

## **Metropolitan Police Authority: Strategic and Operational Policing Committee**

**Date:** Thursday, 14 July 2011

**Location:** MPA, 10 Dean Farrar Street

Start time: 2.00pm

Finish time: 3.10pm

### **Committee Members:**

Reshard Auladin (Chairman)

Tony Arbour

Jennette Arnold

Chris Boothman

Toby Harris

Jenny Jones

Joanne McCartney

Caroline Pidgeon

Dee Doocey

Graham Speed

Valerie Brasse

Victoria Borwick

Valerie Shawcross

Kit Malthouse

Kirsten Hearn

### **Metropolitan Police Authority Officers:**

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive)

Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive)

Bob Atkins (Treasurer)

Siobhan Coldwell (Head of Policing Policy, Oversight and Review)

Thomas Foot (Policing Policy, Oversight and Review)

### **Metropolitan Police Service Officers:**

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner)

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner)

Mark Simmons (Deputy Assistant Commissioner)

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources)

### **Independent Police Complaints Commission:**

Deborah Glass (Deputy Chair)

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Right, Members, we are under some time pressure, so I propose to start promptly at 2.00pm. As you are aware, this is a scheduled meeting of the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOPC). However, a few Members have asked us to deal with issues raised by Members on the phone-hacking events. We have asked the Commissioner to attend this meeting to deal with some of those issues. However, we do still have an agenda for SOPC. In particular we have the report from Deborah Glass, who normally comes to us on an annual basis to give us a report. This has been planned a few months ago and I am keen for us to deal with that item as well today.

I propose to allow about 45 minutes for the phone-hacking discussion. The Commissioner is here for about 20 minutes. He has had to delay again a longstanding commitment that he had. Then Tim [Godwin] will be here for the rest of the discussion to answer questions that the Members will have.

Can we just go around and introduce ourselves, please. Reshard Auladin, Chairman of the Committee

**Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA):** Bob Atkins, Treasurer of the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA).

**Siobhan Coldwell (MPA):** Siobhan Coldwell, MPA.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Jennette Arnold, MPA, Greater London Authority (GLA).

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Tony Arbour.

**Christopher Boothman:** Chris Boothman.

**Toby Harris:** Toby Harris.

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

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

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

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

**Graham Speed:** Graham Speed.

**Valerie Brasse:** Valerie Brasse.

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

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

**Kirsten Hearn:** Kirsten Hearn

**Kit Malthouse (AM):** Kit Malthouse

**Thomas Foot (MPA):** Tom Foot, Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA).

**Helen Sergeant (MPA):** Helen Sergeant, Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA).

**Deborah Glass (IPCC):** Deborah Glass, Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC).

**Anne McMeel (MPS):** Anne McMeel, Metropolitan Police Service.

**Mark Simmons (MPS):** Mark Simmons, Metropolitan Police Service.

**Tim Godwin (MPS):** Tim Godwin.

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

**Jane Harwood (MPA):** Jane Harwood, MPA.

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

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. I understand the Commissioner will start with a statement.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you, Chair. Thank you for inviting me here today. I have delayed the start of this afternoon's long service and good conduct ceremony at Hendon, where there are some 173 recipients representing some almost 3½ years of public service. I have 400 guests waiting so I do hope that Members will understand why my time is short. I am going to give a statement and I will do my best to take some initial questions.

I believe the agenda item says I am going to give an oral report of Operational Weeting. Clearly this will be difficult; there is little I can say on the subject of an ongoing criminal investigation. I would, however, like to give you an overview of where we stand at the moment in the subject of phone hacking more generally. Before I do, I would like to remind Members of the care that I must take not to prejudice any of the inquiries and proceedings that are currently ongoing. I would remind you these are Operation Weeting, the new investigation that was opened following receipt of additional material from News International earlier this year; Operation Elveden, the anti-corruption operation overseen by the IPCC that is investigating allegations that, in the initial analysis, a small number of corrupt officers took payments from News International. A judicial review is pending against the

Metropolitan Police Service concerning Operation Caryatid, the original investigation back in 2006, as to whether it was an effective investigation and, importantly, whether there is a legal duty to notify potential victims. There are a number of civil actions in relation to phone hacking and of course a public inquiry to be led by Lord Justice Leveson looking at a range of issues covering the media, politicians, the press, police, their behaviour and regulation.

Members will recall that at the last full Authority I supported the need for such an inquiry to be established, and indeed the Metropolitan Police Service is looking forward to the opportunity for an examination of the facts around these issues that can take place in a methodical, measured manner with the proper independent oversight of Lord Justice Leveson that he will provide, and, of course, in an atmosphere that will not only ensure that the right questions are asked but also that the answers can be properly heard and considered.

As part of Operation Weeting there have been nine people arrested to date and proceedings are therefore active within the meaning of the Contempt of Court Act 1981. We must therefore be mindful of any discussion that might concern the possible guilt of any suspect or the conduct of the investigations relating to Weeting or indeed Elveden. In relation to the judicial review, these issues are sub judice and we also therefore need to be careful about discussions on these issues. In relation to the public inquiry, the terms of reference have recently been published and it is important that we are now mindful not to do anything that could be interpreted as attempting to prejudge the outcome of that inquiry. We are now in a fairly unique place and I must be mindful of not saying anything that would undermine or prejudice that it.

These caveats aside, I can update Members on the following. You will be aware that several current and former Metropolitan Police Service officers gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee on Tuesday. This was the first time that we have heard publicly from former Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC and Acting Assistant Commissioner (AAC) Peter Clarke, giving details of the original investigation and his rationale in relation to why the parameters were drawn tightly around in terms of that original investigation. I believe this has helpfully informed the public debate relating to this original investigation.

Evidence was also taken from Assistant Commissioner John Yates on why the decision was taken in 2009 not to reopen the original investigation. I am not going to revisit the evidence given by John [Yates] to the Committee as this will now be considered by the public inquiry, other than to say that I support his view that had he known then what he knows now, it is likely he would have taken a very different decision at that time. You will also have seen or heard my statement in relation to John [Yates].

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers also attended on Wednesday at the inquiry and has been widely praised for her evidence, and rightly so. As Sue [Akers] confirmed to the Committee, she leads a skilled team that is following the evidence where it takes them and she is determined to undertake a thorough investigation that primarily places victims at its heart.

Operation Weeting is working to identify all individuals who may have been victims or had their voicemails intercepted, and is committed to contacting all of those whose personal contact details are found in the documents we hold. As Sue [Akers] has said, this commitment will take some considerable time. Sue Akers is also leading, under the independent supervision and oversight of the IPCC, Operation Elveden, and of course we have here today the Deputy Chair of the IPCC, Deborah Glass, and no doubt Deborah [Glass] will be saying something more, or not, about Operation Elveden later.

As Members will be aware, the Metropolitan Police Service takes any allegations of police corruption extremely seriously and we will not tolerate corrupt officers. We have a strong track record of driving out officers of driving out corrupt officers who in no way represent what the Metropolitan Police Service and the vast majority of staff stand for.

On 20 and 22 June 2011, the Metropolitan Police Service was handed a number of documents by News International through their barristers. The Metropolitan Police Service then met with IPCC on 22 June 2011 to inform them of these developments and discuss the contents of these documents containing information relating to the alleged inappropriate payments that our initial inquiries would reveal a small number of Metropolitan Police Service officers. At that time it was agreed that the Metropolitan Police Service would conduct the investigation under the direction of Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers in partnership with the Department of Professional Standards and if or when any officers were identified, the cases would be referred back to the IPCC. However, in view of the significant public and political concern expressed from the publication of this information, on 7 July 2011 the Metropolitan Police Service made a formal referral back to the IPCC, and that is entirely proper and they have that oversight and ownership.

I am, of course, deeply concerned by these developments relating to phone hacking, which are a product of meticulous and thorough work of Operation Weeting. Under the oversight of the IPCC, Operation Elveden will be equally thorough and robust; I have no doubt about that. We must and will do everything possible to ensure that corrupt officers receive their just desserts. Not only would the public and indeed this Police Authority demand this, but I have to tell you that the overwhelming majority of police officers and staff who work for the Metropolitan Police Service deserve no less. Their efforts, success and reputation must not be undermined by the dishonest few.

Members may have noticed that yesterday the Prime Minister made reference to the fact that I am looking to appoint an independent figure to advise me on the ethical considerations that should underpin the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the press in the light of the current debate, and to ensure maximum transparency and public confidence in how the arrangements are working. Whilst the current position that we, the Metropolitan Police Service, find ourselves in is anything but comfortable, we must ensure that we view this as a point in time, an opportunity to examine and improve as necessary.

There have been questions asked by this Authority, and I know that the public inquiry will look into this, about contact between senior officers, including me, and senior executives at News International over a period of time. One of the reasons we are seeking independent advice on the ethical underpinnings of these relationships will be ensure that we do have appropriate learning and wisdom and transparency in place. This, I think, will be an important element of whomsoever I appoint to this task. Clearly, advice given to me by this independent adviser will be made public and will feed into the public inquiry and I would expect him or her to meet with Members of this Authority as part of the work that he or she will undertake in advising me. I will of course report back to you with more details on this issue in due course. We have not at this moment identified or appointed that independent adviser but I have had discussions with certain people, including the Chair of the Police Authority.

I am aware that Members have submitted a number of questions for answer at full Authority. Whilst we are happy to answer questions, you will be aware that we are significantly constrained in terms of the answers that we are able to provide in the light of the ongoing inquiries. I do return to my early theme here: there are legal processes in place that I must recognise and I most certainly do not wish to do anything that could be construed as undermining any of these, not least the forthcoming public inquiry. Therefore, we need to carefully consider the extent to which we can answer perfectly the very proper questions. Although Tim [Godwin] will remain here to take some of those questions, where they relate to persons arrested, the current investigation, the matters within the judicial review or public inquiry or private information concerning victims, he is clearly constrained in doing so. He may therefore have to answer that we will respond in writing when it is possible to do so, but we will do our best to answer the questions, and I will take some questions that are obviously more personal to me straight after this statement.

You have been provided with a timeline that gives details of key events that have taken place since the original allegations received in 2006. This has been a lengthy and at times confusing set of events, and we did think that the best way to assist Members would be to lay out as clearly as possible the key events, and by no means all, that got us here today. I do have to apologise that we did not get this document to you sufficiently in advance.

Thank you, Chairman.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. Can I start by asking a first question, if I may? In terms of public confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service and the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service, I do not know whether you would agree with me that they have been severely damaged by events over the last few weeks and months. For example, only yesterday or the day before yesterday, police officers coming out of a Federation meeting were saying on television how badly let down they feel and also how embarrassed they are by the whole episode. Could you tell me what you will do to repair the damage that I feel has been done to the Metropolitan Police Service?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** You started by saying you do not know what I think. I would be very foolish not to acknowledge that there significant reputational issues in this whole matter, and, of course, that is a matter of very real regret. I recognise there will be concerns by people in the organisation. They are the people that have to go out there every day and deliver.

Firstly, by recognising that whatever is going on it cannot detract from the work they do day to day tackling robbery, burglary, violent crime, serious crime, dealing with victims, working with partners, combating terrorism; I could go on. My message to them is that we value what they are doing and they have been carrying on doing it the last week in this very febrile atmosphere. They are doing it tremendously and I need to keep reinforcing that message and actually getting that message out to the public, and I am pretty sure that would be the feelings of the majority of this Committee.

Secondly, the corruption message, we are taking it very seriously. I have done a message out to all staff; I have addressed senior staff yesterday on how seriously I take any allegations of corruption and what we must do about it. Thirdly, by actually welcoming the public inquiry and calling for it early. I think it is right there are lots of questions to be asked and we do need to find appropriate avenues to ensure that we answer those questions and answer them in a way where the questions can be heard, and it is entirely right that that is done.

Next, the appointment of an independent adviser to advise us on what lessons to learn and how we can ensure that our relationships with the media are sufficiently transparent, that we have learned any lessons that are to be learned and that we do have an ethical underpinning. I do think this is a point in time, so that whatever we are doing we are able to justify it and rationalise it and explain it, and that is important. And then showing that all staff are aware of key messages.

Finally, and this is not an exhaustive list, most importantly taking this opportunity to tell you and anyone else who wants to listen - and I actually believe I do not have to convince all or the vast majority of people here - but taking this opportunity to remind everybody that the vast, overwhelming majority of people who work for the Metropolitan Police Service are decent, honest, hard-working people, professionals

who do not want or do not deserve to have their reputation tainted by the dishonest few. The more I can get that message out and support them, the more I can show transparency, the more I can welcome the inquiry, the more I can appoint an independent adviser and the more I can open ourselves up to questions, that is about restoring that confidence and ensuring that we also listen to their messages.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. We have a few Members with questions. Can we take them in batches of three, please? I have Chris [Boothman], Joanne [McCartney] and Dee [Doocey] first.

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Thank you. Sir Paul [Stephenson], can I start by just saying that I understand it has been reported that I have called for your resignation? Can I just make it clear that that is not what I said to the reporter concerned? What I actually said was that I thought that you found yourself in a difficult position.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Can you not put this in writing so that we can actually ask questions in this meeting?

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Certainly. I am not going to ask you about how investigations are managed, supervised and reviewed, because I understand that your time with us is short. But what I would like you to help me with is what your thoughts are on two other matters which I think are relevant. Firstly, whether or not you think that the culture of the organisation at its upper levels has anything to do with the quite significant numbers of investigations. Some that come to mind: Operation Minstead, Levi Belfield, Stephen Lawrence. There have been a number of important investigations in recent times that have not gone as they should have, if I can put it that way. Can you tell me is this anything to do with the culture of the organisation at the upper levels and the fact that people who get to positions take 30 years to get there? Also, can you tell me whether the police accountability model that is being proposed by the new Government is likely to make matters better or worse?

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Before you answer, can we take a couple of questions so you have them in batches. Joanne [McCartney] is next.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I have about three questions that follow on, so I would actually appreciate an answer before I ask my next question because the next question will depend on the answer I get given. Perhaps take Chris' [Boothman] and then we can go into mine.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Okay. Chris [Boothman], I am not entirely sure I get the full meaning of your question but I will try. You mentioned upper levels of the organisation and is there a culture there that somehow is connected with, if you will, the mistakes that you have identified in some operations. Whenever we make mistakes we should be held accountable and should be open about it. Actually, in the Metropolitan Police Service we have not been slow to put



our hands up where we have made mistakes. But I would actually caution you, Chris [Boothman], and remind you that we receive 6 million calls every year. We deal with over 800,000 crimes every year. You just mentioned a few inquiries, and where they go wrong and people are victimised unnecessarily, that is a matter of real regret and apology. But we need to put it in the context. The inquiries you have just mentioned have gone over a number of years. Start doing the maths around those 6 million calls and 800,000-plus crimes every year and then let us give credit to the staff in the Metropolitan Police Service, both senior and junior, of how they get it right so often, and when we get it wrong, hold our hands up, admit it, learn from it, but try to do the best for victims in the future.

As for will the new Government structures affect it, I honestly do not think that is something for today. I have made my views absolutely clear on what I think about governance here in London but I have also made my views clear that it is not for me, as Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service, to be saying what sort of governance arrangements should be put in place. That is for others to decide; ultimately Parliament and the Government.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney]?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Given the parameters you have put around what you can or cannot answer, I am not exactly sure what I can ask, but I am going to ask and hope that you can answer. For the past two years many of us have been asking questions about the allegations coming out of the Guardian newspaper, in particular about the number of victims, the offences and we have repeatedly been told that the initial investigation looked thoroughly at this and that there were problems in the legislation as to why further charges could not be brought. But on Tuesday at the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, we heard for the first time about the limits that were put on that first investigation. You alluded to it in the statement that you put out following that. You said,

*“Today, for the first time DAC Peter Clarke put into the public domain his rationale and the reasons that the terms of the original inquiry were drawn relatively tightly.”*

Looking at DAC Clarke’s evidence to the inquiry, he stated that the investigation was strictly to investigate who was hacking into royalties and how a decision was made not to look at all the evidence to see who else was hacked. He went on to say that he decided the parameters were drawn so tightly and that a wider investigation would inevitably take longer to complete. He also said that,

*“With senior colleagues we have considered an exhaustive analysis but decided against it.”*

For the last two years we have been asking questions at this Authority and we have been told repeatedly that there was a thorough investigation, you could not bring charges because of legal problems around that. However, given that we now know

the original parameters are so tightly drawn, that entire debate and argument we have had has been shown to be absolutely sterile. There was nothing that was done at the original inquiry. We have heard that now. There was never any prospect of further charges. In July 2009 AC Yates stood outside New Scotland Yard and stated in his statement that,

*“Their potential targets may have run into hundreds of people but our inquiries show that they only used the tactic against a far smaller number of individuals.”*

Can I ask, therefore, that given that contradicts AC Clarke’s evidence with regards to the original inquiry, was AC Yates aware of the terms of the original inquiry? Which senior officers did he consult with and were you aware of that at the time or since?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** Let me deal with the last one first and try to assist. I can tell you that I have absolutely no knowledge of any problems or issues with the 2006 inquiry. There was absolutely no reason for me to have any concerns over 2006 inquiry. I received assurances that there were no new issues of relevance coming out in the closures of 2009 and I struggle to see what would be the trigger for me have inquired further beyond that. You mentioned the legal interpretation. I am not going to revisit Peter Clarke’s evidence and I am not going to revisit John Yates’ evidence but I think they have been clear. I do think some of what I have said reflects what John Yates said, that he did not believe there was anything new and he did not know there were any problems with the original inquiry. I do not know who he discussed this with and it is not for me to second-guess here, and that will be a matter for private inquiries in the future.

I would ask to remind you the joint statement - and I think I am right and the trouble is I am now going from memory - that John Yates and Keir Starmer issued, when I think they both acknowledged, in terms of the legal interpretation, neither of them were part of the original inquiry and they were both trying to judge events now that happened when neither were party to them. Therefore, hindsight is perfect sight, but it is worth trying to acknowledge they were doing their best to interpret events that they had nothing to do with. I think there was a debate between them, a debate in public, about what legal advice was given and what was not. I think that will be a matter for the public inquiry.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Joanne [McCartney], quite a few other Members wish to ask questions. Can I suggest you put your other questions in writing? I know there are loads of other questions that we will have to put in writing to get answers in due cause. Will that be OK with you?

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** That is fine, other than just to make the point that John Yates to Jenny [Jones] at a previous MPA meeting stated that when doing his review he adopted the number of principles around the scale and scope of the original inquiry.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Dee [Doocey]?

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Yes. I will be very brief. Could I ask you, Commissioner, if you regret the fact that Andy Hayman had 7 lunches or dinners with the News of the World executives during the time that he was investigating, that John Yates had 5 lunches or dinner with News of the World, News International, at the time he was investigating and that you yourself had 24 meetings of which 18 were lunches and dinners. Do you in particular regret the dinner you had with the deputy editor of the News of the World in September 2006?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will preface my answer again with the last point, reminding you I had absolutely no involvement with the inquiry in 2006 and I had absolutely no reason to suspect anyone, including the individuals you were talking about, of any involvement in such an inquiry in 2006. But this Authority has asked questions in past about the relationships that I have and other senior officers of the Metropolitan Police Service have with the media. Our answers to those questions have been put in the public domain, ie the number that you just quoted. I continue to maintain that it is clearly important that police leaders not only have appropriate relationships with the media but that we should use those relationships to set the context for policing and policing issues and to properly promote the image and the reputation of those organisations we lead. I think it is an area, quite clearly, that Lord Justice Leveson's public inquiry is going to look at.

Let me go further. Although I maintain that these relationships, certainly as far as I am aware, have been proper, what I do acknowledge is that the perception could be different, certainly in these circumstances. That is why I am seeking to appoint an independent person, because even if we believe we are acting properly, and I do - and I firmly believe I have acted properly - there will undoubtedly be learning for us in this area, learning that might relate to transparency, wisdom, perception. It is right that we learn those lessons. I do not believe on any occasion I have acted inappropriately. I am very satisfied with my own integrity but I do accept, in matters such as this, we need to move on and take this as a point in time and actually acknowledge that perceptions can be different from the reality.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** I will not take up too much more of your time. The only think I would say about that is I just wonder what the role of the 69 press people that you employ is if you now need somebody else, but there might be a very good reason for it.

Can I finally ask you to explain the extraordinary statement by your senior officers that one of the key reasons that the Metropolitan Police Service did not uncover some of the crucial evidence that has since come to light was because the News of the World did not co-operate? I do not know, obviously, policing anything like as well as your senior officers do, but I would have thought it was highly unusual for people being investigated for criminal activity to hold their hands up and say, "It was me, guv, let me tell you how I did it". I would have thought it was the job of the greatest

police force in the world, which I think there is no doubt is the Metropolitan Police Service, to uncover the evidence. If you had looked at the files in more detail, surely the next step would have been to go in, to take the computers out and to examine the financial records. I simply do not understand why the fact that somebody who was under investigation for criminal activity would not co-operate would in any way hinder your progress.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** One point and one question, but I do have to respond to your first point. We might have 69 or whatever press officers --

**Dee Doocey (AM):** It is 69.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am sure you have done your maths and I am sure you are right, but it is the responsibility of leadership to set the context of policing. It is the responsibility and I think, if I look back, it is in my job description or the appetite for this job. It is my responsibility to promote the reputation and indeed what it is the Metropolitan Police Service does. That is why I think I have to have a relationship with certain media. But we have to move on and learn lessons and ensure it is transparent and that people have confidence, not only in why we do it but in how we do it. That is my response to your first question.

Your second question, that sounds very logical and sensible and sane but I think it was either John Yates or Peter Clarke, and I cannot remember which, and that was a very difficult process, tried to explain the process of production orders with the media. I am happy to circulate a note of what we have to go through to obtain information going through production orders. Again, as I have said before, it is very difficult to think aloud and remember precisely the legislation, but from recollection, for a production order we need to ensure (1) that we need to prove that people are not co-operating. When people co-operate partially it is very difficult to prove that are not co-operating if we do not know what they are not co-operating about. Secondly, it cannot be a fishing expedition. I am very happy to circulate the legal details of production orders and what is required, but I will repeat there is little doubt that had News International co-operated with the first inquiry, we would not be sitting here today. There is little doubt that the subsequent disclosures both in January and June of this year are deeply disturbing.

**Dee Doocey (AM):** Finally, would you agree, in view of what has happened, that in future you will get your officers to put a list of all of their meetings with the media freely available on the internet so that anyone can see them so that there are no misunderstandings? You will be aware that it took us more than a year of freedom-of-information requests to get the details that I have just read out today.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** And I think you will remember, Dee [Doocey], when you have asked a similar questions before, I said I would publish all such details; I am very happy to do it. If I can just say, that is the importance of getting an independent adviser. It is one to publish these things but we need to go

more than that. We need to build confidence in what we do and why we do it and have that narrative better than we have done up to now.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** It is 2.30pm. I am not sure what you want to do. I know Toby Harris] wants to come in with a question. Can you take another one before you go or will Tim [Godwin] deal with all the other questions?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will take another one.

**Toby Harris (AM):** I will only ask the question I have which is specific to you, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Coming to the review of the phone-hacking case in 2009, what remit did you give Assistant Commissioner John Yates when you asked him to review the phone-hacking case? Did you set a timescale for that review and how soon after you asked him to review did Assistant Commissioner Yates report back to you? Were you satisfied when he reported back to you that he had properly fulfilled the remit that you had given him?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am going from memory, but I think it was asked by the media at the Associations of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) conference in Manchester did I have any comments around the story that I think the Guardian had produced that day. I think I said words to the effect - and it is on record, so people can check it - that I had asked someone, I might that named John Yates, to check the facts and see if there was anything new, but someone would likely be making a comment later that day. And that is what John Yates did. I did not put a timescale around it and nor would I. It would be impossible to put a timescale around it. I asked John Yates to do that and that is what he did.

**Toby Harris (AM):** So there were no written terms of reference?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I cannot remember if there were subsequent written terms of reference. I was in Manchester, he was in London, and I am pretty sure it was a phone call from me to him to say that is what I had said.

**Toby Harris (AM):** And he reported back to you when?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I guess I saw the report in that media later that day when he made a statement, when I think he said there is nothing new.

**Toby Harris (AM):** You were satisfied with that (several inaudible words)?

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I will remind you what I said earlier. I have no reason to have any doubt about the 2006 inquiry. I was not involved in it and I had no reason to have any doubts about it, so it did seem to me to be logical for somebody to say, "Is there anything new?" Because if there is nothing new, and you have no reason to doubt a police inquiry, it is then very difficult to expend further

resources on that. That is the logical position, so I would not see any need to question him.

**Toby Harris (AM):** Given that you are relying on your memory, and despite the fact these questions were submitted in advance, perhaps we could have a written response on that point. The rest do not specifically refer to your role so I am happy to pass to anyone else.

**Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS):** I am happy to give a written response but it will confirm I did not set any timelines and nor would I expect to do, nor could I have done.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you very much. I think the Commissioner has to go now. Thank you for attending, and we will ask Tim [Godwin] to answer the rest of the questions. Jennette [Arnold] is next.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Thank you. In fact I think Tim [Godwin] is actually much more familiar with this case than you, Sir Paul [Stephenson], so that is fine. Tim [Godwin], you will recall that recently we had the family of Daniel Morgan at a meeting. The concern that I and they have is we understand that the officer who was investigating their case was subjected to phone hacking. Will there be an inquiry or an investigation looking at those officers where their phones were hacked, and the cases that they were involved in, with a view to seeing whether or not any information at that time that was relevant was leaked to the press and therefore may well have prejudiced their case? It might not be the case. This is a fact of public confidence and the fact that we are all fascinated by issues around Assistant Commissioner John Yates. There is more information that suggests that other officers had their phones hacked, and their relationship to their cases -- Members will recall Daniel Morgan's murder was a 20-year-old case which went up hill, down dale and everywhere, everybody in denial, and in the end failed. It is of concern that the head officer's phone was hacked. So will there be work not only in that case but in other cases?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you for that. In terms of reinforcing how badly we feel about the murder of Daniel Morgan and the subsequent investigations that we eventually brought to court some time later but did not end in what we would perceive as success. In relation to the story that came out in the media in relation to Dave Cook, we are at the moment exploring what that was about and we still need to get to the bottom of it so it is very difficult for me to answer that. At the moment it does not appear there was phone hacking as part of that, but that is part of the investigation and I need to wait and see where that one goes.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Through you, Chair, can I ask - you have the details of his brother Alastair [Morgan] who speaks for the family - that a note be sent from your office to him to just relate basic information to Alastair and any other family that will

be linked with any other named officers. I think that is the minimum that we need to do as soon as possible for the family's peace of mind.

**Graham Speed (AM):** One of the key learnings that we have had over the last year or more is about the need for us to reflect on our victim care programmes in the sense of how we do keep people informed. Daniel Morgan's family is one very close to our heart, so I will make sure that is done.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** You will be sending a letter out to them?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We will make sure that we keep him informed as to what is going on.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** So he will be getting a letter shortly from you?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, once we get to the bottom of it all.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Jenny [Jones]?

**Jenny Jones (AM):** We learnt through the media today, Mr Godwin, that the Commissioner was going to give us an apology today. Did he apologise? I did not notice. I am genuinely asking, because you know him better than I do.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Things are in the media that are not always what his intentions are. I have not been talking to him about an apology. I think he was here to explain that obviously John Yates has, with great humility, articulated that with the benefit of hindsight we would have done things differently. Are we happy where we are now? No. Are there things that we need to learn? Yes. When we launch the Operation Weeting inquiry we said that it would be a robust investigation, no stone unturned. That is ongoing as we speak, that is why we are here today. Additionally, at the end of the appropriate time in the process, questions will need to be asked and answered, and we have always stood by that. It is about when those questions need to be answered.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** I have several questions, Chair, if you do not mind.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** That is fine.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** There were several times when we were getting false information, apparently in good faith. I thought the Commissioner might apologise of that, but obviously not.

What about the Metropolitan Police Service's failure to get any further information when civil actions got more information out of News International? How does the best police force in the world not get as much information as civil actions?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think this is an area where I will have to be a cautious in the sense of certainly the public inquiry will be looking at all matters, I believe, in relation to journalistic privilege in terms of the investigations. There is a different requirement in civil law in terms of disclosure of the information, and that some of those disclosures have assisted us to get more production because it gives us those grounds. I do not particularly want to go into the specifics of those because (a) I do not know the specifics of those and (b) just to point out that the two rules of evidence and of evidence gathering are different for a production order in relation to a criminal investigation of journalistic privilege and a civil action that requires disclosure. I think we need to go through case by case as we go through the public inquiry and I am sure that will be looked at.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Can I ask you a couple of questions on Weeting? How many detectives are working on it at the moment?

**Graham Speed (AM):** Forty-five or 46. As Sue Akers pointed out, that will vary as needs arise in the sense that if we need more in, at that point we will take more in. Sometimes we may need less. Sue [Akers] will be making, with her team, those decisions nearly on a daily or weekly basis.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Is the Government giving you any resources on this?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** This is a Metropolitan Police Service investigation.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** So even if it stretches nationwide you will not be asking for more resources from the Government?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** At this time, no.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Can I ask you about Elveden? When were you actually aware of evidence pointing to payments to the police?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I believe that the Commissioner reported that one and I am told that that was on 20 June 2011 when the first disclosures were received by Operation Weeting that led to Elveden.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** So Elveden was set up immediately after that?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Again I have to heavily caveat that here, obviously not being involved and not here, the actual part was that at that point an early conversation was taken on by the IPCC and as it became more apparent it was then referred to the IPCC for supervision.



**Jenny Jones (AM):** Finally, can you tell me why, consistently, Home Affairs Select Committee gets more information than the Police Authority? We are consistently asking questions and get fobbed off, and yet when officers go to Parliament they seem to be able to give loads more evidence than you give to the scrutiny body that is meant to hold you to account.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I always feel that I end up answering lots of questions.

**Jenny Jones (AM):** Not you personally; officers.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We have every intention to answer as many questions as we can within the judicial processes that are ongoing as we speak. The Home Affairs Select Committee has an advantage over the Police Authority in that they can call other witnesses other than just merely members of the Metropolitan Police Service.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. I have Tony [Arbour], Toby [Harris] and Caroline [Pidgeon].

**Tony Arbour (AM):** I would like to ask you about the thing that most concerns me, the allegation of police selling information. In 2003 Rebekah Wade, as she then was, told a select committee that they had paid police for stories. I would like to know what actions did the Metropolitan Police Service take after those allegations were known. What were the results of those investigations, and can you tell me what action the Metropolitan Police Service have taken about the allegations in the New York Times that the Metropolitan Police Service tried to suppress the investigation into bribery, "To protect the police's long-term relationship with News International"?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I do not recognise that last element, albeit it that I want to obviously say that there is a public inquiry that is judicially led that will explore what those relationships were. Equally, there is Operation Elveden which will look at allegations of payments being made to corrupt officers. The one thing I can say is that for the Metropolitan Police Service we take tackling corruption as one of our major areas of activity, because it is abhorrent, they are criminal and they should feel the full force of the law.

In terms of the Rebekah Wade allegations made, that does involve another individual and I think I will need to answer that one in writing, if that is okay, for the various reasons that were outlined before, because when things involve other people it is absolutely essential that I get that totally accurate. I will take that question and respond to you in writing.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** Are you able to answer the simple question that the Metropolitan Police Service did take some action in relation to that allegation made in 2003?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** There were a range of investigations about that time that were made into issues around corruption and leakage, some of which did result in successful prosecution and conviction. Those investigations happened, as I say, around about the time that that appearance at the Culture and Media Select Committee took place. There was not a specific investigation purely on what Rebekah Wade said in that appearance.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** If I can continue on that, eight years ago you knew, because of the result of the prosecutions, that this practice was a practice which existed at that time. Did you not take any steps to see that it would not continue between then and now?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Again can I just say that in relation to the specific individual I would like to see the question and answer properly, because there are other people involved who have rights, and there are judicial processes, whether it is through any of those four judicial areas that we have running at the moment, Weeting, Elveden, a judicial review and the public judicial inquiry. So I am not going to answer here off the cuff without the necessary information what was done eight years ago in relation to an individual and the allegations about an individual.

What I will say is that the Metropolitan Police Service, when I came to the Metropolitan Police Service, had the most robust anti-corruption command of any police service in England and Wales, and was actually setting the pace in terms of the use of covert units, intelligence gathering and all the rest of it, which was intelligence led. That was to tackle and to drive out any form of corruption. When you have 55,000 people, you will always have the odd bad apple. As a result of that there is a need for us to maintain the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS), which Mark [Simmons] heads for me, in terms of identifying and dealing with them. That goes on as we speak. In the last 12 months we have had a number of police officers arrested for information (several inaudible words). Where we get the intelligence, where we get that information, we will pursue it, and Elveden will be in pursuit.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** I am pursuing these. Clearly I understand the point that you are making, but the point that I am making is that it appears that there has been a corrupt relationship between certain individuals in the Metropolitan Police Service and News International for a period of at least eight years.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** These are totally proper questions in light of what is being discussed and speculated on in various quarters. I have to say, though, that we debate this as we should, which is this is a very important, extremely

... I think what I am trying to say is it will have an impact on how we do business in terms of our constitutional position around the press, the police, politicians, et cetera. It will affect individuals in one way or another through those various judicial inquiries. So to answer it I have to make sure that the answers we give are fair to all those individuals concerned and that we answer accurately and correctly, which is why it is very difficult for me to answer that here. I do see the point of pursuing it but I will need to take those questions, gather the evidence that I can justify, validate and corroborate, check with those individual judicial areas and then submit it back to you.

**Tony Arbour (AM):** All right, thank you.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Toby [Harris]?

**Toby Harris (AM):** Yes, I want to follow up the line from Tony [Arbour] and also the point that Jennette [Arnold] made earlier about DCS Cook and the surveillance by the News of the World. I suspect you are going to answer it in the way you have just answered the last couple of questions from Tony [Arbour]. The Guardian specifically reported that in November 2002 Rebekah Brooks was confronted at a press social event, as they put it, in New Scotland Yard by being taken into a side room and confronted by Commander André Baker and Dick Fedorcio about News of the World surveillance of DCS Cook. No further action was taken about that.

What I am interested in, and this is about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the News of the World, was, first of all, who actually took the decision, who was party to the decision, to proceed in that way, i.e. to have a conversation with the editor of the newspaper concerned but to take no further action? For example, was the then Commissioner and the then Deputy Commissioner either involved or informed? What other senior officers were involved or informed? I can confirm, because I was Chair of the Authority at the time, that I was not informed. Indeed, the first I learned of it was when I read the Guardian's article. In particular, was the team led by Assistant Commissioner John Yates, which subsequently reinvestigated the murder of Daniel Morgan, been aware of that previous behaviour by the News of the World? I have a couple of other questions as well.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I know this sounds wholly inadequate, but all I can say is that in response to your question we have spoken to a couple of the people involved in order to respond to you appropriately. This is one that we will respond to, but there are a couple of other people that we have yet to talk to who are no longer with the Metropolitan Police Service. It would be inappropriate, until we have had a chance to talk to them, to be able to point out as to who was told, who was privy to that and all the rest of it. Additionally, there is the matter of what offences, if any, were there as a result of the actions. So we need to get to the bottom of exactly what was being alleged and what that would mean in terms of law, because obviously phone hacking is a specific offence.

**Toby Harris (AM):** It is not clear, incidentally, whether it is phone hacking or surveillance.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Which I have said to Jennette [Arnold] that I am not sure that phone hacking is part of it. The bit around it for me is I need to get to the bottom of it. It was raised and it is an ongoing line of inquiry. It was being prepared for the full Authority, which is where this question was being tabled, and it will be done by that full Authority and we will give you that written response.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** In view of that answer, could we then ask that the other questions are dealt within in writing. I think they have a list of your questions, so hopefully we will have that by the full Authority meeting.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Absolutely, and they are proper, appropriate question. There is a lot of heat, there is a lot of comment, there is a lot of speculation around sentences in all this, which is why, to be fair to everybody, including victims, we need to make sure that we get the answers right. That is why I am quite happy to come here. It was not in that diary piece, but I do not want to give you an answer that later turns out to be wrong.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Caroline [Pidgeon] next.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** One of the things I wanted to ask you I think you will probably say you cannot answer because of the current investigations. I was just staggered that only 170 people so far out of essentially nearly 4,000 have been told that they were potential victims. I realise you have to investigate this thoroughly but it seems to me you need to let people know, the soon the better, and that I find really worrying indeed.

The two points I wanted to make, one Dee [Doocey] has made already in terms of making sure that all ACPO officers now register every contact they have with members of the press. I think that is really, really important. The other issue that I wanted to raise is something that I raised and colleagues did, Toby [Harris] did, at corporate governance committee when I first joined it a couple of years ago, about the register of hospitality and gifts. We asked for this to be put online. We were it could not happen. Catherine [Crawford] got hold of for me the infamous book and I trawled through and found that you had had some tickets to rugby at Twickenham and the Commissioner had been given a bottle of champagne from his local off-licence. At face value it is not necessarily that much, but actually it is transparency. Given that it has taken us so long to actually get details of these dinners and lunches with News International, it is really important that that register is up online as soon as possible and the Metropolitan Police Service does not resist it any more.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I think it is up online now. I am horrified if we have not got it up yet, because certainly that is our intention. In terms of the Twickenham that you mentioned, that was actually to get a charity going called Hitz for young people in the inner city. Equally we make contributions anyway, so we have the price of the tickets, because I generally do not do hospitality. In terms of ACPO officers declaring their contact, yes, that is now policy.

**Caroline Pidgeon (AM):** Online, so it is transparent.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** The debate was had last week with (inaudible) whilst I was not here, and I think it was further done this week, whereby that policy has now been very much reinforced and it will be going out from me that there will be compliance with it across the piece, not just ACPO, and that we need to make sure that we get that right.

In terms of the speed with which we contact victims, again I have to be cautious. We are keeping Weeting very tight, for obvious reasons, in terms of how that is conducted, but I think Sue [Akers] articulated the complexities. It is not like there is a list of names, and there are different ways of accessing what that means and who the individuals are. It is not as straightforward as just a list of several thousand names. As a result of that, what she is going through is that process to do it. There have been lots of bits and pieces that were done that were destructive at the beginning but it should get quicker. But we have had that debate as to whether we need more assets or whatever to do it and Sue [Akers] is very alive to the fact that we need to push on and make progress to let victims know.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. I am conscious of the time. I will take just two more questions, who I think are Joanne [McCartney] and Chris [Boothman], and then we will move on to the next item.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Thank you. I am asking for the terms of reference of Operation Elveden, and perhaps I could have that in writing. But my question is really for you, Tim [Godwin], but also for Deborah [Glass] as well, and that is the investigation into inappropriate payments. Some Metropolitan Police Service officers appear to have been on the payroll of News International. Do you not think that that investigation should not be done outside the Metropolitan Police Service and taken away, wholly in the ambit of IPCC, because I do think there are public confidence issues here and it is still not public. The fact that the Metropolitan Police Service having now been at various inquiries that it perhaps acted appropriately with this inquiry in the past, or the phone-hacking inquiry, just look and think, "Should they really be investigating themselves?"

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Can I follow that up? I was conscious when the Commissioner said earlier about the joint statement between Keir Starmer and John Yates about what did or did not happen and who said what and when. Then actually what struck me was were there no bits of paper? Somebody must have written

down something. What happened to it? The question I wanted to ask you, and indeed Deborah [Glass], given that they are now mounting Elveden, is just to be quite clear about the instructions that went out to secure all the evidence that is going to be both Elveden and indeed the judicial inquiry and whether the IPCC are content that there are instructions, that you are content that that evidence is being secured and that it will be there for the judicial inquiry; otherwise they frankly will not be able to answer half the questions that we want answered.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Naturally, Chair, Deborah [Glass] will speak herself for the IPCC on their level of satisfaction or otherwise. The other thing I can say is when Weeting was established I said I wanted a robust, full investigation that left no stone unturned, that gathered secure evidence, et cetera, which is what they are doing. Sue Akers and her team are doing that diligently, robustly, pursuing the evidence. Where it led we still do not know; we are still following those trails. So, all that is being done. I have total confidence in the integrity of Weeting and of Elveden, but equally that is the role of the IPCC. That is why we referred it to the IPCC, and at any point Deborah [Glass] may wish, and the IPCC may wish, to take it off and do it totally independently, which we would understand, and naturally support and comply with.

In terms of for us, can I just say that all the Metropolitan Police Service officers and police staff, police, police community support officers (PCSO), et cetera, there is nothing more abhorrent than a corrupt cop and we will do everything we can to bring them to justice, and that will be done. I am certain if people do not trust us to do that, that is a matter of circumstance and event. But we will do everything, and whether that is complying and is supporting the IPCC or doing it ourselves, we will pursue them until we have actually dealt with them.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Deborah [Glass].

**Deborah Glass (IPCC):** It may be helpful, Chair, if I say something about what I am actually doing in relation to this matter and then perhaps, Joanne [McCartney], if I can go on to answer your question. I am personally supervising the Metropolitan Police Service's investigation to identify any police officer who may have taken money from News of the World. That is essentially the terms of reference.

What does supervision actually mean in this case? First it means that the control of the investigation remains at the moment with the Metropolitan Police Service under Deputy Commissioner Sue Akers. My involvement, however, will be robust and intrusive. That means that we discuss lines of inquiry. I am assisted by one of our senior investigators, I am kept informed of all developments and I have access to any information generated by the investigation, as I require. I can ask any question. I can also change that mode of litigation as and when I see fit.

What I am very conscious of - and this is moving on to your specific question - is that this is an extremely complex, interconnected series of inquiries. This is not just into

the actions of police officers. It involves the media and members of the public. What I am very clear about is that nothing should be done to compromise the effectiveness of that. I have made it clear to the Metropolitan Police Service that as and when officers are identified I would us to independently investigate. But I am also very mindful that there are operational and practical issues that may well come to light because these things are so interconnected.

The most important thing and the overriding objective that I have and I have no doubt that Sue Akers has is to bring wrongdoers to justice. I will not do anything or make any decisions that might compromise our ability to do that.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Can I just ask a follow-up? Are you satisfied, then, that all evidence is secure? Secondly, is your decision not to take it away at the moment based on your own resources or is it an actual operational decision that you have made?

**Deborah Glass (IPCC):** No, it is actually not based on our own resources. If it were possible or practical to carve out that bit of this inquiry that just related to police officers and simply independently investigate it, I would do that. I just do not believe it is. It is not a matter of resources. I have certainly been assured this is something that we can and should do, and I believe we can and should do it if that were going to produce the right result.

Similarly with an external force. If you could carve that out in such as way as to give it to an external force, then I would want to do this ourselves. So I think there is no mileage in suggesting that some other force should come and do it. I do believe that Sue Akers is as committed as I am to identify these villains and bring them to justice.

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Can I just at this point just evidence the point that we do take this very, very, very seriously? In the last 12 months we have had a number of officers and staff that have been put on trial for misuse of information and the leaking of information that we mentioned before about our professional standards team. We have an officer sentenced to 2 years imprisonment; we have a member of our police staff sentenced to 18 months suspended sentence. The prison officer they were involved with has five years imprisonment. The corrupter - the person who had approached them - 12 years' imprisonment. Another one where a police officer was sentenced to 13 years' imprisonment for conspiring with others to pervert the course of justice. The associates of that particular officer received 11½ years, 8 years and 7 years. We have another officer with misconduct in public office as a result of information misuse, sentenced to seven months' imprisonment. The corrupter received 16 months' imprisonment, and a PCSO who was using our criminal information system inappropriately was in prison for 15 months. That is just some of the cases that we do, but they are a very small percentage of all the men and women that make up the Metropolitan Police Service. But we are constantly alive to it and we constantly seek it out and it has no place in the Metropolitan Police Service.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Sorry, Chair, I do need to get the response from Deborah [Glass] that she is satisfied that every step has been taken that secures the evidence in relation to Elveden.

**Deborah Glass (IPCC):** I am perfectly satisfied at the moment that the Metropolitan Police Service are doing everything they can within the law.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. Chris [Boothman], last question.

**Christopher Boothman (AM):** Can I ask a question, Tim [Godwin], that is not so much about the criminal activities but about the propensity for this kind of thing to happen in the future? Are there standard operating procedures for senior officers who manage investigations, who supervise and who review? Because one of the difficulties I have had is hearing these different terms talked about, and there seems to be no fixed definition. It seems to be a bit of a moving feast as to what the review is, what it means to supervise. Are there bits of paper that you can share with us to help us understand what these terms mean and whether there are minimum standards that officers are expected to adhere to?

**Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** There are, and one of the issues in relation to the review of major crime investigations, there are specific processes and policies and procedures that we do, likewise with some other forms of crime that do not hit the serious crime target, there are various reviews that go in as standard operating procedures. We will make that available to you. But of course the one thing you have to remember is that a lot of these investigations that do not go the way we would want them and mistakes are made, they have a series of different rules, potentially, because they go on over such a long period of time, that whilst the rules of today are this, the rules of 2002, 1999 would have been different. That is always the problem we have in articulating what those rules were at that point, and they often get judged against the standard which has changed as a result of learnings that have gone through since that time. We will provide that but with that caveat.

**Reshard Auladin (Chairman):** Thank you. I think we were now going to move on to our proper agenda. We will give people five minutes' break so that those who wish to leave the room will do so and then we can start again.