

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 30 June 2011 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.**

**Present:**

**Members:**

Kit Malthouse (Chairman), Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)  
Jennette Arnold, John Biggs, Chris Boothman, Victoria Borwick, Valerie Brasse,  
Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Kirsten Hearn, Neil Johnson,  
Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, 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:**

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner), Anne McMeel (Director of Resources),  
Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner) and Professor Gary Pugh (Director of Forensic  
Services) - item 4 only.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right, ladies, gentleman and Members. That is 10am. Good morning everybody. Apologies for absence. I have Tony Arbour and Steve O'Connell - who is recovering from an operation and we wish him well and safe. Any other apologies? No? Thanks very much.

Declarations of interests. No? OK. Thank you.

Now it is actually, formally, our annual meeting at which we have to renew people's franchise as various Chairs and Members of Committees. Before you you should have a note of attendance. I think we have to now consider appointments don't we? Right. At the Mayoral Authority meeting apparently it was agreed that Members would let us know if there were any particular changes that they felt needed to be made or people who wanted to make a Committee change in terms of membership, or people could notify us if they did not want to continue as Finance Chair. Officers also wrote to Members asking them to confirm any changes prior to the meeting. The Mayor wrote to Reshard [Auladin] and I confirming both of our continuing appointments as Vice Chair and Chair.

We have had a couple of notified changes which I just want to get your OK on. The first is that Steve O'Connell expressed a wish to stand down as Chair of Finance and

Resources. Dee [Doocey] has graciously agreed to step in and Chair it in his stead. I need to ask Members to endorse that nomination. All happy with that?

**All:** Agreed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. There are no other proposed changes to any of the current positions as Chairs or membership of Committees or, indeed, appointments to outside bodies. People should note that Chairs and Vice Chairs of Sub-Committees will obviously be considered by the parent Committee, as it were, when it meets - although the Authority is being asked in this paper to approve Sub-Committee membership as a number of meetings take place soon after this Authority meeting. Sub-Committee membership can then be ratified by parent Committees in due course. Are you happy with that that has been put in there? Yes, Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I just say that I have been added to the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee and I am not on it. Can I be removed from it because I am already on four or five other Committees?

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

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Not sure how that snuck in but we will accommodate that. Yes, Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, I did not move fast enough on 3(a) so I am going to slip this in under 3(b). I notice under the listing on my attendance that I attended nine out of ten Full Authority meetings. I would like to make it clear - because I did make it clear at the time - that the tenth one that I did not attend was on the Jewish festival. If it is structured so that it is impossible for people to attend that should not look the same as people who do not get around to it.

The other thing though, more importantly, as we all know Chairs of Committees get an additional stipend for being Chairs. I am listed as attending only three out of the five Sub-Committee meetings that I Chair. I have gone through my own records and I, in fact, attended four out of five, and the fifth one that I failed to attend was because three Members of that Sub-Committee turned up at the wrong time and decided, therefore, to hold the meeting at the wrong time, without me, and I was available on that occasion. I am not objecting to the fact that they did that but I would feel extremely uncomfortable to have on public record that I am receiving additional money for chairing a Sub-Committee which I then appear to have attended only half the meetings. That is simply not the case. To the best of my knowledge I have attended four out of the five and the fifth one I did not attend because Members, understandably, changed the time to a time that was not originally listed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will reflect that in the revised minutes that you attended four out of five and then held a fifth meeting on your own!

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Exactly! Thank you.

**Toby Harris (AM):** It is of course illegal to hold a Government Sub-Committee meeting at a time different from that which has been advertised to the public but I am sure that is not something the MPA would be unduly bothered about!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will wait for the judicial review! OK. Thank you, Members. Just before we continue, Kirsten [Hearn] has arrived. Can I suggest we go round the room? Kit Malthouse.

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

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

**Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive):** Jane Harwood.

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Bob Atkins.

**Amanda Sater (AM):** Amanda Sater.

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

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

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

**Graham Speed (AM):** Graham Speed.

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

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Victoria Borwick.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Toby Harris.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Ian McPherson.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Great. Thank you very much. OK. Fine. I think that is us done on the annual meeting if everybody is happy. We will move on to the minutes of the full meeting.

I am conscious that today is a very busy day in the capital in that we have got a march, a strike and quite a number of people who have been arrested who are likely to be, unfortunately, released early. What I am going to do is try to ask Members if they could keep it snappy today so that we can allow the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner to be about their business on what might be a trying day.

I should do minutes first. Does anybody have any matters arising from the minutes? No? OK. Thank you.

Chairman's update. I think you have got a printed copy of my update so I do not intend to read it this time, in the interests of speed. Did you get a printed copy? We will circulate it after the meeting. Not sure where it is. Sorry. Does anybody have any questions that they particularly wanted to put to me? No?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** What, on a report that we have not seen?!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I know. Sorry. I do not seem to have it in front of me. Oh there we are. Chairman's update. Right. OK. Very quickly then. First obviously our congratulations to the six new commanders that recently passed the selection process and were interviewed just last week. Two from within the Metropolitan Police Service and four from outside. Thanks to those Members who were on the interview panel. It was an extremely interesting day and I think we recruited some very high quality individuals into the organisation.

Obviously congratulations for some fairly major operations to the Commissioner and his team; Trooping of the Colour, when went off as usually very smoothly, and also the launch and operation so far of Operation Target. I think we are well over 2,000 arrests now, which is looking very good. Certainly the reports in the media are giving reassurance across the capital.

A couple of awards that I wanted to highlight. This month's police officers in Islington and Camden were recognised at the Safer Neighbourhoods Annual Challenge Award Ceremony for their work with young people. Also congratulations go to one of our volunteers who helped to cut serious crime by nearly two thirds in local trouble spots in west London and was honoured at the National Policing Improvement Agency Specials and Police Volunteers Award Ceremony.

There are a number of meetings that I have had over the last month but a couple of key ones just to mention. Obviously a number of meetings around the Police and Social Responsibility Bill with Ministers and others. We are monitoring progress carefully. As part of that, I attended the Police Training Centre (PTC) Transition Sponsorship Board at the beginning of the month, along with plenty of other work on it. We are working closely with our colleagues at the Metropolitan Police Service to make sure that, when the Bill does eventually get Royal Assent, that the transition will be smooth and we get the arrangements in London as quickly as possible after the Bill becomes law.

I appeared in front of the Senior Salaries Review Board to talk - not about my own salary - but about what other PCCs in the country should possibly be paid.

We have had three joint engagement meetings (JEM) - Merton, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest - in the month, all of which were extremely useful and constructive.

One of the issues that I know Members will be conscious of, and the problems it is causing across London, is metal theft and the rise in metal theft over the last few months because of the rise in commodity prices. I held a round table with BT, Transport for London and various police forces, including our own, involved in dealing with that problem, and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead on metal theft. We will be doing the same again in the autumn to see what progress has been made.

I obviously appeared, with the Deputy Commissioner, in front of the London Assembly for a Plenary question and answer (Q&A) on the budget and implications going forward, which again was very useful and constructive.

Then we have had the usual round of road shows around some far distant outer reaches of London over the last few weeks. We have got a couple more to do. You are all very welcome to attend.

Finally, the London Crime Reduction Board met on 20 June 2011. We talked about the financial incentives model put out by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) which is now being piloted in five different places across London and how we could work on helping that. We talked about offender management generally. We also talked about various violence against women issues and improving our relationships with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), particularly where they are plugged into operations like Connect and Target.

That is it from me. Any questions? I think, in future, we should hand this out. It is handed out is it? Oh right, OK. Fine. Thank you.

The next item then is the Commissioner's report. Commissioner?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Chairman. Before I go into talking about performance as I should do and do every time, I just thought I would update you with two items from today's daily review - something we get every day with our various operational matters going on. I do it - none of this will surprise you - just so that publicly we can talk about the breadth of London; the challenging bits and the wonderful bits. Yesterday I think it was we had a call out for a domestic violence incident and officers attended, as they should. The officers when they attended then did a search nearby, got out of their car and they were then threatened by a long barrelled firearm and shots were discharged at them. The good news is the officers were not injured and, subsequently, the suspect was arrested in a different force area. I raise that because you will want to know what your officers are facing and that is the downside and the challenging bit of what officers do have to face here in London.

The other side on my daily report here - and whilst it is very sad that an elderly gentleman has been taken very ill and our best wishes should go to him - we have an elderly gentleman of 85 years of age who is a volunteer for the Metropolitan Police Service and who regularly does a couple of hours every Friday in assisting in public service and assisting the Metropolitan Police Service. The reason it has been brought to my attention is he was taken very ill yesterday whilst assisting us.

I am trying to illustrate, with those two things, the challenges in the breadth of London and the breadth of the Metropolitan Police Service. We have, on the same day, officers being shot at and, very sadly, an elderly gentleman collapsing but, actually, an 85 year old gentleman volunteers to assist the Metropolitan Police Service. I think it paints a broad picture of activity in London and the sort of reports we get through.

Anyway, on to performance. So far into this financial year of course we still only have two months of validated data. Overall the total number of offences are marginally down - largely flat lining - but just marginally down.

If I turn to violent crime, which is on the figures of reported crime, actually we have some good news on violent crime. Overall violent crime has fallen by just under 2,000 offences, down by 7.5%. Almost 1,000 offences, 7.4%, fewer violence with injury offences. The number of homicides has fallen by 7% in the two month period of this financial year compared with the same period last year. Overall gun crime is also down - a huge percentage 22.9% - but actually, because there are not as many gun crime offences as people think, that is 126 less offences. Pleasingly the guns actually discharged again is showing a reduction, so that is pleasing. Still too many but showing a reduction.

Overall knife crime remains a challenge on the figures. That is an additional 272 offences reported. I have said on a number of occasions before that parallels are

problems with street robbery - and I will come back on to that. Also there is another reason why I think knife crime is showing a rise. Of course it the product of police activity. Operation Blunt and various things is much more proactive in searching out weapons so, sometimes, the knife crime offences represent just sheer increased productivity of cops on the street and not reported offences. Nevertheless, knife crime is up and there is a parallel with the rise in robbery. It is the case that knives used to injure, over the first two months of this financial performance year, again, are down. They were down at the end of the last financial year. We did a three month snap shot in my Commissioner's report where it shows it is rising but it just shows, if you splice and dice the figures, you can do statistics anyway. At the end of the last financial year knives used to injure were done and, currently, this financial year knives used to injure are down again. Nevertheless, there are challenges and I will come to those in a moment.

If I can just turn to hate crime offences. I always caveat this by saying, of course, we do know there is very significant under reporting in all hate crime offences so, therefore, we always have to consider that when we are looking at figures. There are reductions in domestic violence, reductions in racist and religious orientated crime and reductions in homophobic offences. Those are reductions in reported crime. I will keep stressing that.

Last week we had a coordinated day of action targeting all hate crime but with a particular focus on forced marriage, so-called honour based violence and disability hate crime. That led to 162 individuals being arrested. Two reasons for doing that. It is about targeting offenders - quite clearly that is what we should be about - but it is also about raising the issue, and that was the reason for that coordinated day of action.

If I can to property crime which, as you have seen in the media, there has been some highlighting of that and the challenges around it. Overall robbery offences are up by some 864 offences during this financial year, this reporting year, and burglary offences, likewise, are up by 1,500 offences, some 10.7%. I think there was some media reporting that actually just reported a single month. Over the first two months of this performance financial year burglary is up by 10.7%. That is why we have launched Operation Target to renew our focus on it. On average we have got something like 1,200 officers particularly focusing on that operation and that is about flexing the balanced policing model across the Metropolitan Police Service and bringing aid in from the other specialist groups to actually target a particular problem that we have. It is early days - and Ian [McPherson] is leading that with Steve Kavanagh from Territorial Policing (TP) - but we are seeing a change in that reporting pattern. We are starting to see those offences come down, and so we should - we have got to do. There has been a drop in offences from week to week for the most serious violence, for violence with injury and knife crime and, critically, street robbery and residential burglary. We are going to have to keep and maintain that focus and it is our intention to maintain that focus for some time.

If I turn to serious youth violence, that always remains a challenge for us in London. That has increased by 86 offences. Of course, since we last met, we have had a teenage homicide; the shooting of Nana Darko-Frempong. You must get bored with me saying this; I am always cautious about saying good news on homicide numbers, particularly

around youth homicides, but it is true. In the financial year to date we have had four less than last year, one less than the previous reporting year and five less than the previous year. So, in other words, we have seen a significant reduction in youth homicides over this financial year, (inaudible) reporting period, and over the calendar year a similar picture. We have had four less than last year. The previous year was the same as that year. The year prior to that the figures are something like 12 less than 2008. We are seeing significant reductions but we would all turn round and say, "We are talking about homicide here, youth homicide, and one is far too many".

Could I just, quickly if I may, Chairman, turn to budget savings and redundancies. Obviously a pertinent issue at this moment in time for all of us. As you know, we have been focused on making savings for some time and in the three year period since 2007/08 to 2010/11 we have made accumulated savings of £581 million - a not insignificant figures. Going forward we still face significant financial challenges as an organisation and we need, as you know, to find some £600 million additional savings by 2014/15. As we have previously reported we have already identified £323 million of this of planned savings but, of course, the job is turning plans into delivery - and we are very conscious of that.

Our strategy for managing that budget gap, as you know, has been firmly focused on reducing the cost of our asset base, delivering an effective business operating model - in particular the very significant change programme that Ian is leading with Territorial Policing - and only, as a last resort, reducing our operational capability. Given the level of savings required and the significant cost of payroll it has always been clear that there has to be some reductions in staff and, in particular, police staff who are leaving the Metropolitan Police Service.

To manage this the first phase of the police staff early departure scheme was launched in November 2010. This led to a total of 405 members of police staff leaving the Metropolitan Police Service. In April 2011 the new Civil Service Compensation Scheme was introduced which includes voluntary exit, voluntary redundancy and, of course - something we do not want but nevertheless we are going there - compulsory redundancy. So far, in the new scheme, 601 police staff members have accepted voluntary terms. We have worked closely with the trade unions throughout the early departure activity and our relation has, on the whole, been positive. Nevertheless, unions do not support and they oppose the principle of compulsory redundancy.

We have, in the last few days, issued the first dismissal notices - and let's be clear about it - that is compulsory redundancy. We do not take that step lightly and all these individuals - of which there are 20 at this moment in time - will have a six month notice period during which time all possible redeployment opportunities will be explored, so hopefully we can reduce that figure. Human Resources (HR) will continue to work closely with the unions and business groups to support all future affected individuals and provide them with appropriate information to make the right decision for their circumstances.



I also have to continue to report it remains an option at this time for me to invoke Regulation A19 for police officers. I still do not want to invoke that regulation because I actually think it is too blunt a regulation and, of course, I am in the position of wanting to maintain, if I look at the budget, the current operational numbers of police officers for the reasons I have outlined on a number of occasions at this Police Authority. Not just about operational capability but about the surge requirement I require here in London to deal with, as we see today, significant public protests and the return of disorder to our streets. Our priority will continue to be the maintenance of operational capability.

Having mentioned demonstrations can I now turn to today's events and the impact on the Metropolitan Police Service and London. I want to just give you a brief outline of external - what we are doing with activities in policing London today - and then I want to turn to internal and our own industrial action. At this moment in time we have this significant event taking place in London. Our response to this is - please do not ask me where we get these titles from - Operation Moosehide! I really do wish we would choose something that does not embarrass me when I give these titles. Anyway, Operation Moosehide is currently in action and it is the response to the action by the National Union of Teachers (NUT) and the other trade unions.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** They did it specially in order to embarrass you!

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Well they have done a jolly good job of it on this occasion, Victoria! There are around 3,000 officers in total involved in the operation and staff in policing this and other events in the capital, including an unrelated march that just happens to be taking place as it takes place annually. Our operation is led by Bob Broadhurst and Nick Johnson and it is very significant. The operation is in place to manage the peaceful protestors, which are the overwhelming part of this, as well as any criminal elements who wish to cause disruption. We do have information of direct action and obviously the operation has got to take account of any criminal intent. At this moment in time - just before I came into this meeting; it is a moving feast - we had arrested seven people in relation to this operation for a combination of criminal damage and public order offences. I think three of those arrests were at Parliament Square. That is very current information and that could change.

I have said many times before we remain committed to facilitating peaceful protests in this city - and so we should. If our information suggests there is going to be disorder or criminality then it is our job to deal with it because other people have rights as well. Throughout the planning process we have had many meetings ongoing with partners to discuss approach and tactics and I have to say, as always, our meetings with trade unions and responsible organisations have been first class. That is what we have come to expect and that is what we get. Vulnerable premises along the route have been identified and contact made with those vulnerable premises. Of course there is lots of information and people have a lot of opportunity to cause a lot of disruption.

Can I now turn to the effects on the Metropolitan Police Service from internal industrial action related to today. At this moment in time - and again this is remembering we have

a shift system so it could alter during the day - in Metcall, which is our critical area, 90% of police staff have not turned up for duty. I think I am right in saying - and of course I am getting the figures in - when you think about it, probably the remainder that have turned up for duty are supervisors; that 90% is a very, very significant number who have not turned up for duty. We have got contingency arrangements in place covering the shortfall - and I will come to how many police officers in a moment - using police officers in there. Actually that is really difficult. If I swing the old blue lamp and look back on my 30 odd years' service, it was one thing grabbing me back off the beat to staff the old call centres which, frankly, even somebody of my technological capability which is not great - I can manage a telephone and I even used to get to be able to do the old teleprinter but not very good. The equipment we now have in call centres - and whilst we have contingencies in place - is much, much more challenging. I will come back to my concern in a moment but 90% have not turned up in Metcall.

What is the effect of that? Well at this moment in time we have no critical incidents as a result of that attrition rate and whilst we are managing our 999s it is absolutely the case that our average pick up call has increased so, therefore, there is an attrition rate on our service to the public of London. That is inevitable. We are managing it because we have brought police staff in. If I can tell you, at the Palace of Westminster, 75% of police staff have not turned up for duty. Again, we have to cover that in one way or another. The way we cover it is we drag police officers in. At this moment in time we have 135 borough police officers being used in call dispatch and we have 37 borough police officers being used in call receipt. Of course we are also using staff in the integrated borough operations (IBOs) in boroughs to assist.

We are managing it but the effects are this. Whilst I do fully understand the lawful rights of people to withdraw their labour in certain circumstances - and I make no comment on that at all, and neither should I - I also understand the childcare problems that our staff have and that is why the figures could change later on today because I guess the childcare problems will be most acute at this time in the morning if schools are closed and people are having to look after children. I understand those problems. I am your London's Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service and my job is to run policing services and emergency services. Whilst I understand those problems I have to say the consequences of this are that there are less officers available on boroughs - that states the blindingly obvious - because we are having to cover, and the service we are giving to Londoners is necessarily degraded. I am saying quite clearly the way in which we manage 999s, there are no particular incidents at this moment in time and I think we are doing a good job but the reality is the amount of time we are taking to answer those phones has increased.

Critically - and this is equally important, if not more so - at this moment in time the service we are offering to your police officers out on the ground, going about their normal day to day business - which is challenging enough as I said yesterday about the firearms incident, but particularly at this moment in time when we are challenged doing this demonstration as well, that concerns me as well.

Am I overplaying this? No, I do not think I am. We are managing it. We have got contingency plans in place and I make no comment on peoples' right to do what they have a right to do. I am very sympathetic to childcare arrangements. But I am concerned - and you would expect me to be concerned - at that level of attrition and no show in an emergency service, and it is right that I draw that to your attention.

I think, Chairman, it is probably right that I stop there.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you very much. We have had a smaller number than usual of submitted questions and then we will move on to general questioning. Caroline [Pidgeon], you were first on the Cardiff model. Would you mind reading your question for the camera?

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Yes. Can you update us on the use of the Cardiff model across London, whereby hospital accident and emergency departments anonymously share information about the time and location of violent incidents with the police?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The Cardiff model, Caroline, is a good model and let's establish that from the start. We have been working with the National Health Service (NHS) since 2008 to develop processes for the routine sharing of non-personal data and we continue to engage hospitals to improve that.

At this moment in time we have 17 Cardiffs. There is one Cardiff and they do that at their hospitals with their health authority. We are slightly different in London, as you know. We are bigger. We have got 17 boroughs that have now established data sharing agreements in line with the Cardiff model. We have got five boroughs who have impending agreements. One further borough - I think I am right in saying, Ian [McPherson] - is sharing some data and nine boroughs currently do not have an agreement in place. It is clearly our desire to spread that right the way across London because it is a good model and can be added to - and there are various differences in the way we do it across boroughs.

The good news is, under Ian's leadership in the TP change programme, we are engaging in the MASH project. That is not of the American TV fame, but multi agency safeguarding hubs, led by the London Safeguarding Children's Board and the Association of London's Director of Children Services. That is seeking greater sharing of information between all partners, including health, for safeguarding and problem solving. We are looking to be part of the MASH hubs right the way across London which should assist - I am hoping - in bringing those other nine boroughs more on board and doing the negotiations with the various hospitals to make sure we can make the best use of data, without impinging on peoples' rights about how that data is managed.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** I am quite concerned that since 2002 I think the Cardiff model has been up and running it has been shown to have a 40% fall in violent assaults over the first five years of it. They saw that being able to use this data. It is worrying that you are still saying nine boroughs' specific hospital trusts are not engaging in this. That, to me, is

very worrying. I am wondering what focus you are going to put on this to make sure that we really get all hospitals in London signed up to this?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I with your concern. Actually it is not entirely within my control as to what other agencies do or do not do with the data. Our intent to spread this across London is quite clear. The fact that we have got 17 Cardiffs. That is our intent. What are we doing about it? The MASH programme should assist greatly. I do not know if there is anything you want to add, Ian? We do intend to spread it but we are not entirely in control of this.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** As part of our anti-violence strategy, which is multi agency, we have a senior clinician involved with that. He is very keen that we are involved and he is very much alive to this. He is engaging for us.

We have also set up a scheme called Medics Against Violence which is taking all the hospitals across London where clinicians are actually accredited for their attendance, as part of their learning, at schools and telling young people about the consequences of violence. We are engaging and we are finding health is moving on. It is a bit slow in some areas though.

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

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

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, just a supplementary on that. Now that more than two thirds of boroughs have gone or are going with this, it seems to me no longer a matter simply that some do and some do not; it seems to me that there is a proportion of Londoners who are being less decently served than most Londoners. I fully understand the kind of softly softly approach to bring people on board but where there appears to be strong resistance - not least, for example, I wonder whether local community and police engagement groups (CPEGs) could know about this? It seems to me reasonable that people in a borough should know if they are not being as well served as people in other boroughs and that it should not only be down to the Metropolitan Police Service to try to negotiate this, but that all partners should realise that this is a weakness in certain places which most other places in London now are not experiencing. I wonder if that could be pushed out to a wider variety of partner and pressure groups and local papers, or anybody else, to ask, "Why is this not happening in our place?"

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We will consider that, Clive. It is true - and I think you know it - it is always the case that good partnerships are better formed on the basis of operation and cooperation and bringing people on board and actually convincing the professionals that this is not undermining something that is fundamental to them and that this data can be treated.

When you say softly softly I do not think our progress thus far would indicate softly softly because I think we have made very good progress. I think where we can get cooperation is the right way forward. We will consider what more --

**Clive Lawton (AM):** I fully agree. I am only talking about maybe the one or two, not the nine, that you really feel that nobody is going to consider this.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Dee [Doocey] had a question about Paladin and then the dog section.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** My question is, "At Mayor's Question Time two weeks ago the Mayor promised that he would talk to you about expanding the Paladin and Child Trafficking Team so it had a permanent presence at St Pancras International. Can you tell me what progress has been made on this?"

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I have discussed it with the Chairman but I have not had a chance to discuss it with the Mayor. Historically, as you know, we have put considerable effort and resource into Paladin. For everybody's information it is a joint team with UK BA and there is now a clear legacy of us having been a catalyst for that improved collaboration and improvement - which I know you are very supportive of.

In terms of specific action in St Pancras Station, British Transport Police have responsibility there for passengers using the Eurostar terminal. Paladin officers have been developing a close working relationship with British Transport Police (BTP) on a single point of contact for issues arriving at St Pancras. As BTP looks to enhance their service that they provide at Eurostar's terminal, they are planning to shadow Paladin staff to enable them to learn and understand how we have been doing this at Heathrow to identify anybody who may be at harm and risk. In other words, we are assisting BTP to pick up their responsibilities at the Eurostar terminal and make sure we provide a seamless service and a collaborative and cooperative service.

In addition to that the Paladin team have been working closely with the ports officers from special operations who are also based at St Pancras and we delivered some training to them to raise their awareness of trafficking and other issues which may make children vulnerable. We are trying to utilise the asset that we have there legitimately through special operations and we are assisting BTP, who are shadowing our Paladin officers, to pick up the learning so that they can pick up the process because, of course, St Pancras is on their turf - quite rightly.

I am not going to go into the rest of the answer because I think the rest of the answer you know very well. Paladin is wider than trafficking. I do not think I will need to do that because I think you know very well what Paladin is all about.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes, I think I do. I am very disappointed with your answer. As far as I am concerned, when the Metropolitan Police Service said, "We will look at extending the Paladin team to the UK border area of Kings Cross and see what we can do

to clamp down even further on this problem. I will be taking this up with the police” I had - perhaps incorrectly, but I will check with him - taken that as he was going to extend what he said; the Paladin team. Now I am, as you know, a great supporter of the Paladin team. I think they do the most amazing work at Heathrow. Of course they cannot cover Kings Cross St Pancras. They are a very small team working with UK Border Agencies and they have done fantastic work.

I am extremely concerned at the potential for child traffickers to say to themselves, “We cannot get in at Heathrow because they’ve got this really good team so let’s move to St Pancras where we don’t have to do anything and we can bring kids in no problem whatsoever”. They can all come in on their own, as we know, with a letter from parents which is not even authenticated.

I am very, very concerned about this. I had a meeting with Eurostar this week. I have got a plan for Eurostar Kings Cross St Pancras and the Metropolitan Police Service to work together, but it would not involve the Metropolitan Police Service handing it over to the BTP - which I just do not think will work at all. We need dedicated child protection officers - Metropolitan Police Service trained - in that area. I would welcome your comments on that because it is not going to help by just saying you are going to let them shadow you. It just will not work. This is a vile problem that the Mayor of London has got to take on board. It is his responsibility to stop child trafficking through Kings Cross St Pancras.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I hear your comments, Dee, and I actually support your ambition to do everything we can to do something about the heinous nature of child trafficking. You and I share - I think everybody would naturally share - that position.

I think we have got to recognise there is a jurisdictional issue here. There is a British Transport Police and there is a Metropolitan Police Service. There is a Manchester Airport with a Manchester police. The Metropolitan Police Service cannot just go in and pick up everybody else’s responsibilities. What I will do - and what we are doing - is actually trying to get a coordinated police response.

Whilst I am grateful for your faith in the Metropolitan Police Service - I am always grateful for that support - I would resist the temptation of saying that British Transport Police cannot pick it up and be equally good. We work together on many areas and using that collaboration is the best way forward. It is the best way of servicing children who have been trafficked to make the best use of the asset that is available here in London which does, whether we like it or not - and actually I think they do a very good job - include British Transport Police.

We are taking it forward in a responsible way and in the way that we should do because there are jurisdictional issues here.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I have no problem with British Transport Police. I have had no dealings with them so I have no view one way or the other. I am sure they are as professional as any police force. The concern is that we need dedicated properly trained experienced child protection officers and I do not believe we are going to get that by handing it over to British Transport Police. I would --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am not handing anything away.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Can I make a suggestion, Dee? I am quite interested in this. Why don't you and I go up there and arrange a visit to see the BTP unit that is stationed there and talk to them about what they are doing and then we can make an assessment about whether we think it is right?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I would like to talk about the whole of the Paladin and go to Heathrow as well. If we could do that that would be great.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Fine. More than happy to do that.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Super. Thank you very much.

My second question is about the unfortunate incident that happened at Keston this week. Could I preface my remarks by saying that over the years I have been to Keston on a number of occasions and I have been absolutely blown away by the dedication of the officers and all of the staff. I have watched them training. I have watched the puppies from the time they were puppies - I have watched a complete litter - until the time they passed out as police training dogs. I think the facilities are just brilliant and I have seen nothing but amazingly caring officers and fantastic facilities.

My concern is - and I know that you are not going to be able to comment on individual cases - an assurance from you, Commissioner, that whatever the recommendations are, that you will make sure that those recommendations are implemented in full and, if necessary, come back here for the money to do so - because I think it is absolutely essential. We do not know what happened. I should think it is a tragedy but we do not know. I feel desperately sorry for the officers and the families involved. What I wanted to make sure is, if there are things that can be done, that it will not not be done because there is not enough money to implement it.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Firstly, if I may say without sounding patronising, thank you for your comments about Keston, and I would concur with that. I am extremely saddened and concerned by what happened. There is a full investigation. You are right; I am not going to pre-judge the outcome of that investigation. It is being led by the RSPCA. Also, the RSPCA is making itself available to make any interim recommendations of how we might be even better in the future at Keston. I make no criticism or judgement on other people at Keston, or indeed the services there. We have got to wait and see the outcome of that investigation. I am saddened and concerned and

anything we can do to make sure that animals are treated properly and this sort of thing does not happen again, then of course we want to do.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question is on police community support officers (PCSOs) and it is, "How many PCSOs attached to Safer Neighbourhood Teams have applied to become police officers since the freeze on recruitment was lifted? Please include those who have had applications pending at the time the freeze was imposed. How many have been successful to date?"

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thanks, Joanne. In the absence of Tim Godwin [Deputy Commissioner] I will venture to do numbers - which I try not to do mostly! The freeze on police number recruitment was lifted on 10 February 2011, as you know, and, as a result of the freeze, 190 PCSO applicants were placed on hold, of which 111 were attached to Safer Neighbourhood Teams. That is how the freeze affected it.

All 190 PCSOs formally joined as police officers on 14 March this year. The current recruitment campaign, which was launched on 30 March this year, has generated 1,969 applications from serving PCSOs, of which 1,139 are attached to Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

It is anticipated - because of course the process is ongoing and we have got something called the police led certificate course and various things so there will be an attrition rate here, so we have to do what is the likelihood? It is anticipated that something in excess of 1,000 of current PCSOs will join as police officers, of which we are anticipating 625 - I do not know how we come to that precise anticipation, but they do it on previous applications I guess - of whom currently occupy Safer Neighbourhood Team posts.

That is the answer you are looking for. 625 PCSOs currently in Safer Neighbourhood Team posts we anticipate will be successful in becoming regular officers. We anticipate vacancies on Safer Neighbourhood Teams being filled by the redeployment of PCSOs from the functions. You will of course recall that we are anticipating in 2011/12 a reduction of 814 PCSO posts with a further reduction of 100 posts planned for 2012/13.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** You have anticipated one of my supplementaries there which was, with that in mind --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** You would expect me to!

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** PCSOs going off Safer Neighbourhood Teams to become regulars and noting that you have already reduced PCSOs by 644 by the end of March 2011 - which I think is over and above what you had anticipated or what was budgeted for - do you expect to have difficulty in back filling those Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) PCSOs?



**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The numbers work but of course numbers then have to equate into people and people have to be redeployed and skilled. Actually we have an answer to this because we are saving more posts than we have PCSOs leaving and becoming regular cops. We are working through a process to where we need to scale to make sure we can fill. I cannot give you a guarantee this will be so seamless that on the day a PCSO leaves a new PCSO comes in. That would be our aim and we are working very hard to try to do that - it is a horrible phrase but - **team-led**(?) if you will, because we have got more numbers in the reducing posts than we have leaving to become cops. I think that is the case.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** It is.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** The reason I raise this is because I have a letter from a Chief Inspector on one of the London boroughs to a Chair of a Safer Neighbourhood Panel who sought assurances that his PCSOs that are no longer there would be back filled as soon as possible. The response from the police is to say that, "I am disappointed to say I cannot give the Panel the reassurance you seek". The letter goes on to talk about the ongoing Safer Neighbourhood Review but then states that, "With reducing the number of PCSOs likely across the Metropolitan Police Service it may not be possible to fill all vacated posts. However, please rest assured that it is my intention, in line with the (inaudible) strategic direction to preserve the numbers of PCSOs and SNTs as much as practicable".

There seems to be a lack of concrete reassurance there and a genuine concern amongst the police that, where PCSOs are successful in moving on, those posts in Safer Neighbourhood Teams will not be filled.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am going to ask Ian [McPherson] to answer it. I am quite happy, if you want to let us have the letter, we will look into it. There are a lot of chief inspectors about London. It sounds to me as though you have got an honest chief inspector there who is trying to give an honest answer, but of course he is dependent upon other services actually being able to deliver what I have just spoken about. I think what he is probably trying to say is, "Yes, that is our intention, but I am dependent upon other people to back this up". Ian?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** It is very, very clear the ambition and the design is to ensure that all Safer Neighbourhood Team PCSOs are filled. That will happen. There is a natural churn so, at the moment, here in the Metropolitan Police Service, out of 2,158 PCSOs that we have in Neighbourhoods, we are 64 down. That is only just a natural churn. It is a tiny, tiny percentage.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Of a very large number.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Given the size of the number of people it is actually relatively small. Of course we are up by over 117 in terms of police officers. One is slightly down; one is up. It is the natural nature of an organisation that is as large and as complex as this. Within that we will have lots of people with lots of

different ambitions wanting to be diverted to different places in the organisation. That is natural and it will always be thus. There is no such thing - as the Commissioner has rightly said - one goes in and one immediately goes out. It just does not work that way because we have got proper HR processes which are there to safeguard the needs and wants and desires of individuals against that of the organisation.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** If there is a difficulty in future will you look to open recruitment to PCSOs?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** What we will do is make sure we work within the budget, but our intention is to make sure we continue to staff the police constables and PCSO posts and the sergeants posts that are budgeted for that we give you.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** John [Biggs], did you want to come in on this

(background cheer)

Sorry, there is an event going on in London's Living Room.

**John Biggs (AM):** I thought they were anticipating my contribution, Chairman! I am sure they were without realising it. I have two little questions. The first is that I am sure people who are anxious about neighbourhood policing will be pleased that you are going to back fill those officers moved into police constable recruitment but that clearly cannot go on forever without recruitment, as Joanne has said. There is clearly an opportunity cost as well because they are being taken from somewhere else. Can you just give us a two sentence summary of which bits of London's policing will lose PCSOs as a consequence of this?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I cannot remember from memory the precise ones but it is actually in the budget that has come to this Police Authority saying where we are reducing PCSOs from, and it is from there that we will put them in. The Government's safeguardings are on --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Central security zone.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Government security zone, youth courts and diamond districts are the areas. There are one or two zones in relatively small numbers.

**John Biggs (AM):** OK. We clearly need to monitor those areas and their performance.

The other question then is I am hearing through the grapevine through my various link boroughs and elsewhere that the number of officers - this is an anecdote. It may not be

true. I would be very grateful if you could rebut it. There is an anecdote in circulation that the number of officers taking early retirement or doing their numbers because of concerns of a variety of natures, including ones about pension terms and conditions in the future, has gone up. If that is the case then that would readjust the numbers from those anticipated in your budget. Could you comment on that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I can, John. That has been a concern that has been raised by the Federation. Actually, if you just naturally work it through intellectually yourself, when there is pressure on pay there is uncertainty in the police service. We have the Windsor review. We have the Hutton review. We are under direct leadership, quite rightly, reviewing the supply to demand and shift review. All these things are disturbing and difficult for police officers to all come together. We would naturally be concerned to monitor and increase the attrition rates right the way across the organisation. We have done that and, as of last week, the reports to me, there had been no increase in attrition rates.

Quite naturally people are looking at their own numbers and they will do that. That happens from time to time in the police service anyway. I recall when there was a rumour that the lump sum that officers get under the old pension arrangements was going to be taxed. That led to a significant increase in inquiries to the payroll saying, "How do I currently stand?" It did not equate to a huge exiting of police officers. They were just making inquiries. There has been no increase, at this moment in time, of attrition rates at all.

**John Biggs (AM):** There have been a lot of conversations, a lot of anxiety and people doing their numbers and conversations in canteens but, as yet, people are not increasing their numbers of early retirements?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We have no indication at all of any increased leaving.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** That is exactly right.

**John Biggs (AM):** You do not anticipate that changing?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am not going to predict the future, John.

**John Biggs (AM):** I think we employ you, with respect, to predict the future.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Not on this you don't! I am not going to predict the future of people's personal intentions and I would be very foolish to do so. I am keeping a very, very careful eye on it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** It is definitely the case that actuarial calculation is becoming a significant skills base within the Metropolitan Police Service in a way that it has not before! Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Commissioner, what are the consequences for the Metropolitan Police Service of the recent High Court ruling on **rates**(?) and periods of bail?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** The ruling overturned 25 years of Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) interpretation application. You asked me for the implications. There are currently - gosh I am doing a lot of numbers today; it makes me nervous! - 14,029 persons on bail. Of these 175 are on bail for murder, attempted murder or conspiracy to murder. I have deliberately chosen the most high and most serious.

We had a briefing for senior borough officers - which was held at 5pm yesterday so, from that, you can tell the seriousness that we are giving to this; we are very, very concerned - to provide guidance on the current position and how to deal with it. We have had advice from two Queen's Counsel (QCs) now which concurs to say this is a serious situation and there is a significant likelihood of requiring primary legislation to get into a position to deal with this position.

The consequences could be serious for us. We are putting into place all sorts of contingency plans, profiling those most serious offences where people are on bail, because of what the implications are of this. You need new evidence to arrest and you cannot just arrest on bail. What is the interpretation of new evidence? We are in new territory here so we are being as careful as we can be about the most serious cases because the last thing we want to do is 1) damage the judicial proceedings through this ruling of those serious cases, or 2) leave the way open for people to sue us for doing what we have always done in the past under the law that now suddenly seems to be a different interpretation.

It is very worrying, Toby. I have raised it personally with the Home Secretary and, to be fair, I do know the Home Secretary is very much engaged on this problem.

**Toby Harris (AM):** I will not ask you to agree with me that some High Court judges need a re-education process. Could you also tell us whether there is an implication in terms of retrospectively people who will say, "Now my bail was illegal, therefore the arrest and subsequent charging is illegal, therefore the case falls apart"?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** You would expect us to assess all the implications but it is not my intention to suddenly alert various people to use this latest ruling to then, in my opinion, behave improperly.

**Toby Harris (AM):** You are implying that it is a possibility.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am not trying to be difficult here, but I am agreeing with you; the implications are serious for ongoing cases and, of course, historic cases would be an issue of assessment.

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

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Are we into general questions?

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

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Chairman, can I just follow that up?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Just on that then, quickly.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** Only to ask, since you say that you could only re-arrest or follow something up if you have new evidence, as I understand it the reason why the police would not arrest and charge somebody at a given moment and would seek to do so later is because they do not, at that point, have all the evidence they need to charge them. Would it not be the case that the availability of the evidence that would have resulted in you being able to arrest them is new evidence, or am I missing something?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I think we could debate here and we could end up baiting the head of the pin. For instance, if we take forensic samples, it is logical that we would bail for the results of those forensic samples - and I look at the various people with legal qualifications around this table. I will be as careful as I can be here. Are the results of those tests new evidence or not? That is a question on legal advice. I know where the bar was set previously. We are looking at that. There are very significant implications for how we deal with people currently on bail, some for very serious offences, and we are taking it extraordinarily seriously.

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

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

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Thank you very much. I wanted to raise a general question from a specific example - and you may not be able to deal with this now. I basically wanted to air it with you. Lambeth Police Community Consultative Group has had a stop and search monitoring group for a long time now, since 2004 I think. It has done a review of what has gone on over that time. It is quite interesting and worrying that over that period of time there were four incidences when there was a substantial procedural glitch - to use a small word - in the collection and entry of data which caused the data that was collected and expressed to diverge significantly from the reality of what was going on. Of course these things got fixed because there were debates at the time and it was aired.

It raised the question for me about the integrity of data. We have talked a lot about figures and data this morning and we obviously all of us - politicians and officers - rely on data. It raised a question for me about not just now but into the future. What is the Metropolitan Police Service going to do to make sure that there is integrity in the collection and the entry of the data that it does collect? I appreciate there has been a

streamlining process so, in a way, it is even more important that what has been collected is real - I will not go into all of those instances but they were big enough to make a difference to the story that was being told by the data.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Val, I will ask Ian [McPherson] to answer in more detail. What I would say is, if mistakes are made on anything that is serious around people's liberty etc, it is always serious. I cannot comment because I do not know the detail of those --

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** It is a general point.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** What I am saying is it is serious when one mistake happens. Four mistakes. Set against the total volume four might be a small number but, nevertheless, something we should look at.

In terms of what we are doing, the one thing - before Ian comes in - I will point out is we had an inspection in 2008/09 by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) on the collection of these materials. I have got to say, back then, there was a criticism of us in one place where we actually stored it wrongly in a fridge. We have rectified that and I can tell you the HMIC is satisfied with the progress against all those recommendations. Ian, what are we doing?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** We actually have a commander, Tony Eastaugh, who leads in respect of this. We have recently reviewed our processes. We are of the view they are tighter than they have ever been, notwithstanding the numbers are huge. I think we are in the region of near 40,000 stop searches a month and something like 50,000 stop and accounts.

I think we find ourselves on a haunt of a dilemma here. There is always the issue - I know this is a live debate nationally and indeed within the Authority - around levels of bureaucracy, time for officers and the importance of getting this right. I think this is just where the debate is. We are sticking very clearly to actually bureaucracy works in such an important area.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** If I can just quickly, Chairman. Perhaps I have not expressed properly what kind of things were going wrong. The kind of thing that was going wrong was, for example, that stop and search which ended up in arrest, that data was not being entered as stop and search. The Territorial Support Group (TSG) locally were doing different things with their data and it was not finding its way in. There were big procedural flaws in the data collection that significantly affected the total data. The question is do we not need to have processes that audit the integrity of data collection in the same way that we need to have procedures that audit the integrity of our financial processes?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We actually do have those processes in place and I am very happy to bring a report back. Will I say that there will never ever be

mistakes again? You know that would be nonsense. We need to learn from that. I am very happy to take those individual ones away. I am sorry; I did misunderstand the question.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** I was trying to raise the systematic question, rather than these individual things which have been sorted.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am very happy to report back.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** It is how do we stop this happening again in the future and how do we pick it up?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We do have processes in place to do exactly that; to qualify and quantify and put the quality into data. We have processes in place and I am very happy to bring a report back to this Authority on that; what the processes are.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** I would like to see that. I do not know if the whole Authority would, but I would like to see that.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** What I would acknowledge is the amount of data we collect is a problem. It is a problem to make sure are we collecting it correctly, are we using it correctly and are we sharing it correctly? We are very, very concerned to make sure we do because there are big implications about getting it wrong - 1) in terms of individuals, but 2) in terms of the business information that drives our activity. I do accept that.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** In a big and complex organisation people go off at a tangent sometimes. It is how do you keep it pure.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Indeed they do, Valerie. They sometimes do exactly that. I noticed that! Let's have a chat about what are the processes we have got in place and if we can improve them, we will improve them.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, thank you. Commissioner, can I just take you back to your report about knife crime? I preface my couple of questions by saying - and I am sure you will know this - on Sunday night, 26 June 2011, another knife incident resulted in the loss of yet another young person in my constituency in the borough of Islington. It has to be said our condolences go to the families and friends but the young people in this location are particularly shocked and angered because it was only five days previously that someone was viciously assaulted with a knife. That is in one locality that does not have the history of there being guns and then knives are taking over from guns; this is in

Holloway, with its own issues, not in a location where, in the past, we have said that people have moved to knives having previously carried guns.

Firstly, will you join me in a call for anyone who has witnessed these incidents to contact Crimestoppers anonymously on its number? I think we should use this opportunity to promote that number. It paints another opportunity because there has been no arrests, I know for a fact, in these two cases.

The figures that you gave us in paragraph nine show that knife increased by 8.6% and that where knives are used to injure that was also up by 5.6%. Can we be provided with an **hprofile**(?) of this? I know that it is around 18 to 24 but it would be good to see that profile. We can pick up these incidents from the mapping but I think the **hprofile**(?) would be good. Do you have anything to say? Is this about young people now being detached from projects that would normally have engaged them? Are we seeing this trend now with the closure of more and more services for young people? What is your intelligence telling you about this trend?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** On your first point I will happily join with you in encouraging people to pick up the phone and use Crimestoppers. It is a superb facility that has brought huge benefits nationwide and to London. It is heavily used, there has been an increase in take up and it has been responsible for solving many, many, many heinous crimes. I would happily do anything I could with you to support encouraging the use of that number, particularly amongst young people. There is always a suspicion, "They don't really mean it. It won't really be anonymous". It really will be anonymous. It is so heavily policed to ensure that nobody's anonymity is breached. It is a superb facility so I would do anything I could to actually promote that.

You talk about the figures and I actually covered that when I was speaking earlier. In the report it does show over a rolling three month period that knives used to injure had increased. I would remind you that, overall, last year, at the end of March, there was a reduction in knives used to injure in this city.

Since March, from April, for the first two months of this year, there has been a further reduction in knives being used to injure. I never ever try to pretend that means everything is great because I always say it is too much, what we have got left. There has been a continuing trend - which occasionally will blip - of a reduction of knives being used to injure in this city. I will turn around and still say it is too much.

What are we doing about it? I have said this many, many times. It is right that you should be on my case encouraging us to constantly do more and more to do what we can do to stop that issue of kids making the wrong choice, carrying a knife and using a knife, because the consequences are absolutely dire.

We do that but I have always said we are largely at the suppression end of the business. I say it time and time again. Whilst we should support other schemes - and I will come back to your last point - actually we do not lead social engineering; we should be



supporting it. We are at the suppression end of the business. The long term solution to young people making the right choices lie elsewhere than police-led suppression action. We all know that. (inaudible) parenting and all the rest of it. I am not trying to evade my responsibilities here but I want to make sure the debate on youth crime is a much wider debate than just, "What are the cops doing to suppress it and arrest people?" That is the failure end of the equation for society.

In terms of am I seeing any trend of increasing kids making the wrong choice because of a reduction in youth engagement activities? I could not, hand on heart, say that is the case. Clearly, I would be concerned; we are cutting back in the Metropolitan Police Service. This Authority is partly responsible for us having to cut back on that because we are having to manage a difficult budget situation, and we are doing it the best way we can.

Other authorities, as you know, all the way round London and the country are having to make economies. I am looking at where local authorities are making decisions to cut any of their services and how it impacts on our services. In fact, I spoke to the combined London Chief Executives last week about this precise problem and how we might - this Authority - might have an effect on how local authorities deliver services. Of course it will because actually we provide police officers. Their decisions have an effect on us as to where they are putting cuts into place.

I would always be concerned but I cannot say I have noticed any trend, at this moment in time, of an increasing problem of youth knife crime linked to an absence of diversion schemes. In fact, knives used to injure are continuing to go down on the trend line.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Thank you for that. You have answered my follow up question because what I was going to ask you was about your direct relationship with the leaders group or the Chief Executives of London. I hear what you say but you cannot stand aside from what is happening because, if the cuts continue, that does impact on the lives of citizens and then that does impact on the police's ability to police safety.

Chairman, if I can finish - I know that you are dying to come in - I welcome the fact that you have had this recent meeting with Chief Executives of councils and that this will be an ongoing dialogue that you will be having with them, because I think that is a crucial dialogue that you, as one of the key services, must continue to have with local authorities.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am very aware there is an active debate that is about the reality for practitioners and professionals in the field and there is also an absolute assurance there is nothing I have said today and nothing I have said in the past that says I am suggesting I should stand aside from this problem. I actually say you are right to keep on my case to make sure I am doing everything I can in leading the Metropolitan Police Service to do whatever the Metropolitan Police Service can do to reduce this problem. We are doing. The results are there. The figures are there. All I am saying is the debate should not just be about what the police are doing. It is a much wider and much bigger debate than that.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Can I have the figures by **hprofile(?)**?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I think it is worth pointing out, because I have heard this question over the last couple of days, that three years ago was a time of quite significant spend by local authorities on youth diversion and all the rest of it. Knife crime and youth violence were rising very significantly. There is no direct connection either way as far as we can see. It is always about what actually works and part of the work we are doing here in this building is to try to work out which of those diversion things actually have some evidence base to show that they are a good spend of money. In the past, as I say, there was a lot of money being spent and knife crime and youth violence were rising.

Jenny [Jones], you were next.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I have got three issues to raise with the Commissioner but, before I do, you made a comment earlier about our all being brief. While we exist it is our job to scrutinise the police. We are the only body that does in this particular way. I am sure you were not putting pressure on us not to ask questions that we wanted to ask.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No. I was asking people to be concise.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I think that is a good thing to ask for.

**Toby Harris (AM):** We are all in agreement here.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** For once. The last thing that the Commissioner mentioned in his report was the 90% absence of police staff which is a very interesting figure because it is very high. I wondered if the Commissioner felt that this was partly to do with the fact that the police staff did feel that the negotiations about their future were not particularly well handled, the negotiations were flawed and that the information flow was poor to them? Do you just think they are angry at the Metropolitan Police Service and this is an opportunity to show that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** No.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** You do not think the negotiations were badly handled and the information - that is what the unions are saying and they were very upset. I, personally, would draw the conclusion that the Metropolitan Police Service is partly to blame for a 90% absence of police staff.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I hear your comments, Jenny. You have a view on it. I have seen the negotiations. I have seen the evidence gone to. Can you always improve things? Of course you can. Do I expect people to be happy about the financial situation we and many other agencies find themselves in? Of course I do not. I

am a realist about it. My job is to manage that with as much dignity and fairness and within the rules as we can. We have done that. I have been part of those discussions.

Actually the discussions, up until very recently, have been very fruitful, with the support of trade unions. It is only very recently that they have withdrawn the support for the scheme. I think people have gone to extraordinary lengths to try to do this properly and we are still trying to avoid compulsory redundancies at this time; doing the generic scheme and talking to individuals.

I do not accept that the situation is as you describe but I do accept that people are feeling vulnerable. I am feeling upset. Why wouldn't they do? This is a difficult situation. For me to try to pretend it is not a difficult situation would be trying to mislead everybody.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jenny, I met union leaders yesterday morning as it happens, and they did not express any dissatisfaction with the negotiation process and the level of information that was coming through. It is worth pointing out that, of course, the strike is a national strike, it is not actually the Metropolitan Police Service's strike, and they are responding to a national call from the union.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I was responding to the Commissioner's point about the 90% absence. I actually went to the Annual General Meeting (AGM) of the union and I can tell you that is not the story that I heard from everybody at that Annual General Meeting.

I also wanted to ask you about the Madeline McCann case because you have had five weeks now. I am presuming that you have a resourcing plan for it and I wondered if that is something that you could share with us, because this is a heavy resource commitment and there are opportunity costs? Are you able to tell us how many people are allocated to the review? How many are detectives? How long it is going to go on? I am not asking you now but if you could let us know. Has the Home Office given you a limit on the amount of resources that you can use?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I can give you some answers to that now. I cannot confirm or commit to how long it is going to go on. I would not do that. That is a matter for the team themselves. Secondly, I have not been given any limit by anyone. Thirdly, in terms of numbers engaged on this, I will happily share that information.

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

Finally, it is about the phone hacking. You said at the Home Affairs Select Committee - I am quoting from a newspaper and I do not know if that is accurate or not. You said something about would you rather they were used on burglary and you said yes. Surely this is quite an important decision. I am presuming there are still 45 detectives working on the phone hacking, which is a considerable resource. If that is true, why not put fewer on the phone hacking?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am quite happy to get my staff to obtain a transcript of precisely what I did say to the Home Affairs Select Committee. It is not quite as you understand it.

In terms of responding to questions there about resourcing, I was trying to be very responsible. I was actually trying to say it is our job to do this thing and do it well, and I do not resile from that. If you are asking me would I rather those detectives be doing other things - and actually I did not say burglary, I think I said robbery - of course I would. I do not resile from the fact we have got to get on with this and do it well. I gave them information that, at that time - and it could change - there are 45 detectives on it, Sue Akers is looking to make that more economic as best she can, and that a significant number of those officers are engaged in properly servicing the legal requirements for a civil disclosure. I stick by those comments. It is right that we do this, we have got to do it properly and we have got to make sure we can give a good account of ourselves in any future process.

I also went on to say it is inevitable, in my opinion, that, at some stage after the investigation and after any related judicial proceedings, lots of people will want to ask lots of questions and, at some stage, there will be a process which, quite naturally, will want to ask questions around the parameters of the original inquiry and will want to ask much wider questions about all of this. We need to make sure that we do our job thoroughly and well in doing that by putting the right amount of resources to it.

Would I rather them be doing robbery? Of course I would. I would rather concentrate on those crimes that we have just been talking about. We have a responsibility to do this and do it properly, and that is what we are doing.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I accept that you have to do it properly. It is a crime. You have to investigate it. It just seems to me that, if more robberies are happening and the figure is rising, surely if you reduce the number of people - and you say you are doing it but I would say reduce substantially - on the phone hacking case, it takes longer but you are still dealing with the robberies. Why not do that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Because we have certain legal obligations. We cannot just expand the timescales when we have legal obligations around disclosure for the courts. We have to comply with those legal obligations.

When you talk about why don't I put my people on to robbery? That is exactly what Operation Target has done but something like, on average, 1,200 officers are directly against the rise in burglary and robbery and that is why we are seeing a reducing trend in burglary and robbery.

It is more complex than that. We do not just make a decision between phone hacking and robbery. We have got to deal with the whole balanced policing model and the whole range of issues that are here in London. Sue Akers is responsible for that investigation. I

am very satisfied she is doing it well. She is looking where she can make economies and, where she can reduce the number of police officers, I am quite sure she will.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Just for clarity, I was not suggesting it was an immediate link. I am saying that, generally, it is a matter of resourcing and spreading people around. Thank you.

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

**John Biggs (AM):** It is about burglaries. I welcome your comments earlier on and your recognition that it is an unwelcome development; the increase in recorded burglaries in London. You spoke at some length about Operation Target, although your report tells us that that is primarily focused on the robbery challenge. I think a lot of Londoners who have either experienced burglary or who fear it are very apprehensive about the rise because it is a fundamental violation of their space and people actually suffer quite considerable emotional psychological trauma after their property has been burgled as well. I know that from indirect experience.

Can you tell us a bit more about how you are really going to focus resources on reducing burglary? For over a year now there have been rising trends in two thirds of my boroughs in east London, for example. I think all three now.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Firstly, there is context here. I do not resile from the fact that I am the one that has highlighted the fact that burglary is going up, and robbery. Of course we are still comparing that to the historic lows here in London of burglary figures as against ten years ago. The progress we have made is quite fantastic.

I have made it clear that target is more than robbery. It is about burglary as well. They are the two prime offences. Although we use two different tactics it is quite clear that target is actually dedicated to robbery and burglary as well because they are the two rising trends.

What are we doing about it? You have got to be careful as it is early days. I am looking at some figures here - I will pass over to Ian [McPherson] in a moment. The short term trend suggested offending is decreasing in burglary when comparing the last four weeks with the previous four weeks. You know and I know we have got to be careful with that. Looking at that comparison, over that period, in the last four weeks we are seeing a reduction of 4.9% in reported burglary. That is what we are doing about it. We think Target is having that impact but we have got to make sure that goes into a longer term impact. Ian?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Essentially, John, we are focusing, as you would expect us to, on the high crime areas for burglary. Very much on the location piece. We can designate that. We know that about 2.5% of London's geography

equates to about 20% of its crime. We are focusing in where we think there is the best chance of us hitting particular crime types would be.

In addition to that we have had a concerted effort against offenders. 2,277 people have been arrested over the last two weeks of target. That is by a very focused approach saying, "Right. Let's get out there. Let's use whatever asset we have". Actually it goes to Jenny's [Jones] point earlier; if we had been able to divert resource would you divert resource? Yes, we have. It is in significant numbers.

In addition to that, as an organisation, we have altered our shift systems. That means that in the evening times and late evening we have more officers on than we have ever had. 9,000 police officers across London had their shifts changed under the response model. That gives us, I think, an additional 500 officers on between 1am and 3am and an additional 270 officers, I think it is, a little bit earlier in the evening. The point being we are diverting our resources to the peak times. We are diverting them on to the offenders in greater numbers and it is having an impact. In addition to that, we are looking very much at the victimisation of our communities and saying, "Right. Let's get in there. Tell people about the risks that are associated with burglary". We are having an impact.

Remember that Target is not a one week wonder. This is going to be going on for the next six months. It is about, as the Commissioner says, rebalancing the model. When it goes out of kilter over here let's move to it. That is the clever bit about the approach of the Metropolitan Police Service; it is about being much more flexible in the way we deliver resources.

**John Biggs (AM):** So it is not just about a six month initiative; it is also about re-engineering the way police respond to burglary. Your argument is that the total capacity being applied to tackling burglary will be increasing, notwithstanding the cuts in funding of the overall budget. Is that correct?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** No. What I am saying is, as things occur, we will monitor them. That is why we have big intelligence systems which say, "OK. Let's use our resources appropriately, taking into account the need to have a commitment to confidence and satisfaction, the need to deal with specific crime types and the need to deal with the blips that might occur as well as events such as are occurring today in the centre of London.

**John Biggs (AM):** I had, hopefully, two little supplementaries. The first is there has been quite a lot written in the press about things being - I like to use the term counter cyclical but it depends what you think is cyclical. As the economy gets into difficulty the amount of property crime tends to increase - it is not linear but it is perhaps a lagging indicator. Do you accept that that is a genuine concern and, in the past, it has been shown to have some voracity?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** In terms of increasing crime?

**John Biggs (AM):** Increasing property crime including increasing burglary at a time of economic difficulty.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Intellectually and intuitively that does feel to be right.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Could I just add something there? Sorry to interrupt. I have been clear before; there is, if you will accept it, criminological thinking that says, at times of economic boom, personal crime goes up and, in a recession, property crime goes up. That is the generally accepted thinking. I have also said that we should not just be slaves to history and our job is to do what Ian is doing. Whilst our task in coordinating procedures in the Metropolitan Police Service has improved dramatically over recent years, what we are actually doing is refining it further so that we cannot just accept that criminological theory but make a difference. I do not accept that there should naturally be a rise in burglary. We should be doing what we can about it and be more flexible to it. I think that is what Ian is saying.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Can I add something on the cycle? There is a cycle which does, frankly, concern me. That is to do with the judicial system and how long prolific burglars, in particular, get locked up for. I am not sure if you were on the Authority then but it is not very long ago, probably about 18 months ago, that we were sitting here listening to the Commissioner announcing the relaunch of Operation Bumblebee to deal with a rise in burglaries. All those prolific burglars were caught and locked up and were given sentences of 18 months and they are out after 9 to 12 months. All of a sudden, gosh what a coincidence, we see another rise in burglaries, largely in the same areas that they were before. We know prolific burglars come out and start burgling again almost immediately in many cases. Whether the length of sentence is contributing to the cycle as well is another issue we need to look at.

**John Biggs (AM):** My final supplementary then is, linking this back to the neighbourhood policing model, when I visited my neighbourhood teams I found that the resource, particularly of a sergeant and the two police constables (PCs) and the intelligence they have access to in identifying prolific offenders in their area and possibly targeting them in working with other initiatives to ensure that people are managed and that we have a better opportunity of catching and holding them to account. That is one of the effective tools that a neighbourhood policing model can provide.

I suppose my anxiety is that, by reducing the capacity of neighbourhood teams, particularly the intelligence - not that PCs are stupid or anything but the sergeant and the managerial competence that they have - and diluting them across an area will, potentially, have an adverse effect on the capacity to deal with people at the blunt end. Can you just comment on that?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am guessing we are going to come to that report later --

**John Biggs (AM):** We may do, yes.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I have to say we are not reducing the PCSO/PC commitment to Safer Neighbourhoods. That delivers. We will come on to it. We are looking to reduce by 150 - because of the budget situation - the number of sergeants. My very strong professional judgement is there is no reason to actually concern ourselves that that should reduce that intelligence supply. Frankly, in some areas, we can extend the supervisory reach of some of those sergeants and some of those sergeants have agreed that we can do that.

**John Biggs (AM):** I do not want to pre-empt that question but I do have an anxiety about that loss of management capacity.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Can I just add one thing, Chairman? The one thing I do share with you, John, is a concern about the crime figures and a concern about the burglary figures. What I want to do is make sure that we are as flexible as we can and make it so we do not just slavishly follow what has happened in the past.

**John Biggs (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We have got half an hour to go of our allotted time, although we often over run. Just to remind Members about the requirement for concision. Cindy [Butts]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I wanted to come in partly on the back of your response to John's question around being alert to the evidence that shows that burglary and property crime go up at times of recession. You were saying it is important to be proactive. I was just wondering whether or not you would be prepared to extend that to hate crime? The figures and the evidence also show that race hate crime in particular increases at difficult economic times as well. That was just one point.

The other point that I wanted to raise is - I do not usually use press reports as a marker for what kind of questions I ask you at Full Authority, although I was very intrigued by a press article that came out last Sunday which was about police officers and how they respond to abuse from the public. I smiled when I read it but when I saw the clarification that came to Members about the Metropolitan Police Service's position on it, I was very intrigued. Mark Simmons made a comment. He is a senior officer whom I have a lot of regard for and respect for I should say. He said that he did not think that police officers ought to have a higher threshold of tolerance. I thought, "Really?!" I was intrigued as to whether or not you would agree with that; that police officers should not have a higher level of tolerance towards abuse that they might receive from the public.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** To deal with your question. I think you are right; there is some research that shows that at times of recession people's ability to become hateful becomes even greater. Of course the figures at this moment in time are showing reductions. What we have got to do is be careful we monitor it and respond



accordingly. What I do not want to do is extend Operation Target so it becomes completely unfocused and it is just what cops do. I think that is what we are doing with Target. We are honing down our tasking and coordinating systems so that they are even more dynamic and more alert than in the past to respond as quickly as we can to try to take those sort of things out. I do accept there is a potential there. There always has been the potential there.

Now turning to your intrigue. Actually I would have been amazed if somebody had not asked me about the swearing factor to the cops thing. What is that about? That advice was initially issued, I think, back in 2008/09 and we are just reissuing the advice. It is practical advice. Frankly, some of the commentary in the newspapers just misses the point completely. What we are doing is giving advice to officers on the basis of what court interpretation is. That is what we are doing, as you would expect us to do. If the courts interpret things to say that we should show higher levels of tolerance, whether I agree or disagree, that is what they are doing. For us to then say to police officers, "Ignore that. Carry on arresting people so that people then go to court and get off and then sue us and we pay money out of the public purse" is, frankly, absurd. Utterly absurd. To suggest that it is about political correctness or going soft in the Metropolitan Police Service is even more absurd. People would expect us to look after public funds properly and that is the court's interpretation.

Now let me deal with your intrigue. I am with Mark [Simmons]. I am pretty thick skinned and I have been around a bit. I kind of regret that people do not think cops can be alarmed, harassed or distressed. Actually they can. We know that and we know the long term damage to officers. This builds up. I am not looking to sit here as some sort of bleeding heart/thin skin saying, "I get terribly, terribly offended if somebody swears at me". I can manage that. But a general society that thinks that is all right that does concern me a little bit. I am a pragmatist. I am leading the Metropolitan Police Service, I am advising the men and women of the Metropolitan Police Service and I am trying to deal with public monies responsibly. The advice we have given has nothing to do with political correctness or going soft. I do kind of regret that interpretation.

The legislation talks about alarm, harassment and distress. I might flippantly regret that the legislation does not talk about getting irritated, annoyed or just plain angry, but it does not do that either. Therefore, we should respond appropriately to what the legislation says and the interpretation of the courts.

My irritation about this is some of the nonsense that is spoken about why we do these things. It is just plain commonsense. I might be a little disappointed that, generally speaking, people are saying that police officers cannot be alarmed or distressed. We can. We are human beings. We have feelings, like the rest.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Absolutely. We do not want you to be super human. You have feelings and emotions just as we all do. I guess the difficulty for me was that, in some senses, I thought that police officers ought to be trained to be able to be a bit more tolerant than us ordinary folk --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We do and we are. That does not stop us regretting the fact there is a sliding civic slide. That is a personal view and, actually, I support Mark there.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** That balanced view that you have just given I can completely understand and would agree with actually.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** There is also an issue about enforcing the natural authority and respect for police officers. I would like to think I bring up my child so they would not swear at a police officer and, if he did swear at a police officer, I actually think he probably should be arrested and punished in some way --

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Unless it is your own children and you are a police officer!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** The courts are not reinforcing the authority and the respect that the police should be held in out there on the street. I think that is a legitimate cause for concern.

**Cindy Butts (AM):** I think it is, but if police officers spend all their time arresting people who are rude they will not have time for phone hacking cases and all kinds of things!

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

**Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman, MPA):** I was just going to say that I agree with the Commissioner 100% on this. I hear what you say about police officers need to be trained and so on. There was a time when people working in the health service were subjected to the same sort of treatment and it was said they needed to be trained to deal with all of that. In reality, when people were saying, "You black bastard, go back to your country" it was an acceptable parlance in the NHS for exactly that reason; it was said that people were trained and they needed to be able to cope with that. I disagree.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** When I go and pick up my parcel from the local post office there is a big notice saying that if you step over the line and abuse our staff we will call the police and have you arrested --

**Cindy Butts (AM):** Racial abuse is a crime. Just to clarify what Reshard said. You have got the angle completely wrong.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Chris [Boothman]?

**Chris Boothman (AM):** I would like to ask you about road traffic collisions but, before I do that, can I just commend you on two of your answers that I have heard today. The first question that Jenny [Jones] asked and the question that Cindy just asked. I thought

your answers were excellent. My observation is that they were not scripted. My advice to you is to do more unscripted answers to questions!

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Can I be really rude and interrupt? I have said before, thinking aloud at this Authority, historically, has tended to get a Commissioner into trouble!

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

**Chris Boothman (AM):** Back to my question. It is about the reported 60(?) more fatal road traffic collisions. Is there anything that you can tell Londoners, or us, or anyone that is involved in driving, about these accidents that can help reduce this thing happening? Police come into this after the event normally. Is there anything that your people have picked up in terms of trend that can be fed back to try to reduce what is going on? Road traffic accidents are often overlooked in terms of their significance but they actually result in a lot of deaths. I think it is important that if there are any lessons or any observations that officers have in terms of what is happening, what kinds of situations are causing these things, whether it is drink or whatever, that it is fed back.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Again, I am very happy to do a more detailed trend report on the issue. I think it will be entirely proper to do so. I will bring that back.

It gives me great satisfaction to say last year was a significant reduction in fatalities. What we are looking at, if we ignore last year - and I am not saying we should - during that three month period, there has been one more in the same period the previous year. Again, I would still say that anybody who has been involved personally with a fatal road traffic accident just knows the trauma that one of those require. A lot of us, when we read the local newspaper and see a tiny bit in there, we skip over it. Once you have been involved in it you do not skip over any more.

We do have a dedicated traffic command and, actually, its productivity has just gone up. We are very much concentrating on the dangerous drivers. As a result, there were over 65,000 traffic offence prosecutions in 2010/11 and that was up 17% on the previous data. We are more proactive, we are more targeted and we are prosecuting more people. It is about how much resource and balancing the resource against all the things in the Metropolitan Police Service.

We do need a scripted debate, if I may say so, with some proper analysis about what are the effects of the various initiatives. Sometimes we concentrate just on what do the road traffic police do? What are the effects of furniture versus non-furniture? What are the experimental schemes internationally? It might be counter intuitive but actually there is some evidence in some other places that if you have less control and less constraints around junctions, actually it can lead to a safer society because people become more aware and pedestrians become more aware. Then there are huge problems regarding disabilities. I actually think there is a need for a debate. A lot of this debate is either

centred around what do the cops do and what do speed cameras do? Frankly, there is a much wider debate and we all know there are too many people dying on our roads and too many people die on the roads of London. I am very happy to bring back a better and broader piece of analysis around it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Walking across Tooley Street this morning I saw what was possibly a serious incident that was avoided. Tooley Street, in my view, is an example of where traffic control creates more problems and more danger than less. I sent a text to Transport for London (TfL) roads to see if we can get it sorted out.

OK. Jenny [Jones], you wanted to say something?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I wanted to thank Chris [Boothman] for bringing this up because I was going to mention it and I thought I had already mentioned enough issues. There are a stack of things the police can do before these crashes happen. That is the whole point. It is a matter of resources. More resources mean fewer deaths. It is a straight equation. The traffic police - I am defending the traffic police here by the way - do an incredible job but there are never enough of them and they do not have enough resources. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thanks. Clive [Lawton]?

**Clive Lawton (AM):** First of all, picking up Cindy's [Butts] question about the alarm and distress, I think distinguishing between whether a police officer has a right to feel offended and insulted is different to whether or not they react with alarm and distress. That is something about the sense of vulnerability of individuals. Certainly they have a right to feel as offended as anybody else if they are abused.

Secondly, I want to interpret the strike information slightly differently to Jenny [Jones]. My grandfather taught me, in the middle of the last century, that if you are a member of a union and it calls a strike you have only got one choice which is either to strike or to resign from the union. That 90% choose to strike leads me to commend the Metropolitan Police Service on appointing a very high proportion of principled staff, rather than anything else!

The question I wanted to ask related to the figures. It may be a small matter and I may simply be failing to understand it. Under paragraphs eight and nine in your report you make reference to gun crime and knife crime and you give some figures there. In Appendix one, where you have got it charted on a chart, you indicate slightly different figures and I am not sure what I am missing here. For example, guns discharged 114 in the current period and in the same period last year 114, indicating no change. In your paragraph eight you indicate that the numbers of guns discharged fell by 6.7%. It is something and nothing but it seems to me that your narrative figures do not match your displayed figures and I just wondered about that.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will clarify it for you.

**Clive Lawton (AM):** OK. Consequent to that, because we have had a bit of an exchange relating to knife crime and you have said it has gone up, it has gone down and it has stayed the same and so on and so forth. It is going down, if it is - although the figure on the chart does not seem to indicate that. Your text does. Either way, I just wonder whether you feel that the rate of reduction is gratifying?

I come back to the fact that Blunt 2 has been running for quite a long time and it has been tweaked a little bit. Do you feel that now is the time, after this period of time, that really that whole knife policy needs to be thoroughly refreshed, or is it just a matter of keeping on and keeping on? You may have reaped most of the outcome of steady pressing, which is what Blunt does on this front. I wondered whether there needs to be a complete rethink on this?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will ask Ian [McPherson] to answer but just to be clear, Clive, about what I said about the figures; knife crime has gone up and knives used to injure have gone down. In the report it takes a three month slice. I did say these things can be quite turbulent and go up and down depending on the figures. To be absolutely clear, the term around knife crimes used to injure, at the end of March last year, for the full performance year, had reduced. At the end of the first two months of this performance year knife crimes used to injure has reduced.

Knife crime has gone up. I believe that is largely related to two things. One, there is a parallel with robbery because one thing we do know; intimating a knife in robbery is part of the problem, as opposed to using the knife. That is certainly a problem. Secondly, there is little doubt that police proactivity increases the amount of recorded knife crime because we search and we find knives.

I will ask Ian to mention about what he is doing around looking at various operations in there. I remind you we are at the suppression end of the business. The real discussion, in my opinion, should always be about the wider issue of how we do something about (inaudible).

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** An officer said to one of my senior people the other day in Tottenham, "Oh you're back then" - ie that a member of the public said, "Oh you're back". There is something about learning. We talked to the Chairman about this and things like Blunt; you have got to teach muscle memory to say, actually, if you go out and carry a knife there is a consequence. I think Blunt as a tactic is a very good tactic. I think it works extremely well and we know that when we go into an area and we increase the muscle memory of those young people that actually it is dangerous to carry knives and there are consequences of carrying knives, it has an impact. I think carrying on with that is a good thing.

In terms of your broader question, Clive, around refreshing, I think we have done that very well. If you look at things like Operation Connect, that has a very different way of dealing with issues. It is about taking the partnership elements. It is about dealing with

things; Medics Against Violence. It is about the violence against women and girls. It is about the centres that are associated with those. I think we have a very sophisticated way of dealing with this.

We then look at Operation Target and the general principle here in the Metropolitan Police Service now is to use this volt approach which is focus in on victims, offenders, locations and times. It is a funny old thing; they are very, very clear indicators as to when crime occurs. It has been occurring in many of these locations for many, many years. We have been, I think, quite accomplished on locations.

The shifting of police resource through the altering of their duties to work more in the evenings. Well it is busier on a Friday and Saturday night. It always has been. We have moved resources. That is a really difficult thing and a big consequence to some of our officers because it has an impact upon their lives. I think it is a credit to them that they have done that and done that with very little kickback.

I think we then look at the repeat victimisation. We know that certain crimes for people will be repeats. The British Crime Survey suggests that only 4% of the population accounts for 44% of recorded crime. Now that gives you a bit of a clue that some of these people find themselves heavily victimised.

I think that our tactics are learning, they are developing and they are being refreshed. We are seeing, against some very difficult challenges, a really terrific response from the Metropolitan Police Service, which actually sees some of our violent crime coming down, and holding on to many other areas of crime. If you look at our overall crime just on property crime it is only up 3%. Yes, we have got a big spike in burglary, which we are doing something about, and robbery. Overall, property crime is only up by 3% - which I think is a credit to the officers, the men and women of the Metropolitan Police Service.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. We are going to have Joanne [McCartney] and then Valerie Brasse and then we are going to move on, if that is all right with everybody. Joanne? Can we be as quick as possible because we have got other stuff to get through as well. Sorry, Joanne.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question was about knife crime and I think most of those have been answered. I want to turn also to serious youth violence because we have seen it slowly creeping up over the last few months. This last quarter it was up by 5.2%. Anecdotally, I am having lots of parents and family members saying that their young people, particularly young black boys, are extremely worried about moving around London. I will give you an example. This weekend I had two separate family members tell me about young boys in their family who are now scared to move from one part of Haringey to another. One of those had been challenged as to which postcode he came from whilst out shopping with his mother and his aunt. That was no bar for other young men coming up and challenging him in that way.

I am getting a sense that there is a pervasiveness of concern amongst particularly the black community about young boys, but also that is spreading wider than that at the moment. I am wondering if that is your sense as well? I am concerned about this because we see in this last quarter quite a marked rise of 5.2% and we have also seen, in this last quarter, knives used to injure up by 5.6%, where we have seen previous falls. It does seem to be that that is taking place in a situation where we have services being withdrawn for young people across London, be it from the police, from local authorities or from the voluntary sector as well. I wanted your thoughts on that.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Dreadfully boring, Joanne, but I am going to be precise. Actually the figures for knives used to injure, if you take different slices, you always get slightly different results. More consistently for the whole of last year, the whole of the performance year, knives used to injure reduced and, for the first two months of this year, reported knives used to injure have reduced. You are right; the concern about youth violence, there is a rise there in reports.

Your question of is there a pervasiveness? Certainly in particular communities and concern by young people. Is there an increase? I do not know if there is an increase or not. Actually what I would acknowledge is there has been a concern there for some considerable time. We have done that. I remember going back some time when this Authority did some research with young people. What came out - I cannot remember the exact details - but very powerfully was the concern of young people. What the media is constantly doing - and sometimes we are in danger of doing it, foolishly - is demonising young people; they are the problem. Actually, they are also the victims and they are also the people who are most concerned.

That is why the various things that Ian has been talking about and the activities that we do that then set this in a wider context are so important. We have seen some real successes here in London because of the policies that we, the police - the Police Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service - have put in place to reduce and make an impact on crime. Nobody should actually think that that is yet good enough. We compare very well internationally with other major iconic cities. That to me is not the answer because, actually, that makes other major iconic cities just more dangerous. We need to make more impact against ourselves and against our own history of doing that.

Are we where we want to be? No. I have already answered. I cannot, hand on heart, connect any of the figures at this moment in time with any reduction in any other services. Of course we would all be concerned - because there is an economic problem in this country and we are all having to cut back. People have different views on that. Of course I would be concerned if another agency has to cut back on its services. Not only how does it affect the way in which I deploy the Metropolitan Police Service but how does it affect the wider problem? That is why we have to work much more strongly and better together in these coordinated activities. What we were talking about earlier; the MASH approach. That has to be the way forward.

When I had a discussion with local authority Chief Executives last Friday, everybody is concerned about will the reduction in spending lead to a reduction in partnership activity? Actually, it has got to be the opposite. The reduction in spending should force more partnership activity, should force us to make better use of our buildings so we can share, should force us to make better use of our asset and should actually force us to make better use of what we can to impact a problem because, on our own, we cannot do it.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** If I could, Joanne? As a service I think we anticipated many of the things that the Commissioner has talked about, which is why you have got things like the MASH in now. I think the debate at Management Board around some of these issues and saying, “This has the potential to come up. Let’s look ahead” - the anti-violence strategy, looking three years hence, actually saying what can we do about some of these things. I think we have anticipated that and actually I am very proud of the fact that my officers actually did anticipate those things and do have strategies. That is why Connect is in there. £2.5 million invested by this Authority in this year and £2.5 million next year. Broaden that across other agencies as well. I think it is pretty impressive; the fact that we considered it and got ahead.

To place things in context, that 5.2% increase is 95 crimes. I am not in any way belittling that, but that equates to one additional crime per borough on average per month. That is what is the increase. I am not in any way belittling it; any increase is too much. It just shows the extent of the energy that is being put in to try to keep this down and actually reduce it further.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** You promised Jennette [Arnold] a breakdown of an age profile of where knives are used to injure and knife crime overall. Could you also give us a breakdown of an age profile with serious youth violence? I believe serious youth violence stops at the age of 20? Could you also look at the violence figures for those up to the age of 25 for me as well and give me that? Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** You can do that through the (inaudible) team at the MPA as well. Valerie [Brasse]?

**Victoria Brasse (AM):** Thank you. Just listening to that exchange I am thinking here is a suitable candidate for that MASH partnership work, but what worries me about what I am going to talk about is that it is actually not being monitored. When you talk, Ian, about rebalancing the policing model based on what you are picking up out there, where you get the blips so you can think about rebalancing and re-associating or realigning your resources, the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) report yesterday was lambasting agencies’ responses around the issue of street grooming and rape of children on the basis that, frankly, we do not know what we are dealing with out there and we are certainly not responding to it.

Here is one I would say to you, how do you respond to its comments when it makes absolutely clear that the police do not really know the scale and scope of what is going on



out there and that kids are afraid to come to the police? What are we going to be doing about responding to that?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Peter Davis who made the comments yesterday - I look at the broad swathe of internet. The diversity of the population of London will increase by about the equivalent of two boroughs by 2016. The truth is we do not have a perfect picture. He is right in respect of that. You will see that one of the big areas of the anti-violence strategy, which I know you are fully au fait with, is that of intelligence.

It seems to us that the way to get round that is actually understanding - and, again, I know you are familiar with this, Valerie - the issues of MASH and why did we set MASH up. MASH in part was about understanding the overlays of everybody's information. The truth is --

**Victoria Brasse (AM):** Sorry, Ian, can I just interrupt you? I understand where the MASH is coming from. I think the issue here is street grooming. All those individual incidents that make up street grooming need to be seen as street grooming that leads to something else, rather than picking off the individual bits of activity and not seeing it in its entirety.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** I agree with that. That is the point - forgive me - I was trying to come to. What I was trying to say is, at the moment, we can deal with things in a fairly disparate fashion. What we are trying to do - remember we have got 17 boroughs now signed up to MASH - is say, 'Where do we draw these trends together? Where do we see that the information that is being held in education, held in the police and held in the ambulance service? How do we draw those and how do we draw the themes? It is not perfect but we have acknowledged it, we have recognised it and we are doing something about it.

There is a gap. I know there is. Unfortunately there is a process we have to go through of persuasion, frankly, to get people to understand, and build on the opportunity, which is quite bizarre, that reductions in budget give us, because it is making us actually think differently. Getting other agencies to think alongside the Metropolitan Police Service - and for us to change our thinking as well - I think is happening now, but there are still gaps. I know there are. Huge.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you, Members. Thank you, Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner.

We will move on to agenda item four, if we might, which is the report of the Civil Liberties Panel. Our thanks go to Victoria [Borwick] and the team for the production of another good report, and to **Sharani(?)** and **Simon(?)** - officers who worked directly with you in doing so. Who is introducing? Victoria?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. First of all I would like to take you briefly all back to last week when DNA was referred to in Prime Minister's Question Time and to allay Ed Miliband's concerns and the slightly strange answer that the Prime Minister gave which perhaps was not very clear. I only wish that my fellow colleagues from the Civil Liberties Panel could have given a better answer. You will all know the provisions of the Protection of Freedom Bill to confirm the destruction of samples but the retention of profiles. If you were arrested for rape your profile would remain. That is an important point.

Yes, on a technicality you could argue that, as science develops, the retention of samples is useful but our view is it is more important to protect the civil liberties. Not keeping samples of those not convicted of an offence is an important point and something we have considered.

Turning to the report, like all good books I want you to turn to the back of the report, where you will see an excellent summary of the Bill. This is a Bill that we welcome as a Panel because it does confirm the points I have made about destruction of samples and the retention of profiles.

To be honest with you, this is not a report with easy sound bites. It is a serious and sensible investigation for which I seriously thank most sincerely my colleagues on the Panel and of course the work and support that we have had from Gary Pugh, from Stacey Gibbs and the rest of the team. It is a very complex subject.

As a Panel we have observed the journey of a DNA sample from its collection and custody, where we have made several recommendations in the report, to the checking systems, to the laboratory and then to the database. Obviously Members of the Panel participated in each part of this investigation.

We also had a public meeting. Over 650 people wrote in. A large number of organisations also made representation to us about their concerns. Obviously there has been a lot of detailed work going in to putting this report together.

As a Panel we fully appreciate the taking of DNA can seem to be invasive but there can be no doubt that, for many cases, particularly for very serious crime, the identification of suspects through an analysis of their DNA is a vitally accurate tool in ensuring that we find the right person and solving the crimes.

We have called our report Protecting the Innocent as we feel very strongly that the public needs to be reassured what an important tool this is to protect the innocent. Our role, we felt, was also to banish some of the myths about DNA being used commercially or batches of samples being commercially exploited. However, we do feel there is a role for greater transparency and more information being made clearly available through the communities who are impacted, particularly by this topic.

We have made a number of recommendations that we feel will help the Metropolitan Police Service gain greater support from the public of this very valuable tool. One of our roles as the Civil Liberties Panel is to increase confidence in policing and this is something that comes out very clearly in our report.

Obviously as a Panel - and once again I thank my colleagues - we very much welcome any questions on this point, and I am delighted that Gary Pugh has taken the time to join us this morning because no doubt, even with the work that I have put, there may be more technical questions I have not been able to answer. Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you very much. Commissioner, I do not know if you wanted to say anything?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Very briefly. Thank you, Victoria. We support the report. Thank you for your comments about Gary Pugh. That is why he is here; because it would be entirely inappropriate for me to take any credit for the huge amount of work that was done on this by the Committee and also by the Metropolitan Police Service. Gary has led that. Also, like you, I am deeply grateful he is here to answer any technical questions! We do accept the report.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thanks. Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I would endorse everything Victoria said. There are just a couple of things I would like to highlight that the Committee looked at. I understand that sometimes it is very difficult when you get a range of recommendations to deal with them immediately but there are some recommendations in this report that really could be dealt with very quickly and would not cost officer time or money.

One of the things I think that we all found quite surprising was that there was not a chart in every custody suite detailing exactly how the process should happen. We are saying that there needs to be an agreed chart detailing each step of the process, and that chart should be dated. Now that could be done instantly. It is not a big deal. That is Recommendation 5(c).

Recommendation 5(e) that any deficiencies identified through the HMIC/Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) custody suite inspections in relation to the management of DNA be addressed. One of the things they picked up - and they have said that this has improved but I will just mention it - is about fridges within custody suites not being cleaned properly and not being properly defrosted with samples being stored alongside food. Things like that. You can buy a new fridge for £100. That could be done very, very quickly.

The final thing that I would draw attention to is the problems and the hoops that people have to go through to - and I know it is not just a Metropolitan Police Service thing - in order to get their DNA samples removed from databases when they are innocent. We give examples. One that particularly comes to mind is a young boy whose parents really had to go that extra mile and keep hounding until they got the sample taken off, even though the borough commander agreed right from the beginning that the sample should never have been taken. It is things like that that I would urge you to do immediately.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** On the last one, I hear what you say.

On the second one about fridges, I do not think it is just about buying new fridges. It is not about buying a new fridge, it is about keeping the fridge and some of those things are about supervision etc. I want Gary to expand on that.

On your first point about the charts I am always conscious that I might sit here and say we can do that and then somewhere people are howling and saying, "What on earth is he agreeing to. He hasn't thought of this, that and the other".

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I will do the chart for you. Victoria and I can do the chart today. It is not a problem.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** It does not sound as though it should be a problem to me either --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Victoria and I will do it for you if you need it.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** That is an extraordinarily generous offer, Dee. I am going to hand over to Gary and he can tell me if it is as simple and straightforward. I am sure it is --

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

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Jolly good. I take your word for it on this occasion, Dee!

**Professor Gary Pugh (Director of Forensic Services, MPS):** Thank you. Yes, I think it is relatively straightforward to produce the poster. We are in the process of looking at that because we are obviously aware of what the recommendations are, so I think that is something that can be quickly implemented.

We have done this in the past. We do posters for the benefit of the officers in custody so they understand what they are doing. I think perhaps what is more relevant in this report is a poster that explains to individuals about their DNA profile - and we are giving some thought to that.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Not a poster. A chart that is laminated and that cannot just get pulled down.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** It is getting more expensive by the minute!

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** You did not say you were going into a specific design!

**Professor Gary Pugh (Director of Forensic Services, MPS):** The only caveat is we do have the Freedom Bill and the poster will change when that Bill becomes active.

**Male Speaker:** Posters and leaflets because we are concerned about portable information.

**Professor Gary Pugh (Director of Forensic Services, MPS):** Secondly, on the fridges. Off the back of the formation of the SCDD Command looking at rape and serious sexually motivated crime we have actually had a major review and replaced a lot of fridges. We have been replacing that as part of the implementation of that Command. I think we are on the case there.

Finally on the exceptional case procedure, we have in the past - and I have certainly dealt with Members of the Authority and Members of Parliament who have been concerned about the time taken and the opaqueness of that process. We have that centrally managed now so I think the process we have in place is much slicker than it has in the past, when it did take sometimes weeks or months to have someone removed from the DNA database -

**Dee Doocey (AM):** More than a year.

**Professor Gary Pugh (Director of Forensic Services, MPS):** There were occasions like that.

What the Freedom Bill will do as well - and in fact it will fall to me in a different capacity is the process will change to take a different view about the threshold for which there is room for of the DNA profile and destruction of samples from those who are not convicted.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, can I start by thanking Victoria for her leadership and for the contribution of everybody involved here? I say this because I remember the question of DNA sampling and its retention being brought up under Toby's [Harris] watch and then we were concerned because we saw then signs of disproportionality, and this report clearly shows that this is still an issue. What is really nice about this report is that everybody is on the same page and everyone is working and we now have appropriate legislation.

Coming from the health service as my profession I remember the bad old days where any sort of sample was stuck in the kitchen fridge. That was a hospital. I remember becoming a health and safety representative and saying, "Really we must do something about this" and being told by Matron, "If you find the money you can change it". It was not a big issue then. I smiled there. I really do think that we should be looking to say that we could sort that out as quickly as possible because this is so important and we should not really have that issue now in this day and age.

The other one was about the point you made about the hurdles. It is my understanding we did receive from an organisation that is very well respected and held in high regard - the Black Mental Health UK Trust. I welcome the report in terms of the appreciation of how difficult it is for some individuals, even when they are working with support, to get their names off the database --

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** You will know that we made particular reference to the mental health issues because I think you are quite right; we did feel that that was a group that was even more vulnerable.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** That is something that we, as an Authority, should be asking you to look at; to say these are vulnerable people. As our report says they start off as innocent. They are then innocent and really everything should be done to support them and their carers to get their information off that database.

Loved the report. Well done. I think it is something to be said about this Authority; that we stick at things and we are able to influence legislation in the same way that we are able to influence police practice.

**Victoria Brasse (AM):** Chairman, could I just say, as a Member of the Panel, I found this a fascinating journey and a fascinating experience working our way through this and working with colleagues in the Metropolitan Police Service. For me at the end of it - and I hope the spirit in which this report is driven and given to you - it is really to say this is all about helping Londoners to feel more reassured about a process that is very difficult, quite traumatic and they feel more confident that the Metropolitan Police Service is doing all that it can do. They are confident and they are reassured. That, I think, is what we intended to do. I hope that is the spirit in which it is received.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Super. Did you want to say something, Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Very quickly. As a Member of the Panel as well I think it was a great learning experience for all of us. What was clear is that there is certainly a great deal of misinformation out there as to how DNA samples are taken and what is retained and what is not retained. Even we found it amongst people who thought they knew the field.

The issue about the posters or the charts in the custody suite, but also being able to develop something that you hand to people and they take away so they can digest it later. Let's put clear steps as to why something has been taken and what the process is then, but also how they go about getting their sample removed. I think that is the thing that we thought - we know there is disparity across police forces across the country. Those forces that do provide that information do seem to have a better job of actually taking people off the database when necessary. If the Metropolitan Police Service could do that as well that would be very good.

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

**Clive Lawton (AM):** First of all I want to join people in commending Victoria's leadership of the group. I think it was a complicated thing.

I also want to say that I was broadly impressed, not least but especially with Gary, about the concern about the technicalities and the ethical issues of this. That is not a reason for saying it cannot be improved and that is the reason for the recommendations. We certainly came across somebody just going through a custody suite who, as far as we could tell, had been properly informed of everything and he was absolutely sure he understood and he was completely wrong. Those kinds of things do need tightening up.

Just picking up on something that John [Biggs] said earlier about burglary. What came across most strongly to me - and I had difficulty understanding it I think - was the emotional intensity of this issue; fingerprints are external somehow and DNA is very internal. You can argue to the cows come home that, technically, what is the difference and so on. It sits very deeply and there is a lot of emotion around this. People feel that it is something about their very spirit almost being taken. It is something that has to be taken tremendously seriously and not only dealt with, I think, as a technical detail but something that sits very deeply and almost irrationally - but that does not make it unimportant at all.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you. James [Cleverly]?

**James Cleverly (AM):** Really I want to echo the positive feedback that I think is coming from the whole Authority about this. The thing that rather strikes me - and it was referenced by Victoria when she brought up the exchange at PMQs - is this is an incredibly emotive but incredibly poorly informed debate. Even using that example, amongst people who are much better informed than most, there were still errors of knowledge.

I would be very, very keen to see even a distilled version of this to be really pushed and for the Authority to make a real effort to get this distributed. Having had a look through this I feel now much more comfortable about the debate - our personal conclusions may vary - but having a proper knowledge base is really important and I do not think there is enough of that. I would very much like to see this (inaudible). I think it plays very, very well on Members of the Panel and on the Authority.

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

**Amanda Sater (AM):** Chairman?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Yes, Amanda [Sater]?

**Amanda Sater (AM):** Sorry. Can I just echo James' point and say it is a very, very informative and comprehensive report and I would like to thank Victoria and all the Members for all the hard work that they have put into this. Thank you very much.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** That is much appreciated.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jennette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** A point following on from James. I go into our local libraries a lot. I have never seen an MPA report. Could we try - through you, Chairman, or through the Chief Executive - because it is so informative, if we could send a copy to each librarian? They are closing by the day so there are not that many!

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will have a look at that. It might be worth sending an electronic copy to Members of Parliament as well, who are also involved in debating this issue.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes. Very much so.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you very much. Thank you, Gary [Pugh], for all your work. Thank you, Victoria [Borwick] and the team. Another good piece of work by the Civil Liberties Panel. We look forward to the response back from the Metropolitan Police Service in three months, as to how it is going to address the recommendations. Then we have got a plan - as we had with Race and Faith and others - to monitor it going forward.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Thank you very much indeed.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Thank you. OK. Thank you, Members.

Agenda item five. Safer neighbourhoods review. Commissioner?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will be very brief and then hand over to Ian [McPherson]. You have got the report? I am not entirely sure (inaudible) and no doubt you want to debate some matters and you want me to hear it. I think we should be brief and then listen to what you have got to say.

At the risk of being boring again, to repeat that the Metropolitan Police Service is committed to safer neighbourhoods. Why wouldn't we be? We invented it. It was the



police service that invented this and got huge support from the Police Authority to implement what was the biggest community policing scheme, certainly in this country, if not in the greater policing world.

Why wouldn't we support it when it has brought us so many benefits? We have seen significant increase in confidence in policing in this city and there is no doubt about it, safer neighbourhoods has played a major role in that increase in confidence. That does not mean to say we should not review things. Of course we should. Nothing should stay the same. In fact, the suggestion that Blunt has done good things but Clive [Lawton] was saying what about reviewing it? That is exactly what we are doing on this.

Of course it would be completely dishonest to say that we have not always got to bear in mind the difficult budgetary situation we find. Of course we have. Everything we do, the backcloth should be how much money have we got and what can we afford? That is it. It would be ridiculous to say otherwise.

This review actually does maintain the same size team, albeit (inaudible) sergeants - and I know that will be debated - in every ward. The changes we are proposing in terms of the way in which they are used in boroughs are minimal, and they will be minimal. We intend to keep the same size team and we intend to give some flexibility around the edges. As I have said before, this is about allowing officers to do the logical thing that is thoroughly transparent and to work cross boundaries where there are problems going across boundaries. Any abstractions like that to be discussed and reported to the Safer Neighbourhood Panel. There is nothing else going on there.

We are proposing a change in sergeants and we are proposing a change of 150 reduction in sergeants. I have to tell you that it is my very clear professional opinion that that is doable and appropriate in these circumstances. It is also the opinion - not of every sergeant involved - but of some sergeants. Anybody who tells me that in some of the wards in London that a sergeant cannot appropriately supervise, where it is judged by the borough commander, two teams then, frankly, I do not believe it, I do not agree it and, in my professional opinion, that would be nonsense. It is down to the local borough commander, with local Safer Neighbourhood Panels, to come up with the right proposals to implement this. My strong belief is this is appropriate in the circumstances and you have my very strong commitment to safer neighbourhoods. Anything we do will be transparent.

Ian, is there anything you want to add?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** To be honest, Commissioner, I think very little really! Hand it over to you, Ian. OK, boss! You will see from the papers a wide consultation. Most things stay as is. There are a couple of watch words which are really around flexibility and there are issues around making sure that the neighbourhood officers - and listening to the 12,000 people who were there in the survey - work more at weekends and more in the evenings. There has been a tendency, on occasions, to come back. I had a meeting with 600 neighbourhood officers the other day. Just to support the

Commissioner's point; there were sergeants in that room - obviously we were all talking about this document - saying, "Actually, I couldn't just do two; I could do three wards. It would not be an issue. Assistant Commissioner, it is not an issue for me for this". There was no kick back at all.

That is not to say that there will be some sergeants somewhere who will have a different view. Of course they will. We have to balance this against a really difficult backcloth which is the financial position we are in and also significant amount of resources that we have engaged as part of territorial policing. Neighbourhood policing. Safer Neighbourhood Teams represent about 20% of the resources I have. It is therefore really important that I have the flexibility against these challenges of crime and anti-social behaviour - which is what the public is saying to us - to have some flexibility to deal with it.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you. Right. I have got Caroline [Pidgeon] first.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Thank you for this. We obviously discussed it at the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP). In fact, Reshard [Auladin] can probably guess the points that I want to make.

The issues that I am concerned about really are around the halving of the sergeants. You said it was 150 sergeants but I think, actually, it was 300 over two years.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** We are looking at 150 in the short term, with a budget proposal of moving towards the 300.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** You have **found**(?) the budget. I am concerned about that. I am particularly concerned that when we have got pilots going on in places like Lambeth and Lambeth has specifically requested that it does not want any sergeants being removed because it is having more officers moving to the front line working alongside the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, therefore it needs the sergeants because they have a greater number of officers to manage, that you are going ahead with this. We have not actually got the results of the pilots which we might then roll out across the capital. Our concern really is that to make a decision when you have not got all of the evidence before you does not feel right. On that area, I am concerned and we cannot support that.

I am also concerned about the issue about temporarily flexing resources and all of that throughout the report. In the answers we had in the supplementary paper, which we received yesterday, you will not define how long it could be that officers are removed from a Safer Neighbourhood Team. What I worry about is some wards in London will be left at times with one PC and one PCSO and it could be for months and months on end - there is no time limit to that - because they are working on something else within the borough. It just feels to me that particularly some of the perhaps quieter wards in outer London could end up with two members of a team. If you take sickness leave or if you take holiday leave, actually they will have very little resource. It feels to me it is going

back to the days when I was first a borough councillor when you had virtually no police resource. Unless you could put a time limit in, again that is an area that still is of concern.

I am also concerned about the Safer Schools Teams because there is a reduction in numbers overall within that. Unless you can give some guarantees on those things in terms of waiting, before you move the sergeants, to see the results of the pilot and in terms of **timing**(?) on flex and resources, I am afraid I cannot support this today.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** A couple of points. The Lambeth pilot, of course, which is Operation Hannah which people will be familiar with, is about moving officers out of response, and we have moved significant numbers out of response. They have gone to a number of areas. They have not gone into Safer Neighbourhood Teams. They have gone into local policing teams under a different regime of inspectors. That is not to say that those safer neighbourhood sergeants would have some influence upon that.

I do not see, at all, that the Hannah experiment is a blockage to moving this paper forward. Not one jot of it. I just do not see that that lands. It will be down to the borough commander to say where those sergeants actually come from within the neighbourhoods. They have to make professional judgements around the flexing of their resources.

In terms of the issue of how long people move out it would only be short term. It would be silly of me to say, "Well you can only move them out for a day or you can only move them out for three days" because events are not like that. You have my guarantee that it will be short term and that we will report back to the local community panels around this when we do move people away. There is going to be a monitoring effect here for individuals. I am very happy to produce reports to this Authority to say, "This is what we have done".

There is no attempt to be opaque around this. In fact, quite the contrary. What we have done is we have gone out and listened to communities and said, "What do you want?" It has been very, very clear in the feedback they want flexibility because they understand it. Why? Because it is just plain commonsense.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Can I just come back? The issue in terms of the pilot in Lambeth and the response - I appreciate it is from the response teams but the whole idea of the project is they work really closely alongside the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. That is the whole point of it. If the borough commander there is saying that they do not want sergeants removed at all because they need them because of the extra supervision and all that, it seems to me we need to look at that before it is rolled out, hopefully, across London if it is a success. It seems to me we are putting the cart before the horse if we make this decision before we have that evidence before us.

In terms of your assurance about it is only going to be short term, the removal of teams. That is fine whilst you are in that post. My experience of three years of the Metropolitan Police Service is people do move on fairly regularly and whilst you might make that today, if it is not actually written down that there will be a time limit or whatever, then in a year or two to come, someone else will be there and it will shift on the policy. That is what will happen inevitably and that is what we are concerned about.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Can I just respond to that last point, Caroline? Actually it has been the case, since we put in place the constraints and the policy around safer neighbourhoods, there have been a number of people moved on. Because we have openly monitored it we have, largely, overwhelmingly stuck to the policy.

What we are talking about doing is putting in place a monitoring regime so you can see what other governance regime is in place and local people can see what is happening.

We intend to maintain Safer Neighbourhood Teams. The absurd thing would be not to do it. We did invest this thing. We want it. Providing we have the funding in budget - and if we do not have the funding in budget some years in the future we will come back and hopefully say what we can and cannot afford. That is the purpose of governance and that is the purpose of oversight. It is the monitoring that would be in place to say, "Are we keeping to our word or not?" - not the individual.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Would the extractions from Safer Neighbourhood Teams - this moving of staff - be reported locally, you are saying to a Safer Neighbourhood Panel, before it has taken place, so it can decide whether it is happy to support that, or after, once the decision is made?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** It would be both. If a Safer Neighbourhood Panel is not due for ten days or 20 days and we have an immediate issue, you would expect us to deal with that. Otherwise, frankly, it would be foolish and we would let members of the public down. I am sure you would not want us to do that. We would report on it.

If it was timely that we saw something and we anticipated coming up - Notting Hill Carnival which is already in the terms for removing neighbourhood officers - yes, of course we would tell the Panel and of course we would consult with the Panel. It would be sensible.

What is really interesting about this exercise that we have been through is we have been so transparent and we have been so out there with the public saying, "What do you want?" and having 12,000 people on a survey coming back to us saying, "These are the things we want; we want you to deal with anti-social behaviour, we want you to deal with crime, we want you to flex, we understand the logic of that - in fact, frankly, can't believe you don't do it now". It just seems to us to be a sensible proposition.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Do you see this decision as already made so your boroughs are already planning for this and deciding how many sergeants will remain?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** The sergeant was decided through the budget.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** That has already been decided.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** That was decided in the budget two or three months ago.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Which we did not support. OK.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Caroline said a lot of the things that I was going to say on my concerns about this.

On the issue of sergeants there is a concern that they are going to be cut in such numbers. I know it is said that they are managers but my experience of my local sergeants is that they are out on the street, they are patrolling, they are doing street briefings, they are attending community forums and seeing the various groups in their community. To say that they are going to have more than one ward is stretching them and is actually taking them off the street and doing that patrolling that they are doing so that they then have to become purely managers, which means that then you will have the less front line officers actually on the street itself.

I also note that it is 150 now by September 2011. I am still not clear. The 150 that are now to be lost in the forthcoming year, are they going to be from Safer Neighbourhood Teams or from TP as a whole? It seems to me that if you are going to take them from Safer Neighbourhood Teams in the second year, what you do not want to do is to have borough commanders reorganising this year and in a few month's time having to reorganise their sergeant and supervisory structure again. That would cause confusion and could cause great concern in local communities.

When we did the MPA report into this as well we made certain recommendations. The recommendations we made - if I read out the one with regard to the sergeants and supervisory ratio,

*“In regards to the supervisory ratio of sergeants, the MPS should evidence the case for change and demonstrate that they have consulted and agreed changes with local stakeholders”.*

My boroughs are very concerned they are losing five sergeants each. They were not consulted about the loss of sergeants and told that you are going to have five sergeants lost throughout this consultation process.

My second thing is again on the temporary flexing. I have the same concerns that Caroline has about how long it is. If I look at the briefing paper that you sent us yesterday, which was a response to some of the questions we asked at SOP, you said that the abstraction policy will mean that redeployment is through the tasking process and that, "It would be a local operational decision in line with the abstraction policy". We do not yet have the abstraction policy that is underpinning this and we have not seen it. I do not want to back a policy where I have not seen the policy that is underpinning that.

Secondly, the consultation and the communication with Safer Ward Panels and the local community is after that has taken place because, in that briefing that you sent yesterday, it states that, "The deployment of safer neighbourhood staff away from their ward will be a local operational decision in line with the abstraction policy". It states that, "It will then be monitored and then communicated to Ward Panels". Again, our MPA scrutiny stated that you have to have consulted with agreed changes with local stakeholders so that is a difference there. It seems to be good at consulting after the event, rather than before.

I have the same concern that it may be the safe wards that are regularly plundered as a result of this and we are going to have some wards being disproportionately affected and we are in danger of voids being created. Local criminals know when their local coppers are not on the beat. The danger is, for crimes such as burglary or whatever, you could create more problems than you are going to solve.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Can I make a couple of quick points in response and then Ian can go into detail? Firstly, we are talking about supervising managers here. We have got to actually restate that. Funnily enough it is a mistake the police service has made and the Metropolitan Police Service has made in the past. Of course everybody in the police service is a crime fighter. The police service should be about building confidence and giving that reassurance. We are talking about supervisors and it is the case that we have failed, on occasions, to make sure that everybody understands that when they go through the ranks and take on more responsibility, their job is to lead and supervise and manage. That is what it is about. We are not talking about every ward going towards one sergeant for two in every ward, as you know. This is a smaller number of wards.

I do have a great deal of faith in local borough commanders to make sensible decisions. There are not many borough commanders come knocking on my door and say, "Commissioner, can we have less resources and less asset" and special pleading goes on. Actually I do have faith that this is a reduction that is thoroughly manageable and professionally manageable and a lot of sergeants do agree it can be done and it can be done properly and they can carry out their intrusive supervisory responsibilities.

I also have to say the sergeant reduction of 150 was part of the agreed budget process that went through this Authority.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** A lot of us did not vote for it though.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I ask the second 150? Thank you.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** I will deal with that. The second 150 is put in there very clearly as an ambition. It has been through here in terms of the budget. The reason it is not stated where they will come from is actually because we are in the middle of TP development. That is 13 separate strands of business. It is dealing with centralised crime recording to save around £12 million. It is dealing with our telephone investigation bureaux, all of which have supervisors. It is dealing with our investigation teams and integrated prosecution teams. It is dealing with custody officers. It is dealing with total resource centres. It is dealing with management own costs. So it goes on. It is placed in there because we have to balance the budget. You are aware of that. It is your budget. It has gone through here.

It is to say our professional judgement is very clear that to take 150 at this stage is absolutely appropriate. We have got all these other strands of work and we will seek to mitigate those as we go along, once we get those findings, and then make decisions as to where and when those sergeants will be removed because we are going to have to do that. My judgement is that it is absolutely appropriate and doable to take 150 away now. Absolutely the case.

The issue on the temporary flex and the testing process. Actually it is entirely appropriate to go through a process which looks at the intelligence and says, "This is where the crime occurs. This is where the anti-social behaviour occurs. These are where the priorities are" and actually put resources across, leaving - to your point around the policy. The policy is as simple as you will never go below a minimum of one PC and one PCSO so no place ever finds itself bereft.

We find ourselves in a position where some of our neighbourhoods are up to 16 times busier in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour than others. Crime does not occur - you made the point actually the criminals know. Yes, they do know. They know when we are on and they know when we are not on. What they do is they move. We have got to be as flexible as they are. We have said this so many times at this Authority; crime does not occur in little silos, 634 of them, across London. It just does not. We have to be flexible to deal with things when we need to.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thanks. Jeannette [Arnold]?

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chairman, it follows on from this point. I have some real problems with it.

Let me start by saying I welcome the retention of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams to wards. When we started on this - unless my memory is wrong - it was going to be in a different way. I am glad that sense has prevailed there.

I support everything Caroline has said and Joanne. I cannot understand why this was not an opportunity to talk about the issue which is that you cannot treat all boroughs the

same. We do not treat all boroughs the same in any other way. The Chairman recently had a meeting with 15, or was it 12, boroughs subjected to the highest volume crime - whether it was youth or what have you - at a special round table. That signifies to me that there is something going on in those boroughs. Within those 15 boroughs - three that I represent and am linked to - one of them has got a campaign where it is looking for equal treatment in terms of getting its establishment increased. Another one we do not carry the badge with pride but it is in there in the top ten boroughs that are regularly featured.

I had a conversation with a Cabinet Member on Monday. We were out in the main thoroughfare asking people did they know their sergeant? 80% of them did know their sergeant and knew them by name and said the sergeant was there to lead the team and they were very happy with what they were getting. That Cabinet Member, myself and a good grouping around key stakeholders would have a problem with supporting the removal of five sergeants from this borough - a borough that is absolutely always there under stress. We cannot see which ward that a sergeant is telling you that they can manage another ward with, because when we have seen the vacancies and the issues that have arisen in those wards, the residents and the people involved in the Safer Neighbourhood Panel have shouted quite loudly and said, "We want our safer neighbourhood sergeant back in that team as soon as possible".

I am just looking to understand the rationale that says that that sort of ward is going to be treated with the same guidelines as a ward that falls into the borough represented by Tony Arbour. Tony Arbour is not here today but I am sure that he will not mind me saying - because it is on record - at the SOP meeting Tony Arbour said he does not feel that he would be able to go out and speak to those he represents or those who call him to a public meeting to support the reduction of sergeants. Now if Tony Arbour cannot support the reduction of sergeants in one of the safest boroughs in London, I certainly cannot support the reduction of --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I do not think that is quite what he said, Jennette. That is not what he said at the meeting. I do not think you should be putting words in his mouth.

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

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No. He said it was politically difficult but made sense.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** You were not there. He said he would not feel able to stand up and justify the reduction of targets. We were there. You were not.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Politically. To be fair to him.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** There are various people who were at the meeting shaking their heads, Jennette, and disagreeing with you.



**James Cleverly (AM):** Johann Hari there!

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I am sticking to what I think I heard, if you don't mind, because it makes my case! If I have missed out the word politically then maybe that is the thing here. I have no shame about being a politician and representing those people who vote for me --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No, I understand your motivation is political.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** None of the stakeholders I have spoken to would say, in public, that they are able to support the treatment of some boroughs in the way that is being put forward in this paper. I really do have a problem.

I just want to say that it is my understanding that the Safer Neighbourhood Team was one sergeant, two PCs and three PCSOs. Stop saying that the teams are not changing. If you take away a sergeant you have changed that team. The team, as we understand it, is one sergeant, two PCs and three. That is the standard team. When you take away the sergeant you are reducing the resources to that team so in that ward, those people paying their precepts, will be getting less in their Safer Neighbourhood Team.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Can we do a bit of a round up and then do you want to answer all the issues because there are some common themes coming through?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Something very quickly because there is not a lot I want to add.

Firstly, I am not a politician and I am not engaging in a political debate here. I am engaging, from my point of view, in a professional debate and a professional judgement.

When you say you cannot treat all boroughs the same that is exactly what we are saying about wards. You cannot treat all wards the same. The idea that every ward needs a sergeant in the same way that other wards need a sergeant is, frankly, not the case. It never has been the case and we need to move on that.

When you say why is each borough being treated similarly in abstraction I guess it is trying to deal with Joanne's [McCartney] point. We do not want to go to the usual suspects, because they are a safer borough and a quieter borough, that they actually get hit more and more and more. It is trying to balance out these really difficult debates.

My last point - and this why I did want to come in - when you say stop saying it almost suggests - I do not think you are saying it, but I just want to make sure for the audience - if there is any suggestion we are trying to mislead, we are not. We are being absolutely open and transparent. When we say the team is not changing we say the team of PCSOs and PCs are not changing. They are not. That is honest, open and transparent.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** What people want to hear is that there are no changes to the Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Jenny [Jones] is next. Jenny?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I would just like to point out, on the issue of the budget, we know very well the budget went through here. A lot of us did not vote for it because we were deeply unhappy with the changes then. Please do not remind us anymore. We know.

I want to support what my women colleagues have said so far. On this issue of flexing. I understand completely why borough commanders would want to move resources round. Of course they do. Criminals move round. Of course they do. But flex has the innate concept of actually moving back. You flex something and you move it back. My real concern is that you will not be moving these resources back in a reasonable amount of time. One option would be that, after a certain amount of time, that perhaps the Ward Panel could demand its resources back or have the borough commander come to explain why the resources are not coming back.

It does not look as if anybody is listening which is very irritating from this side of the table.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** I am listening.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It seems to me that we are moving away from the principle of dedicated resources to each ward, which I think a lot of people are going to be very concerned about. Link Members and politicians. We all have to go out there and justify these changes. Even if we did not vote for them we have to explain why they are happening, so, for us, this is a big issue of accountability.

I think if you had some sort of mechanism so that there is a review of the flex that has not gone back, then that should be put on a quite formal basis so that Ward Panels know that they can meet with somebody very senior to explain to them why they are not getting their resources back. OK. That would be my point on the flex; you need a mechanism.

Also, I still think there should be some consultation. It seems mad to me that the borough commander can just move these resources around without actually talking to, at the very least, local authorities and the local councillors and so on. There has to be some sort of consultation, even if it is shortly afterwards if there is not time to do it before.

On the leadership aspect, all right, you see a sergeant as a manager and so on and I have seen that in operation. The fact is that local people on Ward Panels see that sergeant as something more. They actually see him as a real resource that they are proud of having and that they feel is sufficiently senior --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** They will have a sergeant.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** They are used to having their own dedicated sergeant. You know what I mean, Chairman. I am not --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** They will have their own dedicated sergeant.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** All right, but not for one ward. Local people take a lot of pride in having a sergeant. It makes their ward more important. This really needs explaining very carefully to them.

There is also the fact that if every borough is now required to make a 25% reduction in sergeants, that means that each borough would have half their wards sharing a sergeant between two teams. When you come to some high crime boroughs, what are we saying? If we have a clump of very high crime wards, is a sergeant going to have a high crime ward and a low crime ward and have to travel between those two? In a lot of places the high crime ward is going to be clumped together with the lower crime outside. I do not even understand the mechanism that you are going to use to allocate those resources. It would have been good if we could have had some indication of exactly what your thinking is.

I have not finished. I am so sorry, Ian.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** I have got a good memory but ... shall I take a couple now if that is OK because I do not want to miss anything that you are saying.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Heaven forbid!

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** The issue around the flexibility and the moving back. It is exactly what we are saying actually. Yes, there will be reviews, yes, there will be reports back and, yes, we will go to local neighbourhood panels and say, "This is what we have done".

For us to consult, again, I have been very clear; we will consult with neighbourhood panels as to when we move people, when we can. However, if something operationally happens - and things do - then we will have to move people around. It would be our suggestion. That just seems, again, to be very sensible and a very pragmatic way of dealing with this.

The neighbourhoods will always have a leader. It will be that sergeant. If that sergeant operates effectively, he or she will be able to get the best out of their officers and manage them more effectively. The local borough commander will need to make decisions. I am very clear on this. When the borough commander makes decisions on which sergeants are to be removed he or she will do that, in consultation with the local chief executives and the local leaders. They will have that debate. It does not mean to say we do get the right balance.

There is no attempt at all to hoodwink. It is just very, very clear to say we want to be very transparent but, in our judgement, crime moves. I talked about --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Sorry. I am not suggesting you are hoodwinking anybody. I am talking about local accountability.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** No, I understand that.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am not suggesting for one moment that you are trying to hide anything. I think it is great that we are having this debate here. It is about accountability and how local councillors, locally elected people and local citizens, can hold the borough commander to account on more resources that they think is so precious to them --

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** To be fair, I have said that, and I have said that we will be open about the moves. I have said that we will be open about the flexibility. I cannot see what else I can say, other than we will be transparent.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Ian, as I understand it, where possible, where you know that there is going to be something there will be notification and consultation about it happening in advance --

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Where, because the issue is very pressing - ie that afternoon - and so you are not able to give prior notice, there will be a report following. You have said that you are happy to bring a report to this Authority, in whatever forum we decide, that looks at the whole strategic issue around flex, sitting on a regular basis.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Yes.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** The system is in there.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Yes, but what I am talking about is the next stage, ie when the flex has not gone back that people can actually start to demand --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** They will be able to as part of the report.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** You will see that as we report back.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Your final point?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** It is where these sergeants are going really because I am not clear on that. I have not understood. I know that, for example, in the Safer Transport command there are going to be 16 new sergeant posts. My worry is that you are actually taking sergeants out of boroughs like Southwark, with high crime, and putting them into enforcement of red routes. Enforcement of red routes is really important and close to my

heart, but you are moving sergeants into jobs that were previously done by police staff. It seems to me that that is a bigger waste of sergeants than keeping them on the wards.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Let me be clear. The sergeants are being removed. They will not be going anywhere else. They are coming out of the budget. Should the Authority raise greater funds then we could be in a position whereby we would replace those with constables. The sergeants are coming out of the organisation because we have got to find some money.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I am sorry; I have not understood. You are redeploying these. The sergeants you are taking out now you are redeploying. Are you suggesting that --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Immediate (inaudible). They will be (inaudible) --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Naturally. You are getting rid of them?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Naturally, over time, they will work their way out of the system.

Right. OK. Graham [Speed]?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Thank you, Chairman. I have listened to colleagues' arguments and I have to say I come from this from a completely different perspective.

I feel much more positive about this as a report than colleagues that we have heard from so far. I think we do not want to be in this position but we are in a very difficult financial position and, overall, I think this is an outstanding result for Safer Neighbourhood Teams. I have got concerns about what we are doing with resources elsewhere where teams and parts of the organisation are taking a far greater hit than the hit we are seeing here.

I think we talk about intrusive supervision a lot. I think - picking up on the Commissioner's earlier point - frankly, if a sergeant is not capable of looking after four PCs and six PCSOs, I really question whether they are worthy of the rank. To pick up on a word that has been used a number of times, this is doable.

In terms of the numbers of people going, we all relate it to our own wards and our own boroughs. In that case, because of natural wastage, we are already part of the way there because we are missing a couple of sergeants because they have retired or moved on, so that process is relatively straightforward for the first batch. I think it will become more difficult as the subsequent batches come through. In many respects I think it would actually be better to keep the process going reasonably quickly into that second phase because otherwise there is going to be far greater argument locally about the have and the have nots.

I think there are some practical issues around this in terms of local supervision. It comes back, again - I would disappoint you if I did not raise property at some stage - to having

local supervision at a base. If we have got two or three teams in a base it would be folly not to have some supervision there. I think it is going to be vitally important to maintain the natural links between adjoining wards in supervision but I think, equally, we must not lose sight of the fact that we need supervision on site because we know what can happen sometimes if that goes a little astray.

I do share concerns around the issue about flexibility. We did discuss this at some length at the briefing that we had. I have certainly experienced difficulties with this in the past where borough commanders have got a little too keen to see Safer Neighbourhood Teams as a local resource. I felt reassured from the assurances that we were given by DAC Kavanagh as to the extent of what flexibility means. What it does not mean, from my understanding, is it is not going to be a local task force or town centre team that is drawn from the surrounding wards. It is to be used for local problem solving across ward boundaries. I think that Ward Panels and people in local authorities will be far more appreciative of that.

Reference has been made to the multiplier. I think we need to be a little bit cautious about this. The examples have been used, in paragraph 25, about Fairfield versus Seldon and Mallard. I know both of those very well. Fairfield is the town centre of Croydon. It is the largest borough in London and it is the largest retailer outside the West End. It is going to be a very busy ward. The other one that is referred to is out on the edge. There, of course, the Safer Neighbourhood Team is really the only policing resource it ever sees, versus the town centre which gets town centre teams, safety transport teams and everything else. Let's be cautious about making those comparisons.

The final point is that success here is going to come down to communication. All the sergeants are going to be very happy when they are sitting talking to the Assistant Commissioner (AC). In practice, when they are sitting to their Ward Panel there may be some different views. I think most will take a fairly sensible view about this but success will come through a proper engagement strategy. I think we have had the debate and the discussion. I think we know the direction that we are going. I do not think it is an unreasonable position for people to be looking at a reduction in half a sergeant, potentially, over a team. I think it is a reasonable outcome in a very difficult set of circumstances.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Thank you for that. Cindy [Butts]?

**Cindy Butts (AM):** My comments are much more aligned to Graham's. I am actually really quite supportive of it. Having said that, I do think that it comes with a number of risks and a number of challenges. Maybe part of the difficulty that colleagues are having - and certainly the difficulty that I had when it first came to the Co-ordination and Policing Committee (COP) - was that I do not think there was enough of an acknowledgement that if we take this line then we need to be cautious that this might be a risk, or this might be a challenge that will need to be addressed. I think it was not having that as an acknowledgement of where the potential risks are, may have caused some difficulty.

In my mind the key thing that worries me the most is actually what we have focused on here in this discussion today. That is I think it is quite right that the safer neighbourhood resource should be flexible enough to respond to crime and where it happens because, as you say, it can change and it varies and all the rest of it.

For me, the real difficulty I had was losing what I think was the central focus of Safer Neighbourhood Teams which was not just to respond to crime but to also reassure. There seems to be an imbalance now and there does not seem to be enough of a recognition that Safer Neighbourhood Teams provide that crucial reassurance where actually, sometimes, the crime profile may not even match the level of concern and worry that communities might have. It was just on that piece that I wanted to raise that and to say that we have to be particularly cautious around that.

The only other point that I wanted to raise was this issue of checks and balances. I think you are quite right; borough commanders, professional people, can make clear judgements about where resources are needed. I agree with that. However, I do think we need some checks and balances. I would be concerned that those who shout the loudest - whether that is community activists or be that local councillors and politicians. I would want to be sure that borough commanders are making the right decisions for the right reasons and are informed by not just the politicians and not the local authority but also the broader communities.

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** If I may just deal with the issue of the reassurance. Reassurance is incredibly important. It is the mainstay of our Safer Neighbourhood Teams which is why we think we produced for you a really sensible document which says we will stay as we are as far as we possibly can.

Interestingly, the top five ward priorities across London are burglary, anti-social behaviour, multi vehicle crime and drugs. Those are the top priorities set by the local communities - all of which are crime. I am not saying it is entirely a crime issue because, Cindy, I think you are absolutely right; it is more about a sense of how do you feel.

To Graham's [Speed] point. Some of our wards can be as little as 800 yards across. Some of them have a road running down the middle and you are not allowed to cross from one side of the road to the other. It is honestly just being sensible here because those are constraints that, if we think the officers are not going to cross to the other side of the road, we are kidding ourselves anyway, because they do. It is just about being sensible and nothing more than that.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Cindy, the trick of this will be do both; to do reassurance and fight the crime. That is why the monitoring around it and the reports that will come around flex are going to be critical. In the end it is about both confidence rising and crime falling at the same time. Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** We have to acknowledge that we are in a particular budgetary position and that is going to influence the decisions that have had to be taken.

I think part of the problem - and the reason that we are almost making heavy weather of this - is that of course this is being presented as a budget where actually the public will not notice the change. I am not sure that that is really the case.

Obviously a supervisory ratio of one to two for sergeants and two PCs is a nonsense and if that was the supervisory ratio throughout the Metropolitan Police Service we would be saying that was ridiculous. What in practice of course has happened is that in most neighbourhood teams the sergeants do a little bit more than just supervising and they are seen as part of the dedicated resource to a particular ward. The fact that the sergeant is being shared - which makes absolute sense in terms of supervisory ratios and everything else - then appears to a local community as though they have lost somebody or lost part of somebody. That is the problem. That is one of the consequences of the decisions that have been taken.

Assistant Commissioner McPherson has tried to retrieve the situation but I actually got extremely worried about some of the comments he made earlier on in terms of what the purpose of flexing was all about. He did talk about moving it to where there were particular crime problems and so on and so forth. The concept of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams was about a dedicated resource to a particular area, the focus being on problem solving and reassurance - and not about being part of a response team to particular incidents.

The real issue about flex is going to be that this is the nose of the camel under the tent and, before you know it, you have got the whole smelly animal inside! What actually happens is that you have a Safer Neighbourhood Team which is notionally responsible for a particular ward and actually they very, very rarely see them because they are responding to real issues which nobody is arguing - in fact, if you ask the local community in that ward they would say, "Yes, we agree that it is a problem half a mile down the road that needs to be sorted out because we go there as well because we don't just stay within our ward". You would be losing that wider role of the reassurance and solving the problem.

I think the monitoring of this has got to be crucial. We have got to be able to see - or somebody has got to be able to see; and it is best if it is the local community - how much flex is taking place and whether it is for things that are genuinely perceived as being an issue that people would rather not see their local officer around because they would rather that that local officer was a third of a mile outside the ward dealing with that particular problem. It must be seen in that context. Otherwise what you are going to have is a gulf between - dare I say it - the Mayoral rhetoric that this is a wonderful budget and there are going to be no impacts on the community, and people will see that they have lost the service.



**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I was going to suggest that we might add a recommendation around monitoring and that we bring it back to the Authority on possibly a monthly basis, or to SOP - whichever is appropriate - to have a look at what the overall effect has been as it rolls out.

Thanks for that. OK. John [Biggs] was next.

**John Biggs (AM):** I would strongly support your recommendation, Chairman. I think this has been an excellent debate and I do not want to repeat arguments deployed by others.

As I see it, politically, I would agree with Toby; there is clearly a loss of resource. There is no way you can dress it up as anything other than that. Clearly it is about the political balance between deployment decisions made by the Commissioner, and those under his command, and the physical leadership offered by the Mayor and yourself, Mr Moosehide - if I can call you that! It will catch on if I am lucky! That is almost the beginning and end of it. I cannot see it as anything other than a loss of resource.

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

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** I have to say incredibly intelligent and insightful comments from Toby, as usual.

The pity is that here we had, in the Safer Neighbourhood Teams as they were operated and structured, something that was legible to people. For the first time for 50 years the community, and the important people in the community who do things - charities and youth clubs and activists in the community of all sorts, churches - knew how to plug in to a user friendly responsive system. You might think that the structure of a ward is somewhat artificial but, actually, it was the same shape and everybody understood it and there was a lot to be said for that coterminosity with a local state.

To see the fudging of it and things flexing out of shape and becoming a little bit more difficult to understand and people moving around more is a genuine loss and people will feel it, and there are some people who will feel it as something of a slap in the face because I think, for the first time, people felt they had got something that they understood. Confidence really matters. We have been seeing confidence in the police going up and I think, strategically, the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the way they have been operated were absolutely crucial to that. This is a pity. It is a shame.

I think we all understand that the Commissioner is in a difficult financial situation which is brewing towards crisis after the Olympics. Let's remember that this is the beginning of the difficulties. It is going to look much, much worse by next year.

I want to agree on the point about what is the sergeant for. Give you a real world example. If you are in a ward where there is a significant nuisance street drinker problem which is persistent in an area - and it is actually a problem that the public sector does not

deal with very well - you need somebody with the intellectual capacity, the confidence, the experience and the local profile to deal with the health services, to deal with St Mungos or Thamesmead or whoever it is, to deal with the council, to address the local shops, to talk to the Chamber of Commerce or whatever it is, the town centre manager, and somebody who can work with the licensing committee. You need a level of professional capability which is much more than about supervising some colleagues. This is a loss because being able to do that kind of on the ground project management and problem solving for difficult issues is genuinely going to be missed.

I just want to say that in some communities - like the ones I represent - it is really hard to find a ward that is not really, really busy and is not fraught with problems. Having done a lot of visits to outer London I have to say the other thing that strikes me is that there is not a community in London, however safe and quiet it is, that does not have a high fear of crime. These are really sensitive things that we are messing about with here.

I cannot support this, on principle. I understand why you are doing what you have got to do for financial reasons but I cannot support the devaluing of such an important strategic asset.

I just want to say about Project Hannah, quickly, and then I will shut up --

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** I just heard a number of Members indicate that they are going to need to leave quite soon.

**Valerie Shawcross (AM):** Me too. Quickly on Project Hannah. Caroline [Pidgeon] has made the point about Project Hannah but the thing that struck me about that was, what it said was, in a layer of activity and management within the police that is not so visible to us as local politicians, the response teams, there is clearly a great deal of inflexibility and inefficiency and poor organisation that would yield a lot of savings, were it better organised and were they serviced to be run in a larger area flexible basis. Why is it that we would come so quickly to adjust and disarrange something that people have got and understand is working, and not get sorting out those response teams where there are clearly some management issues that need resolving. It just seems like something is - it has leaped over an issue that could have been sorted first.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** All right. Thank you. Very quickly, Jennette [Arnold]. We had six and a half minutes from you earlier so if you could be quick.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Excuse me. Can I just ask Ian McPherson to be clear? When he talks about consultation, the consultation you are talking about is where? Which wards will share? The decision has already been made?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** No. It is about which wards. That is already happening. I have had letters from local authority leaders saying that they support it.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** During that consultation you are expecting to have that with as many stakeholders locally, or just with the council Leader in a private room?

**Ian McPherson (Assistant Commissioner, MPS):** Jennette, I am not going to prejudge what a borough commander will do. He or she manages their borough. They will manage through their stakeholders --

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** No, it is the consultation of what?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Exactly. I would like to add the recommendation that we have monthly reports on the effects of the flex into the Authority if that is all right. Then I do not know how you want to ...

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Could we vote on that separately because I 100% support that but I cannot support the main paper?

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** OK. Can we take recommendations one to six then? Those in favour? Those against? Thank you. That is carried. Item seven which is --

**Jenny Jones (AM):** There was a request ...

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** To put our names as voting against. Thank you. We have done that before. Thank you.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** We will put a great big poster outside for you, do not worry, so you can stick it on your leaflets.

Recommendation seven. An extra recommendation that we have monthly reports on flex. I presume that is agreed by everyone? Yes? OK. Thank you.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** You made the political decision.

**Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA):** Right. Thanks very much. Reports on Committees. Chief Executive, anything to report? No? I think that is it.

The Commissioner might just give us a quick update on the latest on the strike.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** If I could just tell you, because I gave the figures earlier, I said that the 90% related to the early morning in Metcall. The day shift. The figures I now have which, subsequently, were the figures I did not have at the time. That has turned now to be a 95% no show. At that time when I got the information, which was about an hour ago, I think there were 335 police officers from boroughs supporting that.

Sky is showing live time the demonstration. I understand that the demonstration is about 5,000 people but there have been some arrests. I understand - and remember I am going off reports here - there have been some people masking up and they might have been the people who have been arrested. I thought I might tell you what you have been missing on Sky!

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