

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on Thursday, 15 September 2011 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chairman)
Tony Arbour, 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 and Graham Speed.

MPA Officers:

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive) and Bob Atkins (Treasurer).

MPS Officers:

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate), Chris Allison (Assistant Commissioner, Central Operations) Anne McMeel (Director of Resources) and Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner, Central Operations).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Members, if I can have your attention, I make that 10am. The cameras are rolling. Our public awaits. Good morning everybody. Are we sitting comfortably? Good, then we will begin. We will start by introducing ourselves. Kit Malthouse.

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

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

Neil Johnson (AM): Neil Johnson.

Chris Boothman (AM): Chris Boothman.

Amanda Sater (AM): Amanda Sater.

Graham Speed (AM): Graham Speed.

Cindy Butt (AM): Cindy Butt.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Kirsten Hearn.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Joanne McCartney.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

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

Male Speaker: (inaudible), Audit Commission.

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): Karen McConnell, Audit Commission.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Bernard Hogan-Howe.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We have got one or two gaps. Apologies have been received though from Reshard [Auladin], Faith [Boardman] and Steve O'Connell and from the Deputy Commissioner and Jane Harwood. The Deputy Chief Executive Toby Harris has apologised for being late. Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Valerie Shawcross sends her apologies.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. We will note Val's apologies. Anybody else? OK. No doubt those will show up.

Declarations of interests for the meeting. Do we have any beyond the usual? No.

Minutes of the last meeting are attached for Members' approval. You should have had a pack as we agreed last time detailing the Q&A around some of the phone hacking incidents. Everybody happy with the minutes? OK. Great. Any matters arising from the minutes that anybody wants to raise? So accurate and concluded. OK, I will sign those.

With Members' agreement I am just going to change the order of the agenda slightly if I may. We have to approve the annual accounts and we have Karen McConnell from the Audit Commission here so, rather than her and her colleague waiting for a couple of hours for us to get round to the accounts, I thought we might deal with them now. Is everybody happy with that? OK. Great. Bob [Atkins], do you want to introduce and then Karen you might like to say a few words? Thanks.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Thank you, Chairman. This report is to present to the Authority the formal accounts for last year and also, because of the change to the

accounts and audit regulations which allowed me to sign off the accounts as draft for audit back in June, this is actually the first time the accounts have come before the Authority, so we also have with this the District Auditor's letter to the Members of the Police Authority which is the final part of the audit process.

I am very pleased to say that, as you will have seen from the report, we have clean audit opinion and we also have a clean value for money opinion which is very good news. You will also probably have spotted from the reports that there has been a lot of work this year involved in implementing IFRS [International Financial Reporting Standards] and I do want to pay tribute to Anne [McMeel] and her staff in the force for all the work that has gone in to make that a pretty good process without too many issues. As you will see there are some minor issues referred to but they are very minor presentational issues and underline the real work that has had to go on in order to implement IFRS very successfully.

Without further ado I think I will hand over to Karen to present her governance report to the Members.

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): Thank you. I am extremely pleased to be able to present my first annual governance report to the MPA. Your financial statements are an important means by which you account for the stewardship of public funds. Although you do rely on your officers for all the technical matters, these financial statements themselves are your responsibility, so it is right that I report to you before I conclude my audit and issue that opinion.

I am pleased to say, as already highlighted, that I do propose to issue an unqualified audit opinion on your accounts and conclusion to secure value for money. You have responded well to the challenge of a fundamental change in the basis of your financial reporting, IFRS, as has already been mentioned, and you have prepared, on time, a well supported set of accounts on that new basis. I have concluded that I can rely on your system of internal control including your internal audit function.

That is not to say that I have not made any recommendations. For example, there are some relating to the assurance over systems operated by third parties and on the development of benchmarking, but I do believe that the financial and corporate governance arrangements are there, are in place and are well placed to take you through the legislative changes that are coming over the horizon.

There is a further appendix to my annual governance report that I will ask the Authority to circulate to you after this meeting. However, this only relates to presentational items that your officers have addressed when I raised them with them. That is actually all about the timing of the audit and the timing of coming to the Assembly, so there are not any major issues within that, but it is important that you are aware of what is in it. That will come round at a later stage.

The final thing I would like to do is to ask you to endorse the letter of representation which I have requested from management and which they will sign. That is the final bit of the audit evidence that I am going to need before I am able to issue my opinion.

The final thing I would like to do is to thank your officers for their courtesy and assistance. That is the officers both within the MPA and the MPS for their assistance to my staff during the course of the audit and, particularly in this first year of IFRS, I cannot stress how complex many of those changes have been and so my thanks on that are heartfelt. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Good. Thanks for that. Another year of progress despite the attempts of the international reporting council or whatever they are called to foul the pitch. None of us of course understand it any more. There are chartered accountants who are all disenfranchised by the changes in the rules. It has caused consternation across the city. Anyway, does anybody have any questions? I know you will all have read it. Neil [Johnson]?

Neil Johnson (AM): Not a question, Chairman, but just a compliment really to the team. To get such a clean audit report against a very difficult background is great credit so well done.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I had a couple of questions if I may. I noticed in 19.12 that we had £427,000 of donated assets, which was news to me. Do we know who was good enough to give us nearly £500,000? Is it legacies? Do we know what kind of income it is? Rather than confiscated assets, having donated assets seemed unusual to me.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): If you want the list, Chairman, no, I have not got it here.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I would just be interested. I know it is up from £89,000 to £427,000.

My other question was we are conscious that things are happening to the Audit Commission. What is likely to be your status in the future and timing around our audit?

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): In terms of the changes what is happening is that the audit practice is being outsourced from the Audit Commission. The changes will take effect from 2012/13. That is for the 2012/13 audit. The contracts are out for tender at the moment. They have gone through the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) process. The contracts are divided into lots across the country. The GLA family, including the MPA, is within a south London lot. Predominantly the workforce of the audit practice will transfer on a Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE) transfer to whoever wins that contract. What I cannot promise is that would not make any changes in terms of the senior personnel in particular.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. So you will be around for the year end next year, but the following year --

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): That is certainly the plan, yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- it will be some private organisation or otherwise that has taken you on or the team on.

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): Yes. All audits will be undertaken by private sector firms from the year 2012/13 onwards.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Joanne [McCartney], did you have a question? OK. All right. All done. Happy to approve the accounts? OK. Thank you. Thanks very much.

Karen McConnell (Senior Director of Audit, Audit Commission): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Right. We move on now to item four which is my report. First of all obviously I would like to welcome Bernard Hogan-Howe as our new Commissioner. I think you are probably technically Commissioner Designate at the moment. The agreed commencement date is 26 September 2011. As those of you who were involved will know it was the usual prolonged - not in terms of time but in hurdles to overcome - interview process involving a panel at the Home Office, an MPA panel and then the Mayor and the Home Secretary interviewing together.

Those of you who were part of that will know that Bernard impressed throughout. His clarity of vision, his eagerness to be about the task and his hunger to get in amongst the organisation that is the MPS, combined with his experience and his record of crime fighting elsewhere I think commended him to all parties who were involved in the process and we are extremely pleased that he has been appointed so congratulations, Bernard, you are very welcome.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I also wanted to commend the senior management of the MPS, which included Bernard on a temporary basis, for their conduct during the riots. Lots has been said about the riots in lots of other places over the last month or so and I do not propose to rehearse that here but I did want to offer our thanks - and I hope you will join me in thanking - the Acting Commissioner during the period, Tim Godwin, for his leadership during what what was a very difficult and chaotic period over the summer.

Also our thanks to those officers who have been particularly commended for acts of bravery and courage serving on the front line in some very, very difficult circumstances

when that thin blue line became extremely thin in some parts of the city. Obviously our good wishes to those officers who were injured and who are still recovering from their injuries.

Also, thanks to all those other officers who were involved in what was a very difficult situation. There were many stories and anecdotes of personal bravery and dedication; people returning from holiday voluntarily, turning up without being asked and manning the pumps generally in a way that we have not had to see for some time. That dedication and commitment was part of the reason why I think that, despite the disorder, we were able to bring it under control in a relatively short period of four days.

You will hopefully be pleased to know that I have written to all Chairs of police authorities who provided officers on mutual aid to thank them and obviously our gratitude goes to those officers who came and actually made a real difference in London. For many of them, despite what they were exposed to, I think it was a pleasant experience. There is certainly a new slang word for police in London which is Heddlu, the South Wales police - I do not think it is pronounced Heddlu is it, Catherine [Crawford]?!

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): It is Heddlu, Chairman, and I have pointed this out before!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right. I lived cheek by jowl with the Welsh for the first 18 years of my life but never quite got my tongue round the language! Nevertheless, many thousands of officers came from elsewhere to assist and we are extremely grateful to all of them.

I visited many of the boroughs that were affected, along with the Mayor. I think, between us, we did every single one. Certainly we got very pleasing feedback from people there about the police and I know there have been a number of incidents of particular support for police officers across London, not least standing ovations for police officers when they have walked past seated crowds, applause outside pubs and all that kind of thing. It has been a very difficult but, nevertheless, energising period and we are grateful to you all.

Some other matters to do with that. The Mayor called an extraordinary meeting following the riots of the London Crime Reduction Board bringing together partners from across the city, local authorities and others to assess how we might deal with the aftermath. The Board heard how local authorities and the police had all been central to the clearing up operation and discussion was held on how we might deal with those who had been incarcerated and were likely to be released in the months to come.

We also talked about some of the anti-gangs work that was needed although, while there was a lot of talk about gangs in terms of the riots, their significance as a driver is not yet fully established. There is a lot of research and work that is going to need to be done into those who were involved - how, why, when, why certain areas were subjected to disorder

and others were not - before we can devise a proper policy or indeed policing response and we will be doing that over the next few months.

A couple of other items. You will have seen from the media that we received the retirement notice of AC Ian McPherson yesterday. Ian has been in the forefront of some pretty revolutionary change at Territorial Policing, as those of you who have been looking at TUPE development will know, and we are extremely grateful for his service. He will be officially leaving at the beginning of December so no doubt we will see him before then and be able to thank him and pay tribute to him personally.

I have attached a schedule of meetings that I have had during what was supposed to be my summer holiday for your information.

Just a couple of other things. The budget process is well underway. Dee [Doocey] and I have held three departmental budget meetings. We have been slightly let off the hook by the Mayor. He does not now require a budget submission from us at the end of September. We have reverted to the old timetable of November which gives us a bit more space and time to complete our work. Work is going well. The budget is looking in better and better shape thanks to the work of Anne [McMeel] and her team and also Tim [Godwin] and, I have to say, the departmental heads have been involved. There is a real sense of momentum around our savings and efficiency agenda and hopefully Dee and I will be able to conclude things in time for the November meeting.

Finally, good news or bad news, depends on your take, the Police and Social Responsibility Bill finished its passage through the Palace of Westminster last night and, by the grace of God and at the hand of Her Majesty, will pass into law hopefully later today. That means that there is light at the end of the tunnel in terms of the uncertainty that has been hanging around the Police Authority. There is a lot of secondary legislation to get through before we get an exact date for the abolition of the Authority but it looks it is likely to be at some point in January 2012. That means, if you do your maths, that this will be the third from last of our meetings although we may well have to have a terminal meeting at the end to conclude various legal and accounting matters before the Authority is abolished and then the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime is established. There will be a lot of work to do between then and now not least in terms of staff transition but also tying up various loose ends, dealing with or finding methods to deal with, matters that will be halfway heard, conduct matters and others, so we will need your cooperation and flexibility during that period to try to get that completed. Nevertheless, we should hear later, as I say, that Royal Assent has been received today.

In the rest of the country you will know that the elections for police and crime commissions have been delayed through to November next year but the intention of the Government is still that the MPA should go early so that the changes will have happened before the Mayoral election at the beginning of May next year.

That is it from me. Does anybody have any questions?

Jenny Jones (AM): I was just curious about when we could expect to hear for sure because although a lot of us did not want this to happen I think we are quite keen, now, for it to happen as fast as possible. Have you got a date?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We do not have a date because there are, as I say, a lot of regulations to be drafted and laid. You will understand the Home Office Bill team have been working very hard in getting the Bill through. It was a tricky day yesterday but, nevertheless, they got there I understand. Now we can talk to them about a timetable for that legislation. There has always been a commitment from them that it would be early January 2012 but secondary legislation has a fairly rigid timetable about the amount of time it has to be laid for before it comes into effect. There is their working bit in drafting it, which hopefully they have been doing already, and then there is the getting it laid and then we will get a date. We should be able to get an outline timetable in the next week or so.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I hope so, yes. There is a lot of work that has already begun and we are quite closely involved with that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Jennette [Arnold] and then Valerie [Brasse]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, thank you for your report. It was just something that I was hoping that you would include in your report so I wonder if I could just help you along and say thank you for the letters, along with myself and the Members of Parliaments (MPs) and Tom Watson, you have written to the Home Secretary and Dominic Grieve [MP for Beaconsfield, Attorney General for England and Wales] in support of the Morgan family. As you know we are totally supportive of that request for a public judicial review into the death of Daniel Morgan so thank you for that. I know that, alongside a group of supporters, you have been extremely supportive and I would like that on the record so that we all do not have to meet up with you to understand, should you be appointed to this higher office in the sky in the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC), and you will continue giving that support to the Morgan family and supporters.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Just so everybody is aware, other Members, you will remember we agreed unanimously that I should write to the Home Secretary in support of a judicial inquiry into the case of Daniel Morgan. I wrote again recently reiterating that in the light of some of the revelations that had come out of the *News of the World* investigation. I have yet to have a response to that second letter. Valerie [Brasse]?

Victoria Brasse (AM): This is back on the Policing and Social Responsibility Bill Act. A question for Catherine [Crawford] really. What proportion of the secondary legislation that is required to go through the House is by negative resolution as opposed to positive? Do you know?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I do not think there is anything that requires positive resolution. We have already had confirmation that for some of the provisions, like the protocol and the strategic policing requirement, it would be desirable that they were in place but it is not essential in order for us to progress.

Victoria Brasse (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All done? Thank you. Good. That is item four. Item five. Bernard [Hogan-Howe], you are extremely welcome. We look forward to the first of many Commissioner's reports.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Chairman and Members of the Authority, good morning. I am really pleased to be here. I am proud and honoured to have been selected as the new Commissioner of the MPS. I regret the fact that probably we will not have too many meetings together. That is not a political statement; just a practical thing for me.

I just want to take a few minutes to say, first of all, some thanks. My own thanks, on the MPS's behalf and particularly of senior colleagues, to Acting Commissioner Tim Godwin who, over the last 10 to 12 months has been faced with numerous challenges and has carried out a fantastic job. It is very difficult when you have that type of challenge and your own team is being disrupted so I think he deserves all our praise. I am really grateful for the work that he has done to help me to blend in to the MPS at a time when he was trying to cope with all that too. I wanted to put that on record.

My second thanks are to Ian McPherson retiring now in December as Assistant Commissioner. I regret that Ian will not be with us as part of our team into the future. Obviously he has got a new career that he is looking towards and I am sure we all wish him every success, together with his family, in his next career.

I have said a few things publicly, but I wanted to reiterate here to your face, what I will stand for in terms of the MPS that I will lead over the next few years. I have said I want us to be the best police force in the world but first of all we have to be the best in the country and that is what we will be. I have no doubt about that. There will be many ways in which we can measure that and we could discuss it all day but my main aim is that, whatever we do, we are at least as good and ideally better than people who are doing similar things in similar circumstances. That is achievable. We can do that. A fantastic challenge but it can be done.

The second point is to talk about how I think we could do that. We use something in Merseyside which we call total policing. It was about having a war on crime, it was about having a total care for victims and it was about being totally professional in the process. Some people had been concerned that does the war on crime mean in fact you are aggressive and confrontational. That is not the idea at all. In fact one of my proudest boasts I suppose is that in Merseyside during the period I was there the police officers in Merseyside had the lowest number of complaints per head in the country. It was not

about being confrontational; it was about confronting criminals and dealing them professionally but making sure that you did not ignore crime nor anything that you could to prevent it. So that is what is important to me; making sure we have got a great organisation committed to fighting crime.

What I think that strategy addresses is what I believe to be a fundamental purpose of the police which is, first of all, to make sure that crime does not happen. It is better to stop crime happening and having a victim than it is to try to deal with the consequences. If a crime does happen and we have got an ambition to catch the person responsible and put them before the courts. If we cannot manage that then we have to help the victim and we should be professional in that process.

I would like to be innovative and make sure that we maximise our use of, I would suggest, proven technology with an aim of reducing crime or catching the people who did it or helping the victims. It is technology for a purpose, not just information technology (IT) to create lists which, sadly, I think sometimes the service has had a surfeit of.

The three main aims I have set for ourselves, which I think are consistent with what the Authority has pushed for, are first of all to cut crime and secondly to cut costs - one because I think, inherently, it is an honourable thing to do, it is public money and we should be doing something to make sure that costs are kept down but, in any case, the recession means that we have to. What I have said for all the team is that we have to maintain a positive outcome because if we get depressed about trying to implement cuts then that is what will happen to 52,000 people. It is our aim to create a positive atmosphere and make sure that our culture develops in the right way.

So it is first of all to cut crime. Secondly to cut costs. Finally to create and continue to develop our culture. Partly about our diversity but also about our approach and our values. Certainly the three values I have set out which are vital to me are about humility in the way that we deal with people, integrity - because that is not something that should be part time - and, finally, transparency, which I think I ask people to make their own judgements about whether you think you are doing the right thing or the wrong thing and not to be at all defensive if people have queries of us or are holding us to account.

That is my few minutes of preamble but probably just to go into the things that I think the Commissioner would normally address. I know that Members have got a number of questions which Assistant Commissioner Lynne Owens has kindly offered to help me by answering a little later in terms of the disorders but I will help where I can.

I wanted just to say a few words, in opening, about how we are addressing the consequences of the riots which we saw in Tottenham on Saturday and we subsequently saw across London in the subsequent two days.

We have provided you I think already with a broad outline of our internal review. What we want to do is, first of all, understand exactly what happened at every moment in time on those days and it is vital to establish the facts. Of course the difficulty for the police is

we will give our own version of the facts, not through maliciousness, but just because we only have our own account, but we need to make sure it is a comprehensive account. We want to know what happened at any particular time, what actions were taken based on that information and then the impact of those actions. I suppose, ultimately, very importantly, it is what we would have done differently had we had our time again.

What I have said to Lynne is that we want to sit down within 30 days and find out if there are any urgent actions that we as a force need to take to make sure that we do not see a repetition of what happened and, as importantly, if there should be any repetition, that we deal with it and mobilise as effectively as we possibly can.

Within eight weeks we will have an interim report on a piece of work that Lynne is doing which we will share with the Authority - all the findings. That report will be in December. Within three months we should have a very full account of what happened and what we are going to try to do about it. If there is anything we need to do quickly we will react very quickly to.

The Government has also announced a review that will look at the causality of the disorder and will be led by Darra Singh [Chairman, Communities and Victims Panel]. We will do our part to do everything we can to support him in that and we will be very interested in what he finds because that will be a dispassionate view which I am sure will be searching and we will be able to learn things from it.

Despite the fact that disorder had taken place you know that the Notting Hill Carnival took place and it seems to have gone off very well. The August Bank Holiday period is always busy in any case. There were 245 arrests but that was down on previous years. I think a lot of people had approached that event quite concerned but in fact, in the end, it passed off peacefully and everybody had a great time so everybody is very pleased about that and I praise the officers who were involved in that and those who led it.

In terms of general performance there are some challenges, particularly around robbery and around burglary. I think you already have the figures but I thought I would just draw attention to a couple of things. First of all robbery. At the moment it is nearly a third lower than its high point in 2002. However, what we have seen during the last year, is that, in the period from April to August, offences were 21% higher, so it is around a fifth higher. What that actually means is 2,779 more people were robbed. It is not just a percentage; in terms of victims is a vital thing to keep an eye on.

It does appear to have been driven - which I think you have had reports on before - by high value electrical items and the rising cost of gold, which obviously makes jewellery more attractive and is one of those things on show, particularly when people are in public places. We always encourage people to do their best to do anything they can to keep themselves safe.

We have launched our street robbery campaign earlier this month highlighting the simple steps that people can take to protect themselves and I hope that will be helpful to the public.

Burglary offences are also up on the level this time last year with burglaries of people's homes up by nearly 10%, which is just over 2,000 more victims. Our operational response to both burglary and robbery is being driven through Operation Target which is coordinating our action right across the MPS but particularly in those boroughs which are particularly affected by those crime types.

We are seeing some effect after the disorder in Tottenham which seems to have at least stabilised the crime pattern. I suspect there are two reasons; 1) we have had more officers out on the street and 2) some of the people we have been arresting around the troubles have been frequent offenders. That is the positive outcome of what has a pretty awful set of circumstances.

We have also seen that offences where a knife is used to injure are down by about 3%, which is 60 fewer offences.

In light of the disorder I think it would be disingenuous to overplay the reductions that I have mentioned because we have got an awful lot of officers still working on the outcome of the disorder in terms of going and locking up people who have been identified sometimes by CCTV, sometimes by press footage and sometimes by people telling us who committed the offences - which has been really helpful and we encourage the public to carry on doing that because we will take action where we get information. There is a huge tail now of people to be dealt with. First of all to be identified, second to be arrested and then there has got to be a whole process through the criminal justice system and that is something we are having to devote significant resources to, and will continue to do, I suspect, all this year. We will come back to you in a little more detail when we have our own assessment of how we are going to deal with that in the middle term.

In terms of teenage homicides there have been three additional young people who have been killed since the last Full Authority meeting: Thomas Ward who was only 17 years old, Kelvin Chibueze, 17, and Leroy James who was in fact only 14 years old. It is tragic that young people die like this on London's streets and I can assure you I will do all I can to prevent that happening in the future but in big cities there can be challenges. It is always said when young people particularly are murdered.

I wanted to mention the Lord Justice Leveson public inquiry because that is relevant for many reasons in all the challenges we face over the coming months and years. As you know, within the MPS Elizabeth Filkin [Former Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards] is with us as an adviser looking at the ethics of what should sit behind the police and press relationships, and we are eager to hit the outcome of her work. She has been meeting with many people within the Authority. She has met an awful lot of people within the MPS. She is going to a broader church in terms of Her Majesty's Inspectorate

of Constabulary (HMIC) team who are carrying out a national piece of work right around the country with the 43 forces looking at the relationship between the press and the police and the integrity issues that that may involve.

Part of her work touches on the guidance that sets out the parameters of our relationship with the press. Our standard operating procedures will be updated following the findings of Elizabeth's review. We are expecting to see a final report in January but we are hoping to get some guidance far earlier than that on some simple measures. Certainly I will be encouraging her to give us some simple things that we can do quickly.

I do not think that anybody is going to argue that the police service should not have a relationship with the media but it is clear that this relationship needs to have a resetting of the boundaries between us and also how we manage that interface. I certainly hope, myself, that we do not go back to when I joined the service 30 years ago where we did not talk to the press at all, even when we were talking about crime - which sounds bizarre now but that is where we are. I think what has happened over time is that that relationship has probably gone too far. We have to reset the boundary and I am sure that Elizabeth Filkin's work and Lord Justice Leveson's work will also produce similar guidance.

In-between times what I have said that we need to do is we almost treat it as a period of austerity both in terms of gifts and in terms of relationship with the press. We just do not do it unless we have got a very transparent process in place that acknowledges the meeting took place and was for a business purpose and then we make clear why we met. If better guidance comes out later then we will have to wait and see but I think we have got staged milestones where we have this period of austerity of certainty of not doing things and if people can give us guidance about what is wise and what is honourable then we will hear that as it is developed. I think with the benefit of having two sets of people doing that hopefully we should get some really good guidance that will stand us in good stead for about a generation and will reset the balance.

We have published, as you may have seen I am sure, our expenses over the last few years, yesterday on the internet. It may well be that Members want to talk about that. What I would say in the future is that we publish those accounts I would say, ideally, within 24 hours of the event. At the moment I think the best we could promise, because of IT things, is probably 28 days. For me some things in the diary, for chief officers particularly, are set usually 4 to 12 weeks in advance, there are things in there so we know things are going to happen. I see no reason why, within 24 hours of something happening, we could not get it on the internet or wherever we want to put it. We are going to mimic the GLA system, which seems to be a very good system, that certainly we will do our best to maintain. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you very much. Members will have noted a small victory for those Members who have been pushing for some years in terms of publication on the internet of those expenses and gifts and hospitality yesterday afternoon.

Right. We have had a lot of submitted questions on a number of themes. What I am going to do is group them by theme this time and we are going to start with discussions, no surprise, about the riots. There are a number of Members who have submitted questions about that and then other questions but what I am going to do is take all those questions together and then come back to Members in order on their sundry other questions if that is all right with everybody? We are going to start with the Assembly Member for the area, Joanne [McCartney].

Just to explain, we have got Lynne Owens and Chris Allison here. During the whole period Lynne and Chris worked together - Lynne doing evenings and nights and Chris doing mornings and days - around the disorder themselves both in the control room obviously and at the Yard as the Assistant Commissioners involved. Therefore we had full 24 hour coverage. Bernard was obviously pretty much there throughout as far as I could see in the Yard along with Tim [Godwin] but in terms of the detail of what happened we have got a good team to give you the actual detailed blow by blow account if that is what is required. OK. Joanne, we are going to start with you.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. I actually did put these questions to the Acting Commissioner last week at the Plenary so I have got some answers but I think it would be useful in future if we could have a timeline from the police point of view of exactly what happened and whether that is part of the report or whether that can be done sooner would be very useful.

My initial concerns go back to Thursday, 4 August 2011 and the shooting of Mark Duggan in an Operation Trident operation. The main concerns that I have, apart from the shooting itself which is obviously an independent investigation, is about the communication and liaison with the family and then the wider community. It seems that the MPS and the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) have been here before where there has been a high profile incident and there has been criticism and a lot of anxiety about how the police or the IPCC communicated immediately and whether better communication may actually have calmed a lot of tension down if that had been handled appropriately.

My questions really are about that. What was done or not done? Who was responsible? Talking to the various parties it seems that the IPCC and the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) - all of which have family liaison officers - and there seems to be a lack of clarity as to who should actually take the role of liaising with not just the immediate family but the wider family as well. I would like some answers to that. I am glad, Commissioner, that you said that if there are things that can be done straightaway, rather than waiting for an outcome or a report, that they would be done. I would think that clarity around communications is one that has to take priority. That is my first set of questions.

My second are around intelligence that was given to the police about possible unrest on the Saturday. We had a peaceful demonstration by the family wanting answers. There

were concerns about that, that that was not handled appropriately; there was not a senior enough officer to talk to them. Also there have been community voices saying that they warned the police and the police should have been better informed. I wanted your views on that please.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Sorry, Lynne [Owens], I wanted to mention one of the things that Joanne mentioned about early actions. One of the things that certainly I did two weeks ago, subsequent to Mark Duggan's death was to meet with the IPCC to explore that very point about communication with families. We both agreed that there is something to learn there. What we are agreed to do is to sit down and work through who did what and what might have been done differently. We have not got a final piece of work on that. DAC Mark Simmons is going to work together with the IPCC and make sure that should, unfortunately, this happen in the future, a death after contact with the police, you have got a far clearer protocol of how we deal with things.

To be fair, from my reading of it, everyone was trying to be honourable and not tread on someone else's toes in sharing information, but the consequence did not work out as everyone would have intended so I think there is a piece of work to do there.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I think it is important that the agencies are able to challenge each other as well and they have to have the confidence to do that.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Yes. Sorry, Lynne.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Starting at the beginning of your question, Joanne, in terms of the timeline we have prepared a headline timeline that I thought had gone to Members and London Assembly Members?

Joanne McCartney (AM): It has but I suspect, as you are working through what actually happened, there will be extra information that will be added. It would be useful -

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Is what you want quite a granular timeline that effectively starts from the shooting, including what meetings were held by whom and who was likely to be there? I know that work is ongoing. OK. Fine.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): The other briefing note that we have circulated of course is what my review entails and it is a very broad ranging review but the first point on that list is a timeline. We want to get to the place where we do have a very detailed understanding of what happened when, where, how and numbers etc from the very beginning and, of course, we will be happy to share that at the time that we have it.

In terms of the family, the fundamental point to make is, regardless of what the review throws out, Mark Duggan's family feel that they were let down by us and that can never

be an acceptable situation. As a result of that Mak Chishty, who is one of our commanders, has been to see the family and has apologised for that.

I think, as Mr Hogan-Howe has said, there clearly was, whether it be a lack of understanding or a lack of clarity, between ourselves and the IPCC in respect of who was going to do what. It is one of the detailed parts of work. As the boss has said, Mark Simmons is leading that on our behalf and it will report into the review.

My current understanding - and I am sorry I have to caveat all my answers with that dreadful phrase but that is the whole point of a review; that you are trying to get to stages of detail but in the interest of openness I want to answer as fully as I can. On my current understanding, on the night in question, some of our family liaison officers from the Directorate of Professional Standards did engage with two members of the family. They did not engage with the parents and there are some reasons for that that we need to talk through with the IPCC. The IPCC took responsibility for the role of family liaison on the following day, on the morning, and it was not until the public announcements through the media that we were aware that the family was unhappy with our involvement and it was at that point we apologised.

As I say, we need to get into some more detail. We cannot get away from the fact that, no matter what way you look at it, the Mark Duggan family feel let down, and that can never be acceptable.

In respect of intelligence - you have heard us say this before but intelligence is a much over used word. We think there was information that there was going to be a peaceful vigil at Tottenham Police Station on Saturday. There were a number of meetings with different members of the community during that day and we had different feedback. On our current assessment the main feedback we were getting at that meeting is that there was anger towards the police but there was a feeling that that would not necessarily move into disorder. As I say, that is an early indication and what I need to have is a far deeper debrief than I currently have about exactly who said what to whom and when and, as a result of what was said, what action was taken. I do know that 23 members of key individual networks were spoken to. What I do not know is what question they asked and what response they gave so it is that level of detail that I need to get into.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. Can I ask then about Saturday, 6 August? I think there is concern locally that adequate resources were not deployed soon enough. I know we have heard you are reviewing your mobilisation plan but I just wondered whether you have got any early indications as to whether that was the case and whether extra resources there quicker could have stopped the disorder?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): In terms of the numbers that were available the original borough policing operation required this to be a local low key operation. We have had vigils, regrettably, at police stations before and, generally, we have found that is the right response. If you deploy significant numbers of territorial support group in the early stages there are occasions where that has

escalated anger so it was very much a locally based operation. They had asked for a considerable number of reserves to be on standby, the Commissioner's reserve was on standby for the operation and was based locally but I think it is difficult, at this stage, to say had we engaged earlier with more public order tactics whether that would have quelled the disorder quickly. What we do know is the fact that two police cars were attacked, it became an iconic event and violence did spread quickly.

One of the points you made earlier which I forgot to pick up on, Joanne, was the point about chief officer presence at the scene. There has been a lot of misreporting in this regard. There was a chief inspector present at the scene, Adi Adelekan, who is a very experienced public order commander and a very good member of the borough command team. He was there at the police station and was engaging with the family. At that point the family took the view that he was not a senior enough person and we called another person out, but to say there was nobody of any rank there is actually inaccurate.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you. I have got a couple of further questions but they relate to afterwards and the aftermath.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Carry on. Let's get it done.

Joanne McCartney (AM): One is about Operation Kirkin which I believe you have some 30,000 hours worth of CCTV coverage that you are looking at. I believe that that is actually going to be passed back to the boroughs to deal with and to look at and I understand that about 20,000 hours of that may relate to Haringey. Obviously there is then the question of resources that that borough will have to actually continue the investigation. It is about what extra resources are able to be given to those boroughs who are having that great wealth of information but it will take great investigative time and resources to deal with.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Commander Steve Rodhouse is leading the post investigation now. He is an experienced Commander in Territorial Policing. He has already reviewed the resources. There is a paper coming to Management Board tomorrow which will detail the level of resources that each of the boroughs will need to undertake that work.

The best place for the work to happen is within individual boroughs but they will need additional resources to do that work on their behalf and it will be the decision of the Management Board in terms of how we split that resource requirement across the organisation. There is not an expectation that all of the resources are only supplied from within the individual boroughs because we know that some boroughs had more disorder than others and we need to look at our units like the Specialist Crime Department and the Specialist Operations who might support the broader operation.

What I would say is that we should not forget that this investigation takes place in the context of other big events, Operation Elveden and Operation Weeting, so there are a

number of significant inquiries in place in London at the moment and it is our responsibility, as a Board, to make sure they are all appropriately resourced.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is also worth adding of course that there may well be a bit of duplication in that some of those people who were involved in the rioting may well be of interest to the borough anyway. Given what we know about 75% have a previous conviction and some of the gang involvement there may be some overlap there that current investigations could benefit from in the borough anyway.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I am just concerned about the level of resource that they are going to need and the level of resource they need to put out on the streets to regain public confidence; it is going to be great.

My final question was then on the cost. Have we got assurances from the Home Office that they will cover all costs relating to these operations?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That negotiation is underway. The indications thus far are positive but there is no ink on the dotted line yet.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Will you keep us informed, Chairman, of that? It would be quite useful.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): As I always do, Joanne.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Kirsten [Hearn] next.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Some of these have been touched on already so I will not ask any ones that have been dealt with.

I am very aware that there are investigations going on at the moment, and inquiries as well, which may make it sometimes difficult to explain everything at once but what was the pre-agreed objective and outcomes sought behind the operation which led to the shooting of Mark Duggan. That is my first question. Shall I ask them one by one or shall I do the lot? What do you want me to do, Chairman?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Do them all together.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK. Fine. That was question number one. Second question was any equality or community impact assessment done prior to the operation going live? Second one. If so, what did it raise? What, if any, community reassurance strategy was put in place in the borough after the shooting of Mark Duggan. The fourth question. Who from the police was present at the critical incident meeting on 5th? I think actually I might have got the wrong date there but any of the critical incident meetings in relation to that. Which members of the community warned the police about the anger that was

being felt in the community? I would like to know who was at that meeting from the police? Five. To who were the issues about community disquiet raised by people at those meetings with the police? Number six. What action was taken as a result of any messages coming from those meetings? Number seven. What police contact was made with the family of Mark Duggan after the shooting? You have partly answered that but I would like more information. Number eight. The objective of the strategy for the policing of the demonstration by Mark Duggan's friends outside the police station on 6 August? Finally, in the absence of the borough commander, who was in overall charge of Haringey police? I think you have answered that by saying that a chief inspector was but you might clarify that more. Those are my questions. I know you might have answered some bits already but if you could have a go at them that would be lovely.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): I will start at the beginning, Kirsten. In terms of the original operation it was a Trident SCD8 led operation, a targeted operation that involved the support of the CO19 firearms team. As you know, that operation is now subject to independent police complaints investigation so it is a little tricky to say any more about it other than that at this stage. What I can confirm though is that a community impact assessment was completed as part of SCD8 Trident as part of the planning and as part of the authorisation process for that operation.

In terms of the community meetings that took place in Haringey there was a gold meeting chaired by a commander that did not take place in Haringey, it took place at the Yard, on the morning after the shooting. Community reassurance and the requirement for a community engagement and reassurance plan was actioned at that meeting and my review will look at the outcome of that plan and its success or not.

In terms of who was present at the community meeting at Haringey there was a superintendent that chaired that meeting and there was wide ranging membership across the borough.

In terms of the contact made with the family of Mr Mark Duggan I think I have probably answered that as much as I can, albeit it will be covered in more detail in the review.

Your final question was, in the absence of the borough commander, who was in overall charge, I should just stress Chief Inspector Adelekan was responsible for the policing of the peaceful vigil; he was not the officer in overall charge of the borough. That was the Area Commander Mak Chishty. That is quite an unusual decision for us when somebody goes away; to put the responsibility up in the organisation rather than down - you normally would have a superintendent acting on its behalf. Territorial Policing, recognising the significance of this event, made the decision that responsibility would move up in the change to Mak Chishty, rather than down to a superintendent. So, at the time of the disorder, Commander Mak Chishty was responsible for policing of the borough; he was the area commander in which that borough sits.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK. I have a follow up question actually to ask. What ongoing conversations are you having with community representatives in the borough? How are they being involved in the ongoing work to re-establish relationships?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): One of the conversations we had yesterday is that, actually, it is quite tricky to do the review at the same time as carrying on business as usual. So, as a result of the meeting that I chaired yesterday, Commander Mark Simmons, who is leading the work on engagement and community impact, is going to be liaising with the area commander and the borough commander to make sure we join those two things up properly. At the moment Mark has a team that is intending to go and speak to those people but we also need to make sure that we do not disempower the borough to carry on business as usual and any relationship issues that have arisen out of this incident are rebuilt and rectified urgently.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Are there any early learnings that you can tell us about in relation to community liaison and these incidents?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): No, is the headline. The main areas that we have picked up urgent learning on relate to the deployment of resource quickly but in terms of community engagement that is a broader piece of work because, actually, we could draw our own conclusions based on our own documentation but that would be wrong; we should not be drawing any conclusions until we have had an opportunity to debrief members of the community concerned. We have done some of that but not as much as we need to do yet.

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

Jenny Jones (AM): I have been to Tottenham twice and went to a really very large meeting there where people expressed a lot of anger about stop and search and they made the link between this and some of the anger that was expressed in Tottenham. I know that Jo has had similar and dissimilar experiences. I am just concerned that you do evaluate the benefits and the disbenefits of stop and search. Are you planning to do that?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Yes, we do and we will continue to do that. One of the things that we need to look at within the review is whether the evaluation drew the right conclusions in this incident. Every borough has a stop and search scrutiny panel. At the moment those panels are held quarterly. One of the questions that we have asked is whether quarterly is frequently enough in the context of this current debate.

Haringey borough holds meetings with its independent advisory group and its consultative meetings and it has what it calls a community police consultative group meeting which is meeting on 21 September specifically to discuss the impact of stop and search in relation to this incident.

The other thing that we have asked the review work to look at is whether Operation Target and any activity as a result of Operation Target could have had any consequences in Haringey as a result of this exercise.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK. I look forward to seeing that if we are still around. This is meant to be a helpful question because there is a lot of paranoia about what the police said and did. Can you confirm that the police did not call for bail to be denied to all those arrested in connection with the riots?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): The short answer is, yes. The bottom line is, to secure both justice and to make sure that disorder did not continue, we asked officers to be clear that, when they examined evidence, if they could lay early charges in negotiation and discussion with the Crown Prosecution Service, they should.

One of the positives that came out of the disorder was that we had some really good responses by our criminal justice partners and, as the courts were sitting on extended hours, the recommendation was made that those cases went from custody through those courts to ensure that the case was dealt with quickly, justice was done and we could restore to normality. It absolutely was not a blanket ban. It cannot be, legally, a blanket ban. We have to consider every case on its own circumstance and in the circumstances in which it occurs.

The other thing, can you confirm that the MPS did not ask for more powers in relation to managing and shutting down social media platforms?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): I can absolutely confirm that, yes. That was not a consideration. What happened on the night on question - and I think this commentary is as a result of Mr Godwin's appearance before the Home Affairs Select Committee. What he said there was that when we were in the control room in the midst of the disorder and we could see that social media was being used, we had talked about whether shutting it down would be effective but we very quickly dismissed that because of the benefits in terms of intelligence and the fact that you could see that people were self-policing through the use of the networks.

But one of the themes of work coming out of the review is that we do need to work more closely with social media companies, looking forward, in terms of how we work with both intelligence and the reality if those methods continue to be used.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. Could I just go back to the stop and search because this is something that I have just loathed ever since it has been used so widely? For me the concern is that you are not actually really getting any benefits from it, that you are stuck in a groove and it seems to be some way that you can actually monitor what is going on and get a feel for things but it does not actually have any real outcomes in terms of arrests of dangerous people.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): It is one of the things that I am interested in. The power of stop and search is very important to us but there are challenges in its use. There are two things I would like us to develop in the future - one of which I think the Authority is thinking about too. What I think we need to do is target more people who have already previously been convicted of or found to have knives or guns. Already have been found on stop and search, for whatever reason. We need to make sure that we are targeting them when they are out on the streets, rather than just a generic stop and search.

The second thing which I feel strongly about, which I think the community will tell us, is who carries knives and guns. If for no other reason than if they are out with them for the night they are probably feeling as worried about it too. We have to establish a mechanism whereby, whether it is Crimestoppers or some kind of major exercise, we get into the public's mind, "If you ring this number, tell us who has got one, tell us where they are, tell us which car they are driving, what Tube they're on and we'll do the rest". That moves it away from searching in an area towards searching for a person. The more we can do that. I think it is a smarter way of doing it. It stops targeting the people who do not need to be targeted. Both have their place and I think we would have to do far more about being smarter in our application of it, and I am sure we can.

Jenny Jones (AM): How soon are we going to see that different targeted stop and search?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): I am going to have to say by December aren't I? It is a bit difficult on your first few days to give you an exact date. My assurance is that I think the two things I have just mentioned could be established very quickly. If you are talking about getting a campaign out for eight million people to hear I do not think it is that hard actually but you have to be clear about the message and get a mechanism to take the message when they ring and I think there are people out there who are prepared to work with us.

I am just trying to respond, Jenny, to your concern because I agree with you but I think we have got to be smart about how we respond, and I think we can do that.

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

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes. My question is about emergency calls to the MPS on 8 and 9 August. What were the estimated number of abandoned calls from members of the public seeking to make contact with the police via the 999 number and the non-emergency number?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): This is your question about the riots, yes?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes, it is about emergency calls on those dates.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Sorry, absolutely.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): On 8 August we received in excess of 42,000 calls. Of those 3,821 calls to 999 were abandoned which is 18.2% and 15,984 calls to the 101 system were abandoned. That is 73%. The following day, on 9 August, we received in the region of 31,000 calls. Of these there were 119 calls to 999 which were abandoned, which is 1.2%, and 8,515 to 101 which were abandoned which is 39.6%. On an average day, so a normal day in London, about 1% of 999 calls will be abandoned and on 9 August the level was back to this normality and by 11 August, across every 999 and 101, we were back to what we would normally experience.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I appreciate it was unprecedented, what was going on, but it is what learning you have from this for the future that if there are such incidents going on, such huge things, how you resources this because obviously abandoned calls, particularly to 999, is worrying. When I was working home somebody was on the phone trying to report something going on in Camberwell, just near where Jenny [Jones] and I live, and they could not get through and they were getting very stressed by it. It is what extra resources or systems you need to put in place to be able to try to soak up those additional calls in the future.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): The Commissioner has made it absolutely clear that it is his strategy to provide a total service to victims and, clearly, any incidents when people try to contact us and they cannot it fails in that regard. As part of our review work for this we are examining the force mobilisation plan. In historic terms that has generally been about numbers of uniformed officers on the street. In the context of this learning we are also asking the question about how we better support some of the back office functions that have frontline contact such as dealing with 999 and other calls.

I think where we are ultimately going to get to in that review is making it do what it really says on the tin which is to be a true force mobilisation plan, rather than a subset of the organisation mobilisation plan. It may be that we are asking people to have some secondary skills for occasions when things like this occur.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): That is lovely. Thank you.

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

John Biggs (AM): I wanted to say something first and then I have a question. What I wanted to say was yesterday the Mayor's Office appeared to have made an allegation to a national newspaper that I was involved in handling stolen goods following the disturbances. This is a malicious allegation which I think has no foundation. It seemed to be issued immediately after I had raised a question which the Mayor and other people found unpleasant and unhelpful to him. I just thought I would say that because it would obviously bring in question my fitness to serve on this Authority and people should not make such allegations unless they have some foundation for them.

I had two written questions. I understand the point that Mr Hogan-Howe made about work in progress but I wanted us to be clear both from the MPS and the Police Authority about the timeline we are working to because the rest of the world, politicians in particular, have come up with all sorts of theories and explanations as to what has happened and we need to have an evidence based approach to understanding from our side which will help inform and to assert perhaps a better informed version of events. I do appreciate we need to be thorough but I would hope, for example, by the next Police Authority, we would have a clear statement where we could debate some of the issues.

I think also, for you as Chairman of the Police Authority, it might be helpful if you were to outline the work as an Authority we are carrying out to understand better from the Police Authority's side what we did, what we could have done and what we might learn in assistance to that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. We are all slightly foxed about your statement yesterday --

John Biggs (AM): So am I. I spent most of yesterday trying to respond to this allegation but it has not appeared. We will talk about it another time if necessary. I thought I should bring it to the Authority's attention because, if it is true, then obviously I should be helping Mr Hogan-Howe with his inquiries and not be here.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. It is like Agatha Christie. You also --

John Biggs (AM): For the record, it is not true.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): You also had a submitted question?

John Biggs (AM): Yes. There are two questions submitted in my name about the disturbances. I was being helpful on that question. The question is about what we have learned from the recent unrest. I realise we have not reached final conclusions on that but I would like to understand the process by which we are going to and whether we will have something at the next Authority. From you, Chairman, your understanding of what we will, as an Authority, do to get on top of this issue.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. All right. Thanks. We will do that.
Tony Arbour?

John Biggs (AM): I think, when people ask a question, they generally sort of quite like the idea of there being an answer, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Sorry, I am misunderstanding you. It might be that I am being a bit thick. I had assumed that what you were saying was that your question was going to be answered with the report that comes through because your question is a broad one about the lessons that need to be learned --

John Biggs (AM): No, no, no.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): -- and that there had been an indication earlier that that work was ongoing in terms of clarifying what those lessons were in the short, medium and long term.

John Biggs (AM): You have not got your listening head totally attached to your body today, Chairman. It was a question for Mr Hogan-Howe to clarify to the meeting that something would be available by the next Police Authority, and for you to clarify what you think, as an Authority, we will be able to usefully do on this matter.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): As I said, the 30 days was an opportunity for AC Owens and myself to sit down and work out what are the quick things - which I think is the point that John makes - and then we have an interim report by the end of November, which is a further six weeks on from that, with a final report by Christmas effectively. So whatever we have at whatever stage I am quite happy to share.

The only caveat - and I think you acknowledged this, John, in your first point, was that we want to present you with something that we can stand behind; not something we have to review and refresh. What is vital is that if there are things we need to do now we do them now and do not wait four months to implement them. I think both can happen in parallel but we will share and be transparent with whatever we have at the time we have it.

John Biggs (AM): I know you have trouble understanding questions, Chairman, but what work are you initiating, through the Authority, on this?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Our job is, effectively, we are a scrutiny body and there are a number of inquiries that will be ongoing into this, not least the Home Affairs Select Committee and there is obviously the internal inquiry too. I am conscious that the efforts involved in both - and there is significant effort going to be involved in both - means that it is not necessarily the sensible thing for us to reproduce much of that effort. I think what we need to do is to wait for the police to do its job and then have a look. That is fundamentally what we do.

I think there is a bit of work that we could do about what the Authority did or did not do during the period. Obviously there was an attempt to try to convene an Authority meeting shortly thereafter. We were unable to be quorate so that meeting did not happen. What utility that meeting would have had at the time I do not know. I think there is some work we could possibly do around community engagement and intelligence because I did not get a call from a single Authority Member saying, "Something's going to kick off" and I certainly did not get a call from any councils or local politicians about something kicking off so I am concerned around our intelligence antennae and what that might look

like. Fundamentally, I think the most important work is the work that the police will be doing.

John Biggs (AM): OK. My only supplementary to that then is to ask whether there is a question about the decision making and lines of decision making and the interplay between the Police Authority and the MPS and Downing Street and the Home Office. I think we all understand that it was a rapidly moving series of events and that people were expected to make statements and various people were not here. I think there are some lessons to be learned from that which would be useful if this Authority continued into the future but would be usefully learnable for the new arrangements as well, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I agree. OK. Tony [Arbour]?

Tony Arbour (AM): This relates to lessons learned and the first lesson learned chimes in with the new Commissioner's opening statement. He said that he wants a war on crime. It is quite clear that immediately after the riots there was such a war on crime and I would like to suggest to the Commissioner and to you that wars are best fought for forces and not by services. If he wants to, and indeed you want to, learn a lesson from what has happened we should behave like a force, which we have done, and maybe we should call ourselves a force. I would be very interested to know the new Commissioner's views on that particular point.

The second thing that I believe was learned which was a positive thing was that one of the things most likely to discourage crime and riotous behaviour and things of that kind was the belief amongst prospective rioters that they would be met by a large number of serving police officers whom they would only see if they were wearing uniform. Certainly on my patch in outer London every conceivable police officer who was entitled to wear a uniform, whether he or she be a special, a detective or a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) who is out on the streets. People saw them and they were deterred. In the light of that, ought it not be something that we have learned that it is policy that, where possible, police officers should be wearing uniform and, in particular, on their way to and from work?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is not actually the question that Tony submitted but ...!

Tony Arbour (AM): No, it is not but I thought that we were still dealing with lessons from the riot.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We are. You submitted one about riot training which we will perhaps come to in a minute. Do you want to just comment on that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): In terms of high visibility I agree with Tony the fact that obviously the more officers we can have out in uniform the better. I did see quite a few of the police support units that were detectives and it was

amazing to see that some of their uniform still fitted which was good to see! I think, broadly, that is a good idea.

I am a bit more careful about the to and from work. Not least one of the reasons is, for the MPS officers, some of them live substantial distances outside the Metropolitan Police. We have to think about that carefully and it is something that if we were going to do that I would want to discuss. Overall, the more officers we can get out in uniform the better it is. We saw some great things but when you have got 16,000 officers you can spread them round far better than when you have far fewer thousands which is the normal period. We saw some exceptional times and we saw some exceptional response but I think if you want to implement that all the time we ought to think about it carefully.

Tony Arbour (AM): So far as the submitted question is concerned which relates to the costs relating to training riot police, I have been told - and perhaps Lynne [Owens] could confirm this - that the contract which we have for training riot police is currently limited to a specific number of police officers and were we to wish to train any more we would have to pay substantially more than the current rate. Is that in fact so?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Yes.

Tony Arbour (AM): Are we going to renegotiate that because, given the plans that we have heard for increasing the number of serving officers who are riot trained, this is going to present us with a very considerable bill unless we do something about it?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): The piece of work that we are currently doing in the review is looking at how many public order officers we currently have. There are three levels to which public order officers are trained so all officers are trained up to level three, including specials. Another chunk of officers are trained at level two and another chunk are trained at level one against nationally agreed standards.

One of the things we are looking at as part of the review is whether those levels are the right levels and what numbers we should have at each level. Once you have drawn the conclusion from that, we will then go back into the contract to see whether we can deliver the required numbers against that contract. If we do not then we will have to come up with some different options that may involve using other forces or outsourcing but the first step in the process has got to be to define the capability and the capacity that we need. Once we have done that we will then decide how we are going to train it.

Tony Arbour (AM): A fortnight ago Tim Godwin said it would cost approximately £8 million to have the appropriate number of officers who are properly trained. Does the figure that he gave take into account what you have just said?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): The figure of £8 million is the basic cost of delivering the training for those officers so it presumes that it can be done within contract and it does not include any of the on costs such as

abstraction, which is an opportunity cost, but also the equipment that they would have to come with. We believe, if we were going to double the numbers under the current regime, it would be a significantly higher number than that now that we have done further work. That is why I say it is important first we define what the capability is that we need and then properly cost it.

Tony Arbour (AM): Do we believe that is to be a high priority? Perhaps that is a question really for you, Chairman. Is this a very high priority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. Obviously the Commissioner and I will have to discuss it but this all relates to a private finance initiative (PFI) scheme which was signed when the Authority was green and inexperienced back in the early part of the last decade around Gravesend which has been, I think it is fair to say, a bit of a running sore financially latterly and is enough to put anyone off PFI. I am pleased to say I have never signed a PFI scheme and never would. Nevertheless it is one we have inherited and we are struggling with. Subject to some of those constraints obviously we will have to have a discussion about prioritising it.

Tony Arbour (AM): Thank you, Chairman.

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

Jennette Arnold (AM): Chairman, thank you. I am a bit confused. Can I make a comment and a question to the Commissioner Designate before I raise my question about riots because he said something in his opening remarks?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Sure.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Let me start by welcoming Bernard [Hogan-Howe] back to the MPS and I am sure that you will be given every support in your role by those of us who represent Londoners.

You said that clearly you would not be working in the medium to long term with the Police Authority but you will know that the Assembly has that scrutiny role. Have you given any early thoughts about your relationship with the Assembly? Will we have to summons you and will we have to go and stand outside your office asking you to come or will you be a willing attender at scrutiny meetings of the Assembly?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Interestingly I was talking to Caroline [Pidgeon] before we started. I understand Joanne [McCartney] is carrying out a cross party piece of work which is how the Assembly is intending to manage its new responsibilities. I would be happy to work with that group to see how we can best meet the needs of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) and the GLA. What I do understand is that it is a complex arrangement and everybody will have to get used to a new set of arrangements.

I said at the beginning that we are here to be held to account and we will work with whatever governance arrangements are put in place. The only thing I ask is that we reduce any bureaucracy that might involve us as much as possible and what we do not want to do is get trapped between competing demands, but that is the nature of the job so no doubt we will. I am happy to make arrangements with whatever is possible.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I was due to sit down with you tomorrow. Unfortunately, due to a personal commitment elsewhere, I cannot, but that is going to be rescheduled and I think we will sit down and work through what is going on.

Jennette Arnold (AM): I welcome that statement in public because it is good that we will be having that open conversation and hopefully that ongoing relationship between your office and the Assembly because that will be so important within the new structures.

You heard me talk earlier to the Chairman about this ongoing case, one of the longest outstanding murders, and one of the worst I think. Will you agree to meet with me and Alastair Morgan and his family so that they can update you in your new role as Commissioner when you start formally because I think the family would appreciate that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): I will certainly consider it. My only slight hesitation - it is only a slight one - is that, in my Deputy role, for a short time, I have been running Operation Weeting and there is a link in that inquiry, as you obviously know, over to that case. I just want to make sure that I do not cause any problems so if you will allow me some time to work my way through that but, in principle ...

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Obviously previous meetings were held with John Yates as AC Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD) which is where the investigation sat and it might be that an initial meeting with Lynne [Owens] who has got responsibility for SCD might be more appropriate in the short term. I know the family are keen, given the changes, to get in as quickly as possible so that might be a sensible way forward.

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is based on that imperative so that the family get that sense of continuity. Can my office organise that on their behalf? I would really welcome that and they would as well. Thank you for that.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Jennette, just to reassure you and the family that I take that as a very serious matter for all the reasons you are aware of; it is a long running criminal inquiry that has not led to the murderer being convicted and all the other issues that go with it involving police corruption. It is vital that we get to the bottom of it. The fact that very senior people are getting involved in that liaison is very vital for me.

Jennette Arnold (AM): The family will be reassured and I am sure Alistair is watching on the webcast so we will work through that.

To the riots. As Members know and you will know, Commissioner, because we talked during that period, the boroughs I represent, three of them were heavily attacked by the criminals who were on our streets. I just wanted to say that is there a way that you can put some context to this because others and I believe, if we had not been involved in really positive strong partnership working and if we had not had particular operations that have been ongoing at least for a year previously, those three boroughs would be in a worse state. It was bad enough. I think that we must put that in because, unless you are involved with those three boroughs, you would not know. For instance, there was an area that was not touched at all which people were surprised about - Leyton - because of the Connect programme. That is a very targeted programme. It is a very expensive programme. It seems to me, the fact that the thing passed over them, suggests that something is happening there. I do want your assurance that the context is as important as the activity, otherwise we will miss a lot.

In addition to that, during that time what happened I think was a sea change in terms of the relationships that were made locally and the alliances that I saw formed and the activities were absolutely things that I dreamed of seeing happening. It was elders, the church, you, everybody working together, the police working together, Welsh police, everybody working together. Can you assure me that proper thanks will be given locally - it will take a while - so that people will be gathered locally and thanked for that and that you will be able to give the boroughs the support so that they can capture all of that support and then build that in to the community cohesion programmes that they have at the moment? It is so important. If that is not recognised, acknowledged and given support then that is going to be lost and we will not have the base, should this happen again.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): One of the things that I think London should be really proud of post these events is how communities and partners have come together to rebuild. When you look at events that have happened in European cities, days and days and days of rioting and then a long while to rebuild cities, many, many people injured, vast swathes of town centres shut down for long periods of time, that is not what we saw here and that is great credit to London and its people. We are very, very grateful for the support that our staff have had, many of whom have worked unbelievably long hours. So, absolutely, Jennette, we are grateful and will continue that support.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Two other points. Kirsten [Hearn] has raised the equality impact assessment (EIA). It would be good see that but also any reports that you produce. Can we absolutely have the black and minority ethnic (BME) profile in that because we have got to hit on the head this myth that this was BME led or that the BME community was disproportionately represented within the activities? That does not seem to be, from my experience, the case. Similarly that is the profile around young people. They were vilified and are still vilified yet we know it was adults that were really at the heart of this. Will you include that sort of data because I do think it important?

The other thing is transport which we have not heard a lot of. I would like a set piece in your report about transport. It feels to me that, in some areas, it was a bit slow. The Victoria line where people were carrying away the product of their looting. I do not know how quickly they responded from their CCTV. Couldn't more buses have been stopped from coming into centres, especially around the Hackney centre, the night bus services and stuff like that? It was then I think we should have an explanation about that.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Just in terms of the analysis and the data, we are collecting it on a daily basis, we are analysing it on a weekly basis and I have asked, personally, for monthly reports. The reality is it changes every day because we arrest more people every day based on their criminality. I am very happy to give you some figures now in terms of those questions that you have just asked. As of 12 September - so, as I say, it changes on a daily basis - we had arrested 2,555 people of which 1,470 had resulted in charges.

In terms of ethnicity 33% of those arrested were white, 56% of those arrested were black, 8% of those arrested were Asian and 3% were from other backgrounds. In terms of age group 4% were 14 and under, 37% are in the age group 15 to 19, 30% in the 20 to 24 age group, 13% in the 25 to 29 age group, 7% in the 30 to 34 age group and 9% 35 plus.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you. The transport piece you will pick up?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Finally on this, James [Cleverly], you had a question about surge capacity.

James Cleverly (AM): Yes, thank you, Chairman. Hopefully you have the written submission but it is just to ensure that, of the full capacity of the MPS, one of the reasons against more civilianisation is the requirement to have officers available in response to this. What plans are in place to ensure that all warranted officers are able to be deployed in response to public order incidents like this?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): Currently - and this data needs more clarification - we do have around 500 people in non-operational roles currently who are able to be brought forward who are public order trained for these sorts of incidents. As I said earlier, our review is looking at what a force mobilisation should look like so those who can put on uniforms be public order trained and go on the front line but also those who back fill very vital jobs - whether that be running the control room for these events and special operations room or whether it is back filling the telephones or doing any other vital work the MPS needs to follow.

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you. The reason behind this is that, speaking to borough commanders particularly in suburban London, one of the concerns was that when the disorder broke out their officers were abstracted - which, understandably was the case - but that then denuded them of the mobility to respond to admittedly significantly smaller

pockets of disorder but, nonetheless, still significant and concerning. Whereas all police leave was cancelled he had people coming in off leave unable to then proactively be involved. The logic would be, if we could keep more borough officers on borough and then back fill that additional requirement from non-geographically specific warranted officers, then that would actually enable us to have that more complete picture across London in terms of response capability.

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): I completely agree with that analysis.

James Cleverly (AM): Happy with that. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Is there anything else that anybody wants to ask on the riots? Cindy [Butts]?

Cindy Butts (AM): Chairman, I thought that you should have, just before we started this discussion, made an acknowledgement that Members around this table had an opportunity to meet with officers and talk to them about the riots because we had two emergency briefings. That might be good for the public to understand; this is the first time we as an Authority are talking about these issues. I think that is really important that we say that. Therefore a lot of us have obviously had an opportunity to make comments, ask questions and to actually inform the important review that the MPS is carrying out. I think that is really important to say.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Yes. Deficient as always.

Cindy Butts (AM): Two things from me. Firstly, something you said in response to John Biggs' question which was around what lessons could be learned particularly from an Authority's perspective - or should we say a scrutiny governance perspective given that the MPA is soon to go. You mentioned that maybe there is an important issue around community engagement and the fact that not one Authority Member or politician had called you up to say that they thought that trouble was brewing. For me that shows a really poor understanding of some of the issues that the organisation is facing. I think you should be more concerned that something close to 44,000 staff that are in the MPS did not pick up that important community intelligence that trouble was going to happen to happen. I think that would be a very important area for you, moving forward, to examine around community intelligence. How was it sought? When it was there what was done with it? How was it analysed and examined and, more importantly, acted upon?

The only other point I wanted to make was in your opening statement you quite rightly recognised the very positive things that could come out of the riots and I would like to support you and endorse you in wanting to see those positive things emerge, particularly this ground swell of individuals and communities who see a place for themselves in helping the police service to deliver a safer London. You should also be acknowledging - and I would like to hear what you have got to say about - those communities who feel incredibly let down - rightly or wrongly, whether it is due to perception or not - by the

police service and their lack of actions during the riots. I think it is important to recognise that there are those who feel let down and there will be a need to restore trust and confidence in particular communities, not least young people, if we see them as a community, and of course the black and minority ethnic community as well. Just a reassurance that you will see the importance of that as an issue.

In a sense I would like you to cast your mind back to three meetings ago when, through the tears and the snot, I represented my frustrations about what I see as the MPS losing the important lessons that it learned in the past and I think it is really important that the organisation understands that it cannot afford to disengage from particular members of communities. Lessons were learned in the past and I get the sense that there is this complacency developing where the organisation does not really see the importance of engaging with disaffected and isolated communities unless it is forced to do so. I think it is a real danger if the organisation only engages with particular communities at a time of extremes; it has to be ongoing, it has to be constant and it has to be daily.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): On that specific point my concern is not that the MPS has just given up on all of this but that it has become complacent.

Cindy Butts (AM): That is the word I used; complacency.

Toby Harris (AM): Your gloss was slightly different from the gloss I am about to put on it! I think that one of the difficulties is, because the MPS has now set up various engagement processes, it feels that that is the end of the picture. My worry is that those constantly need to be refreshed but also the easy thing to do is to lapse into engagement with people with whom it is comfortable to engage, rather than those who are necessarily challenging. It is important for very senior officers to be seen meeting communities, even if that means they perhaps have an uncomfortable hour or two in terms of the nature of the challenge. It is part of that process of being seen to reach out and never feeling that you have got it right because you have got various groups in place because I think groups fossilise and people who regard themselves as representative may no longer be representative after just a few months.

Cindy Butts (AM): I said the same thing.

Toby Harris (AM): Just slightly differently.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): To respond to that. There are two things to me. One thing I would reflect is, for the MPS or any police service, we have to check on our representation, making sure it is senior enough and people are keeping to that commitment that they have given to lead, whether it be boroughs or other parts of the organisation. The second part is representation from the community and making sure we are talking to the people. It is difficult to say the right people. How do we define right? If we are not talking about democratically elected people, how you

identify the right point of contact can be quite hard at times. What you have to always have is the ambition to keep trying and not, as both of you said, be too comfortable with the arrangements you have. What I cannot say is whether that contributed to this but it is one of the things that we want to know; whether the people we talked to represented a good account of what people are feeling in, for example, the Tottenham area, or not. That would also apply to different parts of London. It is a good opportunity to pause and make sure that the things that we think are happening are happening in the way that they started many years ago.

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

Clive Lawton (AM): First of all I want to associate myself with Cindy's comments about people feeling let down. While I fully share your view that many people feel very good about how the police performed eventually, in the first instance not only the black community and youth but also quite a lot of shopkeepers and property owners were shocked and still do not fully understand - kind of get it but don't get it - as to why the police seemed to stand back and let their shops go up in smoke, or their flats or whatever. I think there is a whole lot of stuff about police tactics and practicalities and realities which are not widely understood. This is just in conversation with folk. I think it is a shame because I think the police have a decent story to tell on this and it is not being told as effectively as it might.

I think it is well known that I am very interested in the issues of community engagement. A deep frustration that I am not going to be associated with these matters going forward as I think this really has exposed this area. It is a critically important area. There is still a huge tradition of thinking that engagement is about an opportunity to talk to or, in another term, tell, rather than listen. There are a very, very small number of police officers who are good at listening as far as I can see. This is a real weakness in the business of engagement and I think it has been exposed in this context in one way or another.

The particular question though that I wanted to ask relates - I have been interested by the manner in which politicians and pundits leapt very quickly to judgement as to what was really going on and wanted to blame the gangs and the youth and the families and the so on and so forth. I am very pleased at Lynne's [Owens], "Wait. We need to find this out" stuff.

One thing I was not surprised about and yet all these politicians and pundits seemed to be was that a high proportion of the people that had been arrested for disorder and criminal damage and so forth have records. Pretty obvious! What I speculated on privately was that this could lead to a reduction in the crime rate because if you swept up 1,000 plus folk who are commonly engaged in crime, the first people who go out and do crimes given half an opportunity, that might reduce crime in the long run.

I noticed in paragraph 13 of the report - sorry to refer to the report - that it says that masses had resumed after the disorder. Since 15 August we have seen lower levels in personal robbery, violence with injury, serious youth crime, knife crime, knife robbery

and residential burglary which is a continuation of the slight downward trend we had seen prior to the disorder. What I wonder is, is it simply a continuation of that and it just continues that line, or is there a dip and is there something significant happening here? That then must, if it is, set a very obvious agenda to what happens soon hereafter when these people re-emerge from whatever constraints have been put upon them.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Possibly there are two responses to that. The first one is, as we have already said, there is a huge amount of work to do looking at all the images of people committing crime. The first group of people who were arrested were the ones who committed the most serious offences; someone being attacked, a fire being set, the obvious things that people would expect us to prioritise. Those have been the ones who have been identified. That was the easy part. You found someone committing a serious crime and then you try to identify them.

There is a parallel piece of work going on which is now kicking in at a higher speed which is identifying people we know who are frequent offenders and then trying to see whether they are members of the crowd who were committing the offences. If you bear in mind what happened you tend to look at a set of images and then you try to identify that person. We are trying to do it in reverse by saying it is likely this person may have been involved, let's see whether or not they were there. We are trying to find them there. We are not trying to do anything else; just to try to identify them at the scene.

That is more likely to lead to a longer term benefit; the frequent offender who is caught, put before a court and receives the appropriate sanction. There is a potential for some longer term benefit but I do not suppose anybody wanted this to happen to achieve it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Right. Thanks for that. Members, we will move on to other subjects now if that is all right. We are going to move on to legal advice with contracts and related and we will begin with Baroness Doocey if we may. Would you like to read your question for the camera?

Dee Doocey (AM): In March this year I requested details of the amounts that the MPS/MPA have spent on external legal advice relating to defamation actions involving the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and non-ACPO rank officers this year and in each of the last five financial years. The response from the MPS was that £1,175 had been paid in March 2011 in relation to ACPO officers. Can you please confirm that this is the only expenditure incurred by the MPS/MPA in the last five years on external legal advice relating to defamation actions and whether there has been any further expenditure incurred since March 2011?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): OK. Chairman. All applications for financial support in legal proceedings are approved by the MPA. Police authorities are able to authorise this support if officers have acted in the course of their duties, have acted in good faith and exercised their judgement reasonably.

Apparently, in terms of question one, £1,175 was paid in March 2011. Then, in terms of question two, £6,000 was further paid in April 2011. That is only in terms of ACPO officers. In terms of non-ACPO officers there were no payments.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Can I just add something to that? I have today written to the Chairman of the Home Affairs Select Committee because, when I appeared in front of them a couple of weeks ago, I was asked this question and gave the answer that we had authorised expenditure on a particular matter up to I think £1,500. It appears that that cap was not adhered to and that has resulted in further payments in the following financial year. I have asked for an urgent inquiry as to why my decision to cap that expenditure was not adhered to; who, why, where, what and how we can prevent that happening in the future. That is why expenditure has risen above the £1,500. As I say, I have written to Keith Vaz to clarify that this morning.

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you. My next question is MPA gifts and hospitality. This has basically been overtaken by events. The website version of the MPS is not up to date. Why has no progress been made? Instead of that can I ad lib and say that I am very pleased to see that, at last, we have got a proper system up and running. As you know I originally raised this in February and it has been very difficult. It was, at times, like pulling teeth.

There are a couple of things that I really want as a result of this that I would like to talk to you about. I was absolutely delighted that the Commissioner said about resetting of the boundaries about gifts and hospitality. This is music I am sure to all of our ears but last February, when I originally raised this, the MPS defended the fact that senior officers were accepting hospitality from organisations who they were investigating. Can I just clarify, is that still the MPS's view or has that changed?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): My view is very clear; you do not accept hospitality from people whom you are investigating. The only caveat I would put on that - and this not trying to be conditional about my comment I have just made - is that when you are talking about very big organisations - and sometimes, frankly, even Governments - the police need to maintain a relationship across Governments with local authorities and with many people who, from time to time, either are complainants or, alternatively, suspects. The challenge is trying to make sure that you can carry on the normal meaning of life whilst still dealing with some very complex organisations that underpin the whole of society. I am not trying to run away from my first point, I stick with it but I think, sometimes, you just have to realise that, certainly in somewhere the size of the MPS, there is a risk of overlap. I am not going to run away from the first point I made.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is also worth saying that we have discussed - Bernard, just to confirm - the qualitative difference between having a relationship with somebody say in the media where you need to understand each other's context and that

being done in the context of a business meeting at the Yard over a cup of coffee as opposed to in a hospitality environment. Both can achieve the same objective but the one might be more appropriate.

It is also worth saying, just so Members know, that I was interviewed by the HMIC integrity review that Sir Denis O'Connor [Chief Inspector of Constabulary] is conducting yesterday, which is looking at exactly these issues. They asked the question what kind of product did I think should come out of that review? As some of the rest of you might be being interviewed by them as well my view was there should be a fairly rigid code of conduct that comes out that is appropriate for the special and different status of being a police officer as opposed to being a businessman or a politician or whatever may occur. They would be doing that work, I think, in quite fast time, up to Christmas, and producing a report and we will see what the product of that is going to be.

Dee Doocey (AM): That is very helpful. I do not think anybody would suggest the police should not communicate with the press. Of course they have to. There are times the press can be really, really helpful. There is a difference - and I absolutely think you have hit the nail on the head, Chairman - between a business meeting which presumably is minuted and there are minutes available. Life is about perception a lot of the time, rather than reality. If something is called into question it is covering the MPS' back to say, "Here are the minutes" and that is fine. I have no problem with that at all.

Could you just clarify one other thing? Given that the MPS has got private dining facilities for senior officers. Are you also going to have a similar system so that anybody who is wined and dined in the MPS we will also know about? It would be regrettable - I am sure it is not your intention - if we just had the other side of the coin so, instead of the MPS being wined and dined, the MPS is wining and dining the same people. That is what I am trying to avoid.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Lynne [Owens] may correct me here but that should be part of the same policy. I see no distinction where it is provided; it is who has provided it and for what purpose. I presume that would be included.

Dee Doocey (AM): I do not think it is included at the moment.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Really?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): The provision of corporate hospitality is covered.

Dee Doocey (AM): It is covered?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): It is covered but I think, from the exercise that we have just undertaken in terms of publishing the information over the last three years, different parts of the organisation are interpreting the policy in slightly

different ways and there is an inconsistency. The review of the policy will be making sure that there is consistency of message and that we have consistency of reporting.

Dee Doocey (AM): Good. In future we would have a system. I understand that it is based on the GLA system so anything over £25 is now declared. In future I think it would be helpful if it could say where the hospitality took place and who was hosting the hospitality. If you are hosting, whatever, the London Assembly - I cannot imagine that you would but if you were - it would actually say, or if the London Assembly was hosting you it would equally say.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Presumably it would possibly be easier for us to provide a register of dinners held at the Yard and who was in attendance rather than relying on particular officers to remember to register it.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Unless the system has changed there is a register that everyone signs when they go in which has been there for years. It is not IT friendly but the information is there as to who was there.

Dee Doocey (AM): If we could have that also for the last three years so that we have got the same system up and running at the beginning that would be very helpful. Thank you very much.

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

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My first question is contracts awarded by Dick Fedorcio. Can you please let me have details for the last five years of all contracts personally approved by Dick Fedorcio, the Director of Public Affairs and Internal Communication of the MPS with a value of over £5,000? I do not know if this is going to be a huge list or just a short one.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): The advice I have, Caroline, is it is just difficult to give you the information now but we will provide it as soon as we have it. As Members are aware a significant programme of work has been implemented and continues to improve compliance and value for money in respect of the MPS' procurement activity. That recently included an Authority paper that mandated the use of the CompeteFor contracts between £500 and £50,000. It is, however, difficult to extract information on a historical basis. We are having some difficulty at the moment apparently answering your question. All contracts over £50,000 are dealt with by the procurement service in liaison with the relevant sponsoring directorate and procurement with a value of less than £50,000 is dealt with by the relevant business group. It is stored in separate places which is causing, I think, some of the problem.

I am informed that, over the past five years, the Director of Public Affairs and Internal Communication was personally involved in the sourcing of two local projects which were awarded to **Chami(?)** Media Limited and Alternative Genius. I will ask my officers to

contact you to see whether there is further information you require about either of those contracts.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): It would be useful to have that in writing. Given recent allegations and given you are saying it is very complex to try to get the information I have asked for, is there anyone within your team actually reviewing all of the contracts within that particular area and possibly referring them to audit for further investigation?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): My understanding is that there is already an audit being carried out but I am afraid I am not in the position to give you full details now. I am quite happy to provide those to the Authority.

Toby Harris (AM): I think the internal audit service has been doing a review. Not sparked by this particular instance but by another issue about what had grown from a series of small little contracts to something which amounted to a substantial sum in relation to somebody who did have a relationship with a member of staff. So there has been some general review on those small contracts and the extent to which they add up and things like that. That work is ongoing.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): OK. I wonder whether it might be something to consider; making sure that we review these contracts given recent allegations.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): Chairman, I was going to say some Members will be aware part of the programme of work that has taken place, which is the more general programme of work, was starting to look at the level of spend locally because when you start aggregating it a lot of it should be done by corporate contracts above the £50,000 limit which should be dealt with by procurement services. A lot of those contracts and a lot of that activity over the last 12 months is we have been going through all of that to identify where we should have corporate contracts (inaudible) Sponsoring Directorate to work with procurement services to take that forward. I think the issue that Toby has just raised is wider than BPA and that work has been going on. We will be engaging the Authority's internal audit function on that.

As part of the work that I think the Resources and Productivity Sub-Committee of the Authority has been doing it did ask us which contracts we had in place that were media based and we were doing a bit of work for that Committee in identifying those contracts.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I appreciate the work that is going on that Toby has mentioned. I am sure that will come back to corporate governance. I am asking will you be reviewing - clearly it has not happened yet - all of the contracts as I have highlighted, given the recent allegations? It is a yes or no answer.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): The answer is yes.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Thank you. Victoria [Borwick], your screening question?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you. Briefly just to take us back to Dee's [Doocey] question, in view of what you have just explained to us about a change in the amount of money that was then spent even if not fully authorised by you, will we be able to have, perhaps, a copy of that letter circulated, just to clarify? We have all seen the media reports and there seems to be a bit of uncertainty as to exactly what happened.

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

Victoria Borwick (AM): That would be helpful I think for all of us. Thank you. Just to go back to my screening question for the sake of reading it out, this is about screening out cases and I particularly wanted to draw reference to the ones that show in the last 12 months 72.9% of theft or handling cases and 25.9% of burglary cases are still being screened out. Particularly in view of what you said at the beginning where these recently, regrettably, have been on the increase and cause impact as far as the victim is concerned, perhaps you could give us a bit more information about that and whether that will change under you.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): OK. First of all I will give you the answer we have got here which is in terms of the screening out you mentioned the 72% and one particular group. Overall, since 2005/06 to 2010/11, the percentage screened out has dropped. It has gone from, I think, 56% down to 41%. Overall it is coming down but there are areas where it is still high.

I can give you a long list of why there is a rational reason you would do it. If you do not have someone to investigate; sometimes the victim does not want it. There are many reasons why you do screen out and it is something that the service has got involved in in the past.

I will give you my own view which is that I do not agree with it. There is a practical problem which is there are 800,000 victims of crime in London each year. It is a large number. Of course if you divide it by 30,000 it adds up to about 30 a year which is less than one a week per officer and of course not all officers are just doing that. It relates to probably about a third of their work. That leads me to a point which is that I would prefer to be victim-led than I would be to have a very clear policy.

It was certainly something we did in Merseyside. I hesitate before I promise it here because London is different I realise. If the victim wanted it then we would go. Actually it did not lead to any different screening out but it did lead to a different spirit which was the police responding to victims' needs and not to what we believed was the professional response to a particular problem.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I think you are right; it is to do with sustaining confidence in policing. I think you are quite right; there are some times when obviously it is not

appropriate or you are not able to continue but I think a new spirit of continuing to rebuild confidence in the police that they do care, even if it does not seem to be much in the major scheme of things, I think is very important.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): I did not quite make the promise but I want to discuss with colleagues what I have just explained to you. Certainly my experience is that if you make the offer it is well received, but not all victims will actually say, "Therefore I want you to do this. I want you to come." There are many times when people do want to just register it and then that is the end of it. I would prefer to respect their needs, rather than just to be too objective about it.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I can also add, with the benefit of being a counsellor, that I know I have a particular resident, again, who is entirely different to these particular burglaries but feels that, again, the police have not been responsive. I think it is a case of the way we note it, the form with which we note it - and I mean that in the general sense of the word - and the fact that we give confidence that it is open should you wish to come back and not disregard it just because, to us, it does not seem to be a major crime, it is a crime to that person and people look to have confidence in the police in reassuring them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Leaving it just to victim support is not always the best way.

Victoria Borwick (AM): No, I think you are absolutely right.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Jenny [Jones]? Gang intervention road safety questions please.

Jenny Jones (AM): Are you concerned about the potential loss of local authority funding for gang intervention work that runs alongside Operation Connect in Waltham Forest?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): First of all my position would be I think the Connect work that has been carried out in Waltham Forest is a good approach. I think it has built us some best practice internationally and also within this country. It broadly has two elements; a carrot and a stick. It is essential that you get partnership work to carry that out because the police cannot always provide the carrot. I know that, equally, at the moment, there are an awful lot of challenges for all public services in meeting their needs. I understand why people have to prioritise.

All we need to see is that all partners, particularly the police, continue to prioritise this gang work and I will be bringing forward, over the next few weeks and months, how I think the police can continue to spread that Connect work and how it can develop it across more than one borough over a much shorter period of time because I think it is the right thing to do but also, in terms of the disorder you saw, I think it is absolutely the highest priority to make sure that we are addressing the gangs issue within London.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am afraid I cannot remember the woman's name who led on the work up in Glasgow --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Karen McCluskey.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. She said that she found the MPS lukewarm when she approached them about doing this which is why - that is what she said on --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That's odd because she was on secondment here for two years.

Jenny Jones (AM): Lukewarm was the phrase that she used.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Right.

Jenny Jones (AM): I think perhaps the pilot in Waltham Forest was considered so small. Do you feel you might take it forward more robustly?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): Yes, in short. I think what has been happening, understandably, is that people wanted to test some of the ideas that had been seen in Strathclyde. We did similar things in Merseyside and in America they have tried a similar type of approach. I think the idea was to implement it in a London environment and then, incrementally, to spread it across the city. For me, you can pilot things to death can't you, or you can get on with things. For me, I think the evidence is fairly clear it works. If we can find the resources then we can get on with it. I do not want to give a promise today about how many boroughs and by when. That is why I said, within a matter of weeks, we can come back with that promise. We will also identify the leader within the organisation who is going to get on with it and then give us all reassurance that that work is going to get a high priority.

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

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Just before your second question, Jenny, Joanne [McCartney] wants to ask about this?

Joanne McCartney (AM): On the back of that I have got a plea really. In paragraph 12 of your report you say that further boroughs have been identified to roll out further. Let me make a plea for Enfield here. We have quite clearly got gang issues in Enfield and we have had two recent murders of young men. You mentioned Leroy James earlier. There was also the appalling death of Stephen Grisales. I know the investigations are ongoing and we cannot say whether they are gang related or not yet, or what the connections may be, but there is a great deal of partnership working already in Enfield that is very good and the extra resources that Operation Connect can bring all partners think would have a real immediate impact. That is my plea really; when you look at further boroughs that Enfield is looked at as a priority. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): All right. Jennette [Arnold], you are going to ask a question at the end so you can perhaps tack in on then. I am conscious of time. I have had a number of Members indicate to me that our two hours, our official time, is up so I am going to try to keep things moving on if we can - quite snappy. Jenny, your second question about road safety.

Jenny Jones (AM): This is about road safety and, Commissioner, I know you have got form in this area which I am very glad to hear about!

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): That is usually a negative thing!

Jenny Jones (AM): Not always. Have the reductions in the road safety budget and officer staff numbers had an operational impact? For example, are there fewer automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) operations in 2010 than in previous years?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): In short, there has been a reduction but that will change. I cannot give you details today except that I did meet a really good inspector in the MPS who has been doing some really good things around ANPR and I think Lynne [Owens] is meeting him next week.

I would like to bring you back a better plan around ANPR. I want to say two things. I think ANPR is a great thing that can achieve some incredible things. It keeps criminals off the road. Certainly one success we did have in Merseyside was to take a large number of vehicles. I think in Merseyside they are still taking 1,000 vehicles a month off the road and in London it is about 2,500. If you bear in mind that Merseyside has 12% of the resources of the MPS the proportions seem odd. I think we have to magnify that hugely.

There are two indirect benefits. 80% of the people who have their cars taken are criminals. We are not talking here about good people who forget to put their tax on the window because they only get the car back if they put the tax on the window. We are talking here generally about criminals. It reduces their mobility. The indirect benefits are that what we see is that people who are criminals who drive are five times more likely to have an accident and therefore to cause more damage.

It is really vital for me that we use this great opportunity that the Government gave us to take people off the road who are not bothered about insuring, having a licence or having tax. The details of that we will publish shortly. It is a great opportunity, I think, to carry things out that the people of London will notice.

Jenny Jones (AM): Bernard, that is music to my ears because the fact is a few years back, I think it was in 2008, there were a million activations of safety cameras, so people were speeding a million times. Of that we managed to get 90,000 to pay their fines. That was in 2008 itself. The ambition of the MPS at the moment is getting 65,000. There are the same number of cameras. I doubt there are many fewer speeding offences. It seems

to me that the MPS has dropped its target by a third in three years which is very worrying because, as you say, we are allowing criminals the use of the roads when we can catch them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. The Commissioner is obviously going to bring a plan forward so we will look forward to that.

Jenny Jones (AM): Brilliant. Even if we do not have a Police Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): We have got Graham [Speed] and then James [Cleverly] on metal theft and then Jennette [Arnold] finally please, and I do need Members' cooperation if they are concerned about time.

Jenny Jones (AM): Who is concerned about time?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): I have had a number of Members signal that they are concerned about time.

Jenny Jones (AM): Who?

Valerie Brasse (AM): I am going to put my hand up please. There are other issues on report that I would like to raise.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Graham?

Graham Speed (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I would like to start talking about music to our collective ears. I would certainly support a drive towards increasing the number of untaxed, uninsured and unroadworthy vehicles from the road. I think we would all be keen to see that and support the expansion of Operation Reclaim.

Less good to the ears are my concerns around the Stolen Vehicle Unit which is a small but highly specialised and productive unit which has been in existence, as I understand it, for something over 50 years. There are two parts to the question. Could you please comment on the proposal to close the Stolen Vehicle Unit following the loss of its proactive team? The follow up to that is, as an alternative to closure, given the high levels of sophistication of organised motor vehicle crime, some of which we have been hearing about earlier and is referred to in the report in terms of numbers and the unrivalled technical expertise and national, if not international, reputation of the unit, would you agree to review this decision, possibly with a view to repositioning the team somewhere within the service and could you further develop and encourage its valuable partnership work with the motor vehicle and insurance industry?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): I will take the response to this one. Graham, you and I have had discussions outside of here and now I have two heads with my Central Operations and my Specialist Crime head I have been able to understand the background a bit more. The Stolen Vehicle Unit has got two

parts. It has got a part that liaises with vehicle manufacturers and the insurance industry and development of crime prevention measures and then it has got a separate part - which I think is the bit you are focusing on - which is the proactive team.

Of course you know we are under significant budget pressures at the moment. One of the questions that has been asked with SCD is what that smaller element, the proactive team, as a stand alone contributes, but it is not considered in the whole of the MPS' tasking process. There have been absolutely no decisions made yet. I know that Members within that team are speaking proactively to people about what their future may be but no decisions have been made and I am awaiting a business case and then I will take the view about where I think it should or should not sit within the MPS business.

I completely concur that we have seen a rise in vehicle crime - actually not in this year but we did see a rise last year - and so making sure we retain proactivity against organised criminals involved in vehicles is important. I think what is less important is the structure we do that through, but I will come back to you, Graham, with a reassurance about what the future will look like.

Graham Speed (AM): Chairman, I think that is helpful. My own view is that you are not really going to survive with one part of the small group without the other, but I think it would be helpful if Members - I know we have a number of things on the lunchtime agenda but I think this part of the organisation has a relatively low profile and it might be helpful for future discussion if we were to have the opportunity of a lunchtime briefing by the team as to what exactly they do do, in parallel to the discussions that are going on with Lynne and with SCD. I think it would be good if we could endeavour to fit that in to the lunchtime programme. I think it would be helpful as part of the wider understanding.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. We will do that. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate that this we are running on so I am quite happy to get a written response to this one to speed up proceedings.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): That is very kind. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): My question I do not want rushed. Deaths in police custody or involving the police. It is just too important. I will take the responses in writing to the question.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Not least because I think there was a bit of a misunderstanding about your question.

Jennette Arnold (AM): No, it is because it is wider isn't it? It is about deaths involving the police.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): In contact with the police, rather than in custody.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Contact with the police would give us more numbers. It is important for members of the community that I represent.

Can I just say we have talked a lot about Connect here this morning. I would just caution and say, before we go any further and talk about rolling out Connect, can we just look at the cost and the funding package that underpin Connect. You are nodding. You will know that it is not a cheap initiative and it will be so wrong to talk about rolling out something that you know the cost of it and then it is watered down and then it does not work. As Jenny [Jones] says, the MPS has form on this, so much of it, where we just roll things out without the proper underpinning. If we are going to be serious about this we have to look at the resource because I do know that there are issues to do with the possible continuity of it in Waltham Forest because of the cost because the borough cannot maintain the cost of this programme alone. I do not think any borough can. I do not know if the Home Office or any funding --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): They have had some money from us too in support of it.

Jennette Arnold (AM): I welcome to be corrected but I believe they are still waiting for promised funds from whatever pot Iain Duncan Smith [Secretary of State for Work and Pensions] and the Home Office were committed to. I do think we need to look at the full cost of this.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Valerie [Brasse]?

Victoria Brasse (AM): Thank you. I just wanted to raise the question of rape sanctions. It would be remiss of us I think not in this forum to have raised what is a very disappointing performance. I know it had some airing at last week's Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP). On the other hand we have you here, as Commissioner Designate, and we have got Lynne here. It would be really very helpful to get your take on this. My understanding is a 28% drop in the number of sanction detections over a comparable period. I think the sanction detection rate now is down to 10% across London with at least 13 of the SCD team units coming in at less than 10%. That probably is the worst performance in the MPS in this area for a number of years.

Really what are you going to do about it? I know the paper will come back. I would like to hear where this is on your priority list and a timeline for dealing with it and what it means for resourcing. My concern is probably the figures are going to get worse before they get better because I do not know what abstraction there was, for example, in Operation **Willow**(?), taking people out of SCD to help move on the fall out from the riots. Whether, in fact, these figures are going to get worse even before it gets better.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): The first thing in terms of priorities is I have already realised it is a priority. As the Acting Deputy I chaired the Performance Board and each time we meet they want us to prioritise the thing that

seemed the most serious at that time and one of the two things out of the first meeting was around rape and the detection rate so at the second meeting I had a report back about what is the problem.

In public I will not want to go into too much detail at this stage but we are going to work with our criminal justice partners to find out if there is a backlog of offences which could be prosecuted but remain we are waiting a decision. That accounts for some of the lack of detections, but not all. There are some things from (inaudible) where I was which I want to see some more clarity about our policy around forensics and about how we check the DNA database. Also how we link serial rapes. There are a significant number of things on the investigative side compared to the criminal justice side that we need to work on.

Certainly as it has now landed in the Commissioner's role I will be treating it as a priority because it is important; the number of rapes and the number of people who are prosecuted and it is detected. It is vital. I do not know if Lynne [Owens] wanted to add anything to that?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): We spoke outside. In terms of SCD performance across the board at the moment clearly the highest priority from my perspective I have, despite having been a little busy with disorder over the summer, is I had the opportunity to meet with both Simon Foy [Head of Homicide and Serious Crime Command, Operation Sapphire and the Child Abuse Investigation Command] and Caroline Bates [OCU Commander SCD2 Sapphire] who recognised the focus that we will be wanting to put on this. It is as a consequence of that discussion and some of the other things that that meeting identified that we are meeting with the business partners.

Victoria Brasse (AM): Abstraction to deal with Operation Willow(?)?

Lynne Owens (Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations, MPS): I have asked for a review of the abstraction across SCD. I did not bring the numbers with me to this meeting because I was not expecting the question. Suffice to say by far the biggest abstraction was from SCD1 and there are no officers currently seconded from SCD2 to the inquiry.

Victoria Brasse (AM): I look forward to the discussion at the next SOP.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Kirsten [Hearn]?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): Yes. In relation to the comments you made at the beginning, Commissioner, about your approach to policing in London, the Equality and Human Rights' Commission launched its disability harassment inquiry on Monday called Hidden in Plain View and the overwhelming comments made by people and the overall findings made in that inquiry were that all agencies ignore what disabled people say about their

experience with the police and that it begins with the low level name calling and all those kinds of things, they are ignored and, in the end, they lead to rape, torture and murder.

What I want to know is how will your total policing, your victim approach, actually deal with the fact that your officers quite often do not listen to what disabled victims are saying about their experiences and how will you improve that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): There are two things. It touches a little on what Clive [Lawton] was saying earlier; obviously you need to listen to what people are saying. That is a training issue as well as a cultural issue.

The second thing for me is that if you actually get to meet victims then you have got a far better chance of hearing what they are going to say than if you choose not to attend a scene or you choose not to have a meeting with a victim. Whether it be anti-social behaviour - all the work that the inspectorate did over the last year showed that the police deal better with anti-social behaviour when they attend the scene, rather than screen out (inaudible) better and I would say that, on the whole, applies to all crime. For two reasons; you are able to assess the situation and you are able to hear what the victim is going to say and presumably you best then tailor your service to their needs.

For me two things are vital; getting the right culture and the right training is important and we need to give officers the best opportunity to have that conversation which is usually by attending the scene for me. That, for me, would be the link to the total policing.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK. Steve Trotter(?), on behalf of ACPO, has actually accepted the findings and report. When will you be able to do that on behalf of the MPS?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): I will certainly consider it as soon as we can it. I have not seen it, myself, but I am certainly happy to receive it.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): OK.

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

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, this may be a minor technicality but I think it is important. There is probably nothing that has more inconvenienced or bothered Londoners in the last couple of weeks than the train disruptions as a result of the cable theft. I know that James [Cleverly] had a question tabled and, out of consideration to the meeting, accepted that he would receive a written answer. It seems to me important for the public record that this is an issue receiving our attention and that a question has been asked in relation to this and we are seeking to know what is happening about it. I think that should be formally recorded because James has not publicly named what his questions were.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Commissioner, I do not know if you want to say something on metal theft?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): I would certainly have to --

James Cleverly (AM): In which case, if you are able to give an initial response, I would be happy to receive it.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner Designate, MPS): We can still write anyway and give you a full account.

I think there are probably two major issues on metal theft. I think people are aware why it is such an issue; because the value of metal has increased. The police are having to revisit some of the tactics that worked in the past because, frankly, it has become a new crime but it has always been there so we are going to have to make sure that we do the checks that we need to do in terms of licensing of scrap metal dealers, which means visits, getting in there, checking books and being there when people deliver scrap is very important.

The second thing which will be really helpful in this is to make sure there are stronger identification requirements upon the people who are delivering scrap and that metal dealers are held to account if they do not keep those accounts.

Those are the three big things that will make a difference in the future but I accept our responsibility which is we have to be more vigorous in our checking of scrap metal dealers and make sure they can account for what they have got.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Just for information, two months ago I held a round table meeting at the Police Authority with BT, Transport for London (TfL), the British Transport Police (BTP), the lead at the MPS on metal theft and people from the Home Office to talk about the problem. There is an ongoing operation at the MPS around metal theft in particular but we explored the possibility of improving the regulation around scrap metal dealers and whether that needs to be looked at. It is certainly on the Home Office radar from a policy point of view.

Angela Browning who was the newly appointed then Minister at the Home Office in the Lords has a particular personal interest in that and I am meeting with her in about a month's time to explore what the Home Office policy response is going to be to assisting the police in possibly giving them more power to deal with scrap metal dealers because, fundamentally, at the moment, it is pretty easy to get rid of the stuff once you have nicked it.

It is a particular issue obviously from a transport point of view, not just in terms of cable and railways but also TfL is losing, in some instances, whole bus shelters which are getting nicked for the aluminium and other bits and pieces. BT has had whole areas of the city go down because, when the copper cable is cut or ripped out, they are also cutting

the big fibre optic cables that carry all the trunk calls. It is definitely on the radar as an issue.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Every day there are train problems. Again this morning.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): There are. Of course a lot of those are outside of London so there needs to be a national response really. The BTP are the lead on that.

James Cleverly (AM): That is interesting that you say that; a national response. A large part of my constituency was plunged into four days of no electricity because of a fire directly related to attempted metal theft in the electricity networks.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It is worth also saying if you see somebody removing cable do not assume they are workmen because a lot of them just turn up with a thing, attach a piece of rope to the cable and drive the car away and strip it all out, and they do in under the guise of looking like workmen. So, by all means, challenge people.

OK. Thank you very much. Thank you very much Members. If we could please - we are now at 12.20pm - be swift about the rest. Thank you, Commissioner.

We have done the accounts. Reports from Committees. Does anybody have anything? Does any Chair want to raise anything? No? It has been a quiet time since we last met on Committees anyway. Right. Thank you.

Urgent action taken under delegated authority. Catherine [Crawford], is there anything you want to confess to?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): There is just one urgent action, Chairman, which you signed and details are available to Members on the usual basis if they wish to have that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK. Thank you. Any other urgent business? We have an issue around claims made under the **regional development agency (RDA)**(?). We have been asked, as an Authority, to ratify the process of claims handling by the Authority when that all hoves into view. I think the period in which claims could be made has now closed and we have --

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): No.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): No. It is still open?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): It closes next Wednesday.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): It closes next Wednesday. Right. Once that has happened we will then be able to look at the claims and start to process them through because, ultimately, we as the Authority, although it will be the Government who is

funding, will need to process those claims and approve them. This is just asking for your approval of that process. Is that right, Bob [Atkins]?

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): It is, Chairman. It is because we were faced with a large number of claims potentially, up to 2,500 at the moment, and therefore we need a process by which we can handle those effectively and efficiently. Of course one of the key things is to actually get compensation out into the community where businesses have suffered as a result of this.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): OK.

Victoria Brasse (AM): Could I ask a question about it really on the appeal mechanism? At the moment, as I understand it, there will be a form of appeal to a SOP Committee for claims under £500,000 but over £500,000 there is not, so we have a slight anomaly that the higher the value of the claim there is no appeal mechanism.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): The process under the limit is that, if the decision is contested, it comes to the Authority for a decision. It is the Authority that has the final say on whether a claim is permissible --

Victoria Brasse (AM): Right. For claims over £500,000 --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Of course that does not preclude the claimant taking legal action for recovery of the money.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): No, absolutely.

Victoria Brasse (AM): I am just pointing out that slight anomaly around our own appeal that, in effect, there is one for under £500,000 and there is not one for over £500,000.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): That is because the final arbiter is the Authority itself and we just need that filter to --

Victoria Brasse (AM): I know. You also do not have an appeal if the DLS make a decision that it does not count as a riot claim.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): There is an appeal against that.

Victoria Brasse (AM): There is an appeal on that? It is not what it says. I just wanted that out. If people are comfortable with that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman, MPA): Otherwise happy? OK. Thank you. Approved. I am afraid we now have to exclude the press and public so those of you who are thank you very much for your attendance. We will see you next time. All five of you!