

**Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on
27 October 2011 at 10.00am in Committee Rooms 4&5, City Hall, SE1.**

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chairman)

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

MPA Officers: Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Bob Atkins (Treasurer),
Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive), Maxine de Brunner (South Area Commander)

MPS Officers: Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS)

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Members, I make that 10.00am. Before we start can we go
around the room? Kit Malthouse.

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

Reshard Auladin (Deputy Chair): Reshard Auladin.

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Bob Atkins.

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

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

Tony Arbour (AM): Tony Arbour.

Jenny Jones (AM): Jenny Jones.

Toby Harris (AM): Toby Harris.

Amanda Sater (AM): Amanda Sater.

Dee Doocey (AM): Dee Doocey.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Caroline Pidgeon.

Faith Boardman (MPA): Faith Boardman.

Cindy Butts (AM): Cindy Butts.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Val Shawcross.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Valerie Brasse.

Maxine de Brunner (MPS): Maxine de Brunner, Metropolitan Police Service.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Bernard Hogan-Howe, Metropolitan Police Service.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Apparently the chamber was occupied today, so welcome to one of the many reasons why this building is an architectural disaster. We are about to spend over two hours in a room without natural light. I am sorry about that; they should make the architects hold their meetings in this building.

Apologies for absence: I have people with duties at half term: Graham Speed, Neil Johnson and James Cleverly. Anybody else?

Declarations of interest. Does anybody have an interest to declare that is not on the sheet? Thank you very much. Minutes of the last meeting are attached for Members' approval. There is a transcript on the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) website if you want to see exactly what you said. Does anybody have any matters arising from the minutes? Are you happy for me to sign them as an accurate record? OK, thank you very much.

Item 4 is the Chairman's update. First of all, Members, to update you that earlier this week we appointed two new Assistant Commissioners, Mark Rowley, who is the Chief Constable of Surrey, and Simon Byrne, who is the Deputy Chief Constable of Greater Manchester. Both were part of four interviews of very high quality that a panel did, and I am grateful to the panel of Members who assisted in that. Both Mark and Simon performed very well and made, I think it is fair to say, ambitious claims about what they can come and achieve in London. Obviously over the next few years we hope to hold them to that. We have, I think, a start date for Simon of 5 December, and Mark we are waiting to hear from, but about the same time. Both obviously have to make appropriate arrangements with their existing authorities about handover and what have you. Nevertheless, they are a great addition to the team and we welcome them both.

Cindy Butts (AM): Are Members aware of the portfolios that they have been given?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Have those been assigned?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I have decided around the territorial policing but we have not announced it within the Metropolitan Police Service. There are a couple of things I just want to check out, both with the individuals and also around one or two things that we want to achieve, so by the end of today I will have decided it. One I have decided but the other one needs a bit of negotiation, so I will announce it later today.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We will make sure Members are circulated with that by email.

Members will also know that the Police and Social Responsibility Reform Act has now passed all its parliamentary process and received Royal assent. We expect to start, as I think I said last time, in January. The current date, therefore, for handover at the moment is 16 January, although there is still a hell of a lot of work to do between now and then to make sure we hit that date. Nevertheless, as work has progressed over the last few weeks, that date has become firmer and firmer. There are one or two technical issues that we need to overcome, not least around closing one set of accounts and opening another set, and there is a lot of negotiation going on at the moment. I am participating, along with Catherine and other officers, with ministers in transition meetings, not just for us but for the whole country, but also looking at the strategic policing requirement, the protocols, the various other bits and pieces that are going to be required of us over the years to come.

In particular, something to look for in near future is the shadow Strategic Policing Requirement, which we think will be published by the end of November. That is the document that codifies, if you like - it is currently being negotiated - what the force's national responsibilities are going to be and is an attempt, if you like, to raise the eyes of elected police and crime commissioners across the country away from the merely local and to push them towards a contribution towards the national. We are both, I think, very keen on that, both the Authority and the Metropolitan Police Service, because obviously the general view is the Metropolitan Police Service has shouldered more than its fair share of national responsibility over the last few years and we would like provincial forces to do their bit a bit more. So we welcome that and we are both participating in the negotiation of that. As I say, the shadow one should come out in November.

Assistant Commissioner (AC) Owens and Jennette Arnold, who is not here at the moment, we participated in a meeting with the Morgan family a couple of weeks ago. Obviously they are distressed about developments, not just the case but also the refusal of the Home Secretary to accede to our wish, as an Authority, that there should be a judicial inquiry. Work is ongoing with the family at the moment to see what we can do about giving effect to that desire after the various reviews, I think case reviews by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and the Metropolitan Police Service, that are taking place. Lynne Owens is in close contact with the family and you should all have been copied in on some correspondence between me and them over the last week.

The London Crime Reduction Board has also met and started what was a new strand of work for them, but not for us, which is around gangs. Obviously the Metropolitan Police Service is doing a lot of work on Operation Connect and elsewhere on gangs. In fact, the Commissioner and I went to Hackney yesterday to see what they have managed to achieve there, which I have to say was extremely impressive and is a model that I think a lot of boroughs could learn from.

At the September meeting the board agreed to develop a data-clearing house to manage demand and supply on women's refuges across London. This is an area that has been of some alarm over the last few months as the austerity measures hit, and local authorities are a particular area of importance because contribution towards the overall effort in London for women's refuges is patchy amongst local authorities, and of course it is almost universally an imported client base, so they are not necessarily residents of your borough that you are providing service for. We are trying to do something about that.

We are also working very hard on a strand of work with London Probation and the Metropolitan Police Service about improved offender management. This is going to be pretty key over the next couple of years in terms of us improving our effort on crime fighting and, as I say, work is underway with that. Also bringing pressure upon prisons who are frankly providing the raw material for the police and probation to play their part too.

In September we trialled a focused, issue-specific, joint-engagement meeting (JEM) meeting around rape and sexual assault. Sadly for family reasons I could not be there but it was ably chaired by Valerie. A wide range of partners attended: Rape Crisis, The Havens, Victim Support, **SED2**(?), the CPS and various borough representatives. Feedback from the meeting was very positive. There has been some follow-up work since and we look forward to some specific product out of that that will tackle what is a very serious problem here in the capital, so thank you very much, Valerie, for that.

Finally, just on budget, we are expecting revised budgetary guidance from the Mayor in the next few days, not least because some of you who were glued to Conservative Party conference will have heard that there was an announcement of some more largess from the Government, specifically for police authorities, in an attempt to contribute towards a freeze in council tax across the country. Negotiations have been ongoing between GLA, the MPA and GLA Strategic Finance and the Government about what that is going to look like, and we should know from the Mayor in the next few days.

We have, over the summer, had our usual budget work. All the ACs and various others on the management board have been in to talk about their budget priorities over the next few years, so we are drawing all that together in the next few months and should have something for you I think in November. The GLA scrutiny of the budget starts in January, and I have been invited, sadly, to a meeting which I cannot make on 5 January, which is bright and early after New Year, for the Budget Committee, and we will try, if we can, to rearrange that or provide other people to go.

My particular thanks to Dee [Doocey] who has worked very hard on the numbers of the summer in her new role as Chair of Finance. It has been a good and productive set of meetings and we should see the result in November.

Finally, you have a list of a sample - it feels like only a sample - of the meetings that I have had since the last meeting. That is it from me. Any questions? Yes, Toby [Arbour].

Tony Arbour (AM): We are now in a position where the statutory framework for accountability for the Metropolitan Police Service is clear going forward. As the sort of Deputy Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime (MOPC) in waiting, are you yet in a position to share with the authority your detailed thinking as to how you are going to set up new arrangements and, in particular, meet, I think, the public expectation that somehow the visible process of accountability and answerability is going to go on? Presumably you have also discussed those with London Assembly colleagues, but I think it might be useful if you were to share some of that thinking with this full Authority so that the benefits of any crude wisdom might be able to be fed into that process.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Great minds think alike. My question was actually about the Community Engagement Programme, because of course we are all being asked now, not just by community police consultative groups (CPCGs) but other organisations, how will the community have an involvement in advising, being asked about, have a voice on, policing issues. Although there is a lot of work going on in the Assembly on the scrutiny side, I think there is anxiety that at this moment of huge change we should not lose one of

the things that is very important to London, which is voice for our diverse communities within policing decision-making. So will there be an advisory board, what is the long-term future of CPCGs and what is the thinking about even safer neighbourhood panels? It is not a perfect regime at the moment but I think the community out there needs reassurance that there will be serious work done to create opportunities for productive engagement when MOPC is created.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am very alive to both those issues. I am not, though, in a position yet to share with you what our plans are, not least because I have yet to meet with Joanne McCartney and her panel whom are doing the work on what the London Assembly is going to be doing and what that scrutiny process is going to look like. I think we have a meeting scheduled relatively soon to do that. Also, although there is a lot of work and thinking going on about that, I have yet to have that discussion finally with the Mayor to see what he thinks and what he wants. We have had various discussions along the way but we are trying to fashion that.

What I am hoping is that before the end of the year we will be able to bring to you a model of operation that we are intending to put in place in January and then we can obviously have a briefing, discussion, whatever you like. It will be something that we would be keen to take people's views on, although obviously bearing in mind that the whole thrust behind the changes in the bill is that things should be streamlined and be less bureaucratic. The key area of importance for me is exactly as you say, Val [Shawcross], which is engagement. We want people to feel more invested in policing in London not less, so getting that model right is absolutely key.

John Biggs (AM): Two things. First of all, not that it is for me to be critical, 'bureaucratic' is a word that is very loaded. It could simply be a description of talking to people, so I think sometimes bureaucracy is a useful thing, in the same way as support staff are useful things as well, although we pretend that they are not quite often. The second is I really think you need to pinch yourself, because you are talking in the future tense as if you are already rid of the pestilence of the Police Authority. In reality you are the Chair of the Police Authority and you need to speak up for what we are saying, which I think is a fairly clear majority of us saying that this is a clear deficit which needs to be addressed in the new arrangements. As a Police Authority we want to make sure, as part of our legacy, that that is recognised and is addressed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, that is basically exactly what I said.

John Biggs (AM): I did not quite get that sense.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I also said before you came in, John, that the date of transfer was not yet certain either, so while we have to work towards it, it has shifted around a little bit in the last few weeks. One thing we do need to be careful about - and this is one of the things that Government is warning across the country - is that there must be no attempt to reinvent police authorities by another name.

John Biggs (AM): Perhaps it would be a good idea if there was, actually. I had trouble getting in because the doors are locked on the side doors.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): That is not the intention of the Government or the wish of the Government and we have to bear that in mind. As I say, I need to sit down with Joanne [McCartney] and her panel and understand what the Greater London Authority wants, the Scrutiny Panel wants, to see and what that is going to look like and whether that is going to be copeable with and dealable with in terms of data. Then we can work backwards from that to see what else we have to do. In particular of importance - and we have talked a number of times about it ourselves internally - is the public engagement side of this, because, as I said before, we want to preserve and indeed enhance the sense of public investment in policing, not reduce it. That may mean, frankly, getting out of the centre of London a bit more, those kinds of things, and being a bit more exploratory in our dealings.

Tony, you wanted to say something.

Tony Arbour (AM): Yes. I do not go along with the fact that there will be a loss of community linkage with the new arrangements. You will know, Chairman, that Members of our group, both constituency Members and list Members, will retain the direct links which we have with the communities that we already represent and to whom we are democratically answerable. You can be assured that certainly those people that we on this side - and I am now able to say that since we are arranged in this way today - will ensure that links with the community will not be lost and hopefully will be improved.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Anybody else?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I hope you do not subscribe to that view, because I think our experience is that some participatory democracy actually adds to the value of representative democracy. There are dangers for this city if we do not have some process of linkage into the community.

Can I just suggest, Chair, it might be helpful and reassure people a bit if you produce something like -- send us a letter that we can circulate on to say broadly - no detail - what

your intention is and broadly what the shape of the consultation process is, because then people will know that there is something going to be happening.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): There will be a communications effort around the whole launch of Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPC) in January. As I say, we need to work out the deal. What we do not want to do is go off half-cocked. That will start before Christmas.

Yes, Clive.

Clive Lawton (AM): Can I say that we on this side also feel that community consultation and inclusion is a complex business, multi-layered and all the rest of it. While I have no doubt that Tony can keep contact with everybody in his own particular area, some people cannot. It is very evident that in fact community consultation and engagement is anyway and still challenging and insufficient and flawed and needs attention. It would be extremely unsatisfactory if the response was, "We need less of it" or, "We can manage without" or something like that. I hope none of that is taken away from this side, because I know this side does not think that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Toby?

Toby Harris (AM): I think we need to distinguish two issues. One is the process of community engagement, and, of course, I am second to nobody in my admiration of London Assembly Members and their ability to engage with several hundred thousand people continuously. However, that is a separate question, and whatever structures there are about local engagement will no doubt be clear in the future.

There is a separate question, which is the answerability of the Commissioner in public to an accountable body. Now, the new accountable arrangements are the Deputy MOPC will hold the Commissioner to account. That is a one-to-one meeting. I am sure you could invite the TV cameras in, and journalists, to watch you having a tête-à-tête, but I suspect that would not have quite the same drama. It would look like a scripted occasion and is not going to quite cut it in terms of the meetings that we have sometimes had with large numbers of the public either physically present or watching when issues of major concern have been aired and discussed and people have heard the Commissioner answering questions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service in terms of what has happened in the past. I think one of the things we must avoid is a situation in which that is lost.

It may be that that role can be seeded to the Assembly Committee, in which case then something else has been created. Of course, that will not have quite the same statutory relationship, but if you are not able to give it now, I think it would be useful if we could have some clarity about how that is to be continued, because that is different from the relationship between Members and their constituents.

There is a subsidiary point that I would be interested in hearing from the Commissioner, either now or in his report, a little bit about the developing thinking within the Metropolitan Police Service about how they intend to relate to the new arrangements. Obviously they will be waiting to hear exactly what you have in mind, but I am sure, knowing the Metropolitan Police Service, that they will have done extensive work on this already.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Steve.

Steve O'Connell (AM): I have some sympathy for those latter points that Toby has made, but going back to the earlier point around Assembly Members, what we have to address is the fact that we do not want to reinvent the role that Assembly Members already carry out in their constituencies. Good Assembly Members - and they all are good, I am sure, around this table - do assiduously go out and are the contact with their panels, because if you turn it the other way round, the question back to us is, "Will you be continuing to support us", etc, etc. I would say, "Yes, of course, I am your Assembly Member". So we do not want to reinvent stuff, but there is a gap, of course. The point I am making is where those Assembly Members do not sit on the panel, etc, etc. Good Assembly Members will have the contact with their constituency, and their constituency will expect those Assembly Members to be the people who have the democratic right to take their concerns on to hold to account the Commissioner and the Metropolitan Police Service.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Kirsten Hearn (AM): I know that next week the Communities, Equalities and People Committee will be discussing the legacy of that work, including some of this work. My concerns are that some of the expertise that has been gained, some of the specific ways in which the Police Authority has actually gained an opportunity to hear those who are the hardest to hear, may well be lost. I guess I want at some point, when you know what you are going to do, to seek some reassurance of the mechanisms that you will lose to hear those who are quite difficult to hear and who we have become quite adept in trying to enable to hear through the various mechanisms that we have been using for the last 12, 10, 11 years, or whatever it was.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, Victoria.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Just a really quick one. I just wanted to clarify, really to follow up from what Steve said and try to get some clarity, as to what you see, if there will be a role for link Members or not and, if so, how you envisage that reporting in.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): As I say, I have to have a discussion with Joanne and the panel. I am not entirely sighted on what they are planning, but once we have done that, we will bring forward a model of operation that will hopefully take into account all your concerns, and then we will be communicating that to London. Time is tight but hopefully we will get on to that fairly sharpish. As I say, watch this space.

Does anybody have anything else? Joanne.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Just a couple of points, really. It is quite clear that the panel that will set up is a scrutiny panel and, by its very nature, will depend on the information that is coming out of the MOPC, so that is obviously one of the key questions that we have. There are other issues, and I think Victoria has touched on of them. At the moment, as MPA Members with our link boroughs, we sit on family disorder partnership boards by virtue of that position. That will go, so that is another link that you have to consider as to how that link with those boroughs take place.

Also Val's point about wider consultation and Community and Police Engagement Groups (CPEGs), for example. They are funded by this body not by the Assembly, and that is a decision you will need to take as well. There is quite a lot of concern out there as to what is their future.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I agree. There are lots of other areas, like independent custody volunteers and those kinds of things, that we have to look at. As I say, the work is ongoing; watch this space.

OK, thank you very much. We will move on to item 5, which is the Commissioner's report.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. Good morning, everyone. First of all probably to start where the debate just finished and reposed to Toby's point. I suppose just four points. First of all I said, as a starter, that I want to have values and I hope the organisation would have the value of humility, integrity and transparency. Everything that we do should follow those values. In that spirit I would want to be held

to account for the people of London. The process by which we do that, I would want it to be open and accountable. I suppose I want to ensure that it does not cause duplication, it does not cause -- I know John made the point that bureaucracy can be a good thing and a bad thing, but not to increase bureaucracy would be helpful.

In terms of our preparations, I think to some extent those preparations -- perhaps the Metropolitan Police Service has probably got a history of having lots of proposals to put to you and therefore at times it might seem like domination. I think actually in this case, because of the disruption of leadership, I suspect our preparations are not as remarkable as they may have been in the past. Therefore, you may have fertile ground. I suppose I am willing to engage in the debate.

Joanne recently wrote on behalf of GLA to set out a broad position of we would support whatever was created. I was a bit hesitant to do that until I know what is being proposed, but very happy to meet, together with the Chair, to make preparations for the future. Broadly we will support what we agree. I just do not want it to become a huge bureaucracy. That would be my only plea, but I doubt you do either, so we will do our best to support the arrangements that are proposed.

In terms of this last month, I have been out and around in London. I have been to Hackney yesterday with the Chair and we had a look, as he said, at the gang work. I have been out to Haringey. We have a new plan, which is an old plan, really, which is to take the management board around the Metropolitan Police Service, and our first visit was to Haringey. We had a good day there. Tonight I am in Croydon. I had meetings this month with the head of probation, Helen Munro, and that was in part about gangs but generally just how can we work better together in the future, and we have a few ideas about how that could happen.

In terms of some of the emerging themes that I have found around the Metropolitan Police Service up to now, because I have also met -- I have said that I am going to meet within 90 days all the management teams. Bear in mind there 100 business units in the Metropolitan Police Service, 32 Borough Command Units (BCUs) and then another 60 units, including transport and kidnap. I have now seen 12 management teams and I am trying to find out from them an answer to the simple question, "If you were going to do my job over the next up to seven years, what would you change?" There has been some consistency and I found it a really powerful piece of information. It only takes half an hour with each, so they have to get good preparation by the time they get there, but that has been pretty helpful.

The sort of themes that are coming out: in Haringey there was an issue about resilience. They have had a pretty heavy series of events over the last few weeks, as the people of London did in terms of the riot and the subsequent events, so there were a lot of issues for them to talk about locally. Then more generally, Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) recruitment was a process that seems to be causing some difficulties. Procurement processes was something that came up an awful lot, and IT strategy and how we could improve for the future. I did find an awful lot of people who were passionate about the job and were keen to keep the people and the public of London and are actually doing it very well in most cases, so I thought that was good.

You have heard already about the appointment of two new ACs, who I look forward to working with as part of our team, and our team will now develop. I think in the New Year we will have our team fully embedded with a plan for the next few years, which will be really helpful for me personally, but I think organisationally it will be helpful.+

As you are aware, we are carrying out the Operation Kirkin review, which is the review into the rioting in Tottenham and the two subsequent nights of disorder. That has been led by AC Lynne Owens. The early learning and initial findings have been shared with Members and I hope that people have seen those and have had the opportunity to see what our initial plans are. The first four points we have drawn out are critical incident management and community engagement; mobilisation and mutual aid - that means how quickly do our people out. When we need to respond to an incident do we get enough people there with enough kit, and we have some doubts about that. Thirdly, the tactics we use when we do get them there, and then finally the criminal justice process and the investigation which followed on from the tableau of events that we saw.

We are still looking closely at the issue, of causality, including the demographic breakdown of offenders and what that tells us about what potential causes of this problem were. We are linking in with Darra Singh's review on behalf of the Government and, as you are aware, there are two local authority inquiries, one of which is reported. The deputy and AC Lynne Owens have already met with Darra Singh and I hope to in the future. Wandsworth have published a number of recommendations, four of which are especially for the police. Having looked at those, I have to say they seem to me balanced and sensible conclusions. When we conclude our report I do not think we will be a million miles away from each other, but we wait to see what the outcome of that report is.

We are carrying out some social analysis, looking at the context of the disorder, but that is a complex piece of work and I am a bit concerned if we have reached conclusions, they really need to talk to us about what their conclusions are rather than a police-centric view about what the cause was.

Riot damages work continues together with the Authority, as you are probably aware. There are still claims being processed, with a liability estimated in somewhere of order of £200 million to £300 million. It is a large amount, but of course £200 million to £300 million is a broad range. It could be 50% out, but it is a huge amount of money. I know that the Authority continues to look at full recovery of all costs from the Home Office via a special grant, and those negotiations are ongoing, but it is an important negotiation.

Our interim report will be done in the middle of November and the final report will be available by Christmas. The date we have is 23 December, just before Christmas, so we will do our best to get that to the Authority. It will be Christmas reading, but you will have something before Christmas to reflect on over that Christmas and New Year period.

Of course, this is still an ongoing investigation and we are still making arrests. There was a large clothing store in Peckham, people may remember, that was badly damaged by fire. We made an arrest and charges this week, which I think is a positive outcome. The message I would like to send to the people of London is we are still determinedly working our way through the investigations. The criminal justice process is still working and there are still more people to arrest. We have a large number of officers and staff dedicated to that purpose, so we will not stop until we have got to the end of our evidence trail. In that particular case, the gentleman has been charged; he was aged 22. He has been charged with two counts of arson and three counts of burglary. The total number of arrests now stands at 2,923, so just short of 3,000, of which 1,794, just short of 1,800, have been charged. That was as of Monday this week, so it will have increased slightly from Monday.

There has been an issue around undercover officers, and I know there are questions today and I will respond to those questions as we get to them. The limited point I say at this point is that we will refer the issues that have been highlighted in the press to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) to further investigate.

In terms of performance, for the year to date to September, violent crime reduction remains steady at about 10% reduction. Gun crime continues to reduce, which is around a 15% year-to-date reduction. Of these offences, where a gun has actually been fired, they are down by not far off a quarter, at 22.5%, so I think that is a positive outcome. Knife crimes, however, are showing an increase of around 15%, although when knives have been used to injure someone, as opposed to where it has appeared and been a threatening event, that is down marginally at about 1.5% less. So the overall use of knives has increased but the use where there has been an injury has slightly come down. Operation Connect continues to help to drive down gang-related violent crime and within

this month two young men have been jailed for a total of 3½ years for a gang-related grievous bodily harm.

Rapes: actual detections remain below the level recorded last year, with 60 fewer than last year, and that is something that we are working on with the CPS to improve but continues to be a challenge. Theft from motor vehicle is more or less static; it is marginally down at 0.45%, but personal robbery is still up, and that is up around 17%. Operation Target focused on robbery, particularly around school pupils, and continues to do work which we hope will bear fruit, together with a new Assistant Commissioner, providing a new impetus on that issue.

In terms of targeted approaches for the coming weeks and months, we have Operation Autumn Nights which was launched on 17 October. That is a seasonal crackdown on crime and antisocial behaviour, which is a combination of enforcement and education activity, really targeting the half term and the change of the hour, which we come to this weekend, which can produce a change in behaviour, particularly in young people, and it is something that we have to be aware of and do something about. Our schools officers are giving safety tips after school patrols at key locations. We have got screening **arches**(?) as part of a wider detection tactic to deter the carrying of weapons.

We have a burglary awareness campaign, because we do see a seasonal increase as the nights change, and that will start - as I am sure Members will know, Operation Bumblebee - on 31 October, and so as the nights get dark earlier remind people of simple measures that people can take to reduce their chance of being a target. This accompanies and ongoing operational activity as we continue to target burglars.

We have started our APR operations. The first big one was on Wednesday, 19 October, which the Mayor and the Chair came along to, or at least a public relations (PR) event that we had around it. On that day 558 vehicles were seized and 76 arrests were made. I expect to see even more vehicles seized on future days. As well as arrests for traffic offences, we also made arrests for money laundering, the wanted on warrant, particularly warrants for domestic harassment, possession of offensive weapons, assault, possession with the intent to supply Class A drugs, handling stolen goods and immigration offences. So this is not just about taking uninsured vehicles off the road, although that is important. As usual we found that probably about 80% of the people whose vehicles we seized had a criminal record. We are not taking these from generally innocent people. It is also the knock-on effect that people driving the cars, because they do often have a criminal background, we do already want to another reason. It is not just about seizing the vehicles. It does contribute to road safety on the grounds that uninsured vehicles appear five more times likely to have an accident or a collision, so it has a dual impact for me.

That concludes my report, but I will take questions if anyone would like to.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We have had a number of questions submitted by Members which are on similar themes, so I am going to take things on a themed basis this time to try to get things through as quickly as possible. If Members find that their question has already been asked, please feel free to signal.

Toby Harris (AM): If we do not have a tabled question, should we come in on the theme as you go through them?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, although I am going to manage time quite quickly, if you do not mind, because otherwise we will drag on. We are going to start with questions about production orders, and that starts with you, Valerie [Brasse].

Valerie Brasse (AM): Yes, thank you. You will have noticed that Joanne [McCartney] has a linked question. Indeed, hers probably would have been my supplementary had I written it myself, as it were.

Commissioner, I think you have now conceded that there was an error of judgment in relation to the pursuit of production orders against --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): You will have to speak up.

Valerie Brasse (AM): I will do slower and louder. The first thing I will say is that my question is linked to one that Joanne [McCartney] has asked specifically around the Official Secrets Act. My question to the Commissioner is, as I understand it, you have now acknowledged there was an error of judgment by the Metropolitan Police Service in its pursuit of a production order against the Guardian and one of its journalists recently. Of course, that fell out of the Metropolitan Police Service's investigation in the leak of very sensitive information arising from the phone-hacking inquiry. There was some suggestion in the press that in fact the Metropolitan Police Service has resorted to production orders more frequently in recent years.

My question is for each of the last three years how many production orders against journalists and the press has the Metropolitan Police Service sought and how many have been granted.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): OK. First of all, in terms of the last few years, in 2010/11 - and I am going to explain how certain I can be about these figures

in a minute - we had two applications for production orders against media organisations and journalists. One was successful, but is still subject to an outstanding judicial review, and one was withdrawn, and that was the Guardian production order. In 2009/10 there was application, which was successful. In 2008/09 there was one application, which was successful.

Just to say how certain I am about these figures, when we apply for production orders generally - and I want to come back to this because it is important what a production order is - any officer could apply for it. It would just go straight to a court and there is no need even to do an awful lot with our own legal advisers. When we are talking about legal organisations, then often legal advice is taken. That advice is taken through the Department of Legal Services (DLS), so these figures have come from our own lawyers and we are pretty certain that these figures are right. Without a huge amount of work right around the Metropolitan Police Service asking everybody, "During the last three years did you apply for a production order", I do not want to mislead you and say I am absolutely certain these figures are right, but I am pretty sure they are right because they are near to this type of order. That is the number.

Valerie Brasse (AM): That is interesting, because that probably goes to Joanne's question about the governance arrangements for seeking a --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Would you mind if I work through it a bit? Sorry to interrupt, but I just thought that is the straight answer to that question.

Valerie Brasse (AM): That is obviously contrary to the implication by the press.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I accept that; that is fine. If I could just say a couple of orders about production orders and then about press production orders. This might be a matter of information. People may know this but I thought it was worth sharing. A production order is something that the police can seek or others can seek when they are seeking information that often is held by a third party but not the person that you are investigating. For example, a bank may hold information on behalf of a customer as a contractual arrangement, but we cannot get a warrant to go into a bank to get it. That would be quite inappropriate and probably quite impractical because we do not know who their systems work. The way the system works is we gain a production order from the court, go to the bank, give them the production order and that is their defence against their customer taking litigation against them for sharing their private information. That is the general system we have; that is what a production order does.

However, there are some areas of relationships between people where the law says it is not OK to do that in the usual way. One is legal privilege. Broadly, if there is a legal privilege claimed, ie if there is legal advice being given to someone, then generally the law will say you cannot get that material; there is no reason why you have it. It is just absolutely protected. If, however, we are talking about journalist material, then there is a process by which it has to be gained, which essentially means going to court. Therefore, there is a system described. What it is pointing out is obviously vital that the press is protected, but equally there are times when it has information which it should give over.

There are two broad areas when we go to journalists to get information. One is where they are trying to help us but want the protection of a production order, and one is where they would resist in general. For example, in the riots, lots of media attention was focused on the images of people committing crime, so we will go to the BBC, we will go to ITV and Sky and say, "Can we have everything you have?" They will say, broadly, "Of course. However, we would like you to give us a production order to protect our journalistic principles, which are that generally we are here to gather information and share it with the public, not to help the criminal justice process". Sometimes that could put journalists at risk if that position were not in place. So generally they want to do it but need us to take the legal process.

The other way is the one where we get to the Guardian one, which is where there has been a story of which we are seeking the source to help us with the criminal investigation, and they do not want to reveal it because they allege public interest, and we may have a different view. I just thought it was important to sketch that out, because some of the discussions I thought had get a bit confused publicly about it.

Valerie Brasse (AM): That is very, very helpful.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I do not know if you want me to go on to official secrets.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. Joanne, do you want to ask your question?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes. My question was, was the Metropolitan Police Service wrong to apply for a production order from the guardian under the Official Secrets Act - this is the latest production order - and what changes to protocol have been made that applications under the Act are authorised by the highest level, by the lawyers, in the future.

I want to ask a further question: is there not now the need for further oversight on this as well. I know the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) has said that he would have expected some liaison before the application was made.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Can you just repeat the first part of the question again?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Was the Metropolitan Police Service wrong to apply?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I appeared before the Home Affairs Select Committee a couple of weeks ago, which I think is what Valerie [Brasse] was alluding to. What I said was I think in retrospect - and it is always easy in retrospect - it was a mistake to make that application at that stage. It was not entirely inappropriate, because, as I have shown already, we do make applications. The production order is a legitimate process by which a court will decide whether or not our application is fair. That is what it is there for, so it is not wrong to make production orders against journalists. I think what could have happened is that more legal advice could have been taken before the application was made.

The officers in the case did get legal advice. They were not ignorant of that, they did get legal advice, but perhaps more reflective legal advice was taken from a Queen's Counsel (QC) and their advice was that this was not entirely appropriate in these circumstances.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I think it is because it used the Official Secrets Act.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): This is another piece of information I just want to put on the table, from which people will draw their own conclusions. It has been repeated often, and I think it was one of the questions today, that this was an application under the Official Secrets Act, and it was not. It was an application under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act. That is the only process that is known. As far I know, the Official Secrets Act does not give this opportunity. However, in the application process you have to justify the grounds on which you expect this order to be given. Therefore, you lay out the potential crimes that could have been committed if only you had the evidence to prove it. That is what you are seeking, the evidence. You have not got enough to make a charge, so you have to point out the areas in which you are investigating.

Bearing in mind the nature of this case, this is about a potential leak by a police officer in an ongoing, live police investigation into phone hacking, ironically, to a journalist. It is not good practice for police officers to leak information to anyone in an ongoing

investigation. You might distinguish whistle blowing, if they thought there was something dishonest or something terrible. I think we would all accept that would be understandable, but that is not the allegation in this case. So in the very case in which there is a question about the relationship between the police and the press, the investigating team are alleged to have leaked to the press. So I think there is a legitimate purpose of an investigation to make sure that further leaks do not happen.

If a police officer does leak information to the press or anyone else, they potentially breach the Official Secrets Act. They have signed the Official Secrets Act, which is not to reveal secrets. So it is a potential, I can put it no more than that. Of course, there are other potential offences. It could be misconduct in a public office. Without knowing exactly what was shared, it is hard to be conclusive. It could have been they have committed a fraud; it could be many things. So I think one of the grounds on which it was considered a potential ground for the production order was the Official Secrets Act. It was not an application under it but it was one of the grounds that was mentioned. This is one of thing that, on reflection, probably was one of the weaker grounds rather than one of the stronger grounds. In that sense I think there was a potential mistake and, on reflection, we came to a different conclusion at the moment.

I think the only final thing I would say is that generally I would expect the senior investigating officer to make this type of decision generally, but when we are talking about the press I think it would be wiser if we had a chief officer who gets involved in that process; there was not initially. We did do that later. I think one of the lessons we could learn from this is that in future we would expect that to happen.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Does anybody have any other questions on production orders? Thank you. The next subject we are going to move to is undercover policing, and we are going to kick off with Jenny, who has a general question about undercover policing.

Jenny Jones (AM): Do you want me to read the question?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Jenny Jones (AM): If I could say first, Chair, that I do not think it is appropriate not to take questions from Members of this Authority on any topic if they want to ask them, however quickly you want to rush the business through. I think that is a very important principle to seek scrutiny ongoing here at these meetings that are held in public.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I would agree with you, Jenny, but my experience of this is that there is an awful lot of repetition, questions that are asked twice, and people are not as brief as they could be. There are often questions that are actually speeches. Nevertheless, I take your correction.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am asking the Commissioner will the Metropolitan Police Service conduct an audit of every undercover policing operation to see if spies lied in court.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): There are actually other questions under this heading, so I was going to try to group those together. I do not know if you wanted to share the other questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Shall we do the others at the same time. Dee?

Dee Doocey (AM): In relation to the undercover officer known as Jim Sutton, was the officer authorised by his superiors to lie to the court about his identity? If so, who authorised this, why was it authorised and is the officer still working for the Metropolitan Police Service and, if he is, doing what in what role?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Joanne?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Mine was with regard to the same undercover officer that Dee is referring to, and asks if the Metropolitan Police Service will undertake a thorough investigation into this and any other cases where undercover officers have been charged with criminal offences? Will the Metropolitan Police Service notify co-defendants in any of the other cases, and will the Metropolitan Police Service give an assurance as to the current oversight and supervision of undercover officers and provide any details of any guidance in respect of their use?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In relation to the auditing of undercover operations, all current covert undercover operations authorised by the Metropolitan Police Service have been reviewed under the direction of Commander Mark Streeter, who is the head of covert policing. Our initial view by today - and I stress by today - is that they are all fully compliant with the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) 2000.

Jenny Jones (AM): How far back did you go?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Would you mind if I just complete this part, and then I can take questions? What I was just going add to that is just that what

Mark [Streeter] has been able to do in relatively few days -- bear in mind what I ought not to do is going into the number of operations, but there is quite a lot of information around undercover operations, and he has made a good attempt to look at every one of them and talk to some of the officers involved but he has not talked to everyone. I am not yet reassured that he has been able to do everything I would expect him to do. Before the next time I appear before the Authority I will meet with Mark Streeter and make sure all the things I expect to be done have been done.

However, my first assurance is that broadly they are legal, ethical and all being carried out in good faith. The things that are alleged in the latest reports in the Guardian of historical events do not appear to be happening in our present operations. We are also auditing the cases where undercover officers have been involved but have not yet appeared at court. I have also asked for a further audit - which is one of the reasons I cannot give you an absolute conclusion at the moment - of the operations that are in what I would call the pipeline, operations which we are today considering, which might in the future lead to the employment of an undercover officer. So the first audit was of the ongoing ones where we have an undercover officer deployed. We have looked at the ones which are between deployment and the court approach, and I have asked him to make sure that the ones in anticipation are legal and ethical. So I want reassurances, as I am sure you do.

Similarly, those deployments by what is now the Metropolitan Police Service National Domestic Extremism Unit -- remember that that used to part of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and a few months ago, I think in January was transferred over to the Metropolitan Police Service. I have asked for that also to be part of the audit, although many of their deployments have been in the past and now are authorised by the forces. Bear in mind what happens: it may be a national operation but, as we saw in Nottingham, the undercover officer was deployed in Nottinghamshire. Their chief officer would authorise it. This is me trying to reassure myself about some of their authorities, which is another layer of complexity that, when I asked Mark Streeter to go around the country and talk to people, just takes a little bit longer. I am just trying to explain why I cannot be absolutely certain yet.

I also want to get for myself, and I hope for you, some external evaluation of what I am telling you. I have asked whether the Office for Surveillance Commissioners could get involved in this evaluation to reassure me, and I hope to reassure you, that they are content with what is happening. At the moment they are not able to do that, so I am searching for a further level of independence. I have asked the chief HMI whether he is prepared to help. He is willing to help but we are trying to work out a mechanism to do

it. By the next time I talk to you I hope I have an independent person, as well as me, who comes to a similar conclusion. If we do not, then I will let you know that too.

In relation to previous operations, and picking up on Joanne's point about linked cases, there is currently a review underway led by Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC) Mark Simmons, which is assessing various issues arising from covert deployments of the period 1968 to 2008. This is a complex process due to the time elapsed and the nature and volume of the material and the inherent sensitivity of issues involved. That review is considering the range of issues associated with undercover deployments that have been raised. Any matters arising from this review will be assessed and, where appropriate, will be referred to the IPCC.

We are in contact with the CPS as well. The reason for that is regarding the one case that has been reported in the media, which may be the subject of an appeal by one of the other co-defendants involved the case, where it is alleged that an undercover officer did not reveal his identity when he travelled through the court system as a co-defendant. We will also liaise with the CPS about any other cases we discover where that has happened, because obviously when a police officer has travelled through as an undercover officer there may be an issue to resolve there and there it could have another impact on others who were co-defendants in the same case.

In relation to the specific case that you referred to, the one that Dee refers to, one matter has already been referred to the IPCC relating to the appearance in court as a defendant of an officer using a false name in 1997. This referral has been considered by the IPCC and I understand that it is likely to incorporate the allegations made in the Guardian in recent days. I think there have also been further allegations made today. They will also consider the matters relating to the court appearance of a second officer in 1986. The IPCC has asked that we share with them any relevant documents to inform their assessment of the issues, and we have agreed to do so.

There is, in addition, an ongoing Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) investigation, that is an internal Metropolitan Police Service investigation, started in January of this year into a number of other allegations regarding the same officer - that is the officer I think who was named by Dee with the name of Sutton - which have also been subject to media reporting. I know it might all get a bit complicated, but what I am trying to say is that we are carrying out an audit of present operations and ones that are in the pipeline to court or beforehand. The IPCC are going to look into these historical allegations to see whether or not there was a crime, or alternatively any misconduct, and I think that is the best way to do it rather than me trying to reassure you, but there are some difficulties in getting hold of material because some of it is quite historical.

Finally, in relation to Dee Doocey's point, which is that in terms of the officer named in the press, there was already, if you remember, a misconduct process going on about alleged allegations and relationships in terms of his deployment, but not to do with him travelling through the court system in another name. That was already ongoing and now we have this other layer that has to be looked into. I am sorry that has gone on a bit but I thought that was important.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): That is fine.

Jenny Jones (AM): It is very useful and I look forward to next month. You said that you are looking at current operations, but current operations might have been kicked off some time ago, so we are talking about a length of time, possibly years, since some of the current ones were started off, so he is actually going back some way to look at these?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Yes. It seems to me the bare essentials for me to reassure myself and to reassure you is that I need to know what is going off now and if it is legal, ethical and appropriate. Part of that would be, of the current operations, how long have they lasted, what they are doing, what did they do, is there anything in there that I would not be happy with. Part of that will be looking back. It will not be today. If it is going off OK today, then I will reassure you. It will be I want to know everything that has happened during that deployment.

Jenny Jones (AM): Are you now considering perhaps looking for judicial authorisation for each operation? Because clearly there are problems and some sort of authorisation of that kind might actually help to focus minds on the real function, the real purpose and the scope of operations.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I will answer that question in one way, which is that there have been press reports about the fact that the report that Sir Dennis O'Connor was about to produce last week, but it is now delayed because of the revelations in the Guardian, I think quite properly that anyone would want to reflect on that before they made recommendations. I started that report and then I had to hand it over when I was selected here to help as a temporary Deputy Commissioner what seems like five years ago but is probably about two months ago. This is not me trying to be defensive and saying I am going to abandon him to take responsibility for the recommendations, but I cannot take responsibility for his recommendations. I am going to make that clear because there have been various press reports that it is my report. It cannot be. We cannot have it both ways. I cannot leave the thing behind and then be called to account for something that I am not making recommendations. I did start it.

In terms of Sir Dennis' [O'Connor] report, I think part of his recommendations will be about how better this whole area could be supervised in the future. Because I have privileged knowledge, I know what those recommendations might have been, but I do know that he is actively considering whether or not he needs to change those recommendations, but it will be informed by the outcome of these investigations. Otherwise we have a series of allegations and we need to find out what, if any, crime has been committed, what, if any, misconduct, and, of course, what we are not only talking about is the individual officers in the case, but what supervision, what policies and what strategies were in place. At the moment I do not think any of us know. There is enough there to be concerned and that is why we are taking it so seriously, but I think we have to await the outcome of getting the facts and then certainly I would have a view about how I see the future. All I see at the moment are a series of allegations.

Jenny Jones (AM): I thought you had actually finished the report. This is the understanding I think most of us had.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): If it helps in terms of the report, I had concluded a draft some weeks ago but I know that that draft has changed, as quite properly it should. Nobody is going to parrot my words. I suspect the book of the investigation that was carried out, the collection of facts, has not changed, because I do not think he went on to do more work. Of course, Sir Dennis [O'Connor] has to stand behind his recommendations and he has to stand behind his executive summary, so I am sure he has done whatever he needs to do to make sure that he is happy with that. I am sure I probably, at the end of the day, will agree with him, but we cannot do it both ways. We cannot both be accountable for it; he has to stand by it, which is why he is going to wait to see the outcome of these inquiries before he makes his final recommendations. I do know he is eager to get his report out, so he is not seeking to delay it. I think he has made the right decision to delay it until he has the facts.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Joanne, do you have anything?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have three quick supplementaries arising out of what you said. I am still not sure, when you talk about something being legal, ethical and appropriate, whether that actually includes police officers being allowed to go into court under an alias and give evidence that I think the former DPP has said is overstepping the line by not disclosing a true identity. I would like your view on that.

The second part of my question is whether the Metropolitan Police Service, if it identifies co-defendants where there has been an officer undercover that has been to court, will

actually notify, retrospectively, those co-defendants, because, of course, there is a situation where the undercover officer has had access to legal, privileged advice. Again, Lord Macdonald has stated that this is really overstepping the mark for the police to be party to that and then perhaps feedback information to the prosecution as well.

My third is I am glad you saying that you are trying to get some independent oversight, but it just appears to me that, when you look at these historical cases -- and I appreciate lots of them are allegations at the moment, but when you have undercover officers going in to cycling groups, it does appear that there is a need now for independent oversight to look at the proportionality of these. I would like your views on those.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the first point about whether or not it is OK for an officer to lie about -- well, not lie, at least not be open about their identity. Certainly I think if it has happened in the past it will not be happening now. I have to say that I think we have to be really careful about this and judge each case on its merits. We are seeking legal advice; there is no law that says it cannot happen.

The point I just raise for the Authority to consider is the fact that someone lies about their identity does not mean to say that a crime did not that; that is point one. If you just let me develop it just a shade. My point is, I think, we are all seeking the legal advice about what is the proper position on this, because there is no legal advice saying it is improper. If you are dealing - and I know Joanne has made the point of are we dealing with the most serious thing - with the most serious matters, you have to consider all options, and I think we are all going to seek advice about the future of that and how that should be managed. Part of what I am trying to assure myself about now is that that is not happening now. Certainly, even if it had been, we would be pressing the pause button, at the very least.

I think in terms of notifying any other co-defendants, then as we discover them we will be notifying CPS. I think the proper arrangement is that CPS should carry out that notification; I would expect they would. Certainly what I expect they would do is notify the defendants' solicitors and see how they want to deal with it, because potentially they may have the right of appeal. There may be some danger in us contacting them directly; they may worry about our motives. Either way we would contact the CPS and I would suspect that would be the route, but I am open to suggestions.

In terms of the final point, which was -- I am just trying to think now. The final point was whether ...?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Independent oversight.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Yes. Certainly for me at the moment, I have said how in our audit we will try to get independent oversight. In the future it seems to me Sir Dennis [O'Connor] will come to some conclusion of what he thinks and, of course, so will Government.

I have to say that if it is to change there will have to be a statutory change. One of the things I think certainly we drew attention to when I wrote the report - and I do not know how it is going to turn out - is that one of the things people are sometimes unaware of is that in legislation, in law, an informant, the way the law treats an informant, is the same way that they will treat a police undercover officer. In law there is no difference, which I find quite interesting. Of course, if that law changes it will have an impact on many organisations, some of which are law enforcement. I think there is quite a broad debate to have there about that, and I think it is an area of law that has been quite esoteric and it is one that people have not got involved in because it has been secret. I suspect that this whole debate will enliven that process.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Dee, did you have any further questions?

Dee Dooney (AM): Yes, I did. First of all, I think I would like to put on record how refreshing it is that you are willing to answer questions in such an open and transparent way. However, having said that, I would completely disagree with you when you say that an officer who goes into court and swears on the Bible that their name is Fred Bloggs when their name is John whatever, is not lying. Sorry, for 90% of the population, that is lying, although I do accept that probably the technical description is that if it is not material to the case they are not committing perjury. I do think it is important to draw the distinction.

I have a couple of questions. You first of all did not answer the question about whether this officer is still working for the Metropolitan Police Service and, if so, what is he doing. I am particularly interested to know if he is still involved in undercover actions. I am not worried about where he might be in the Metropolitan Police Service, just if he is working there.

Secondly, I would like to know if the IPCC investigation that you have asked for, and which I think we would all welcome, if it is supervised by the IPCC, if it is a supervised investigation, or if they are supervising the Metropolitan Police Service carrying out that investigation. I think there are two very, very different things.

My final comment would be just to say that I am very concerned that in all the years I have been on this Authority, we never get bad news brought to us from the Metropolitan Police Service, “There has been a major problem like this. Let us tell you about it so that we can do something about it together”. We always get our information from the press, and I regret that very, very much. I really think that, going forward, that has to stop.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): First of all, just to make clear what I was saying, I was trying to answer your question about whether it was absolutely criminal to lie about the name. I would encourage everybody to be open, honest and transparent in any legal process. In fact, people swear an oath to do that. In absolute terms the criminal law does not make it crime; that was my only point. Therefore, what clever lawyers have to then work out is which crime is it they committed. Is it attempting to pervert the course of justice, is it perjury? There are a series of actions you have to go through, and if it was a police officer, even if it was not either of the first two, for a police officer it might be misconduct in a public office. All I am saying is that there are a series of checks people have to go through. Of course, certainly as Commissioner, I want to make sure people are honest in court processes. That is what a judge would expect, that is what we all expect and I encourage it. I certainly do not support the latter, and I tried to indicate that in my response.

I am just a little careful about answering the point about whether he is still working for us and what he is doing. He is in the misconduct process, which is a publicly reported fact, so he must be still working for us. If you do not mind, I will not say an awful lot more about it.

The final point is that in terms of supervision we are waiting to see from the IPCC which they would like to do. The only reason for that is, to be fair to them, they have not had enough facts to conclude it yet. We have an allegation from the newspaper; we are trying to find the facts and then we will share them with them. I have told everybody involved I want everything out, for no other reason that I am new and I want to know as well. The idea was to give them everything to give them their best chance of working out should they do it, should we do it, should another force do it. To be fair to them, they just do not know yet because they do not have enough information to work it out. That is the state. We are discussing it with them and I am sure they will take advice and they will make their own decision, at the end of the day.

In terms of the final point about revelations, certainly my view would be that we would reveal to you what we find. Sometimes, of course, with a big organisation like the Metropolitan Police Service, we do not always know what we know. That is one of the challenges for the people I have asked to look into it. They have to be sure that what they

are being told is accurate, and sometimes it is not about being dishonest, it is about being incomplete, because getting hold of records, getting hold of people is a real challenge. So, I think even when people are trying hard, they do not always have the knowledge to share with you, but that is no excuse for not sharing it when it is known.

Dee Dooney (AM): Can I just ask for an assurance that when the IPCC decides what type of investigation they are going to carry out, that we actually hear it from the Metropolitan Police Service or the MPA rather than read it in the papers?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, we will make sure that it is circulated to everybody. Yes, Jenny [Jones]?

Jenny Jones (AM): Commissioner, could you just say are you advising on the scope of the investigation that the IPCC is going to do, and are you saying that they have to get to the root of this to find out how high and how wide it was and who authorised, how high the whole thing went? Because it is probably not enough just to look at a very limited area of the problem.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): One of the things I did say, you remember I said that DAC Mark Simmons was starting to get all this information together so that we know what has happened in the past. I set some time parameters there because one of the things the IPCC will have to work out is how many years do they want to go back - 1945? They will have to draw a line somewhere. As yet, because they do not have the information as yet, I do not think they yet know. So we set some broad parameters.

It is not really for me to suggest their parameters, because of course that could mean me limiting their inquiries. It is entirely for them to do that but I would encourage them to be as deep and as high as is necessary, because if an issue has been identified, it is not just the UC. What was the supervision, what was the policy, who signed it off? They are all reasonable questions that must be asked, so I expect that they will ask them, but it is not really for me to limit or really suggest the scope of the inquiry.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Any other questions on undercover? No. The questions now become a bit more disparate, so we will take them as they come. We are going to start with Steve O'Connell, if we can.

Jenny Jones (AM): Not mine next?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am just going to move to Steve now and then we will come back to you, Jenny.

Steve O'Connell (AM): I have a couple. Which ones do you want to take first?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): As you wish.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Fantastic. I would like to talk about, if I may, your commitment to total policing, which has, I have to say, caught the imagination of many of my residents, and they would really like to hear a little bit more of your thoughts around what that would mean on the ground. Perhaps you can enlighten me.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): If you remember, there are three broad sides to it: what is the total campaign against criminals and those who commit crime; total support for victims, because sometimes, sadly, we do not detect the crime so therefore the victims who we do not detect the crime for do not have the benefit of a real logistics process but they still need our care. The third is if we are talking professionally of the process of doing both, then I think we will achieve a great deal.

In terms of the crime side, the war on crime, my point is twofold, and then I will give you some specific examples. My first point is there are some things that if you do them all the time and they work, it's amazing, you get better. I think the service on the whole has a history sometimes of doing things and then forgetting about it and then doing them a year later and then remembering it is good practice. So my point is identifying things and then methodically, boringly, relentlessly, ruthlessly, doing the things that work day in, day out. Even in an emergency service that can be distracted by emergencies and major events, if we achieve it 80% of the time, we will achieve it more than by ad hoc. So my point is you have to be really relentless about the detail.

The second part is to get the whole organisation, the 52,000 people we have, plus anybody who will work with us, to concentrate on some themes right across the Metropolitan Police Service together. Examples of that would be the operation we carried out the other day, the reclaim. I think we are going to have to change its name to **QBO(?)** or something. The idea would be you concentrate on taking uninsured vehicles right across London, not in Haringey one day, not in Croydon another day, so that if there are people travelling around that day on the road uninsured, about to commit a crime, we have a good chance of catching them right across London. It is joint campaign.

You will see in the coming weeks we will be talking about something that we had in Merseyside and I think we can work here, which is around what we call Operation Hook,

which is around getting warrants around drug dealers, putting the doors in and then see what we find, the critical distinction being that rather than carrying out surveillance for weeks, months --, which is still necessary in some complicated cases, but for street-level dealers, if people give us information and it looks as though it is good reason, and we check that by taking it to a magistrate -- so it is not just an officer saying, "I've got the power to go in, I'm going to go in". It is going to a magistrate and convincing them, get a warrant and put the door in, so a rapidity, frequency and to concentrate some of that action probably two days a month. We will announce details of that in the coming days about how we will work that.

If you look on the victim side, it seems to me that there are a huge number of areas where we can improve our victim care. We can look at rape victims as being one example. Quite a lot has been done and I think more needs to be done. Generally how we keep victims informed, there is an awful lot more to do there. I have less detail to give you of a big campaign, if I am honest, but that is the sort of thing with the team I want us to work up, but I do know we have a huge area to improve.

The final areas was professionalism, how we train our people and how we promote our leaders, how we select and sanction things. It seems to me to be vital about how we send the message about what matters to us. That is a broad explanation.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Thank you very much for that. My residents will be very pleased to hear that and I am sure Londoners will as well, and I wish you good luck in that campaign.

Going back to the total war on crime, I sense this has a link with the Mayor's recent commitment to encourage the service to concentrate on the smaller crimes and have - and I will not use the 'Z' word - less tolerance with the smaller crimes, particularly around things like car insurance and, something that is a particular concern of mine, the increasing prevalence of running red lights, which is a Transport for London (TfL) and a Metropolitan Police Service issue. Would you therefore perhaps agree and welcome the view that perhaps the more we bear down on the smaller stuff, the likelihood is we pull in the big, serious fellows as well? Is that something that is linked into your thinking?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The bottom line is we have to do all of it. The temptation sometimes for the police is to concentrate on the top tier, because that is the sexier and the more serious stuff, and forget about the lower tier. I am glad of the Mayor's support. It is a sensitive time around elections and things, so I just emphasise that this approach is not new to London. It is something we started in Merseyside and we are bringing it here and we will adapt it to London.

In terms of reassurances, we do need to do all of it. We have as huge specialist crime portfolio, a huge silo of people who concentrate on nothing else but murder, and we have an excellent detection rate for murder, over 90%. We have a huge silo about counter-terrorism. We have specialists out there on public order traffic, so that will carry on. What I would say is that I would expect to have better performance management information from them. There is a tendency to concentrate of the volume stuff - how many burglaries, how many cars are attacked - and set targets. It is harder but not impossible to ask the specialists to account for their performance, and I would expect more from them too. It is not just the borough-based work; I expect the others to contribute to that too.

You mentioned, for example, red lights. One of the things that we have tried before and I think works in terms of that team approach, if we have days for uninsured vehicles, what I have found works is to get both the traffic department and the borough-based officers to concentrate on traffic issues 2 out of every 28 days. We found if we had campaigns, for example, on in-car safety - so it would be are they wearing seatbelt, are they using a mobile phone, are they shooting red lights, and it is not that hard to investigate. We have to make sure we concentrate on it. **TAMPOL**(?) are doing it and we have done it. Part of it, as we develop, would be to have big signs out, explain to the public what we are doing, and make sure there is huge publicity to maximise the impact.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Do you want to ask your other questions?

Steve O'Connell (AM): I would like to ask one other question. The rest can be left, as we are tight for time. It is particularly around the sobriety scheme, which, to remind you, is a scheme that has been adopted overseas, which is a theme on a curfew, where we are pulling in or asking to present themselves twice a day, people who have been convicted of crimes that are linked to alcohol. In other words, rather than perhaps locking them up and giving them a custodial sentence, give them a condition that twice a day they have to report to either the local authority or the police station to have a sobriety test. There are lots of advantages around that, and already I sense that there is some establishment opposition to it, as there often is to good ideas, and I would like your thoughts around how you would view a potential sobriety scheme.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I think I have said publicly already, so this is not the first time. I think I was actually at the same seminar that the Chair was at, where we heard about the sobriety work in America and I thought at all levels it was a really good idea. My only concern is that some of the proposals now in this country seem

to have watered some of it down. The thief of best practice is somebody said it does quite work here in that way.

I think the lessons from America are these, because if you remember -- obviously you may not be aware, but the critical thing was a district attorney who was sick of people dying on their roads. I think it was South Dakota. He made the, I thought, strategic change, which was instead of trying to stop drink drivers drinking, was to try to stop drivers getting drunk. That was the critical distinction. Therefore, what he did was to say, "If you get convicted of drink-driving, for the next six months you will be tested morning and night and if you fail you go to prison for a day". 90%-odd of people passed. So the certainty of detection with the certainty of sanction impacted on their behaviour, it appeared. The direct effect was that fewer people died on the road. The indirect effect was that there was less domestic violence, because the alcohol was having other effects on their lives as well as the most direct one.

It just seems to me that, as Members of this Assembly, you will have gone into cells regularly, and beyond 6.00pm you can smell the problem, because the place is intoxicated with the fumes of alcohol and it goes on until 6.00am the following morning. So the impact of alcohol on people's behaviour which leads to their criminality is massive. So for me anything that can inhibit that - I am not a prohibitionist; that is not my point - I think is worthwhile trying. Even if it had a 10% change it would save a lot of victims an awful lot of misery, I think. I think we ought to at least try it.

Our law at the moment does not enable it to be done entirely. I think the Home Office has a view that it can be achieved under conditional cautions, but that does mean a voluntary aspect for the suspect, and I am not sure that will work with this group of people. There is a lot of work to do about deciding which group of suspects we are talking about, and that is the volumes. I think the Strathclyde approach, the Scottish approach, with a different legal system, is probably better. They have gone for an electronic tag, so instead of calling the offender into the police station twice a day, or a probation office, they just monitor by tag, and if they fail they get breached. They have a system which was explained yesterday, which is that the sheriff can use the power to do that, but we do not have the same power.

That would be my concern. Certainty of detection I think is essential. It has to be, for me, mandatory not voluntary, and I think we need to target on those who cause most harm. We probably cannot implement it right across the board everywhere but I think it is something we should try.

Steve O’Connell (AM): I agree very much so. I think it is something to be looked at in due course. There will be resistance, not least from the civil liberties establishment, no doubt, but I think for the reasons that you have expounded there is a lot of merit around it and I think it is something we need to look at.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We have actually arranged for amendments to be tabled to the current sentencing bill which would give us the powers to run the scheme, and we are trying to seek cross--party support. I have had meetings with MPs from different parties to try to get them to sign up to the amendment, but sometimes politics gets in the way. Those of you who are not of a Conservative bent who want to encourage the scheme might talk to connections politically and see if we can get them to support the amendment of the bill; that would be very helpful.

Jennette [Arnold], did you have a question on this?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes. It relates to the questions that Steve has put. For me, they all speak to this sort of hard-hammer approach to policing. I just want to know have you done sufficient talking with key stakeholders in boroughs that you are going to be targeted. I can tell you who you will be targeting. It will not be the rich members of this world, and it will not be the Kensingtons and it will not be the outer Croydons. I tell you where you will be targeting it: it will be those of boroughs, it will be the boroughs I represent.

This is all taking it from the view that nothing is being done. There is so much that has been done, and I really want to know how this is going to be supportive of what is being done locally by people who have identified these issues, as you know when you were in the Metropolitan Police Service the last time you were here. It just feels to me that you have now come with the Home Office and you have this broad-hammer approach and you are going to get legislation. How does that fit in to what is being done already, when are we going to see the impact assessment, and which communities are you going to be looking to focus on?

Can you just tell me what is your programme about going out and walking and talking with people? Because I have not been approached by your office to go out and talk, because I can tell you I know of ten areas at least that are doing some of this work that could do with your assistance. I tell you it is not about civil liberties resisting it, it is about human rights and treating people with dignity and working with people and actually then following on from you are here to serve us and we want to work with you, but we are not going to be hammered by you or anybody else.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I do not know how to respond to that, really.

Jennette Arnold (AM): You do not respond by laughing, you take it seriously; it is a serious point.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It is not a serious point. The drivers could come from anywhere.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): South Croydon people run lights; it could be anybody.

Cindy Butts (AM): The reason why it is a serious point is, as Jennette said, things are happening at the moment. The point is you need to assess what is good, what works and what does not work. Sometimes in taking this heavy-handed approach where you just put something new in without acknowledging the good stuff and how you can retain and add value to it is important, and I do not think you should dismiss it.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): The reason I said I did not know where to start was because I felt as though the statutory part -- you were referring to the statutory part, Jennette. There is nothing of what I have said about the campaign on criminals which has anything to do with the statutory part. I am not asking for any statutory change as a result of that.

What Steve was raising was the point about the sobriety element, and I stand by that because I do think that there needs to be a statutory basis for that work and I do think it is something that is worthwhile, and it will benefit all communities if we can do that. That was my point about where to start.

In terms of my coming in and doing this to people, I do not think that is fair. The reason I do not think it is fair is I was asked, in the selection process that picked me, "What would you do if you came in?" I gave a view to the Home Office, because it was Home Secretary's appointment. I gave a view to the Police Authority, so I have never been unclear about what I think I can offer. That does not mean to say no one is doing it already. In fact, as it happens, we went to Hackney yesterday, and a lot of what they are doing is what should be done in other places.

Cindy Butts (AM): Did you invite Jennette?

Jennette Arnold (AM): No.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Can I just complete --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Why should we, and have everybody trailing us around to every meeting?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I have never tried to interrupt anybody else and it would be really helpful if I could develop the point and then I will take questions.

Male Speaker: Not tonight, Jennette, not tonight.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): It is quite confusing to be asked questions and be interrupted, because otherwise I miss the point and I cannot respond properly.

The point I was trying to make was that in Hackney, which we went to have a look at the gang work, which was a police account but also included a partners' work as well, it seemed to me there was some pretty good work that was going on. Part of that account was, for example, about the number of drug warrants they had executed every day of the year, so therefore it would be nothing new, I suspect, to Chief Superintendent Bending and his team, but I have to tell you it is not a consistent approach across the Metropolitan Police Service.

My point in Merseyside, when I went there, what I have just described to you was not my idea about putting the doors in for the warrant; it was a sergeant on the Wirral. He started it, but in North Liverpool, in Knowsley, in St Helens, they said, "Well, it works there but it doesn't work here". My point was if it works we do it everywhere. So the point was about trying to get the whole organisation with tactics that work to do it. It was not said that no one does it. I hope that is to reassure you; I know that that work is going on.

Your point about have I talked to everybody, no. The only reason is in the four weeks I have been here it is not physically possible. To give you an example of an approach that I hope will help to work, on Monday of next week - and I was trying to avoid talking about it today because we are not trying to make a public event of it - we are getting the 14 leaders of the local authorities most affected by some of the gang work to come to a meeting, which the Chair is coming to and I think someone from the Home Office at a junior level is coming to, together with Lewis Casey, to see what can we do together - your point - to do these things better. Not that we are not doing it, not that we are not taking it seriously, but what can we do together, because we cannot do it alone, and I

know that. It is trying to set a tone, it is trying to get leadership and get people in rooms and say, "What can we do?" It does not need other meetings.

In terms of the point why were you not invited yesterday, we did not, but we did not invite many other people. We did not invite the leader; we did not invite the chief executive. This was just about me visiting the police station and talking to my staff and getting an update on what they were doing. It happened that the Chair came because he had come because he had had a series of letters exchanged at a political level about whether Hackney were doing anything. In fact, as you know, they are doing an awful lot.

So just hopefully to reassure you that I agree entirely that, first of all, there are good things happening but it is my job to make sure it happens everywhere not just in some places. We have to work with other people, and I think you will find - I hope you will find - the characteristic of my leadership is that is what will happen. The only we achieved what we did in Merseyside is because we worked together, not because I told them to do it.

If you are asking me for a tone and why we select it, I will give you a tone, and that is really what I tried to set out at the beginning. You cannot do everything by enforcement. My point is that all communities deserve -- there is no community that has a majority of criminals. All communities have a minority of criminals but some need more help than others, and we will not help them by ignoring it.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can I just say that the announcement that you have just made is known about, and that is really good news, so thank you for answering that. Can I just say to you that there are already complaints and people feeling miffed. I am not feeling miffed, because I am used to being ignored by the Chair. I do not know that he has ever invited me to an event when he has attended my constituency. When you talk about the visit there, the work that is going on in Hackney is absolutely linked to community leadership. I and other elected Members are absolutely linked in with that, because that is the point of the interface. Just walking around with leaders and not linking in with community leaders on your first visit to Hackney, I think, is regrettable, and so do other community leaders.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): I take the feedback. The only thing I can say is that in the 28 days I have had there is a limit to how many people I can meet. What is essential, I think, is to get some facts in from which hopefully we can produce some plans.

One of the things particularly, I hope to reassure you, is that I am conscious that if I come in with a plan and we say we are going to import this right across London, it may be that we produce the same solution for different problems, and in fact there was some evidence for that in Hackney yesterday. I think they made the case that it is different in Hackney to other places. I think they have a good point, actually. So I want to make sure that what we come up with is representative of the nature of a problem, not just what my narrow view is from the outside.

I only can plead guilty that in the time I have available you have to sometimes have a really focused look at things and then come back later and do the very things you are talking about. I am not against it; it is just trying to manage time. If, in the process of doing that, it has let somebody down, I do apologise, but it is not intended.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Nobody knows we were there. Victoria [Borwick].

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you very much. A slightly different tack, please. Can we just talk about the forensic service of the police? What structures are in place to manage the 180 forensic service scientists who have been moved into Scotland Yard? Obviously there is some history here, and I just want to clarify and have a full understanding of how they are going to operate.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Yes. As you know, the Director of Forensic Services, Gary Pugh, has led the overall management of the transfer of the Forensic Science Service to the Metropolitan Police Service. There is a detailed plan of that transfer and as you know, because the Authority was directly involved in it, first of all there was transfer of the buildings and the assets, so that has been quite a complicated process to do with leasing, but eventually the negotiations with the Home Office were concluded. Secondly we had a responsibility around **TUPIC(?)**, which was to transfer the people. A final area is obviously to make sure this thing works, because, of course, the Metropolitan Police Service has not run a forensic service in this way before, or certainly not for a long time. It used to be for many years before it was deregulated. I suspect there are a few lessons for us to learn.

Essentially, there is a plan in place. That transfer happened -- actually, I think the transfer date is 28 November, so there is an implementation plan. There was a slight problem, I seem to remember, where there was access to the building needed to complete some final works for the handover, the dilapidation work that needed doing, but I think that was resolved so the transfer should go ahead. I am sure we will learn lessons over the coming weeks, but broadly there is a plan in place but you can seek any feedback if that is not working.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I think my only concern was, as you said yourself, looking back historically there were concerns raised in the past about independence and evidence. I am just really flagging that up because it is very important as we move forward, particularly in view of what you have said to us this morning about your own views on transparency and honesty and integrity, which we all thoroughly support, but inevitably the work concerns before about that -- and I am going back historically. As you said you said yourself, I am sure there are lessons to be learned, and I just want to flag that up in order to make sure that whereas there was a view before that there was possibly corruption, that this is something that you must obviously avoid, particularly under the new regime.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): Probably a couple of points to make. Before the forensic science service market was deregulated, there was only one provider, and that was the Forensic Science Service. In fact, I think it was called something else at the time. There were issues then about integrity, even then it was independent of the police. The first thing that happened was that the market was deregulated and about four big market providers developed, one of which was the old Forensic Science Service, the very one which has now become defunct. At the same time the market was deregulated, a regulator was put in place, so there is a regulator who will hold us to account about standards, so that is a relatively new thing. I think that will be a level of reassurance that it is an independent body from the police.

I suppose the potential for not just this Authority, but for any governance body and also for us to consider in the future, is there is a potential for outsourcing again. We are not here to run a business. One of the things we are going to have to consider over the coming years is whether or not there is a potential to generate income and therefore profit, because the size of the Metropolitan Police Service for the southeast might be a hub for other people to send their material to us, and often you find a surges where a big event like the disorder has happened and there is a need to get material examined. That might be an opportunity for us.

Now, that is a bit of a challenge because we cannot - Bob [Atkins] might correct me - often set pricing to make a profit, but we might want to generate income, if that is not contradictory. I think there is something for us to think about because, of course, public service on the whole has not really had to compete and therefore has not tried to drive down costs. I think at some point any governance body will want to say, "Does the Metropolitan Police Service continue with this in the future or does it want to outsource it again when the market has developed?" At the moment I do not think there is any real alternative other than the Metropolitan Police Service taking this on. I do not think the

market could actually fill that hole, but in the next couple of years we might find that changes.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I am sure we wish you well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Caroline next.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My first question is following the introduction of a new operating model for safer neighbourhood teams and the reduction in numbers of sergeants in these teams, can you clarify under what circumstances can safer neighbourhood officers and PCSOs be extracted?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (Commissioner, MPS): One thing that I have tried before, and I have to be careful I do not seek to impose old solutions, was actually set abstraction targets. James [Cleverly] is not here today, but he may have a different view. We set an abstraction target in the sense that abstraction could not go generally above X. I think it was 5%. We accepted that you need to train safer neighbourhood teams; we accepted that sometimes they had to go and do other things, so there may be times when they were not in the neighbourhood. What concentrated everybody's minds was to set a broad parameter which it should not go over and if it did it had to be explained. I would be quite interested in whether or not, at a governance level, you were interested in that. Then we could publish it and we could find out how often those abstractions happen. I think for the future it is something that we could do. Generally, I would not expect any officers to be abstracted together with CSOs.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): In terms of the changes that have currently gone on - it is fine what you are saying for the future and I am sure we would all like to feed into that - I have already started to receive some complaints from boroughs saying that they are seeing high numbers of requests. They have even suggested supplying officers outside of their borough and they are coming from their local teams, but I am getting complaints that the teams are being moved to other bits of the borough or even outside and that is leaving wards severely under-resourced when there are crime issues in that area. Are you keeping an eye on that and can you report back what is actually going on now in terms of the number of abstractions?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Because there is not a target, then it is hard to be absolutely sure about what is happening; whether it is getting worse or better because of the information you are not collecting in the way we have just described. When you set a target, then you do get the information, so I have no clear information to say whether it is getting worse or better but I take your advice. I think what is happening, I have picked

up, is that we are getting more vacancies accumulating on board Community Support Officers (CSOs) and we are getting hit by two things; one is that some CSOs are have gone through to be police officers. We have a budgetary limit because we are trying to work out what our budget for next year is and, of course, if we recruit the CSOs we have just made police officers, we may end up where we cannot afford them next year and until the budget is settled, I think there is a budgetary under recruitment freeze that allowed vacancies to accumulate. So, therefore, in various neighbourhoods, we have seen more vacancies than we probably would in a normal year. I think that is contributing to this fact that there are less people to service some of the needs where they have been called to other places.

I think the other thing is that there has been a push to try and deploy across ward boundaries. I think the idea is because there less of them, to get a critical mass of people to do anything they are wanting to deploy across the ward boundaries, so I think that is one of the pushes for it. Certainly for me, I would expect them to be dedicated to the neighbourhoods and if we do get a target in place, I suspect it could not be before next year, then we would be in a better position to say whether or not it is getting worse or better or if you are certain those are affected by it which may be a local management issue rather than a strategic one.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): OK. I will take up something with the Borough Commander with the specific issues they have had raised.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Sorry; just to add on that. As part of abstraction, on planned abstractions, there is meant to be a notification, so Borough Commanders, where they are abstracting from wards under the new system as I understood it, they are meant to notify, certainly to the ward panel, what the abstraction is likely to be. Obviously there are emergency abstractions that take place and then they are reported post but under the territorial policing (TP) development, I thought there was meant to be a notification and there should be a detail to what those abstractions are being.

Maxine de Brunner (AM): We do not have that notification in place at present although that is part of the development programme although it has not been formalised by the development programme but informally, we are notifying panels. In terms of abstraction rates, we do have emergency situations where we do abstract say for open teams and we have discussed that before but they are approved by a management board in cases of large commitments and cases of disorder and public order which you already know about. In cases of routine abstractions, we try and minimise those as much as we possibly can because obviously we do accept that our local policing teams are the bedrock of our policing model, so that is our starter for ten, if you like, in terms of our abstraction policy

and the development programme which is being headed up by Nina Cope, as you are aware, is very clear that we want to maintain that going forward.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am told there is a member briefing on this subject next week and then there is a paper coming to the next Strategic and Operational Policing (SOP) meeting on exactly these issues.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): You are ahead of the game then with my question. Shall I move to my other one then?

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I ask my safer neighbourhood question now?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right, fine; why not; if you are on safer neighbourhoods too.

Joanne McCartney (AM): My question was that in a recent interview with a police professional, you were quoted as saying, “In regard to safer neighbourhood teams, there was no doubt that the loss of sergeants is not a positive outcome” and you revealed that you had further plans for safer neighbourhood teams. I wondered if you could just explain that comment and what plans you have in future.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): OK. I suppose there were two things we were thinking about at that time. The first one was depending on what our financial settlement is depends on how many officers we have but certainly one of the things I want to do for the future is that it seems to me it is a perfectly legitimate point at a strategic level to talk about how much of our resources do we dedicate to territorial policing. Is it 69%, is it 72%, what is it? It seems to me that rather than get into the political game of talking about shall we have more in Harrogate, should there be more in Hackney, should there be more in Luton, we should be at that broad level and say that we have enough resources in these areas, in this broad area because there is too much serious crime, there should be less. Therefore, I thought that was a possibility for us for the future and I was trying to give a certain amount of some of my intent rather than a conclusion of that thinking process because I do have to talk to people about how that should be achieved. I think there is an opportunity to potentially have more resources in TP generally but then we have to decide what we are going to do with them.

I think the second thing I was thinking about is that one of the proposals that arrived in the Metropolitan Police Services, which was already on the table, was the potential for converting some of the community support officers’ post towards police officers because that is one of the ways that you both save money and you get as many police officers, at

least, that you had. So it could be that we had the same number of people in a ward, or a neighbourhood, but there may be a different ratio of police officers to community support officers because that is just the way that the budgets are working out.

So in my mind, I was not trying to make a big announcement when responding to the journalist's question; that was what I was thinking about, but there is no conclusion and to be frank, until we know what the budget is and how we are going to apply it, I cannot be sure.

Joanne McCartney (AM): It is the comment saying that the loss of the sergeants is not a positive outcome that implied that you might have another idea with sergeants.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Not particularly, no. I was just really trying to acknowledge; it is very hard to explain to a community you had a sergeant, you now have not got a sergeant. I cannot explain that as a positive outcome for them because they might see the lack of seniority, they might see the lack of a person. I never try and persuade something that they do not agree with is wrong just because I do not -- you know, there is no fact that you can deploy, I do not think, to convince somebody that is a positive outcome. That is the only thing I was trying to get over. What the model would be going forward, I think we have still an opportunity to improve it; whether or not it is a sergeant or not I think is up for debate.

Joanne McCartney (AM): OK because we have not obviously planned a further 150 sergeants to come out this next year. The initial plan was for them to come from safer neighbourhood teams as well, so that might not now be the case of all of them, but do you have any --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): This was not me trying to make an announcement that 150 sergeants would stay, for clarity. It was more minded to how we might improve things in the neighbourhood and I have indicated two areas in which I think we could improve things, but until I have had a few more discussions, and I am sorry to keep answering this way, but if I come in with certainty, I am accused of coming in and not knowing what I am talking about and if I come without certainty, then you might say, "Well, what are you going to do?" I just think, on this period, as we build our team, it is one of the things that is important to me but I would like to come back to you with a clearer proposal which I can stand behind and I cannot at the minute but I am trying to give an indication of direction.

Joanne McCartney (AM): When are likely to have that indication?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): When I get a budget.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It will be in the New Year what the budget process is.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): When we know what money we have and, therefore, potentially what people we have, I honestly feel I could give you a better answer.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Does that cover your other question as well that is outstanding? Do you want to ask that one? I am sorry, Caroline, Waltham Forest has been in touch with you, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My second question was I have been contacted by the London Borough of Waltham Forest about their gang prevention programme Enough is Enough. Is this model being used elsewhere and what resources of the Metropolitan Police Service are going into tackling gangs across London?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): This might be to Jennette's point of people are doing things and, therefore, why are you telling them to do things? So I take it on the chin, but I think if I am right, Waltham Forest, what Waltham Forest interestingly call Enough is Enough, I think the Metropolitan Police Service call Connect. It is an interesting juxtaposition and I think what is happened is that Connect has been rolled out in different boroughs, I think up to five. There was not a clear plan as to where else will it go, who to talk to, which is your point, which is what has led me to have the meeting, together with others, about the 14 boroughs to see what we might do together and what we will call it. So I think the Waltham Forest stuff is good but there are other places which seem as good. If I am honest about the Hackney one, I thought it was a bit strong on enforcement and I heard less about the carrot. I understand Waltham Forest has a bit more of the carrot, so that is where I genuinely want to see what others are doing to see how we can build a plan that we can all stand behind. I think that is where money will help with that although there will be more work to do.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I think that is good and I am pleased you said you have 14 boroughs coming together to look at this and I think it is about learning within the Metropolitan Police Service but also elsewhere, whether it is national or even international; if there are other little initiatives and things proving to work, then actually we need to look at that to see what can work in London to try to break this --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Just to give an example; if you looked at what they are doing in Strathclyde, it was taken I think from America about the calling in of gangs. I think that something that is worth looking at. Of course, Scotland's got a legal base on

which to do it. What they say is if the Sheriff has some process that you should come in, you have no choice. I am afraid if I said it now, they would and it may be they do not choose to come and it seems to me that is the type of thing we need to back to the statutory framework around that type of thing which means that when we say we are going to do something, we do it; we just do not make a waffley set of words. So I think there is quite a lot to learn from other places. I said humility and I mean it which is that wherever it is, we can make that best practice. We have to stand behind it together and I do believe strongly we need to have a consistent approach across London while respecting the fact that locally there may be different issues. I do not think the two are inconsistent. The core best practice, we should do everywhere, and then we should adapt it to wherever it is, so there is a lot of work to do and it is early days.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Joanne, do you want to ask another question?

Joanne McCartney (AM): It was on police numbers and it ties in with your written report today. It is if you have had an update on what discussions you have had with the Home Office about retaining police officers for a longer period. This again refers to your same interview I referred to earlier. Can you specify for how long you meant when you are talking about retaining them for a longer period and what happens after the Olympics? Do you see a different environment at that stage?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): OK. I suppose my general urging is I would like to keep as many police officers for as long as possible and ideally get more. I have not really had discussions directly with the Home Office about me asking for more or asking for a certain number. I have left that entirely to the Police Authority and the Chair and the Mayor to have those discussions because, of course, the amount of money that is available for us to spend is an approach of two things; central grant which is the Government's part and local preset which is entirely a local matter. So I do not think it is my job to start interfering with that, so I do await with interest, but the sooner we can get clarity, it would helpful to hear the outcome of that.

Obviously I would like to keep the officers as long as possible. The Olympics is a big issue for us. It is a huge undertaking and we want to get through that safely and then really, it depends on how the public finances can support that going forward and I am eager to persuade people to do more but I am not sure it is for me to be saying about what that answer should be.

Joanne McCartney (AM): If I look at paragraph 30 and 31 of your written report, the police officer complement in next March is meant to be 32,320. If you read paragraph 31, you are saying you are now forecasting it as 31,800 which is 500 less than

planned. Is that a combination of resources and freezing and do you see that changing at all even if you get more money put into the budget for that this year?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I think part of it is just in any of the police generally, we always budget to go under rather than over, so in terms of our officer numbers, you rarely find that if the establishment is set at 32,300, there is never a day when we go over; we are always a bit under, so some of it is that but not entirely. The rest is that if we should get up to that figure of 32,300, and if we on average lose 1,700 officers a year, and we get a budget which is higher than that, we have actually created a budget that cannot work and neither the Treasury nor anyone else will allow us to do that quite properly. So what I cannot do is keep recruiting people at the rate at which we have been if the money is not promised and I think that is where this debate is ongoing. We are trying to manage the risk by keeping some recruiting going but not getting exactly to that level until we can be sure that even if we got to that level, we could get rid of the excess next year to the budget we might be offered. Am I making myself clear? I know it is not straightforward.

Joanne McCartney (AM): So we are expecting 31,800 by March.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): At the moment.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It depends. If the settlement comes in better than that over the next couple of months, then there are measures in place that we can accelerate some recruitment to try to get us at or near that number. Having said that, you have to remember police officer numbers are a function of two things. One is recruitment, the other is retirement and retirement is less predictive and one of the reasons that we are a bit undershooting at the moment is that we had more than expected retirements over the summer. Every time there is some suggestion that there is going to be a messing around with pensions, we see a flush of people putting their papers in for 30 years and retiring, so it is a bit of a imprecise science.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Just to add a little to that in terms of what the Chair has just said about that if we do get the money we can recruit 32,000, is that we are just starting a campaign on transferees, so that for people out there in other forces who can come in, we can get them through fairly quickly; we do not need to go through all the training process and the vetting is more light and we have a battery of CSOs we know in the system where they could get through fairly quickly? So we have plans in place. Obviously the nearer it gets to March, the harder it gets to do it, so we are just trying to manage that by not recruiting fully to the target but keeping a stream of people coming through and hopefully sensible management of the budget and our needs for policing.

John Biggs (AM): I had, what I felt, was an interesting conversation with your predecessor on this subject and I suppose it centres on the question of what the boundary is between operation decisions made by yourself as Commissioner and the more political decisions made by people like the Mayor or Kit or even little old me. We are obviously going through a political period at present, a typical period in this world in which people are holding up police numbers as being very, very important. The budget review, certainly by the Chair, has looked at this a little bit and tried to take some of the politics out of the discussions and there is a risk within limited budgets. You can obviously answer by saying you do not even employ people until you have a budget, that with an imperative to maintain police officer numbers, the police numbers may become lopsided, so you may have too many officers sitting in support posts to maintain police numbers. We had this concept introduced at a previous meeting on the serge capacity so the fact that officers are sitting behind desks is very important to you because if there is a demonstration or a riot or something, they can all spring out from behind their desks; the ones that are physically able to control the unrest or whatever it is has happened. It did strike me as a somewhat tenuous argument but are you clear about the operational boundaries and if the Mayor in deciding to give you a budget which does not allow you, in your opinion, to progress sufficiently with the police service with 32,300, you will simply go ahead and say, "Sorry, mate; can't do that"?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): What did my predecessor say? My view would be that, first of all, I would not support a lopsided organisation. There is no point in it really.

John Biggs (AM): Right but you recognise the risk of that happening?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): There is always a risk, I agree, but I think in the area we are talking about, it is ever so hard to be precise about these; I can only give my best professional advice, but I do not think we are in that territory and if we were to be asked to increase by another 10,000, we probably would be and there is no doubt that if we are going to have maintain the same number of officers by savings in any way, then that pushes your growth, so I accept the broad point. My advice to the Chair and to the Mayor would be it is barmy to have a notional figure and not have them equipped, supported and trained to do the right job. I do not think anyone is proposing that at the moment. I do not think we are in that territory but you could be reassured that if I felt that and all the professional advice we were getting from the team was this is not good then I would tell you. I have to say that of the people I have talked to in the Metropolitan Police Service, no one has said that that have worries about wanting to make sure we make the right -- nobody wants to give up money for savings; that conversation is going on but nobody said, "If we do this, we will start to fail" and I would tell you if I thought that was the case.

John Biggs (AM): Just one supplementary; I was briefed recently by people on the staff side who said that their understanding that something over 6,000 warrant card carrying officers were employed in posts in the Metropolitan Police Service in which they did not really need a warrant card. Do you feel comfortable with that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I would want to understand what their criteria are and how they were playing it. I think there are a number of elements to that. There was some fall which meant there is an issue around members who know they are on restricted duties; people who cannot do all the functions of a police officer.

John Biggs (AM): I think this was in addition to restrictive and recuperative officers.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): OK and, of course, there are some cases; for example, we have officers investigating fraud and we have police staff fraud investigators, one of whom I met at the breakfast meeting which started on last Friday who wanted more powers to do the things and said they were cheaper and why do no we give them more powers. He had a reasonable point. So I suspect there are some jobs like that and there are certain cases where now that we have some of the front counters, where police staff have been redundant, we seem to have police officers doing them, so I am sure there are some cases like that and I would want to make sure that any police officer was using their powers in a job in which they did not have to use them. Of course, there are always some jobs we are going to deploy officers in that way, intelligence being but one. You do not have to arrest anybody but you might want a police officer doing some of it; could even have undercover officers. You do not have to arrest anybody but they do need powers at times. I would like to understand where they get 6,000 from because if they are able to share it, I would be interested to see it as part of my initial look.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Val, did you have a question on this?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): A question about violence, Chair, if I may. The Commissioner mentioned the potential £200 million to £300,000 with the claims under the Riot Damages Act and the extra costs of operation et cetera and your paragraph in your report on page 60(c)(6), there is this chilling phrase, the current planning assumption is that these costs will be met by the Government. If this proves not to be the case, then further pressure will be put on the MPA Metropolitan Police Service resources. I think given the pressures the budget is already under, it is terrifying to contemplate that we might not get financial assistance with that and I think we need to know what the likelihood is of support being met, what the timetable is. What is the contingency planning around what happens if we get let down on this because that amount of sudden

further cut to the budget I think is unsustainable and impractical to be taken in a one-year period. What is the planning around that and I am trying to be helpful here?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, I understand. You realise that Bob and others and indeed I have been in negotiation with the Government and the truth is we have no reason to believe that the money will not be forthcoming and, in fact, those conversations have been very constructive and positive thus far. The only reason I would expect that there is that element of caution is that the ink is not on the dotted line but we have no reason to believe it is not and frankly, we also seek a certain amount of reassurance in the fact that if they decide not to pay, then there are other police authorities who will effectively go bust and they cannot allow that to happen. So we are sort of protected a bit, if you like, by that, but as I say, negotiations thus far have very positive. We have no reason to believe we will not get at 100% recovery. There is definitely recognition at the Home Office that there will be budgetary difficulties if that is not the case, so we have to proceed on that basis. The first payouts have happened already.

Bob Atkins (AM): We have paid out overtimes costs quite clearly but they have virtually been fully paid out now. We have not yet paid out on mutual aid, so that will probably be fairly eminent and the actual Riot Damages Act claims which, of course, are the biggest amounts, are going through a process which, to be perfectly honest, in some of the bigger claims, it could take three to four years before we ever actually pay out the money because they are going to build a new building or whatever.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): It is not going to be a short term --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): So the thing to bear in mind is there are two types. There are the uninsured that are getting paid out and there is the insured who are claiming for their insurance and the insurance companies come to us and that process is likely to take years.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I just wanted some assurance around the Government actually providing us --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, we have no reason to believe they are not going to stand behind us.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): OK, so it is an over-cautionary phrase then.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): We were not trying to incite a fear. We are just trying to be complete in our account.

Tony Arbour (AM): The questions I put down relate to foreign armed police coming to the Olympic Games. Are foreign police and security staff being brought into the UK during the Olympics? Will any such people have diplomatic immunity? If so, how many will be in the UK during this period and to whom will they be responsible for their instructions? Will any be armed and has the Metropolitan Police Service the authority to veto the carrying of arms?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): In terms of the first question, there is no intention to bring any foreign police and security staff into the UK during the Olympics. Any foreign police officer may choose to travel as part of their own country's delegation and the point I am trying to make there is it is not part of our plan around policing the Olympics.

In terms of will any person have diplomatic immunity, there is no blanket granting of diplomatic immunity in these circumstances. It is a matter for the Commonwealth Office to determine who is granted diplomatic immunity. Who are they responsible to? It is a matter for individual countries that travel as part of their country's delegation and, as such, we are not in charge of them. However, officers from the Metropolitan Police Service Close Protection Command Unit are in charge and responsible for the protection of that country's VIPs where a decision has been taken to provide close protection. Just as an aside, I met with the French Brief Equerry this week because they were interested in the other protection around their officers; bearing in mind, there is over 200 countries represented. I think there is going to be around 150 Heads of State attending the event which concentrates the mind just a little.

Will any be armed? The presumption is that armed close protection will be provided by British police officers who are fully trained close protection officers. Has the Metropolitan Police Service the authority to veto the carrying of arms? Yes. Any application for a foreign police officer to carry arms must be granted by the Metropolitan Police Service and the Home Office.

How do the police control non-UK citizens who carry arms? Any foreign police officer or member of security staff who travels to the Olympics as part of their country's delegation is subject to UK law. They have no greater powers available to them than any other member of the public.

Tony Arbour (AM): Thank you for that. On the face of it, there are going to be very few people who are going to be carrying arms although I am little worried to hear that there are 120-odd Heads of State coming who, from what you have said, are entitled to

close protection and theoretically, therefore, could be armed. Are those people notified to you?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): They would be.

Tony Arbour (AM): So you would know, for example, if there was the Israeli Head of State coming to the Olympic Games or do you know who precisely was carrying arms, what they were carrying and where they would be?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I suppose the first thing that we would not talk about is individual protection arrangements about any country or any individual for obvious reasons of security but in short, yes.

Tony Arbour (AM): You would know.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Yes. I just point out why it is essential is obviously if that was to be the case, then it is right for the armed people and who else may be on.

Tony Arbour (AM): Have there been any requests so far from any participating nation to have armed security men with them or indeed, even unarmed security men with them?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I think I should make it a general point. I think it is unwise to say any more detail on this type of issue. I have given you a broad general policy on this issue. In any case, it is far too early for that type of arrangement to be discussed. I have said I will be open but I think there is a limit as to what is sensible to discuss in open forum.

Tony Arbour (AM): I am not asking Hammer Hogan how to --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): You started it.

Tony Arbour (AM): -- to specify any country at all. I merely asked you a general question. Have there been any requests?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Tony, I think the issue is that if the Commissioner goes any further in terms of answering those kind of questions, people might be able to deduce from that possibly who we might be talking about, so I think we just need to be careful. I think, if you will forgive me, the policy framework is clear, the knowledge of the Metropolitan Police Service about who is and who is not armed is (a) controllable and (b)

complete. Whether there have been requests or not around the games or whatever else is a matter that I think we ought not to go into.

Hold on, Clive. Has Tony finished?

Tony Arbour (AM): No, I have not. I have not finished at all. It could, therefore, happen, could it not, since the games are going on for a relatively short period of time, there could, in fact, be members of Olympic delegations who are armed, who have not told you, who could be not simply at the Olympic site but in London who are armed without your knowledge? You are depending entirely, are you not, on all visiting teams, all visiting delegations being entirely upfront on this matter? Is that right?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): To some extent but I think that is the nature of relationships between states is that there is an openness and transparency and if that is breached for some reason, that can be a diplomatic event but I think most states take their obligations to each other seriously and part of that is security. I would expect that the system works appropriately and if for no other reason, you should be reassured that most people do not want to cause more danger than they are trying to reduce and there is a risk if firearms are involved. If it is all hidden, then, of course, there is more danger. So I generally would reassure you that I think the arrangements are in place. Of course someone might be dishonest, if so why are they being secretive; I think that is very likely but not impossible.

Clive Lawton (AM): I was not sure if I had a clear enough answer to one part of Tony's question which is taking that it may happen that a head of security, whatever, applies for permission for armed security officers to come from their country and that permission may be granted in a given situation, once those people are there doing that job, are they directed and controlled by their own service or are they, as it were, supplementary to your service and under the control and direction of your officers?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): The first thing is they are all answerable to the law of this country, so, therefore, they have that general framework in which to work. Second, as I said within the answer, is that the security of individual VIPs is entirely our responsibility.

Christopher Boothman (AM): Chair, I just wanted to say in fairness to the Commissioner, members of the Olympic subcommittee have had a briefing covering all those questions which were dealt with sometime ago by Chris Allison and all those questions were answered to the satisfaction of the committee.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Tony, did you want to ask your other question?

Tony Arbour (AM): Yes, just on this question here that I have on sensible policing, the police should be taken out of the back offices. I would like to draw your attention to a crime which is extremely prevalent in London which is the stealing of metal. I raise this in particular because the principal War Memorial in Twickenham was raided two days ago and not only was the loss something which related to the people of Twickenham who had died in the two world wars, this was a substantial work of art as well as being something as scrap metal. I would like to know whether or not police are active in London in dealing with all of those who purchase scrap metal and I understand we are awaiting some sort of legislation, but what particular instructions have you given to borough commanders to keep a record of what these characters are buying?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): First of all, I condemn this particular theft you refer to. Apart from whether it is a work of art or not, to steal metal from your memorial in those circumstances seems pretty disgraceful. The second this is it is a growing issue because of the value of scrap metal. I know the Chair has been involved in various campaigns. The Metropolitan Police Service is involved in campaigns to improve our policing around this issue, some of which has had to return to the past, checking scrap metal dealers, checking people who are going in; do they have bona fides, are they the people they say they are, if they are taking large amounts regularly, where it is coming from? So they are things that we are doing and the British Transport Police are the national lead because they have particularly been affected by the effect on communications and obviously on the Rail Network and there has been some very dangerous events which have both left the travelling public at risk and also frankly of the suspects, so we are doing a huge amount about it. I think we are relearning some of the lessons of the past. One of the questions we were charged about at some point; do you have a scrap metal squad, which having come from South Yorkshire originally, we always had being the centre of the steel industry and sadly scrap metal theft was a major issue there, so we had a scrap metal squad but it was always linked to organised crime. Now, whether or not we have gone back to that day, I am not sure yet, but I suspect that will come.

Tony Arbour (AM): I think there may well be public pressure for you to introduce one here in the Metropolitan Police Service. The problem is extremely serious.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. Just to say that I had a meeting with the Home Office PTP, the area of the Metropolitan Police Service that deals with this a couple of months ago. In fact, Richard Barnes is holding a large event here in a month or so to look at this issue from a resilience point of view, trying to pull in some of the train operators as well, TfL, all these people who are losing quite significant amounts of metal. I think that we

might need a tightening up of the regulations around scrap metal dealers and I know the Home Office are very interested in looking at that. We have had some policy discussions with them but also the other bit of metal theft which, of course, is spiked is the easy ability to dispense of gold for cash now. We are one of the only countries in Europe where it is so easy to drop gold into an envelope, send it off and get a cheque back. In fact, a lot High Streets have a little caravan now where you can just go and drop the gold off for cash. That is fuelling a certain amount of burglary and robbery, so we are also looking at whether the regulations could be tightened up there too.

Thank you, and Jenny.

Jenny Jones (AM): Chair, I think it is an act of real rudeness on your part not to take my questions in the order they were submitted. This flies in the face of the normal procedure at these meetings and I would like you to write to me with a reason for doing it because I think it just looks as if you are being rather picky and not having a sort of strategic thought about the way the meeting runs.

Commissioner, John Biggs interrupted you just now and you did not even notice, so I claim the same rights if I am inspired.

John Biggs (AM): Or not to be noticed; I think that is what you objected to.

Jenny Jones (AM): No, that is right. John Biggs gets away with murder. My first question is on knife crime. In the light of the recent statistics on knife crime, when will we see the new intelligence approach to stop and search and will this new approach lead to a reduction in the overall number of stops and searches?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): First of all in terms of the new approach; it will be in the New Year. The only reason I am saying that is having just selected two new Acting Commanders (ACs), rather than just giving them a first company, I would like them to be involved in the thinking around stop and search generally and stop and account, a report of which we have out later. Just to remind Members who may not have heard before; I have just heard two things about stop and account and stop and search particularly as I would like it to be even more intelligence focused in the future which is we are going to have a meeting with Crime Stopper on a date I cannot quite remember to see what campaign we can have around a knife stoppers' approach, so if you know someone who carries a knife, please tell us; give us a name, where they are travelling and then we will stop them.

The second thing is even under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, someone who has previously been convicted of carrying a knife is a good reason to start to think they may carry a knife in the future and I would like to target our attention on those, not on the general population. So those are two things I want us to pursue and in the New Year, when we have that strategy in place and we have talked to people about how we might do it, then you will see that action will start in the New Year. I am trying to avoid giving a date because I just do not know yet but I expect January onwards, you would see a change there.

The final part of your question; will that lead to a reduction in stop and search, I cannot be sure yet but I would hope it will contribute to that. I am not offering to entirely stop the section 60 searches because I think they can have a value and some evidence would seem to show that if stop/search came down, knife crime went up. Now, we have to consider that before we just abandon it, so I think it is about targeting it. One of the principal points I want to see in future accounts of present stop/search and stop and account is benchmarking. Now, what we are getting at the moment is absolute numbers. There were 500,000 last year; there were 600,000 this year. What I want to see is across the cities of the country is disproportionality here which we can explain or we cannot. So I think the benchmarking per head of population, even accounting for tourism, what does it tell us about what we are doing? If we can justify it, fine; if we cannot, we ought to be able to explain it. So I think there is a potential for it being reduced but I cannot be certain yet.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK. I want to go on to my next question. Does anybody want to come in? No?

The next is on critical mass. What guidance are you giving to officers on the police in a critical mass event? I know there is no formal policing but there was an incident where a cyclist was assaulted by a car driver. There were some police officers watching. When the cyclist went up and asked for help, the police officers told him not to be a pest and got in their car and drove off.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Right. That would be on advice, in the circumstances you have described, so I would expect a police officer to investigate the allegation and then do something about it if he has some substance to it. So we can look into that incident if --

Jenny Jones (AM): I have written.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Right; we will have a look into it.

Jenny Jones (AM): Are you giving any advice to police officers who see incidents of that kind around critical mass particularly because it is such a controversial issue?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I have a broad answer here which might help answer that question which is that the Safer Transport Command have a co-operative relationship with the known cycling groups such as London Cycling Campaign and work alongside local Metropolitan Police Service units to help officers understand cyclists' viewpoints and the need for proportionate policing when notified of an event. The events are generally good natured and do aim to raise issues of safety and road use. The Cycle Task Force are usually invited to attend - that is, our Cycle Task Force - and ensure the safe use of the roads rather than manage the consequent public code issue should it not be well managed. The more unco-operative and sometimes aggressive nature of Climate Rush and Critical Mass protests are managed by our serial and operational planning teams and relevant intelligence streams as a result of impact on other Londoners and complaints that we received from time to time. The organisers of these groups are reluctant to engage with the police beforehand, therefore, appropriate planning or co-operation in relation to management of groups, static locations is more difficult. Continuance is developed on an intelligence-like basis but can be hard.

The Safer Transport Command is deployed as an operational resource in line with the intelligence picture and the expected level of impact and then through links in the cycling world, the Cycle Task Force does aim to gather intelligence in support of any of these developing issues. So I think what we are trying to say broadly, we are trying to work hard with those people who work with us but it is rather difficult if people will not engage.

Jenny Jones (AM): I understand that point of view. It is really about an assault was committed and police officers drove away.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): That is straightforward; it should be investigated.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am taking it forward. Anybody else want to come in? No? My last question is on automatic number plate recognition (ANPR), how you arrest a decline of ANPR operations in order to reduce the number of criminals on our roads and where will we see this change because there has been a big reduction in traffic? Are you going to build up traffic again or at least stop the cuts so that you can do more operations?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Two points on this. One, I think we need a new ANPR strategy which builds on the fact that there are two ways to use ANPR. One is mobile,

one is fixed. There is already an investment in fixed sites but I think where they should be fixed in the future could be improved and I think we could make more use of those that are fixed. If you take, for example, the system in the city, the vehicles that go into the city often come straight out again, so what are we doing about the pings on that system? Do we have a system to respond to it? I am not sure we have.

The second point is on the mobile usage. You saw the action we had a few days ago which were about using our mobile ANPR as well as we can. One I think we have an argument for having more of it, so I may be coming back saying, "I would argue to spend more money on it". We have about 125 pieces of kit in the Metropolitan Police Service. I think I mentioned here before but I think, at most, we had about 70 vehicles. The proportions do not add up in terms of the amount of kit, so I think we can do more.

The other think I say about traffic, it is probably not right for me starting out in changing numbers here. One of things we did in Merseyside, we only had 100 traffic officers; that was out of 4,500 police officers, so broadly percentage wise, not very many and they deteriorated over the years from about 400-odd to 100 because everybody started in traffic, it meant we had too much. In my view, it matters in two ways. It stops criminals using the roads and it keeps the roads safe. So what we did there was to increase the number of traffic by 40%, so 40 officers, but we got three times more work out of them. The task there was to not only get the traffic officers to concentrate on things in teams but to get their borough colleagues to work on the same things; it is their job too. So I think you will find that we do more and more with ANPR and more and more around traffic safety.

Jenny Jones (AM): I am, in fact, going out on an operation, not just another PR event on ANPR, next week. I am looking forward to it. Thanks for those answers.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Does anybody have any other questions on anything else for the Commissioner?

Male Speaker: Can we move on to item 6?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): You wanted to have an update. Victoria wanted to have an update on St Pauls.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I think we are going on with the Committee to meet in London today. For heaven's sake; that is what we are here for.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Do you have a particular question or just an update?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Just an update.

Victoria Borwick (AM): I thought it was only sensible frankly because those will be people watching us on the web, that part of London that is suffering some might say disorder, someone might protest that we should have a sensible update from you briefly as to what is going on.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Steve O'Connell had a question about Parliament Square which he did not actually ask.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I think I will give it to you broadly and then I will give you some of the details on the complexities of it which as usual, it is never straightforward. Broadly, I would say it seems to me that we certainly getting complaints that people are thinking that the protesters are disturbing people's normal use of the areas in which they are. One is outside St Pauls which, as you know, is in the City of London and one is in Finsbury Square which is just beyond the boundary and is, therefore, in the grounds of the Metropolitan Police Service and in the Borough of Islington.

So certainly for me, I think if there is criminality being committed, then we need to do something about it and there is some evidence. I think it was quoted in Parliament yesterday in the Lords that some of the protesters are leaving at night and then coming back during the day. All taken together, they have a legitimate right to protest. They have no legitimate right to commit crime. There is loads of complexity that we now try to deal with. One is that because it is in the City of London, obviously the Commissioner of the City of London will have to make his own decision about what he wants to do and we will have to make some decisions but ideally, we have a consistent approach. It would be odd to come to inconsistent conclusions about the same problem and we have those discussions ongoing.

Of course, what you have is two pieces of land with different ownership and slightly different issues. If you look outside St Pauls, I understand there is joint ownership partly by the Cathedral Authority; I think the Chapter owns part of the land and partly by the corporation, so they have to have some kind of agreement about (1) how they feel about it and (2) what they are doing about it. Similarly in Islington, I am told there is a private ownership of part of the land and part of the land which is owned by the local authority. We are trying to work out, with both sets of ownership in both areas, what their views are.

We are also seeking views from the residents and businesses who are affected by this protest because, at the end of the day, I might have a view that I think we should do something but if they say, "Well, we are prepared to put up with it", you have to consider that and equally, if they want to complain, we have to consider that, so we are going through that process of either consensus building but certainly getting information to be available.

I suppose there are three broad options for the future and I hope we are able to establish some clarity soon which is either we ignore it. The property owners have the potential for taking out injunctions and I believe that is being considered and the final option is that we use the criminal law to deal or we use some conjunction of injunctions and criminal law to go forward. I suppose the final tune we all have to make is what we want to do is to resolve the situation, not aggravate it, so that will, no doubt, take some careful negotiations over the coming days.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Dee, you had a question.

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. I have a real concern about the fact that --

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I am ever so sorry. Would you mind if I just completed one part because I think it is really important to understand some of the complexes? Coming to the Metropolitan Police Service, people are worried about Operation Benbow. It is the arrangement between the City and the Metropolitan Police Service. In the event there is a large operation in the City, broadly the Metropolitan Police Service provides huge support but also provides leadership too. I think it comes from probably back in 2005/06, so a large public disorder. At that time, the City did not have all the skills in place and the future arrangements with the Metropolitan Police Service would provide the public order leadership.

What that has meant; if you remember when this protest started, of course, there was no certainty about where the protest would stop. There was some potential about it happening outside St Pauls and an attack on the Stock Exchange. There is a possibility it would move into the Metropolitan Police Service and I think one potential was Canary Wharf, a further one was Parliament Square. So, the arrangements put in place in case the problem moved, and in any case the Metropolitan Police Service provides public order leadership - so, we provide the Gold for an event that eventually goes static in the City. So, our commanders are leading the event for which the City of London Commissioner is directly responsible. One of things that I have come to --

Victoria Borwick (AM): Could you explain that?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): That is what I was just about to do, which is that - well, my best anyway - which is that I think it is an issue for us to look at further in the future but we are having to look at it now because we are not in a position where we are inconsistent about this, but if we were, how do we resolve that? Because frankly, as we saw in the G20 protest, Metropolitan Police Service officers were involved and were called to account, quite properly, about all the events that happened. There is still litigation and criminal prosecutions ongoing but the City has a responsibility too. So I generally think there is something for us all to think about in the future about how we manage these events, which is coming home to roost, quite literally, in this particular case. I only mention it for the kind of things that we have to resolve with the public, who might be listening to this and may not fully understand why is there any potentially inconsistent approach and why is the Metropolitan Police Service Commissioner trying to explain some of the events in the City of London.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Just so that we have all understood, you are saying at the moment the person who is directly responsible is obviously the City of London. However, some of our senior officers are facilitating working within that command structure.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): That is correct.

Dee Doocey (AM): My concern is that I honestly believe that coming up to the Olympics in particular, when the eyes of the world are going to be on London, we are likely to see an increase in tent cities springing up all over the place to support various groups of protestors. I do not think there is anyone round this table who would not absolutely agree with the right of peaceful protest but there is a big difference in peaceful protest and camp cities that are coming round.

I am also very concerned that the shopkeepers in the area now need to ask for a police escort in order to get past the protestors, which seems to me to be appalling and I understand their businesses, their takings are down by anything up to 80%, which is absolutely dreadful. I had one suggestion, and that is that the Mayor, who is the Mayor of London, should, I believe, consider calling a meeting to co-ordinate everybody who is involved --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): It happened two days ago.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK, and doing something to put pressure on the Government, because I am very concerned that when the Minister answered a question on this

yesterday he said, and I am not quoting, but basically that if anything should happen at the Olympics we need to be mindful of this. By the time we get to the Olympics it is going to be too late to do anything about it and I just think action needs to be taken and it needs to be taken now.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Just to update, the Mayor did have a meeting here two days ago with the City Corporation, St Paul's, the Metropolitan Police Service and the City Police to talk about exactly that. One of the issues is that actually speed of response matters - we talked about this yesterday. One of the reasons we do not get tent cities on Trafalgar Square is because we have stewards there who shift them immediately. The moment there is a tent they get moved on so nothing is allowed to establish itself and I think that is going to be a piece of learning for people who have private land or have illegal protests, the moment you erect a structure it gets moved, and that is the problem with Parliament Square of course, they were not moved quickly enough when it first happened.

Dee Doocey (AM): There is one other issue and that is I think that more information should be going out to the public to say that if you invite protestors on to your own private land on your head be it, because then when you get fed up and they dig in you are not going to be able to get rid of them very easily, and I do not think people realise that and I am sure the Church, for all sorts of Christian reasons, when they welcomed them in did not realise that that was going to be their downfall when they tried to get rid of them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, the maxim of 'marry in haste, repent at leisure' has been pointed out to them a couple of times.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): To be fair, I think the issue is rather than inviting them, consenting to them remaining there. I think that is what happened, but even now they have changed that view.

Toby Harris (AM): I just wanted to know what - clearly there are issues about the sanitary conditions in the various tent cities that have emerged. What I would be interested to know is the Commissioner's views on the fact that the landowners, because of those concerns, decided and gave notice to the people there that they would, say every two hours, be dousing the area with high-pressure jets of water with disinfectant in it. Would they be committing an offence?

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): I am not going to give them any advice to do it. I think this is quite a sensitive area. I think we are all probably in the same place of saying that people have a legitimate right to protest and I suppose what we are trying to decide is at

what point does it interfere with other people's rights, either by committing crime or interfering with their normal standard of life so it gets to the point where we, the police, or someone ought to do something about it.

There is a part of the Public Order Act, section 14, that talks about in terms of trespass if certain numbers are involved and there is serious disruption to the public then the police can take action. Deciding what becomes serious is why we are talking, as Dee was saying, to shopkeepers, to businesses, there is a large business effect, to people who live in the area to see whether or not they believe that has happened. It is not for us to impose our solution on this. We need to have some kind of consensus to respond to I think, so we are in the process of asking that question.

Of course it is hardly for me to send Metropolitan Police Service officers into the City of London on the Commissioner's ground to say, "Well, what should we do about St Paul's?" There has to be some work by them too. We are trying to work together to get a consistent response. I think over the next few days I am sure that will happen.

Toby Harris (AM): I have suggested in the past that it would be a good idea to fit sprinklers on the gardens in Parliament Square for instance, that went off a couple of times in the middle of the night to keep the garden nice and green, but might have other benefits.

Dee Doocey (AM): Why don't we do that? That is a splendid idea.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Can we move on to agenda item 6, please, which is Stop and Account? The Assistant Commissioner Territorial Policing (TP) is not here so Ms de Brunner is going to fill in. Maxine?

Maxine de Brunner (AM): Thank you. The purpose of presenting this paper to you today is to update you and share with you the Management Board decision to continue to record Stop and Accounts. I am sure many of you will remember that this has been quite a journey in terms of recording Stop and Accounts. This started with recommendation 61 from the Lawrence Inquiry which placed an obligation on police to provide a credible reason and record our reasons for stopping people and accounting for their movements.

Since the introduction of that recommendation we have seen increases year-on-year in terms of our recording of these encounters and at the moment we record approximately 55,000 Stop and Accounts per month just within London. That exceeds our Stop and Search levels, which runs at about 42,000 encounters per month.

Obviously there was some bureaucracy that was attached to that, albeit that there were some really good reasons why we needed to adopt that approach, but in July 2008 we reduced our requirement in terms of shortening the form to try and reduce the bureaucracy and some of the time taken by officers to fill out some of these forms.

Then in 2009 Sir Ronnie Flanagan also further reduced the requirement and the forms that we use to record Stop and Account have been amended.

Following that, in 2010, the Crime and Security Act gave Chief Officers the option to cease recording and allowed Chief Officers to retain the Stop and Account activity to address concerns around disproportionality and made it quite clear that the decision whether to cease or to continue the recording of Stop and Account was an operational one for the Chief Officer. So far 31 out of the 43 police forces have ceased to record Stop and Account.

This came to Management Board and to the Authority some time ago and obviously there is and remains an issue and concerns within London around disproportionality and there are concerns from our communities around Stop and Search and Stop and Account, and that has been a recurrent theme that has been addressed by this Authority on many occasions.

So, back in December 2010 the then Commissioner agreed that we would carry out extensive consultation in relation to Stop and Account and he felt very strongly at that time that it was really important that we take the views of the Authority, the community and our key stakeholders, but in particular taking the views of our London population between 16 and 24-year-old age group, given that these particular individuals were the ones that were perhaps most targeted as part of that Stop and Account.

So, the consultation process has been going on and has included a media awareness campaign, it has included a survey 'Stop and Search' on the Internet site. There have been two 10,000-volt sessions that have been carried out. We have conducted radio interviews and some phone-in sessions and you have also had a questionnaire placed on your own site in terms of obtaining views around Stop and Account.

Then in May this year a conference was held here at City Hall and there was a debate that followed question time. So, I suppose my message is we have listened to the consultation and therefore we have recommended to Management Board and Management Board have decided that we will continue to record Stop and Account in the shortened version, as I have articulated.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Just for the sake of clarity, I entirely agree with that and I think that is what we need to do. I met Neville and Doreen Lawrence last week, I met Neville in the morning then I met Mrs Lawrence in the evening at the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust dinner and I assured them that we intend to carry on with this. It was certainly a question that Mr Lawrence had of me, what was my personal view on it, and I gave a very straightforward answer which is that we intend to continue with it. Maxine has set out very clearly the amount of work that has gone into getting us this far but I do not want there to be any doubt that that is my intention too.

Cindy Butts (AM): Can I just thank you, Maxine, first of all for the paper on this and for me this kind of paper really does take us full circle back to our original discussion when we started this meeting, which was about in the new arrangements how is it we get an improvement on community engagement, community consultation, but almost more importantly how do we get the level of diversity and different views in the actual decision-making. So, it is not just about engaging people once things are done, it is about how you get those different views in terms of at the point at which the decisions being made.

I think Maxine's rendition of what happened is very useful but actually most of it is incorrect and I say that not because I want to expose the Service but because I want to draw out the importance, and I think this is something for you to take back, Kit and for you, Bernard, when we move forward, in the absence of the range of diversity you see around this table and has been present in terms of London policing for the past 11 years, how is it we are able to retain the different views that independent members bring to policing? I think it is really important, because actually were it not for independent views around this issue Stop and Account would have ceased, let us be frank about this. The Commissioner did not believe in it, wanted to get rid of it, did a very minimal amount of consultation, I mean so superficial it was unbelievable, and if it were not for myself in particular assisted and aided by the SEC(?) Committee, which is almost entirely made up of independents apart from our good Victoria here, who assisted me in terms of moving this issue forward and being able to develop a very comprehensive consultation mechanism where we said to the Metropolitan Police Service, "You're not going to get rid of it. You have to go out and talk to the communities and in particular those young people who are most affected by Stop and Search, the young black and Asian young men who are stopped almost certainly on a daily basis in and out of London. You cannot cease Stop and Account unless you speak to those communities who are most affected".

The Metropolitan Police Service thankfully listened and that then allowed us to have some comprehensive consultation and all of the responses that we had back from the majority of people was that they wanted Stop and Account to stay. I think the majority of

them accepted that it was not perfect but it was something and it was in terms of giving some form of accountability, something that was a show and a way of demonstrating that they had been stopped and that officers had been held accountable.

Equally, officers came back and responded by saying that they felt it was an important check and balance for them and protecting them in going about their work. So, the people spoke and we listened, and were it not for the Authority this would not have happened and I think it is a really important illustration of some of the fears going forward that if you do not tackle them I think we will go back rather than go forward in terms of community relations.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thank you. Clive?

Clive Lawton (AM): Chair, first of all I want to associate myself entirely with Cindy's comments. I was going to put a slightly different spin on it but in a way it is the same thing. I want to applaud the Metropolitan Police Service and its Management Board because it was pretty clear that the Metropolitan Police Service did not want to retain this and yet the public consultation made it clear that they should and they have, and I want to applaud that, rather than resisting it or struggling to find another way forward or something or other like that. Ever since I have been on the Authority, not as long as Cindy, I have been trying to retain the sense of shock at the stain, really, on London which has not gone away, which is the disparity of satisfaction between white and black and ethnic minority (BME) folk in London with the police which continues to exist and it goes up and it goes down but it remains and I think it is something which ought to disturb and embarrass and upset everybody that there is that disparity, which is an issue to be very directly addressed. Such initiatives, hopefully, go some way towards ameliorating that disparity - one hopes - and so I am really pleased that it is there.

I was struck though in the report by the fact that a small number, only small number of police services had retained Stop and Account and then some of them was not what you might have expected. My assumption was, just as we see it, we see Stop and Account as an issue that goes towards issues of urban youth and dissatisfaction and so forth, and yet here many of the large metropolitan police forces seem to have retained it and lots of quite rural district ones too. I realise that there might only be speculation on this, but I would be interested in your speculation as to why did many of these thinly-spread, one assumes probably fairly comfortable with their police service regions, retain it and yet more challenging authorities with large urban clusters of young people did not.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Let us have Jennette's question as well.

Jennette Arnold (AM): It is just a comment and it follows on from what Cindy was saying, and I thank her for the work she has done on this because it was the case that so many of us were worried and that (inaudible) the independent advisory groups that we sit on and in those localities that the disproportionality presents itself. So, I welcome the paper, thank you for the paper and it is a paper that we have been waiting for a while.

The points that I have been making myself (several inaudible words) and the records will show in the past I have been involved with the Stephen Lawrence Foundation from the very first through Doreen. It is about accountability on both parts. It is about giving the police officer an assurance, and that is the start of a relationship with that Stop and Account and there is the mix about black communities (several inaudible words) but if you start off by accepting that BME communities are law-abiding communities and so they do want for crime to be detected, that they do want the intelligence that the police use to be followed up. You go up there and you speak to, I believe, nine out of ten members of the BME community, if they are treated with respect, if they are given that accountability, they will not mind being stopped as long as that account is taken and they are given adequate reason. So, I think that this then moves us away from this idea that there is some sort of major block between (several inaudible words) communities.

I also just want to point out that I was able to sit in with some (several inaudible words) but I have to say that more sadly, just by accident, I just happened to be visiting that community project on that day. Myself and others there felt that the way it was happening was such a disappointment because public communication (inaudible) better that that could have been a wider engagement. So, I think the engagement and the communication and, if you like, the positive nature of this paper and the Metropolitan Police Service's position needs some further communication work and that is what I would like to know. What is the media and comms strategy now so that we are talking about this as a positive activity and commitment that you as the new Commissioner are bringing to this subject? I apologise that you are going to be labelled 'Hammer Hogan'.

Bernard Hogan-Howe (AM): Thank you, I will survive. I think in terms of the first point, could I speculate about the reasons why these authorities, which intuitively you might think would have a different view, you might, I do not think I can because I just do not know and probably for the same reason as you, Dee, I found it unusual but I presume that their authority, perhaps, or their force believed it was very important to continue. Sometimes you can look at these areas and think that you know a lot about their diverse mix and often it is not actually what we traditionally believe in these areas. In fact the communities are changing quite rapidly. So, I honestly do not know and I would not speculate. I think I would discourage it. I do not really know which side to debate about.

In terms of the point that Jennette raised about joint accountability, which is really I think in part as well what Cindy was saying, I agree. I think it is interesting, as you say, that in fact the internal communication checking came to a similar conclusion for a different reason by the sound of it. So, I think all the things are pointing in the same direction and the right direction so therefore probably best to follow it, not to try and oppose it.

An aspect that we have to acknowledge, and I do, is that it is all because of the work in Authority and the committee that in fact has changed and I was not here but I have heard enough to know that is the case. I am not trying, because I was not here, I could have made the same decision, I am not trying to obviate myself from that, but I think we need to acknowledge that the reason for the change of decision was around that work. If we can communicate more about the process of communicating with different groups and get feedback then we will, so we will take that away for the future.

I suppose today is part of the communications process which we are announcing here, we are going to continue with it. I suppose the question we go away and reflect on is how do we get that out in our communications as we are going to continue with it? We think it is a positive step rather than just bringing a paper to an authority, so we will (inaudible) and perhaps the Authority might as to how we could jointly get that message out more clearly if it is not reported today in any other way.

Cindy Butts (AM): May I just come back on two things? The first thing is Stop and Account is not perfect and we certainly do not use the information enough and we do not use it to inform performance and to allow it to assist us to do the performance piece but also in terms of individual developmental work with the individual officers. So, I think there is something about improving the way that we monitor the information and put it to better use so that Stop and Account can be even more beneficial than it is currently. I think that is a challenge in itself to make it better.

The second point is that I just wanted to acknowledge what you said earlier, which is that you are committed to ensuring that Stop and Search per se is done in a much more intelligent way and that you will be seeking to understand the issues of disproportionality and where it is possible to ensure that disproportionality has decreased. Thank you very much for that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thanks for that. Thank you for the paper. We move on to agenda point 7, which is reports from committees. Jenny, you notified that you wanted to raise two items.

Jenny Jones (AM): It was the Finance and Resources Committee. It is on page 75, there is a paragraph on Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring which talks about the overspend of £6.2 million. I was wondering if I should take into account the opportunity costs that have been planned but I think have been a bit delayed, so is the Chair going to answer this?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I do not mind. When you say opportunity costs ...

Jenny Jones (AM): There was a planned regime of opportunity costs, various things that were going to reduce costs and as far as I know that has been delayed. I am just wondering if this £6.2 million actually includes that planned ...

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The £6.2 million, I do not really understand what you are asking, but the £6.2 million overspend is the money we have actually spent against a planned budget. The planned budget included various cost savings in it. The fact that we have overspent means either those cost savings have not been achieved or there are various other reasons. Now, we never exactly hit the target month-by-month on budget versus actual spend and what the pattern has been over the last three years is that there is overspend in the early months of the year which is then caught up in the latter part of the year. The budget, yes, those savings are built in.

Jenny Jones (AM): I was curious about how accurate the overspend was or whether it was going to perhaps rise.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, to be perfectly honest, Jenny, given the scale of the budget having a 0.2% variation either way is pretty bloody accurate.

Jenny Jones (AM): Well, let me go on to my next question then, which is in the next paragraph, which is about there is a line here, "It is considered that the MPA is well placed should it become necessary to borrow to cover peaks in expenditure." I am just curious about whether this borrowing is going to happen if we do not have a guarantee from the Government that we are going to get it back.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I think what it is referring to, and Bob will correct me, but that is borrowing for cash flow purposes.

Jenny Jones (AM): Exactly.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): What happens is we do not receive our money in the same profile as we spend it. So, what we do is we borrow short-term to bridge the peaks and

the gaps and repay short term. The other thing to bear in mind is that a lot of our reserves that we have on the balance sheet are effectively unfunded because we did think - we used our own cash internally to borrow to do things like buy Scotland Yard, if you remember when we bought Scotland Yard back in 2008, so we may need over time to borrow money to cover those.

Jenny Jones (AM): What I am worried about is that we do not have any sort of guarantee for the money from the Government and it just is a matter of concern.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Under the prudential borrowing rules we are not allowed to borrow money that we cannot repay.

Jenny Jones (AM): Obviously if I sat on the Finance Committee I would know this, but the Chair at the time did block my appointment for that Committee. (overspeaking)

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Jenny, I welcome your questions at these meetings on finance.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you.

Dee Doocey (AM): Can I just say, if Jenny ever wants to come to any of the Finance Committee meetings while I am Chair I am very happy to welcome her.

Jenny Jones (AM): That is very kind, sadly there too little time, but thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): That is an offer that is reflected by myself as well.

Jenny Jones (AM): It is too late.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Is there any other business that anybody considers urgent? No, is there anything else you need to report to us that you have been up to, Catherine, confidential or otherwise? OK, that is it. The next meeting is November. Sadly I will not be here so Reshard will be chairing, and that will be our penultimate meeting with one more in January. Thank you very much.