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Later. OK. Valerie Brasse?

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I hear what you say and I understand people make mistakes. In another arena I remember hearing a senior MPS detective say, "In the A to Z of investigation we never got beyond letter B". This clearly is a mistake. The questions it raises for me are the issues around supervision and the processes thereafter to be able to pick up some of these mistakes. That is one of my deepest concerns.

I believe that this mistake was identified, as you say, after Delroy Grant was arrested. One of the issues is, if there had been three serious case reviews as late as - and the most recent - in 2009 and this had never been picked up, what does it say about the supervision on the ground and our processes of serious case review?

The other issue for me - and I find myself increasingly wandering in here with loads of bits of news cuttings - is the blunder that was identified in 2009 after the arrest, were we in the MPA made aware of that and is that just symptomatic of an organisation who increasingly seems to be failing to brief us on events as and when they happen?

I suppose my question is two fold; about the processes we have, given that somebody makes a mistake, how comfortable are we about the supervisory processes and our serious case reviews that clearly did not pick it up. Then the extent to which the MPA is kept informed. I could link this to Daniel Morgan. I find that I am getting nearly all my details from the newspaper cuttings and I am getting a little bit increasingly worried that, as and when you realise things have gone wrong, it is coming towards the MPA.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Chairman, I have got some questions. Would it help to have all the comments first because we are going to overlap a little bit?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Fine. If you ask specific questions that is fine.

**Graham Speed (AM):** My concerns very much echo those of the previous speakers but I would want to start by reflecting on the ultimate success of the operation - which is to be congratulated - and to recognise the points that Tim has made about the dedication and commitment of many of those officers that have been involved in this inquiry for many, many years and, in some cases, at significant personal sacrifice to their own personal lives.

I still come back to the question - and it is one that has been raised earlier - I do not understand why it has taken nearly 20 years to catch him. We talk about we all have great pride in the service. I would like to think this is the best police service in the world with the best trained detectives in the world. It is highly resourced and it is highly trained but it still took nearly 20 years to get him.

I have very similar concerns to Valerie in terms of information flow on this. The information flow has come from watching television and cutting out bits from the newspaper. We have not been properly briefed on this recently and I do not think that we have been properly briefed on this during the course of events in recent years. Certainly in terms of my time on this Authority, when I first started I tried to get information. It was very difficult to get that information and I sensed a real reluctance in the service to share information about how this inquiry is developing.

We have heard Tim's suggested next steps but I really do not understand how we are going to learn yet again the lessons from what seemed to me to be a failure in the service in respect to what is a long running series of linked sexual offences. We have heard about it before. We have had Worboys. We have had Minstead. Same sort of problems seem to be coming back again.

I raised concerns previously about resourcing and tactics and these seem to have been brushed aside, "Yes, we are doing everything we can. Yes, we've looked at this".

The suggestion now seems to be being made that someone else has had a look at this, come at it and said, "Let's put aside the high tech scientific approach and let's apply a conventional policing approach to this. Let's go out and do a surveillance job". Lo and behold it seems to have caught him. What I want to understand is could that approach have been taken ten years ago? Mistakes were made but ten years went on from that. 200 linked offences that we know about. Heaven knows how many more beyond that.

I am still not convinced. I do not understand what we as an Authority are doing about this and I do not understand what the next steps are in terms of us gaining a better understanding of how the service has managed to fail to make the connection with Grant for so long.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Steve?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Thank you. I know Tim will come back on those comments. I would like to endorse many of the points that Graham has made but also, as a representative of that area - there was a very large amount of offences across the Croydon and the Bromley borders - it is absolutely fantastic that this weight of fear - and there has been a real fear across that area of the elderly population while this fellow has been out and about for that long period of time - has now been removed. For that elderly population it needs to be commented on.

I would endorse, to a degree, that this has been a long operation. Comments have already been made about early mistakes. In response to Joanne, you can never, in human nature, manage out human error - ever - but the fact of the matter is that this individual was allowed to continue his grotesque offences against elderly people for a long period of time.

However, I would comment. The Deputy Commissioner and I had a conversation a while back around this. I was being given a lot of pressure locally. There were developments and you shared them in confidence with me and I respected that confidence because I knew we had to bring this person to book.

I do not necessarily endorse the comments around information flow but I am greatly relieved, on behalf of the elderly community across Croydon and Bromley, that this person has been taken off the street, but I do share concerns that he was allowed to be out there for such a significant period of time.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, following on from what Steve said, I go back to 2005 and recall discussions about Operation Minstead. If you were a Member of whatever committee that was then, certainly, Members were involved and were briefed.

I also want to pick up the point that Valerie Brasse made. There are some longstanding ongoing cases - and the Morgan family is one - that, from my experience, the Member is kept briefed and is working with the Chairman and the Commissioner and the appropriate Assistant Commissioner (AC) on. I do not know how we make that wider and it may be something that we should look to.

The specific question that I have been asked to raise is to say can we recognise that a huge weight has been lifted off the black men of that age in the community of the south east because they were all suspects until this man's capture and now imprisonment for life? Very many of them came forward and gave their DNA evidence voluntarily. I would like that recognised because that then balances out the negativity that there is sometimes about black males, young and old, not contributing and working with the service. I would like that on the record.



Then I would just like to go on. If not today, Chairman, could you explore how that DNA capture and storage is going to be dealt with? Certainly, what we should be saying is that we are thankful for their involvement and we will now seek to get their DNA evidence destroyed because they should not be on a police database because they were innocent and they did not need to give their DNA, certainly in the last ten years. I would ask you to progress that as soon as possible?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thanks very much. Are there any other matters arising? Just before Tim starts, just on the information point, from memory I attended a Member briefing on Minstead in the middle of 2009 held at the MPA where Simon Foy came and briefed us on the operation. That was prior to the capture --

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Not since then, Chairman. What I was trying to get at was the blunder that was identified, I am not sure whether that was shared with the MPA.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Hold on. If I could finish? It has been on my list up until the capture whenever I have had briefings with Cressida [Dick] [Assistant Commissioner, MPS]. Then in the months and weeks in the run up to his capture, when there were developments, I was certainly kept up to date that there was likely to be something coming forward. These are very, very sensitive issues and there is an issue, quite rightly, about the police controlling the information flow about what is going on and what things might get out and might not. This particular perpetrator, as I understand it, had a pattern of disappearing and would disappear for a number of years sometimes before reappearing and committing again. Nobody yet knows why he did that but that might be because there was prominence in the media about it. The MPS was, quite rightly, very, very tight with the information that there was progress being made on the case.

Following his capture, as I understand it - certainly when I went down to see the team - his conviction was the primary aim and the team was entirely concentrated on making sure that it got to court with all its evidence in place and properly documented and got the guy locked up. I would be more than happy - Tim, I am sure the team would be more than happy - to come and brief Members now on the conclusions of the case afterwards.

The flow of information - I think it is a little unfair to criticise them, given that we had a briefing and then, in the months in the run up to, they were quite rightly keeping things tight.

Sorry, Tim, I probably said what you were going to say.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** You did. Supervision in 1999 and the problems in supervision in 1999 for serious sexual assault led to the establishment of Sapphire, the creation of the Havens and a whole change in the way that we undertook serious sexual assault investigations with sexual offences investigation trained officers (SOITs) and a whole range of things we put in.

That was then challenged again with some of the errors that came - do not forget, in terms of serious sexual assault, we got many thousands of those in that period of time. Every now and again people do make a mistake as I said before.

In terms of where are we now compared to where we were then in 1999 supervision is so different that what we need to do is assure ourselves of the supervision now. That is done and I know that you have been heavily involved in that, Valerie, so I am not sure what more you want, other than I will --

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** Case reviews? Three of them. The most recent in 2009.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of the review processes there were long periods where there was no offending. As a result of that the review processes, again, have now been built into the Serious Crime Directorate (SCD) functionality and they are very used to those serious case reviews.

In terms of the information, the Chairman said it very well; that we --

**Valerie Brasse (AM):** I am sorry. I do want to challenge that. We are having differential information flows and I accept that you say that they are sensitive so some Members will get it and the Authority as a whole does not it would appear. I was at that briefing. The issue for me was the blunder that was identified shortly after the arrest, which led to the referral to the IPCC, I was not - and maybe others were - aware that that blunder had happened. I think it is rather odd that Members cannot be trusted with that information at the time the matter was referred so I asked the question simply, "Was the MPA, collectively, aware? Was it just the Chairman aware?"

As I say, I do not want to find that I am picking up bits of information after the event from newspapers, which I do not think puts the Authority in a good position to be able to do the job that it is set up to do. I am sorry.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Because of the nature of the mistake that was made - and I know it is a far more exciting term to use blunder but a mistake was made - and because it was involved in the individual and in terms of DNA, had that come out that would have been problematic for us in the trial process, and I support the fact that the team, and Cressida Dick, kept it very, very tight in order to achieve the primary objective of this organisation, which was the conviction of Delroy Grant and his removal from the streets of London to stop him offending.

After that we have to very quickly then be held accountable as we are, but it was a mistake that was made in 1999.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Chairman, the issue is that since the conviction most of us found out about this from the press and newspapers and it would be helpful if, when we have a case like this, that a briefing comes out immediately to us so that we are aware of

what has actually happened. Like, Valerie, I am cutting out bits from newspapers. The only information I get from the MPA are the occasional press story that are third party reported.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I did hear that and I will pick that up.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will have a think about that. I would say that the Business Management Group (BMG) operates a risk matrix and it has been on our risk matrix for some time. Reshard was briefed as Chair of Professional Standards as part of the whole thing. There comes a point - I guess this one is at one extreme in terms of the cases - where some Members will be interested in some cases and some not in others and there are also difficulties around confidentiality and judicial process and the press. We will have a think about whether we can improve the briefing process around, particularly, high profile cases. OK?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Are we going to have a debrief, Chairman?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Yes. We will have a debrief in time, once the review is done and the MPS knows what the conclusions of that are. Then we will get the same team along that came and briefed us 18 months ago to come and brief us then.

It is worth pointing out that we should offer our thanks to Paul Stephenson who did ramp up and authorise the ramp up of the investigation and change of approach that led to the apprehension of Delroy Grant.

**Graham Speed (AM):** That should have been done earlier, Chairman. It was a change.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** It may have done but hindsight is a wonderful thing. The primary objective is to congratulate them for catching this horrible man while, at the same time, regretting everybody who was his victim and also the fact that there was an error. I think we have to be very careful. It is very easy to fall into the trap of, "You've found a cure for cancer. Why didn't you find it ten years ago?" We have to be positive about some of these things and this was a great result, albeit it could have been a great result earlier and we have to learn why that did not happen.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** It was as a result of changed behaviour that gave us the opportunity and the investigative lead that we then took and it resulted in his capture.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I am not sure it is quite so simple as just the change of police tactics.

**Graham Speed (AM):** You just said we were congratulating the Commissioner on putting extra resources in --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I think it was a combination of the two.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Once that was identified there was an opportunity and that was seized.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will get that in the briefing when it comes. OK. Can we move on to the rest of your report please?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Saturday. Lynne Owens is here who was the Assistant Commissioner responsible, with Commander Simon Bray as the Gold Commander. On Saturday we had the march for the alternative which involved between 250,000 and 500,000 people. We gave up counting at about 100,000 because we were sorely tested then to get accurate figures. Basically, a great number of people passed peacefully through London. In the vast majority of instances it was very well policed by both the members of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) and the police operation itself and I want to pay particular thanks to those that were involved in stewarding the march together with our officers.

For me there was a significant amount of unfair criticism of the police leadership and the police officers responsible for deploying in terms of that march after the event. If we were all blessed with hindsight as foresight I think the world would be a better place. Unfortunately, we are not and, as a result, decisions have to be made in the heat of events that will have consequences at some point in the future. I thought that they did extremely well and I am very proud of all of them involved in that operation.

There were a number of violent groups within the overall march and these were criminals intent on causing damage and, in some circumstances, violence. They ranged in size from 500 to 1,000. Over 200 protestors were arrested on the day, which is the highest number that we have arrested in a number of years. I am pleased to report that 149 were charged very swiftly after their detention which, again, is not a normal outcome. No one can say that it was not robust.

Over 50 other people were arrested in addition to the 200 but a number of those were arrested for breaching the peace and were de-arrested after the breaching the peace risk had passed.

We still have a number of others who are on bail and there is a significant post incident investigation to bring further and serious charges against individuals.

As a result of the violence that the MPS officers stood up to, together with aid from other forces, we had 65 police officers injured. Fifteen of those officers required hospital treatment. Again, I reinforce, it does not look like an unrobust policing operation to me.

The original intelligence we had was that they were going to target premises across the footprint of the march from Parliament to the West End and vast swathes of London remained untouched and central London remained open for business throughout the whole of the protest. To me that was success in policing and it was success in the

engagement and interaction that we had with the organisers and the vast majority of the people that were attending the march. The use of Twitter and other things was extremely useful in maintaining that communication throughout.

The violent criminals who, therefore, had to change their tactics by removing clothing and changing their appearance several times during the day were problematic but they were then contained and disorder occurred in Trafalgar Square. Attempts were made to damage the Olympic clock and, as a result, the containment was put in place, a number of police officers were injured and a number of arrests were made.

In the time that we now have we do have observers that follow us now and we will be awaiting a report from some of those observers as to what they saw and how they found the policing of the operation.

We have now received 90 messages of support in addition to positive messages posted both on Twitter and other social media sites about the way that we policed that particular operation. The ones that we see more of are those that are critical but we have a number of significant individuals who were both present or owned premises in the area of protest who have expressed their gratitude for Lynne and her team and the police officers and police support officers on duty on that event.

It was a very, very long and challenging day for all those involved and it was great tribute that, the following morning, many of the officers that had been deployed the night before were able to take up further duty and that the morale and confidence was still high. It pays great credit to the organisation that the MPS is and the men and women that you and we employ.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We should take some questions on this now too. Let's get this out of the way and then we can deal with the rest. Jenny, you had a written question?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes, thank you. I was on the march. I hardly saw a police officer all day. I thought it was very well policed from that point of view and I think that a lot of the criticism has been totally unfair because how could you know? I have even seen a picture of a tactical support team (TST) officer hugging a protestor. I am sure that --

**James Cleverly (AM):** Was that you, Jenny?! Hug a hoodie!

**Jenny Jones (AM):** That was obviously probably a minority element. I did want to ask about the Fortnum stuff. These are just straight questions. I am not trying to trip you up at all. I am curious about how many arrests were made at the time or later for criminal damage or for violence? Do you know?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I will ask Lynne if that is OK.

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** I do have that breakdown in terms of offences but I have not brought it with me today. If you are asking specifically about Fortnum & Mason at the time they were all arrested for aggravated trespass.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is the criminal damage aspect that I am particularly concerned about. Perhaps you could let us know about that?

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** I can supply those figures outside of the meeting.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I have also seen footage of a very nice police officer telling all the people inside the store that they are free to go, then they all leave and they get arrested. I do not understand. That officer looked as if she was being completely honest and credible and I am worried that she was saying what she believed to be true and then senior officers either did not inform her properly or lied to her. Did anybody lie to her so that she was saying what - so that all the protestors left peacefully --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** We do not lie.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Where is the --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** We do not lie to our police officers. If I may interject at that point? If messages get cross wired or whatever then that may be one thing but we do not lie. I will ask Lynne if she can answer that one.

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** I, too, have seen the footage. As you will be aware it was a significant operation and we had a command team in place. The command team consisted of a Gold, a Silver and 13 Bronzes, all of whom had a minimum of two sub-Bronzes working to them. The officer that you have seen in the footage was a sub-Bronze. Clearly I cannot say too much about the incident itself because the individuals who were in that premises were being charged and, therefore, any communication that the officer may have had could be part of that communication but, from the documentation I have seen, I think there was a change in what happened over time. She may not have had all the information available to her at the time but I am very confident she certainly was not lied to and I do not believe she lied to the people in the shop.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** The point on this one, Jenny, is that it will be tested in court I am sure. That is the place for it to be tested.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** We had the Westminster incident as well where police officers apparently honestly told people they would be released and then they were kettled on Westminster Bridge.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Again, it will be tested in terms of court processes. The bit that I am going to say here is that we cannot allow people to go in, commit damage, commit other offences and not arrest them if we are in a position to do it. I want to point out that our intention from now on is that we will be arresting those if we are in a position to arrest. Anybody that decides to go and do some of those other actions in the future will know, from me, they stand the chance of being arrested if we are in a position to do so.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I understand that. That is exactly why I asked about the number of arrests for criminal damage because that is a significant difference --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I think there is a difference between arrest and charge but I am sure that Lynne will be able to explain to you with what people have been charged.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Those are crucial because there is a lot of concern about that. Could I say one more --

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** Could I pick up on the aggravated trespassing? We really need to be careful not to minimise that offence. That is a criminal offence and it is a criminal offence for a reason.

Picking up what Mr Godwin said, we need to be very clear; we do not arrest people who do not commit offences and the very fact that we have been supported by the CPS in the charge there will be the court case to come where all of this will be tested. Let's not degrade the fact that there were arrests and have been charges for criminal offences.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Were there police officers in the store during the protest?

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** At various times, yes.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Were there any undercover officers in the store at the time of the protests?

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** You know, Jenny --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Be very careful with that answer because we have had a history of that one! I was just trying to lighten the mood here!

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** Jenny, as you know, we are not in a position anymore to confirm or deny whether we have used undercover officers in these incidents, primarily for the safety of the officers.

One of the points I have made at various points during the week is I do find it slightly ironic that less than a month ago we were being castigated for using undercover officers in protest environments and now we find ourselves subject to scrutiny for potential failures in intelligence, which is an interesting place to find ourselves, but, in this specific incident, I am not prepared to tell you whether there were people there undercover.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We have got a lot of Members to get through so James please?

**James Cleverly (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. Clearly one of the significant challenges that is emerging in public order policing is the speed and flexibility of mass communications technology. We mentioned Twitter and Facebook. I can only assume that, at some point in the future, that will evolve further. Has any thought or investigation been given into the idea of using marking technologies? I mention SmartWater but I am sure there may be other ways of marking individuals who have been identified in being involved in criminal activities which would mean that when they remove or change clothing they could still subsequently be arrested and separating the small number of people intent on criminal activity from the vast majority of people that went on that march and other marches who have no desire to do anything other than make their particular views known?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I have got a lot of people. Why don't you make a note, Lynne, and then we will go round everybody. Joanne?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I start by saying that I was on the march as well and it was extremely peaceful and an extremely good atmosphere and it was extremely well stewarded and policed? Thank you for that. Can I also put on record my thanks to Bob Broadhurst [Commander Public Order and Pan London Operational Support] for his comments following the march and the violence that erupted elsewhere for distinguishing between those that organised and were on the march and those that were involved in disorder because other political commentators have not made that distinction, so that was really welcome and can I personally thank him for that.

On the march I was following you on Twitter, it was extremely useful and I was able to let colleagues around me know exactly what was going on elsewhere, for example the disorder up at Oxford Street, but it also let me know just how far I had yet got to march, so it was a bit dispiriting!

I want to ask two questions if I can. One is following on from what Jenny said about the arrests at Fortnum & Mason because, from the commentators and witnesses that were there, there does seem to be some disparity between what certain officers were saying. Some were saying, "We want you to leave freely and if you turn left out of this door you'll be fine". They did that and then were subsequently arrested so there seems to be some conflict between various officers there.



Secondly, the charge of aggravated trespass. Could you remind me what the elements of that offence are and are we looking, in the future, if organisations are going to mount what they believe to be peaceful sit downs in banks or in stores, does that mean that they will then be subsequently arrested or is that not the offence of aggravated trespass? That is an important point that we need to get out.

My third point is that the Home Secretary has said that she is going to be looking at new laws to enable police to stop potential perpetrators before they get to locations. Is that something you would welcome? I have heard comments that that could be more problematic than the ability to do exactly that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Think we can do that already. Clive?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** First of all I heard some appalling weapons were used against the police and I want to record that I think that is reprehensible and it seems to me not to have received quite as much publicity as it might have done. I am not sure whether there is an intention to avoid copy catting or whatever it is, but some really ghastly and clearly intentionally damaging weapons were used.

A small matter perhaps but there are going to be more demonstrations I am sure over the coming months and years. I noticed that, for understandable reasons, much of the police comment about the demonstration said how friendly and good natured it was and, as you say, differentiating between the two sides of things. I think that is important that people are not afraid to join a march like that and that they feel it is a well intentioned experience, but I fear that people who go on such a march are not going because they want to be friendly and good natured but because they want to make a point.

If there is an unintended statement from the police that there is this party going on and then there is this thing that hits the headlines there is a danger that, in fact, one might end up encouraging people that the only way to make your point is to not participate in these kinds of official and well coordinated demonstrations and, instead, run amok and do damage. I wonder whether, in future and in similar such well managed demonstrations, police might remember to say that the demonstration was forceful or effective or got its point across or was no doubt heard or something of that sort.

I am not saying that the police should concur or otherwise with the position of the demonstration - that, clearly, they are not supposed to do - but if they seem to suggest that it was just a pleasant jamboree in the park and then something else happened that everybody now takes note of, I fear that there will be some who will start to say, "It's a waste of time going to those things. They don't have any effect. Nobody really seems to have noticed what they say" --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No, just to deal with that one, Clive. If the police were to say anything beyond it made it from start to finish peacefully and there were X,000 people there then it becomes a political statement. What the police have to say has to be entirely factual and nothing more than that.

The Police Federation issued a statement of empathy - or whatever smart word it used - and can say that because it is its representation, but anything that the police officers say who are involved in policing the thing that is beyond factual would not be appropriate.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I have to say, Chairman, that, while I understand why you have that reservation, I fear we are in similar territory to that which Dee talked about before when the police plays a straight bat and, as a result, leads to unconstructive misunderstanding.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** In the same way that, under the investigation rules, that might be the price we pay to get to the truth and justice. The price you pay for political neutrality may also be that. Graham?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I wanted to support and endorse your opening comments following your experiences on the day. I regard this as being a well planned and well managed policing operation which led to a successful protest attended by a number of Members here and the march passed off peacefully.

As has been said, it was highly regrettable that an unconnected group of - what I think you described, Chairman, as - thugs chose to rampage through the West End, but it was gratifying to see, on this occasion, well over 200 arrested and, to date, something over 150 charged. That sends a very clear message to those that may think about coming next time that they are going to be met with that sort of policing.

I do want to pay tribute to the officers who were on duty for extended periods of time who showed great restraint in cases of particular difficulty and we should certainly offer our support to those that were injured and wish them a speedy recovery to work.

I want to step outside the discussions of what went on but just to note that, although this was a successful operation, it was also a very expensive operation and this is now the latest in a long series of very expensive operations at a time, as we will discuss later on no doubt, we can ill afford them. We, nevertheless, have to police them but we do need to be aware that they come at substantial financial cost but also operational impact on borough policing. As we have said before, lots of police there - 4,000 police officers, whatever it was - that were not out and about in the rest of London policing London. When that happens it costs and it impacts on policing in London but the overall message is a well policed and well managed operation.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Good. Thank you. Dee?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I want to follow up on something Clive said which is the new weapons that are being used against the police. I was away for the weekend so all my information came from the media. I wondered if the Acting Commissioner was going to look at a new approach to how demonstrations are policed because, whereas I think everyone round the table absolutely agrees with the fundamental right of people to

demonstrate peacefully, what we are now seeing is two lots of demonstrators. We are seeing the demonstrators who are demonstrating for a cause who might, at times, be slightly unruly, but then we are also seeing thugs who are coming along with no interest whatsoever in the demonstrations. I actually do not agree with Graham. I think no matter what you say you are going to do to them they will just see it as excellent, "We will come up with better and more tactics".

We have a duty to the police officers that we are putting against these people and I think we should be looking at better protective clothing, perhaps clothing for the face, and I think we need a fundamental review of how we police these demonstrations. I hate to say this but I cannot see the situation getting any better because the more these people get publicity the more they feed on publicity and their aims are nothing whatsoever to do with making a point; it is somewhere that they can go and create as much havoc as possible. Rather than being behind the curve we ought to try to get in front of it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Jennette?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, thank you. I have got a couple of comments. I was on the march and, as a seasoned marcher, I felt it was nearer 500,000, Tim. Can I add my thanks to the police and stewards that I saw out there; they were courteous and they were absolutely professional with the exception of the one who sent myself and a group the wrong way on Piccadilly and it meant that I then had to get on to the back streets, but that was interesting because at about 12 midday I was able to follow a number of groups of these thugs. What they were doing was getting themselves high on drink --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Tanked up.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** -- to go about their thuggery. I have shared this with Lynne. Myself and others who saw this were saying, "Face covered. Dressed in black. Carrying a backpack". Normally you would be stopped and you would be asked, certainly if you were black - not trying to get racial about this. What happened? Why were they allowed to be out there roaming? I saw them at about midday and it was, as you were saying, 4pm by the time things were kicking off. I wanted, Lynne, to be able to share with us what was the tactic behind allowing these groups of thugs to be out there because, clearly, the police have powers when they see people like this acting suspiciously to take them aside and deal with them appropriately.

I would like to finish by commending Lynne on the communications that clearly came out of this operation and I am following her now on Twitter.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Toby?

**Toby Harris (AM):** I think we should be quite clear this was a very large demonstration which was successfully policed and all involved in that need to be congratulated.

To follow up on Graham's question I would be interested to know whether we used any aid from outside the MPS for this and, if so --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We did.

**Toby Harris (AM):** That is what I had understood and it was not clear. Some estimate of the approximate cost would be useful, not necessarily today but in the future.

By and large all the comments I have heard from people have been extremely supportive about the policing and the details of it. I have one or two comments from people who were not part of the Fortnums gang but were in Piccadilly who felt that they were treated rather badly by police officers who did not distinguish them from the other groups.

The related issue is that most of the people on the march knew exactly who it was who were likely to go off and cause trouble because of the way they were behaving and the way in which they were dressed. Jennette's point about at what point would it have been possible to start to pick those individuals off and to find out what they were doing and perhaps to divert them would be interesting to hear more.

I also want to follow up on the question about the Home Secretary's comments about additional powers. As I understand it there seem to be two things being suggested. One is some different stop and search power and I would be interested in comments from the Acting Commissioner or from the Assistant Commissioner about what additional stop and search powers might be useful.

The second is that there should be some system - a bit like those football hooligans who are required to report to a police station at the time of a football match they might otherwise be interested in causing trouble at, and whether there might be a similar system which applied to them. I would be interested to know what the experience of that scheme is and what the practicalities and resource implications of that would be for this sort of operation.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Victoria?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I do not want to repeat what everybody has said obviously but I wanted to make a brief representation about the businesses in Oxford Street, not only of the cost of the money involved but I know they have also made representation about considering the routes of these marches. I share the comment that this will continue and we should consider that these businesses do want to go on and carry out a very important role as far as being part of our economy here so, if possible, we should try to avoid areas like that which are, financially, important to us all.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Chris?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** Can I start by saying that I was not there so I cannot be overly critical but, at the same time, I have heard from people who were there who have echoed

a lot of what people have said here; that it was a largely peaceful demonstration and it was well policed. For me there is a suggestion that some of these - I will call them disrupters for now - were not gotten to quickly enough. What I would like to hear is what are the suggestions for getting to these people quicker than we currently do? It was good to hear Tim talking about trying to tackle that issue. At the Notting Hill Carnival I have experienced a similar thing where you get one or two people who start to throw bottles and it seems to be a while before someone decides they need to be dealt with.

The other point I want to make is that a couple of us went to public order training a few days ago and what was interesting was in simulating a march there were groups of people who were sitting down, getting up and they were constantly moving and tried to disrupt the attempt to keep the march flowing. It seems to me that there is a piece of work to be done in identifying those people who are likely to cause trouble. We have heard that these people tend to turn up with particular kinds of clothing, masks and helmets. What work is done before the march to try to identify these people? I do get the sense that a bit more could be done to try to tackle them before the event.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** John?

**John Biggs (AM):** I was on the march and I happened to have the good, or misfortune, to be working past Fortnum & Mason just as it was being occupied. It was very clear that there were a small number of people who were fairly militaristic; they had tackle and equipment and they were trying to attach things to lamp posts and seemed to be quite well coordinated. They were a very small core and I shooed the people I was with along to avoid being at that.

As I was travelling on the march I was on the bus, the 25 bus down to Tower Hill, and there were a number of young women who were students and they were chatting with each other. They said, "We're going to get on the march for a while and then we're going to go and occupy Boots in Oxford Street". They seemed like pretty innocent people like anyone else's next door neighbour - if you have next door neighbours like that I suppose. I have got a few students down my street.

My question is a follow up and variant on Joanne's. We need to be very clear about what is and what is not acceptable behaviour. A lot of people consider it to be fair game for them to sit down on the floor of Boots if they felt strongly about an issue. I am not too sure that aggravated trespass was designed to stop you sitting on the floor in Boots although it can clearly be used for that purpose. There is a blurry line where young people who may have strong political views - they may end up like you in the end, Chairman, with strong views of different complexions I do not know - need to be given a signal from responsible people like ourselves as to what is a reasonable behaviour and what they can expect to happen to them if they do things. I think this is a variant on the kettling debate where a lot of people felt that they were being inappropriately treated when they were simply caught in the melee.

I am not suggesting that it is acceptable for everyone to go down to Boots this lunchtime and occupy it in almost any circumstance, although I think people are allowed to express their concern and anger in a range of ways which are non destructive. I think we need to give some guidance to people on that because it is quite blurry and messy, Chairman.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Cindy?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. A couple of points. Firstly I would like to endorse the comments that Graham made about the successful way in which you policed the march. I was not there but I watched most of it on the telly, so congratulations to you and other officers.

Inevitable abstractions. Of course there are. I wanted to know what the process was for ensuring that abstractions are felt fairly across the organisation and what process you use in order to determine that? Also I wanted to ask about the flexibility. I received some representations from officers in relation to other marches that they have been on in the recent past but not Saturday's march that they were abstracted from Hammersmith and Fulham only to discover that they were not needed and twiddled their thumbs playing games on their phones. I wanted to know how you can flexibly use the resources that you rely upon and how you might then be able to respond to what is needed?

The other thing I wanted to ask about was, in response to Chris' point, it sparked off me thinking about whether or not you opened the door so that other people might get a sense of the difficulties you face in policing public order events. Opening up the doors around public order training and how you might use it as an engagement mechanism - in a similar way to Central Operations Specialist Firearms Command (CO19) who go out there and invite people in so that they can demystify and really get a sense of how difficult it is. I wondered whether that was something you ought to be exploring in relation to public order.

The other question for me was, post Saturday, there seems to be quite a lot of emphasis on the use of stop and search and, in particular, the use of stop and search in relation to the forthcoming Royal Wedding. I know Bob Broadhurst made some comments on Radio 4. I, personally, thought that was really quite unhelpful and quite unusual actually; for the MPS to talk about the tactics that it is going to use at a forthcoming event without either not talking about it all or to pick out one aspect and not recognise that the way in which the MPS will police the Royal Wedding is a whole package of different things that you are going to do, rather than emphasise stop and search. I found that particularly worrying, not least because we know that young black men are 26 times more likely to be stopped and Asian men something like 6.5 times more likely to be stopped. The question is, as the nation enjoys watching the marital union of this young couple, who pays that price? Is it young black and Asian men? It is really, really worrying that such a public statement was made. Those are my questions and points.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Great. Thank you. I think, Lynne, we are falling into four broad areas although there are some specifics. One is around intelligence and

the use of intelligence and how, when and whether that can be improved. Some clarity on current offences, particularly the aggravated trespass. You were asked for views on the efficacy of any new offences that might be created or that have been talked about. Then there is the cost and abstraction issue. You might want to talk about the use of Specials in terms of backing up Neighbourhoods.

What I am going to suggest though is that there will be a big debrief around what happened on Saturday and an analysis of what went right, what did not go quite so well and all the rest of it and it might be appropriate, before another event is announced, for us to have a bit of a Member briefing beforehand about if there are going to be any changes in tactics so we are aware. I know that this will be work in progress in terms of analysing Saturday so, for the moment, our comments are going to be quite brief, and then we might come to a longer session with Members as and when.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Chairman, I would like to say that Lynne did give us a two hour briefing which was open to others. An excellent briefing. The map. The discussions. The tactics. The Twitter. The addresses. I could stand here and talk for an hour about her excellence - which I will not particularly here --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We might do the same again if things are going to change.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** -- but I would like to minute the fact that she took endless time making sure that every Member of the Civil Liberties Panel absolutely understood, as far as we were able to predict - and following the comments that Tim made earlier --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I would like to endorse that 100%.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** -- I would like to set the scene with that first please.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thanks. Lynne?

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** Thank you very much. Very helpful. Taking the questions then under the steer that the Chairman has given me in four themes. On the intelligence point, contrary to the ill informed commentary that you will have seen in some of the media, there was a huge amount of pre-event work that had been taken. One of the benefits of our robust policing strategy for this event is that, having had as many people in custody as we have, that gives us a really good starting point for intelligence and we will be building on that in terms of moving to the events ahead.

In terms of the offences. What would be helpful for me to do would be to get you a briefing note on aggravated trespass and the other offences that we might consider in the circumstances and I will circulate that, rather than go into the detail here. What I will give you some reassurance on is every Saturday for the past few weeks we have seen demonstrations in Oxford Street based on the peaceful protest and peaceful sit downs in

shops that have ended without arrests having to be made. What we saw on Saturday was something quite different.

Connected to that is the issue of Twitter and SmartWater. We did use Twitter both as a communications tool and as an intelligence tool. We had people studying Twitter and responding accordingly and that is why you did see officers moving around London in response to Twitter. Interestingly, on Saturday, we had 7,934 followers at one point which made us the most popular site in London, which apparently is something to aspire to!

The questions that have been asked about the Home Secretary and new offences. We have been strongly supported by the civil servants over the weekend. They have had the same briefings that have come to other people in this room. The position that I have currently taken with them is that I need to fully debrief the events of this weekend. It is clearly up to Parliament to create legislation. That is not a police officer position. I will provide a commentary based on the experiences we had at the time. One of those debriefs is currently ongoing. There is another one tomorrow. Then there is a briefing with me tomorrow evening about the things that we might learn or we might do differently in the future. It is not until I have had that that I will take any view on whether we do need further powers or, if we do, what they might like or what they would be.

I absolutely hear Cindy's note of caution about how we might use stop and search. It would be fair to say we were being significantly pushed about what could be done differently in the run up to the Royal Wedding and I think it was that that prompted the response.

Jennette's observation, having been in the street, is something that we have already picked up in the debrief. I would just remind you it is very easy to look at the events in Oxford Street and Regent Street and to think that they were happening in isolation. At the same time that those criminals were splitting up, changing their clothes, changing their sim cards and running round the back streets of London we were also trying to move between 250,000 and 500,000 safely through the streets of London. The option of moving all my 4,500 police officer resource to Oxford Street and Regent Street would simply have meant that offences could have happened elsewhere in London from Parliament Square right across to Hyde Park. That would have been an unrealistic expectation.

I would stress that London did remain open for business on Saturday and it is very, very easy to forget that. We did have mutual aid. We were really well supported by our county colleagues who, along with our own staff, worked horrendous hours. I have to pay tribute to the officers. They did come under attack from those with light bulbs full of ammonia. We had one officer subjected to a petrol bomb attack. On the point of clothing he was very well protected by his clothing on that instance.



I am interested in the discussion about whether a police officer should be allowed to wear a face covering. That is suggestive to me of something that might look more like a police state than perhaps is somewhere we would want to go but I am interested in that comment from here.

In terms of cost. The original operation was costed at between £1.5 million and £2 million. The reality is that on Saturday almost every single one of my officers worked a 24 hour duty and it is, therefore, inevitable that that cost will increase.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Can I add a couple of bits? One of the things we were saying about new powers and various other bits and I know that we will be responding to that, but when I was asked by senior politicians from all parties after the event about that, what I said would be very, very helpful is, if and when we use the powers we have at the moment, we have political support for their use. I would have one plea here about consistency of message from one event to another, irrespective of outcome, because, at the moment, we are not hearing a consistent message. This is time for me to give feedback to politicians and that would assist us greatly.

Our senior officers have to make difficult decisions based on a moving feast that they know will be scrutinised at length afterwards and we have seen some tragic outcomes that have meant serious implications. To then stand back from a position - I know no one here has done that but some have - of no knowledge and to make the comments that I have heard is an outrageous indictment on them as individuals. What we need to do is have a consistency of approach. We will be robust but fair. We do believe in the facilitation of peaceful protest and we will do our best. Thank you.

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

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Just one tiny thing to clarify what I mean by face covering. I do not mean balaclavas. When I was in Sheffield I saw that the horses had got some superb see through coverings on which protected their eyes in particular. If somebody is throwing ammonia at a police officer there has got to be some way to protect the police officer because, if there is not, we are in dead trouble. I was not talking about black balaclavas but I do think it is critical that we look at some sort of protection.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Some of the officers I saw do have a visor.

**Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS):** Just to be clear, because we were facilitating peaceful protests - which must be our starting point on any of these - people were not issued with their NATO helmets which is the blue helmet which does have a visor on it.

You will have seen reported that four of our officers got quite seriously injured at events at Trafalgar Square when they, on our behalf, were trying to protect the Olympic clock, and did that very, very successfully. One of the reasons they were so badly injured is because, in accordance with our guidance, when the situation had calmed down they took

off their NATO helmets. It is very difficult to communicate when you have a NATO helmet on because all your senses are deprived; you cannot see sideways and you struggle with your hearing. They had taken their helmets off. When they saw people trying to damage the Olympic clock they put themselves in harms way, they intervened, they stopped that happening and, as a result, they got personally injured. We should all commend them for that. Actually, if they had been wearing their helmets they would have been in a better position but they, rightly, made the choices they did - and none of us can criticise them for that.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I would not agree with that at all. I think they made the wrong choice and to leave yourself open to be blinded for life is not to be commended, in my view.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Notwithstanding the opportunities for us to learn lessons from Saturday, you have our collective congratulations on what was a very, very good performance in extremely difficult circumstances.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Can we, in addition, commend Commander Broadhurst for those comments on the Today programme in which he made a number of remarks about former police officers pontificating on the airwaves about the quality of the policing?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We acknowledge that neither of the two who were out there were ever public order trained as far as I am aware. They are speaking from experience, as usual.

Right. We have got a number of other questions to get through. Tim, I do not know if you had anything else to say as part of your report?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** One thing. Can we end on a positive note because this has been a very difficult one, which is what it is supposed to be, and I do get that? We have now started recruiting again. On 14 March 2011 193 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were sworn in to commence training as police officers. We will now also be opening up the recruitment to our Special Constables and more PCSOs so we have started recruiting. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. A number of questions that Members have submitted. If Members want to notify us that they are happy to take an answer in writing then I am happy to do that and then we can crack through and deal with other questions --

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Chairman, you did indicate that I could come in briefly on the Stockwell issue. Very quickly.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Can we get through the questions and then do that, if that is OK?

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Fine.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Question one I am happy for a written response.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Dee is happy for written. Caroline?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Sorry, question one. Not question two.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Sorry. Question two. Police databases. Could you read the question?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Sure. What mechanisms are in place to monitor unlawful access to police databases by serving police officers and police staff?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** One of our biggest risks in terms of corruption is information misuse and, as a result of that, we have a very proactive and reactive investigatory process whereby we regularly dip check. It is a strand specifically within our professional standards process where we dip check regularly to validate why a certain piece of information was taken, used and accessed by an individual officer or police staff.

All officers are trained in the databases that they are allowed to access and they can only access it through secure passwords. At the same time as progressing through that training they are pointed out that any misuse of that information is an offence under the Data Protection Act and, equally, is a disciplinary offence and maybe a further criminal offence as well.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I do not underestimate in any way how difficult this area is. At the end of the day there has got to be a lot of trust and I understand that. Could I ask you, over the years - and you do not have to give me the answer now - how many officers and staff have faced disciplinary actions for unlawfully accessing databases and how many of them have been fired from the police force or had serious disciplinary actions taken against them?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I do not have that data here but I will provide it for you.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Caroline? Your question?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** My first question is how many ACPO officers within the MPS are members of any Masonic Lodge and is there any requirement to declare any such membership?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** This was a very interesting question for us because I can remember, in 1999, that there was a requirement then, under Home Office

guidance, to ask people to disclose whether they were - as a voluntary declaration because it was unenforceable - a Freemason or had ever been a Freemason. I can remember joining the MPS and being asked that very question, and answering it. It has never really cropped up since so when this question came in we went to review whether that was actually still occurring and it stopped in 2000 because it was never asked again and nobody ever bothered about it.

I have made inquiries as a result of that as to what the current Home Office guidance is in relation to it and there is not any. I have also asked other forces whether they have had the same experience and the answer is, "That's a good question. We've not revisited it and it's not really cropped up again". What I need to do is have a conversation.

The bottom line is I cannot answer the question. I do not know how many ACPO members are Freemasons and we do not, at the moment, ask them to voluntarily declare it or otherwise. Those ACPO members who were here in 1999 you will probably know but that is about it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I have got a follow up question to this. That is very interesting. Doing research on this area it seems around the late 1990s/early 2000s it was a big issue and then it seems to have gone quiet. Given that members of the Police Authority have to declare it and councillors and so on and given that we want openness and transparency in everything that we and the MPS does, is it something that you will look into - I realise, having looked at it, it has to be voluntary - some sort of register so people can have full confidence in the work that you do?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** As I say, it was a good question because it is not one that we have even considered but, yes, definitely, we will consider it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Thank you very much.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I, personally, do not have any problem. What I need to do is take that away and discuss it with colleagues. There will be 101 privacy reasons and various other bits that will come back at me so I cannot formally answer it other than I will definitely take that up and look at it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Lovely. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Clive?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, as a member of the other group that has traditionally been accused of planning world domination - that is the Jews - this seems to me like an extremely anachronistic issue. The Freemasons, of which I am not a member, seems to me to be an organisation that does good work in all kinds of ways. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about it. I am quite surprised that we are investigating the membership of the Freemasons as opposed to any number of other organisations.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Members are allowed to ask the questions they like.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Exactly. I can ask the questions I like.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I do not think we can make value judgements about each other's questions.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** That will be one of the bits we will have to consider in terms of what the implications of that are. It has not been an issue so it is not one that I have ever seriously considered but there are issues about trust and various other bits.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** This Authority has raised it in the past. Maybe you were not around. I do not know.

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA):** Chairman, very quickly on this one. Very quickly. We did have a long debate about this in 2000 and my understanding was there was going to be a voluntary register at the time.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Which there was but, as I say, it went into disrepute and when it was reviewed as part of the ongoing process of data review, the data was out of date and, as a result, it was expunged. It has never come up on the radar again, hence your question was an interesting one.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Second question?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** My second question is what rules and guidance are in place regarding the type of person or organisation that can become accredited under the Community Safety Accreditation scheme?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** There are a number of questions in relation to this particular event in terms of Victoria Coach Station. I wonder if, Chairman, you --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I am presuming that there is a schedule which is adhered to in terms of accrediting organisations as part of the Act and we can just provide that?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Yes. If it is possible.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** There are rules.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I am conscious of the time and conscious of the budget. Caroline, Tony and Jenny have all got questions that are related. I will try

to wrap it up in a briefing. If you will permit me I might just extend the scope of your question if that is all right and see where we go? In terms of the Police Reform Act 2002 it permits Chief Officers to accredit persons under the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) scheme with limited powers if the officers consider it appropriate for the purposes of contributing to community safety, cooperation with the police force for the area and combating crime and disorder and public nuisance.

We have always been slightly reluctant to embrace the will of Parliament in this one on the basis that there is a choice that we can make and it is about how do you keep that accreditation up and how do you actually then maintain standards and how do you then ensure that you get your costs back for that accreditation process?

In support of that, ACPO produced a 98 page guidance document for forces who wished to take on that part of the CSAS and companies were encouraged to work within that guidance. We, ourselves, wrote a standard operating procedure and guidance for those whose borough commanders and other operational command units (OCUs) felt that this would be useful in terms of the Police Reform Act requirements. As a result of that we do have the scheme that is currently being operated in the Victoria Coach Station area and train station area.

Our process at the moment is to review. There are only 15 individuals and, for me, at this moment in time, it is to review how that operates, what the benefits are and how citizens feel about it and, as a result, learn from that experience about a wider use of the Police Reform Act 2002. That is one that we would bring back to this Authority, or whatever replaces it, to ask for a view as to what it feels about an extension of those powers.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** A month ago I spent an evening on patrol with an organisation which is accredited elsewhere - not in London - to get a feel myself for how they work, what they do and the type of organisation that we might be dealing with.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I am quite happy for local authorities' community wardens to be given some of these powers. I have more confidence in that. I am very nervous about a private security firm. That is the difference. Community wardens I have seen work very well in places like Southwark and giving them those extra powers gives the community confidence and they work so closely with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Something like this feels to me a step too far and I am slightly uncomfortable, so I am glad you are keeping it under close review.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Keeping it under close review. Obviously there have been quite a lot of political views about the wider family that is beyond purely the private sector in terms of policing. We are not averse to that because a lot of private sector companies do get involved in policing. As a result of that it is absolutely appropriate that we took the decision - not the Home Office - in terms of looking at that. That seemed like a good scheme and we will learn from it.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Follow up questions? Jenny or Tony?

**Tony Arbour (AM):** First of all can I say how much I agree with Caroline Pidgeon? It seems to me very much the slippery slope. If there are going to be groups of people who are otherwise private individuals being given some sort of statutory power I foresee an immense growth in this. It will be seen, I regret to say, as policing on the cheap. You will recall that was the objection there was originally to PCSOs. I am happy to say that much of that has gone away but, at least, PCSOs are responsible for the discipline which is imposed by the MPS. So far as I can tell these characters are not. I have to say I am exceedingly unhappy about it and I very much hope that you do not progress this one any further beyond this particular scheme.

I have heard you say that the matter is going to be subject to review. Even if the review comes up with the answer that this was a wonderful thing I would be very unhappy to see too many ordinary civilians being given police powers.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Jenny?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you. I want to support my close colleagues here. I am appalled of Camberwell on this. I think it is a really bad idea and I have got three big problems with it. The first is there is no public accountability. There is no oversight from people like us on this.

The second one is I am concerned about how much training these people get. Police officers deal with vulnerable people and damaged people every day. Do these people also have that sort of depth of training?

My last problem is that they have got no public service ethos. They are not thinking about the public good; they are thinking about what suits their company. It is completely different. I understand that it was piloted at Brunel University. That is very different from asking a private security firm that is involved in policing a large public area like Victoria Station.

I have a question and that is, to me, this looks like something that is going to be introduced in time for the Olympics and I am wondering is this policing on the cheap for the Olympics because you are going to be so short staffed?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I have similar concerns and I have resisted the use of the powers for quite a length of time - to quite justifiable criticism of me not embracing that, and I think it is appropriate that we do look at use of those powers. It is appropriate we do it.

In terms of the monitoring that goes on people have to report on the number of complaints they are getting and they have to maintain satisfactory arrangements for the handling of complaints. There is an issue there about us managing that system and what

the costs are for that etc. Equally, we can identify whether training is sufficient or not and withdraw the power. In addition, we can access their individual complaint records about individual people. That, to me, smells cost and things which might not be hidden. There is a lot of learning that needs to go on before we do it.

In relation to the Olympics, The London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG ) has recently announced that G4S has won the contract for the security work. It will operate inside venues where, in effect, they are private property and, as such, we would not need to license them for their responsibilities under any scheme. There is still a lot of work going on. There are no plans, at present, to use this legislation and it has not been raised. This is not a cunning device to create opportunities for the Olympics.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is not only on the Olympic site; it is also in wider London where there will be a lot of missing officers. Anyway, I take your --

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I come back to my further thing which is a review and a discussion and it is one that we will discuss here because it is the style of policing in London.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** What about public accountability?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I have answered that in the sense that we are allowed access and all the rest of it. I do have similar concerns which are we are doing it, we will learn from it and we will keep you informed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Victoria?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I have to say I take a slightly different view because I think the problem is that we keep not talking about the elephant in the room which is, obviously, that there are more and more private security firms out there - for good or bad - and this is going on in many streets across London. I would much prefer that we did offer these people and sold our services - we are all talking about raising money - we did charge them for training and accreditation.

I am not for one moment suggesting that they should not be trained but why can't they have similar training to some of the first level one and two - I am not getting the phrases right; I wish I had read your document more clearly - on the PCSOs and the Specials. In other words, if they did have proper training and they could be accredited, at least we might have less criticism of some of these security guards and their high handed tactics - which I absolutely agree - because then we could charge them to re-accredit them every five years or something.

In other words, let's turn this round to our advantage. These people are out there. People out there are paying for private security guards. For heaven's sake, it is in our interest to not keep hiding the fact that this is happening but let's get these people properly trained



so they are to an open service. If you do rent somebody to police your street at least you can say they have come with PCSO training level one or they have come with Specials training level two, or whatever it is called.

The point is let's not keep pretending this is not happening. Let's be a bit more open here and say there may be another way of taking this forward. I can understand the police are concerned. After all, some of these people are ex-policemen! Let's not beat about the bush here. I would like to move forward in a more positive way and say maybe this is a way forward but let's have them accredited properly.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** The issue for that is, again, referring, the criticism of me resisting it. It is a justifiable criticism. I wanted to make it so that we were more cost efficient in the sense that people would want to invest in the MPS in business districts, rather than others.

One of the things the Rowntree Foundation - I think it was the Rowntree Foundation but I will have to check - did, at the time of the multiplicity of warden schemes at the time when we asked for the PCSOs, was they were confused by the amount of uniforms, they did not know what powers individuals had and, as a result of that, whereas they know what a PCSO is and they know what a police officer is, if you get another security guard in Victoria who may have different powers to the - how do you manage that so people will know whether that person has got the power to do what they are doing to them etc etc?

There are some serious concerns. I do take the point that it is a wider family than purely the police policing London but we do have to be conscious of those risks, we do have to be conscious what the citizens say and we have to learn from the experience.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Anybody can dress up and pretend they are a security guard. Let's say they cannot be unless they are trained.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** They do have to be accredited in most circumstances --

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Who is going to check?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** -- but I understand the issue. Cindy, you wanted to say something?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Chairman, this accreditation scheme is something that passed me by and I confess that I did not quite keep up to date with it all. There are really powerful arguments on both sides and I wondered whether or not it was something that we would want to timetable in to have a further discussion about? Trying to understand and mitigate some of the risks and ensure that the MPS is protected but also the public get a good level of service is something that we would want to influence.

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

**Toby Harris (AM):** We did receive a report on it when the scheme was first mooted and, as an Authority, we took a view that we were not in favour of it. That was also the view of the then Commissioner.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right. OK. Dee?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I wanted to make one small point. I am vehemently opposed to Victoria's position but I wondered if the Acting Commissioner would come back to us before he makes a decision on this because I think this is a real policy area. It is not just an area for the MPS to decide.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** This is the point.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** As I was saying, this is definitely a style issue and it is certainly one we would discuss.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Right. Caroline, your last question is for written answer?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** For written answer. Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette, I think we have dealt with your questions from here. Victoria, your overtime questions. Do you want to take this on written or ...?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Some of it I would like to raise. The problem is that we keep reading newspaper articles about all the MPS officers swanning of with vast quantities of overtime, which I think is very unfair because of course it is a smaller number of people receiving a higher amount. It is from that angle that I am coming.

There was only other one further question I wanted to add. Is it true that officers are paid 24 hour overtime while they are working abroad? Again, I think that skews the figures. I am a bit concerned that the press figures maybe do not actually give a - because, inevitably, they are writing a good story. That is why I was asking for a bit more meat on this. You may prefer to send it in writing but this is the flavour I am trying to get.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** I am grateful for that. In terms of current overtime naturally the main consumers of big hours of overtime are the close protection teams. There are some circumstances where people can claim 24 hour working. It depends on the operating environment, it depends on where they have to rest and come to deal with the different regulations that we have which are under subject review by Windsor.

In terms of the current overtime, it is a very useful opportunity for me to clarify some of those media messages that have been going out. Based on the overtime earnings from

quarter three, on average, a close protection officer earns annual overtime of £25,819. However, a Safer Neighbourhood Team officer - average - will earn £1,680. A response officer earns annual overtime of £1,575.

We have been focused on reducing overtime with this Authority since 2005 and what we have seen is there has been a significant reduction in the average hours of overtime worked each year per eligible officer from 244 hours to 137 hours, a 43% reduction in overtime. A reduction of 35% in the annual overtime expenditure because there have been pay rise increases since then. This equates to a saving of approximately £60 million since 2005 and that is also at a backdrop of increasing public protest etc.

As a result, overtime has been falling in the MPS for some time. There are issues in relation to the high earners that John [Yates] will know more about and there are some issues around that 24 hour, which is the subject currently of negotiation and reconsideration.

**Graham Speed (AM):** Chairman, if it helps, Finance and Resources studies overtime regularly and we recently received a very detailed report breaking down the individual parts of the organisation and the overtime paid. It may help if that report was circulated to Victoria because it gives all that information and more.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I was trying to put it (inaudible) the press stories really.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** That is helpful. Victoria, that is you done. Tony, you had a second question on crime tracking?

**Tony Arbour (AM):** I do. Yes, I would like to deal with it now.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Could you read it for the camera?

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Yes. Would you support a London online initiative similar to Avon and Somerset's website, "Track my Crime" which would allow victims to follow up on crime investigations and be updated electronically?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** One of the things we are looking at under our service strategy is how we can keep citizens informed, especially around crimes that affect them. There has been a lot of publication of data as we know. Online services are a key part. We want to encourage people to use online services for reporting crime as well as tracking it.

One of the key issues for us, because of our size and the volumes, things that are quite easy to implement in some areas are quite tricky for us technically and cost. We will be looking at those systems. It is good if we can do that tracking because it takes significant cost out of the victim witness care functions that we have but, at the moment, we need to get a proper costed effort in terms of whether we can afford it within our capital programme.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** That is a much more helpful response than the response I got from the Mayor when I asked the Mayor last time about whether or not he puts sentencing results on crime maps. He said - and I assume he was briefed by someone in your office - he would not do it until it had been proved. The one thing that we ought to know without there being any prove at all is that victims want information and citizens want information. Whether or not a particular system has been proved is irrelevant. I think I heard you say this will help victims who are often the forgotten people in the justice system to know that something is actually happening. I would very much hope that I could sum up your answer to the question which I specifically posed as yes.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** If we can afford it and if it is technically feasible. The other bit that I would add, though - and it is not a political thing - in terms of the comments about the Mayor and putting sentencing results on the mapped crime data, that is a different piece to online crime tracking. I would support the Mayor not doing that mainly because a) putting the crime to the actual outcome on those maps, so which crime resulted in what - something we are working very hard with the judiciary and the court service to change is the time it takes to get to court and to get a result. One of the things that you will find is a lot of people will be on bail and people will not understand what the conditions are, "How do you know they're not offending here?" and all the rest of it.

As a result, you need more context than that crime mapping would deliver. Online crime tracking gives you that opportunity to have that context which is why I think it is a better way of doing it. Whether we can afford it or not is going to be the thousand dollar question.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Thank you, Chairman.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Joanne?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question is about the *News of the World* phone hacking inquiry and it is a number of parts. I would like to take it one part at a time if I can. The first part is can you clarify whether the MPS's understanding of CPS advice regarding the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) has any bearing on the way allegations of phone hacking were investigated by the police and, if so, to what extent?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Should I deal with that? I know, having spoken to you before Joanne, you have seen now the letter that I sent to the Select Committees so you will see in that letter that our view is that it absolutely permeated every aspect of the inquiry so it was absolutely essential to how the investigation was framed.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) has also given written evidence to the inquiry and he has also written to *The Guardian* a few months ago where he seems to be suggesting that the narrow definition that someone had to have

listened to the message before the victim had picked it up was used for the purpose of investigating Goodman and Mulcaire only. My reading of that seems to be that he is perhaps saying that it was just with that one investigation and those defendants, whereas it may not have applied to other potential suspects. Can you comment on that at all?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I run the risk of repeating myself for the fourth time this week about this. It is very clear how the previous DPP and the previous Head of Special Casework Section advised us around the approach to take with Goodman and Mulcaire and that investigation. That was in 2006. It was repeated again by this DPP in 2009 and, as I said at the Select Committee hearings last week or so, he has quite properly, in his view, revised his view on the basis of new legal advice. That is the way forward for the future. In 2006 that was the advice we received, that was the approach we followed and you will see from the letters written and the evidence I have given that was very clear to us.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Following on from that then, if it had been a broader definition, the current definition if you like, that was told to you back then, do you believe you would have interviewed other potential suspects at the time?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** That may well have been the case but there is a new investigation and so we have got to be very cautious that we do not go anywhere near any of the approach that they may take.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** May I jump in at this point? One of my concerns about this is, understandably, there has been a lot of interest and John has appeared at the Homes Affairs Select Committee, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Select Committee and a number of places answering, effectively, very similar, if not the same, questions.

I have been getting progressively nervous about the consistent themes of this on the basis that there is a very robust live investigation running at this moment in time that I have said will be robust and will go through that process. I anticipate, if there are charges - and it is if there are charges - then there will be challenges to the abuse of process and various other things that may well come out. I do think that what we need to do, as I said at the last Police Authority meeting, is let the investigation run its course and then there will be questions that will need to be asked and answered that will not jeopardise potential prosecutions or whatever may come out of it. I do get a bit nervous if we go into too much detail about individuals and what might or might not have been present in 2006 on the basis that that may be part of an investigation as we speak.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I am not asking on individuals but I think it is right that we have a chance to ask these questions because the Acting Deputy Commissioner (ADC) is appearing and may appear in the future before Select Committees so I think it is only right that we also ask for that clarity here as well.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** The only time my nervous button went in was when you were saying would there have been prosecutions in 2006 because I think that is straying into the area of the current investigation.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** No, I did not say that. I said would you have interviewed other potential suspects. That is different.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** That is why I got nervous.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** OK. My second and third questions are about the advice that you were given and I have seen the very detailed letter you have written to the Select Committees where you have quoted various parts of those various advices along the past few years. Do you think you will be able to share those advices with us shortly?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** As we discussed earlier they are not my advices to give away; they are privileged and they are privileged to the CPS. I am also in correspondence with Keith Vaz, the Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee, because he has made a similar request. I am writing to the CPS to seek its views around that. I had limited permission to disclose some of that stuff but there are other advices which - again, coming back to Tim's point - are very proximate, particularly last year's advices, to the current investigation so we do need to be careful around that. It will be a matter for the CPS, Joanne.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My fourth question was about potential victims and that if you have a wide definition now of the offence does that mean that the range of victims has also widened greatly?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** That is entirely a matter for the new investigation and they will be dealing with that.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My last questions then was that there were questions raised at the Select Committee that the MPS did not fully examine and collate what you referred to as bin bags of evidence at the time in 2006. Was that correct or not?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think I referred to bin bags of material. It was looked at. It was reviewed by counsel at the time on the basis of the indictment that was before counsel at that time. It has been looked at. Not necessarily in the detail that it may be being looked at now. We have got to let the new investigation examine all that material in the light of the new definition and make whatever progress they think is appropriate on the new investigation.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** That material was only looked at for the purposes of the indictment for the two that were ultimately convicted?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** It was reviewed by counsel at the time, yes.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** For that purpose only?

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Counsel take a broad view on relevance and so that is a matter for them.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right. Caroline quickly, then Valerie on Stockwell and then we are going to move on.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I wanted to pick up that John [Yates] talked about letters to the Select Committee have been given to Joanne. Could they be circulated to everyone?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** It is on the Parliamentary website.

**John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** It is on the website.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Is it? OK. I wonder whether perhaps we could get that link sent to us. Also, sometimes we ask for written answers and we do not, routinely, get that circulated to us or even put online. A lot of questions we ask, both orally and written, it would be nice, not just in our paperwork, to have a separate bit about questions and answers on our website.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We said we would do that at the last meeting so, yes, it will be happening.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** That would be good. A separate area.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thanks. Finally, Valerie?

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. As everybody knows, on Tuesday night there was a terrible shooting in Stockwell. A young girl of five and a 35 year old shopkeeper. I think we ought to be sending a message of support to the families of those two victims and we would all hope and pray for their full recovery. Commissioner, the community will want to know that you are giving this your fullest attention and top priority. It will, again, need to be kept in the loop, to be briefed, to have outlets for their fears and concerns and the total fury there is in the community that this could have happened and this could happen in our city. I would hope, Commissioner, that you would want to say something to people in and around the community about what they can do to assist the police with their investigations.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Valerie. Just to assure you, we are appalled with events in Stockwell resulting in the five year old - we cannot name the individuals because there are still family members yet to be informed. We are appealing for anyone - because people will know who they are - from those communities who know who they are to come forward and tell us who they are. We will pursue them. We have full AMET teams deployed, whatever the resources that are needed will be

made available and we will pursue them until they are captured - and they will be captured.

I take the point in terms of keeping people informed but the most important play I have is we need witnesses to come forward, we need people to come forward who know who they are and who tell us who they are so that we can capture them before anyone else gets hurt.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Thank you, Commissioner.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thanks for that. That is everything on that item. Thank you for that.

If we could move on please to item six which is the Policing London Business Plan. As I understand it the plan has been approved at Finance and Resources (F&R) and the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP) and key performance indicators (KPIs) have been negotiated and agreed. That was the main omission last time. There is also attached to it the budget. There have not been any significant amendments I do not think since last time beyond clarification on our specific grants which came through and have resulted in some minor variations of officers that are tied to those specific grants.

We have had an initial look at some of the alternative budget amendments that were put through but, as I think I said at the last meeting, we were never going to have the time or the opportunity to develop them into full business cases and, therefore, incorporate them. That work will be ongoing in year and if they work out then we will put them forward for incorporation of variations of the budget in year.

Bob [Atkins], did you want to say anything in introduction? No? Anne [McMeel], did you need to say anything?

**Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS):** No, Chairman.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right. It has obviously been a long and tortuous process to get us this far. Does anybody have any questions on the budget? No? OK. Can we have a show of hands of those - sorry, Caroline?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Dee has had to leave I am afraid but I wanted to say that we cannot support this today because you have not incorporated our budget amendments that we fully costed, so we will not be able to support this today - though, obviously, there are a lot of things in here we do support but there are some specifics that we do not.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Joanne?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Similar. We may have made some very good suggestions, we think, in our budget. I am glad to see that you say you will continue to look at them --



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Absolutely.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** -- because some of them that we put in we did cost and we think they could be very effective for very little money. There are also issues that we have raised before that still are not concluded. For example, we still do not know about the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and Safer Schools Teams. I did have a briefing on the Safer Schools Teams but it did not satisfy me at all that we would have the level of service that I want to see. For that purpose, I cannot support this either.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Obviously the budget is a living breathing thing that changes day by day and we have picked a point in time at which we have to approve the forecast. We will continue to look at the amendments that have been put forward and see if they make sense in the overall framework of the budget and they will be brought forward to the appropriate committees for approval or otherwise in the future.

Before we move to approve the budget on its own I did say earlier we would make a decision about the ACPO subscription as part of the budget. We currently have a proposed subscription rate of £185,000 to ACPO. We had a meeting with the President of ACPO earlier last week at which he outlined the benefits to the organisation of that subscription. The Acting Commissioner also underscored some of the benefits that the MPS feel that it gets from that subscription. I am happy to take views from Members about whether or not we should be paying or whether we should be paying a smaller amount. I do not know if anybody has any strong views?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Having heard the arguments, what is your sense?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** My view is I think there is some value from the coordination that ACPO provides. I was going to take a general feeling but my general sense is that we should pay it less than it is asking for - not the full amount - but we should, nevertheless, recognise that it does some valuable work, not least coordination around counter terrorism work and one or two other areas that mean we could make a case. There are some police authorities that are going to be nothing. We are such a larger funder of ACPO that we are in a position to cause it quite a serious financial problem which might have an effect on us in the short term.

In the light of the fact that ACPO is going to be undergoing, we understand, over the next year, some changes in structure and function as part of the general changing of policing, it strikes me that we should treat the year as a transitional year and pay it a lower amount with a view to a recasting of the relationship next year.

Now the lower amount is a bit of a finger in the air, because these things always are. Its accounts indicate that it has got some money in reserve. The figure the Vice Chairman and I had in our mind that we were going to suggest, if people felt that was sensible, is £120,000, which represents a very significant saving over and above what we are currently going to pay them.

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA):** It did send out a letter to explain the benefits of the organisation to policing in general. Unfortunately that was not circulated to Members before this meeting. That was the intention. We should get this letter circulated to all Members.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, I may be wrong, but my understanding is, when I have looked at it, the majority benefit goes to the individual officers.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No, that is not the case. No.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Is that not the case?

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** That is SEPOSA(?). That is not ACPO.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I wanted to put it on record. I have got it wrong. I am thinking of SEPOSA(?). That is an organisation that is there to represent some of the highest paying staff in terms of their (inaudible). We are not talking about the same organisation --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No, we are not talking about. No.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** OK. There are still a lot of Spanish practices about in terms of what we support. I will go with any advice you want to give.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Steve?

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Chairman, to support yourself and the Deputy on that I think it is right to reduce our contribution but also, at the same time, indicate that we will be looking at recalibrating our relationship over the course of the year without any commitments for next year and we can work on that in year.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Joanne?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Just to point out that this was actually one of the proposals in the Labour group alternative budget; to reduce --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** There we are. You have got your (inaudible), Joanne. I thought you were asking to get rid of it all though weren't you?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** We suggested 50%. The professional advise is that --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right. Well we are not far off.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** -- it is manageable, and with the intention that we reduce further as things become more streamlined then I am content with that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** If you want to change your mind about supporting the budget that is great! Caroline?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** No. Only this one thing.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I think it is good you are taking action on this and one of the positive things about getting the BMG minutes is that we can see that things are going on, and that is really good. I am quite amazed you have managed to see its accounts because it is set up as a private company which is one of the issues that I have with it; it should be somehow set up in a different way so that it is subject to Freedom of Information (FOI) and it is far more accountable. Then I think people would have more confidence in it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Caroline, as you will know, the Government operates a rather large organisation called Companies House where you can go and pay £4 and pull of any company accounts that you want, which is indeed what we did.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Oh right. There you go. So it did not provide them to you. That is even more interesting isn't it?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Can we take the £4 off our subscription?!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** For the payment of a small fee they are available.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** There are real issues.

**Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner, MPS):** Can I come in? The current President of ACPO and the membership of ACPO see the need to change in terms of the public limited company (PLC).

Picking up Joanne's point, funding needs to be negotiated with central government as well as local authorities or whatever replaces police authorities but it will be on what their value added is. Most of us realise that being a PLC is not a helpful construct but there are things you have to go to through in order to move that forward.

The President of ACPO is very clear he wants to be as transparent as he is permitted to be, and he will be, and it will change and then it has to make a business case. I am grateful for the support you have given it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Can we agree that reduction then? All happy?

**All:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Then, on the budget itself, can I have a show of hands of those in favour of the budget? How many is that? Fourteen. Those against? Five against. OK. Thank you very much.

Item seven. The grant settlement is just to note the final numbers that have come through to the Government. Everybody happy to note those?

**All:** Noted.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Treasury management. This is one of the periodic reports we have around treasury management. Bob [Atkins], you know where it all is?

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Chairman, this report has been to the Resources and Productivity Sub-Committee (RAP) and it has been to F&R but it does formally require the approval of the Authority as our strategy going forward for next year.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. All happy?

**All:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Item nine is Met Forward Two. Focusing on fighting crime. Chief Executive?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** This has been discussed by Members at the workshop last November. It has gone through various iterations and has been taken to SOP who were content. Effectively this is a refresher. There are no dramatic changes but it is an opportunity to look again at the priorities and the strategic direction that the Authority wants to adopt if Members are content.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Given that we have been through it a few times is everybody happy?

**All:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Agreed. Thank you. Reports from Committees. Chief Executive, is there anything in particular you want to raise?

**Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA):** Unless the Chairs of the various Committees want to add anything in particular --

**Steve O'Connell (AM):** Nothing to add.

**Toby Harris (AM):** The Authority needs to endorse the recommendation approving the Director of Audit Risk and Assurance's Annual Plan. The meeting was inquorate.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Are we happy with the annual internal audit risk assessment plan?

**All:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Good. I think that is it unless there is any other urgent items anyone wants to raise?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Chairman, we were provided with a briefing on the Safer Neighbourhood Sergeants with some figures but no length of service. Are these months, days or years?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. We will clarify that for you.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, have we moved on from reports from Committees?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Yes. We are now in any other business.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** OK. Missed it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Members, thank you very much for your help in what was a tricky but nevertheless fruitful meeting. Thank you.