

MPA Race and Faith Inquiry

BPA

Attendees: Alfred John, David McFarlane, Leroy Logan, Patricia Fenton

Chair: Cindy Butts

Panel Members: Bob Purkiss, Margaret Blankson and Anthony Julius

This interview has been proof read and names have been inserted only where the speaker's identify is certain.

CB Welcome and thank you for giving us the time to give evidence this morning. I'm sure most of you are aware of how this is going to work 'cause I know that you've sat in on quite a few sessions. Suffice to say we will be talking to you for roughly about an hour, an hour and a quarter, something like that. Panel members, Margaret and Bob - you have their biographies, Anthony unfortunately isn't with us; he's caring for a poorly son today. Can we ask you to make sure you use your mic.s 'cause we're actually tr—taping the session. Because there are so many mic.s you will have to switch them on when you want to speak and switch them off when you're finished speaking. If there were too many mic.s on at the same time, things will, I'm sure, go fairly crazy. We'll make sure you get a – obviously, a copy of your transcript, maybe in about a week or two's time. We hope that you'll feel comfortable enough to give us your honest and open views and I'm sure you will endeavour to do that. Can I start by asking Margaret to kick off with some questions?

MB Hi, hello. I want to start off by talking about membership of the BPA. Could you tell me how many BPA members you have and the s—the split between staff and officers?

(inaudible) say we have around a thousand members but what I would like on clarity is, is that what is the importance of that question in relation to the Inquiry?

MB In terms of (inaudible), sorry

CB Sorry. Firstly, I don't think people can hear you.

(inaudible)

CB Michael, can you just go round and make sure that the volume is set to its highest ex—  
(inaudible) possibly (inaudible)

Fix

CB ..each microphone.

(inaudible)

Can you hear?

(inaudible)

One, two. One, two.

No. (inaudible)

Can you adjust the (inaudible) at the side?

(inaudible)

CB Margaret – can you (inaudible) first? (inaudible)

Yeah, that's (inaudible). That's it. Okay.

(inaudible)

Certainly. Could I just have some clarity in relation to the Inquiry, as to the importance of the breakdown, because our membership is, just on a question of membership, we don't particularly care whether they're members, sort of whether they're police or police staff.

MB (inaudible) it's had ...god! I think the – mine's gone.

(inaudible)

MB Yeah, okay. I think we're trying to get a gauge of how – of your Board representation and – it's a question that we've asked to all of the Staff Associations that have been re— represented here.

(inaudible) Mike.

It's around 50/50.

MB It's around 50/50 okay, great. Thank you. Can you ti—in terms of – and can you tell me, how, how do you, as a Staff Association, consult with your membership? What's the process and structures that you use?

(inaudible)

We use a – we use a, a number of ways – apart from our usual meetings, we also use newsletters;, we have tried to use the Intranet before hand, but we don't actually have that facility to hand. Plus various consultation groups, not just internally but also externally, as well, with Community leaders.

LL Yeah, I'm – I'm Leroy Logan, one of the founder members of the BPA and, and I just want to go back to how we started. We came, we came across as a social forum, reflecting the views of a, you know, the personnel but also the community, so we still have a very strong social network, because we engage with the community we're a part of. And I think that is still

being shown by the Celebration of Life concerts we have at the Festival Hall. It's an annual event; (inaudible) thousands of, of – not only people in London and other sort of people from across the country, but also BPAs not only in London, but across the country so, I – I think it's that, that social forum and, and of course there's networks and of course the volunteers that are involved in all of these activities. So that's a big part of our, our communication and I, I think that's something we been drawn into for a number of years and, and I think it's very effective.

MB Thank you. Can I just take you back slightly? If you could just explain to me the structures for your, how your Executive's organised, you know, what, how that process works, what's the structure of the Executive – those, those types – I, I'm trying to get a gauge of how you're organised.

We have ten Executive members inside the Metropolitan Black Police Association; there are four post holders including myself; there's Chair, Vice Chair, Bevan Powell, General Secretary and, and Dave Macfarlane and my Treasurer to my left, Patricia Fenton. The other Executives also have specific responsibilities which we tend to split off – we deal with youth engagement, we do – deal with community engagement, I should say, support, in relation to case management, we have a support network, which involves a support co-ordinator who distributes the work to our various support workers out there and on the area, as well, so that we can get a collective feed-back as to what's going on in the area, plus the fact with our consultations with community, obviously, we need to know on how the service impacts on the people we are supposed to be serving. So, I mean, the only place we can get that is from Community Consultation groups in those various, as Leroy said, the various social work net--, networks that we use, to basically gauge what the communities think.

MB From these various forums, in terms of your consultation process and through the officers and the Executive, can you tell me, perhaps, the issues that appertain specifically to recruitment retention and progression, that are arising from your members?

Well, I think I'll start off and I'm sure that the other members will contribute. Certainly, in relation to progression, they are – our members do feel that they're being held back, that they are being used as excuses to be d—dealing with diversity from the ma—majority culture, who then use that, within their own submissions, to promote themselves. Certainly the lack of accountability. One of the things that was brought up at the Morris Inquiry and in fact I raised the point, at the Morris Inquiry, was that there is no accountability; there's no admittance from the organisation that they've done absolutely anything wrong, especially HR. Nothing. No matter how obvious the situation is and no matter how much the weight of evidence there is there, simply doesn't happen, but yet still, when the situation is turned,

on minorities, every minute detail is extrapolated and used to held back. And that's the type of message that we get through, in relation to progression and it's a similar deal in relation to support as well; to bring in (inaudible), it seems (inaudible).

It's – it's not unusual, listening to staff a- and when I talk about staff I mean both staff and police officers, that they're – first of all, they have to prove themselves, so much more, in order to get to that point. Even to get on the first step, getting promoted and even when they're in that sort of position, at, if you like, middle management, they still have that difficulty of even going further and that's based a lot upon -- by perceptions and, as there was, some time ago, there was an Inquiry --about ten years, well, not an Inquiry but a report done by the Home Office, which talks about ethnic minority progression, 'cause the concerns were, is that ethnic minorities were not as qualified or as educated as our white counterparts and that report has proved that wasn't the case. It's paper 109, from the Home Office back in 1999. Exactly ten years ago, which proves, to the contrary, that we did have staff who are more than qualified and it's very disconcerting, watching highly qualified staff, even until recently (inaudible) Inspectors in the Chief Inspectors' promotional exams and not getting through, when q-- quite clearly, these staff were very, very qualified to go through.

Just to build on that, I think it's been quite well evidenced that it's not just around the member of staff, police officer or police staff member who -- sense of qualification; it's also around confidence in the process and, if there's anything that we have done in a str-- I think from the beginning of -- of the BPA, it's around how we support and mentor members of staff and we've been part of various mentoring processes within the Met and it's quite clear that one of the first things you need to encourage people with is the confidence – in themselves, say, You are just as capable as a majority culture colleague and despite that might not be sh—reflecting in your PDRs, or any form of assessment, we can - you know, start to evidence it in, in a much more explicit way and, and more importantly, get them in to the opportunities – work experience opportunities – to get the evidence, to put on an application form of one form or another. So, I, I, I – I think it's around confidence. So it's, it's not just about glass ceilings; it's around the sticky floors that people have to experience to get off that sense of being inferior.

MB (inaudible) sorry. So you've talked a bit about progression and we as a Panel have had submissions from people, through the Panel and through the focus group process, about some, some practical examples of where they pu--, examples of where they believe the organisation is not responding appropriately to staff of --black and ethnic minority staff, a sa—staff, particular faith groups. Could you just give me a couple of examples of what you-- the headline is, not in terms of detail, but just some of the headlines of where you think those issues are occurring?

Certainly with regard to the discrimination. The lack of support, as well. In relation to police officers, obviously there is the issue of operational duties and opportunities in specialist organisations. I think it's quite clear, in relation to those, the diversity in those specialist operations, that there is significant problems there, in getting people of colour into those – through those doors. But it's also building those opportunities, to place them in a better position and if the same can actually be said for police staff. It's about the opportunities. We've had examples where temporary promotions are not given to black staff and we've had examples when, in fact, they brought in more expensive consultants from outside, to fill those positions and, frankly, that's just not the way to go. We've seen examples like that, going back over a number of years.

I just want to add to that. In the specialist side, especially in the police side of it, it's nonexistent, especially where being a female's concerned. As an example, I was in the (inaudible) Protection Group 2003 and I was the only female out of 750 officers and one of 20 females (inaudible) as females as well? A lot of the de—the departments are lacking in BME representation and also as females. On the females, training, some are trained but not utilised. You've also got – there's no encouragement for promotion. PDRs – some, a female that I was supporting hadn't had one done for four years, so, I mean, a, a, a, a PDR obviously bench marks to do the training – you know, the objectives for the future and it kind of – if the female, a, a lot of the BME problems that we had was with the training and also had a I—lack of encouragement for the future, for the training etcetera.

(inaudible) up on this point around specialist units.

Yes

CB Firstly, why is it, you believe, what is it – and, and why is it that there aren't that many people of colour within the specialist units,

Yes

CB ..and then, if you can extend that and talk about what you think needs to be done in relation to that. And that's (inaudible)

I think it, there's a lot of favouritism that still goes on and there's this old boys' network, unfortunately; that happens. A lot of the departments are dominantly (sic) white, males. Female representation's very low; I suppose it's visibility; to see somebody of, somebody else from BME into a certain specialist unit, you see that, you'll think, you know, you, you wouldn't – if you ever go into a department that is totally white, because, when I actually went to DPG, it was very challenging for me, as a, as a BME female; very, very challenging.

Mm

Lots of – all sorts of things happened which I'm not going to go into and I've left - since I've left there in 200 (inaudible), --5, I wouldn't go back there. There wasn't any other BME females there; I was the only one that was there. I think it -- the visibility and encouragement to police some of these departments would be helpful. I, I, I don't know. The other thing is, you, you'll have, with some of our females, you have got work life balances.

Mm

We had a female who was in the department, she had some child care issues, she was – she started a particular time in the morning, her Manager said, We have to, between a white female and a black female, somebody has to not come in – come in a bit later, the female – there was no discussion, the female, the black BME female was told, You will have to come in a bit later, even though it was going to be detrimental on her child care issues. So, sometimes, if a, a BME or as a female you're not comfortable in your position, (inaudible) you're not going to go to – to apply for certain posts. And I think it starts with management that's not encouraging us and – we've also had a situation where a female has -- BME female's been in the office for three years, she has sp-- two, two languages, very well educated, she's got a degree and she's offer-- off, three years in the department, a Minute taking course. You then get a white female that comes on board after and gets promoted within a year; you know, there's a lot of promotion that encouragement after someone's come in to the unit, so BME females are, are there to feel not, that very valued, are not encouraged and there's a lot of favouritism that goes around in the organisation.

CB So does that mean, then, I mean, you talked about the – the informal practices and the old boy network, as you put it – are, are you therefore saying that the processes that the organisation uses, in order to post people into specialist units are okay, but that they are

superseded by some of the informal things, or are you saying that the formal process isn't right? Or you're saying, neither are right?

I'd just like to come in on here. It's certainly the informal practices, that's still going

Yes

..through (inaudible) in relation to institutional racism and it was in the practices and policies and we're great policy writers, but that does not translate into practice. It doesn't take much to work out there on how many minorities, visible minorities apply to the specialist departments and don't get through. Prime example, that we've included in submissions, are, are an extremely capable Chief Inspector, six times applied to b – on promotion. The last time, had enough, went, applied once to Nottinghamshire on promotion and got it. That really does epitomise exactly what we have been talking about. Now, these are the things that haven't been carrying on for a few months. They have always been there, but now we have a smoke screen of a number of well written policies that literally don't come up to the practices that are taking place. If those are still happening, in those specialist departments, as they were ten years ago, then the problem still exists and it's merely masked by policies.

Again, I'm, I, m—I'm here as the elder statesman, just to remind people; let's not re-invent the wheel.

CB No, we can see!

Thank you!

(laughter)

It's the quail—the type of tie I wear; it reflects my age. I think we need to recognise that we've been here before. When the National BPA first started, we had the initial conference, chaired by Jack Straw, talking about these various same issues and-- and we had various reference documents, one of which was Dr Ali Dizaei's PhD on this issue, around progression and specialisation and all of the barriers that were there, especially in specialist units. It, I don't think its lack of policy. It's accountability. I think we are policy rich but accountability



poor and a lot of that accountability is before you even get in to the process. I myself, when I was going for the Superintendent, I was called in by – one of my Supervisors, which will be, remain anonymous ‘cause they’re still in the organisation and they told me, I needed another year or two to get depth and breadth. Now, I – I don’t know if he was talking about my neck size, or my waist size, but it was clear to me that if I didn’t have the strength of character and confidence in myself, I would have said, Okay. What would you like me to do? And he wanted me to go in to – a, basically, a role where most people don’t want to do, as a Chief Inspector of the Criminal Justice Unit. It’s not a real, plum job and I refused, ‘cause I, I, I, I knew I had the evidence; I knew I had the ability and I did trust in the process, that if they get through this informal conversation, I could get through. And, fortunately, I did. Not many people can see through that, or have the confidence to say, I--, okay. And we know so many cases of where people have had to fight tooth and nail, all the way through the Fairness at Work issues, through appeals, ETs, Civil Actions, etcetera. Now if you – and – you know, it’s human nature. If you get worn down by this, you’ll say, Well, you know, enough’s enough. And that’s where we – we, we need to recognise those informal conversations can either make or break someone, before they even get through the process and, in closing, I think we need to recognise, in specialist units, you don’t have the rigour and intrusive supervision that you’ll have in a uniform unit, response teams etcetera. You don’t have the amount of openness and accountability that you see. So, they are still enclaves in specialist units and, you know, one of the things I – if you, especially in a specialist unit, you’ve got to, in a lot of ways, assimilate a lot more, to get breakthroughs than a, a lot of it depends on the leadership of that unit and how accountable he or she is.

Could I just say, it smells like coffee, it tastes like coffee, it looks like coffee, it is coffee. We’re talking about racism, pure and simple. The people who are running these Boards are the people who are doing all this; they’re all of European descent. You don’t see people reflecting - the people sitting in front of you and the people and yourselves, sitting on these Boards, making decisions and that’s what we need to change, as quickly as possible. It’s almost like a protectionism to – to make sure we keep whatever departments white and we have to stop that.

CB Presumably that’ll be t—that’ll come in too late, ‘cause you’re saying that the problem arises before the Boards.

Yes and I, (inaudible) yes.

CB So, so what then is the, what is the – the answer?

Absolutely, and this is why we're saying. We need to change and reflect and when we talk about the reflection and this institutional racism, it wasn't a mistake by the – the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, in order to address and define that. You've got institutional racism, you've got racism because whenever we raised issues about racism, everyone thinks we're talking about South Africa, during the apartheid, or Deep South America in the 'sixties. It comes in different forms. As I said to Boris Johnson, when we had a meeting the other day, he asked me, has race relations improved inside the Service? And I said, Well, if you call – when I joined in 1980, I was called a nigger. Well, now, I'm treated like one. So, no, it hasn't improved, it just comes in a different way, from overt to covert and that's what we need to address. So what I'm saying, it looks like coffee, smells like coffee, tastes like coffee, it is coffee and that's what we're dealing with, clear and simple.

MB Can you just, I mean, we, as you'll appreciate, we've heard – and I don't want to sort of repeat the whole range of things that we've heard (inaudible) think that some of them are, are detailed in your submission and also, I think they're already well documented in other numerous documentation about racism within the police force and within the MPS. Can you just explain to me what you, then, as an M, as, as a BPA, believe are some of the responses that the MPS should be adopting, in response to the things that you've raised?

Without a doubt, openness and transparency are words that are

MB (inaudible) can, can I just ask you to be specific 'cause I know, I, I'm, I'm not say – I'm not suggesting you're not going to be, but in advance of your answer. Thank you.

I was about to say that openness and transparency are words that are thrown and tossed around quite often, but the actual practice of that doesn't take place. Prime example, in last March, where the EODB meeting in this very room, I got up and stated that, with regards to discipline and progression, the Metropolitan Police had not moved on since the Macpherson Report. I received no 'phone calls from any Manager. Nothing. Put it in the paper, six months later, I get a plethora of 'phone calls. That's the kind of response that I'm talking about. Why weren't they listening? The significance of the submissions and those examples, if you notice, they span back years. This is the whole point. Years. What was happening during that time? Who was calling anyone to account when these situations were going wrong? What message does it actually give out, to allow that behaviour to continue? Does that not reinforce the discrimination that we have been talking about? That's the, those are the key issues. Very, very specific. It's about the accountability and it's about the fact that, in relation to the organisation reacting to it, first to listen, be accepting; half the people that we've spoken to in relation to

MB Sorry, I – I want to just stop you. I'm trying to be absolutely clear, 'cause you will appreciate that part of our role is to come up with a, a, a range of – and --which is what we'd expect and I think what people aren't looking for is for us to do – is to have a retrical (sic) report

I agree

MB ..and it's to actually say that these are the areas we believe the Met needs to move on. These are the areas we think they haven't been successful on. This is the ways we suggest they do it. These are the structures and systems you put in place and so what I'm looking for from you, from, from, from the BPA, is to say to us, that these are the – these are a response to the types of processes that is, that the MPS should put into place, that will respond to some of the things, so, while I appreciate the cos—the, the – you know, frame work, I think we're all well versed in that. What I'm looking for is something a bit more specific.

(inaudible) I mean, some of the specifics - that I certainly could be some quick wins, if that's what you're talking about. One of the issues that I'm, I'm really concerned about – we've heard, I think, from the De—the previous Commission—the previous Commissioner and the current Commissioner, that race and diversity has not been an Agenda item on the Senior Management discussions, whenever they had their Senior Management Board meetings. Now, how can that be right, considering the situations that we have and dealing with? The other thing, the Head of Diversity Directorate is a black female. Why is she not sitting on the – the Senior Management Board and giving them advice and make sure it's a legitimate – she does have a legitimate voice around the table. Now, that will go some way in order to, to achieve this. Secondly, if we have areas, for instance, we're looking at places like Operation Trident, which is dealing with – and I hate using the term, but, you know, black on black crime – why aren't we seconding people, attaching people, senior people like Leroy Logan and others, into that Unit, who can give a better leadership, if you like? More understanding. I'm not saying the current people are not qua—qualified to do their investigatative (sic) role but, bearing in mind, what we're looking at is to get some, so there are some things that can be done fairly quickly. Now, we've suggested all these sort of things. Never been taken on board. Now these are quick ways. There are some long term measures, like Affirmative Action and other stuff, which I think you may come on to; but these are some of the things that can be done. Now, when we speak, we talk about some of the issues, listen to us and take on what --the advice we're giving.

MB (inaudible) the structures and systems that currently exist for your consultation with, as, with the Senior Management team, are they not effective, do they not work or do they work—are they there and they're just a talking shop and there's no accountability?

The, the, the, the, the – we got, we do have access, you know and I – we're not going to sit here and be disingenuous. We do have access, but it's a case where—the effective listening doesn't seem to be happening. Now, there are individuals – and let me sort of be fair, 'cause I'm not accusing everybody here, but there are individuals who would listen, who would have a dialogue—would talk to us and whatever, but what we want to see are, are outcomes, so it's nice to have, you know, have a nice coffee and tea -- you know, in these nice china cups and everything else, but we want to see (inaudible) outcomes for all people and not just internally, but external. This is not just looking inside, but also outside. And that's what we need to, to, to do as quickly as possible.

Could – could I, can I just build on that? I, I, I think we need to recognise that it's all around leadership. Again, when the past Commissioner, Sir Ian Blair, came in to the Met, there was a big debate, who's going to lead on diversity? And eventually it landed at his feet at the Deputy Commissioner. Now, when he had got it at Management Board level and he was also Chairing the Diversity Board, you then, by definition, had the key people round the table with the decision making opportunities, to make sure that it's cascaded right across the organisation. And then you can start putting in the performance indicators, to hold Chief Officers to account. So you've got to get the, the, the level right and, of course, each of those Management Board members have to account back to the Commissioner, 'cause there's an inextricable link, that if everyone gets it, hopefully, it improve all round. If you recognise that --, how you treat your diverse personnel impacts on serving the needs of your diverse community. So – and, and also the signals that's sent. So, the—there is a lot of tools to do that. One of the major recommendations of the Lawrence Inquiry was the Race Relations Amendment Act and the Equality Impact Assessments and the action plans that and make thereof. How many of those are actually worth the paper they're printed on? Because you've got to question how many are done, the quality of the data, the calibre of the practitioners who carry out those EIAs. So, I, I just think it, it's – it's – what we're having here is not just the organisation is not recognising where they are on the institutional racism continuing, they also suffering from institutional amnesia, because it's not—they're not being held to account, they're not recognising the importance of these issues and, may I say, they might think we're going to go away and not keep the pressure on and challenge people's thinking. And we're not going to go away – whatever form we may be, we want to keep on this issue 'cause we know, ultimately, it's going to assist the organisation to move on and to be more legitimate for the communities we're serving.

MB Just so I can clarify something, so I make sure I completely understand this. Earlier, we talked about the subject – the, the issues, having, having been going on for years, they're not new, they're ten years old, they've twenty years old and not new issues and then -- we're now talking about leadership and we're talking about having somebody on the Management Board who takes the lead in diversity and we, you had that, well you could argue, in Ian Blair, so you had the person in the right place. So I'm s—I'm, I'm just trying to – just to clarify, was it that you had the right leadership, but you had the poor struc—the structures that exist or the accountability that you were looking for didn't exist, or are you saying in effect it's an overall – it is leadership, but unless the leadership is, is translated to accountability at all levels of bus – because I'm, (inaudible) almost as if there's a conflict in (inaudible)

If, if I can assist you and, and I'll, then I'll hand over to my colleagues.

Yes.

It's not just around the leadership in the Met; it's also around the critical distance between the Met and the MPA. The MPA has to be holding the, the lead person to account, because that – I, I think, is where we need to recognise our experiences. Morris, the recommendations, I think, covered the majority of issues. But who was holding the Met to account for those recommendations? So, by definition, then the, the organisation will cherry pick the ones they want. It's human nature. Unless someone said, Well, hold on here. Why weren't, why aren't we covering the issues around the certain Management Board responsibilities for retention and progression? And – and, of course, recruiting. Why aren't we getting the same form of rigour? And I'll give, and I'll close on this. As the Op Superintendent at Hackney, if my burglary figures slightly blipped up more than Met average – fortunately didn't – or street crime, or whatever – shootings, I would get a 'phone call so quick. It might be on my way in to work at 6 a.m. What's happening there? I want a response by... If, if – I'm not saying having a daily conversation, but if cluster Commanders were asking those sort of questions, trust me, people would be focussed on these issues.

MB I'm (inaudible) going to ask questions in a moment about the MPA, so I won't pick up on that. I just one final question, before I sort of pass you over. So I want to just a—if you could talk to me a bit about your decision to boycott - the boycott decision. Can you just talk to me about why you felt the need to do that, some of the context to that and the history to that?

Yeah, I think – think I'll kick off on this one. The boycott was based on and, in fact, believe the Panel member said it to Sir Ian,

(inaudible)

Sorry, I said the, the, the boycott was based on—on our frustration. For years, we have been banging at the doors and slowly but surely, people were ignoring it. All the problems that were turning up, were turning up even with the same people causing the problems. The doors were closing. No-one was taking any notice any more and in actual fact, what race has turned into is the word – it's, it's a dirty word, within the Metropolitan Police Service. The analogy that I use within the report, (inaudible) not going to go into, just to do with the Pyramids; now the fact of the matter is, is that an infrastructure is needed to support that kind of behaviour. It can't just take place at local level. It has to go through the ranks. The, the – as a prime example which is away from race and the Amex credit card, actually there's several processes of - several milestones of authorisation that take place, so when there is a large amount of money that basically has been unaccounted for, has been spent inappropriately over a number, couple of years, actually, an infrastructure would have had to have supported that, because an officer, or a member of staff, cannot sign that off themselves. Racism is exactly the same; it's an infrastructure that supports that and it goes right through the organisation (inaudible).

The concern was, is that there're a lot of people in our communities who may want to join the police service and yes, we'd like to get the numbers in and we'd like to get people promoted, but some of the people sitting behind me here have been trying for promotion, trying to gain specialism's and not getting through, or frustrated with the job, being there for so long and for us to go outside and encourage more people to come in, knowing the difficulties that we've had inside, just didn't seem right; it just didn't seem right. Now the question was asked of us, then, if it doesn't look right to us, why aren't we getting out? Now if you're asking the fire fighters to stop fighting the fire, then things are just going to get worse and that's how, sometimes, we see ourselves, as fire fighters, trying to put out these flames of what's happening with staff inside. And so, we had to be genuine to ourselves and look at it. We don't like what's happening to the staff inside and we don't like what's happening to the community outside. And we've got to be that conscience and we've got to be the voice.

Just like to add a, a particular example. Beginning of last year, which has quite profounded me (sic), I was actually contacted by an ex member who had left the Metropolitan Police Service and one of the things, the first things that he actually said to me, was, If you knew that this was the type of thing that was going on, why didn't you tell me? And, frankly, I

don't want to go through that again. It's as simple as that. It is hypocritical of us to be able to submit a forty thousand words rep—submission, holding examples like that and then turn round and say, Yep, its okay to come in. Actually, we can't stop people from joining the Metropolitan Police Service. It's, it's not our, our, our (inaudible); what we can do is tell you exactly what it's like inside. So, okay.

Just quickly, the Met's response to our boy—boycott was to put on the Intranet site the fact that recruitment is, is up, percentage-wise.

CB And what's your point (inaudible)?

The point is, we're fixed (inaudible) reasons for our boycott, the Met's – we obviously, we're in, in the throes of interacting with regards to this boycott; we're not going to invite members of the community to come in to join the police if things aren't right within, but the Met's – the Met, I – I felt the Met putting on the Intranet site the fact that recruitment percentage was up, was – as if to say, Well, your boycott's there but we're still getting recruits coming in. I didn't see it was helpful to put that message out, 'cause I thought it was, they would make a - (inaudible) trying to put a message up against us for that. I didn't think it was positive.

CB (inaudible) understand, I don't understand that.

So, so

CB Well I mean it.. what, I mean if

Think - I think the point that's trying to be made is in the fact that they didn't understand why the boycott was there. It was not about stopping people coming in. It's the fact that a large proportion of your indigenous staff are not happy about the way that discrimination's is being dealt with in the Metropolitan Police Service and if it's not happy inside the organisation, what kind of advertisement does that give, when we are trying to execute our duties, out there on the streets?

(inaudible) can I just build on that? Be, be—because, again, I might be a bit of a mantra but let's learn from the street. What happened, leading up to Morris. There was various cases and, and – and people were not respecting the views of the BPA around those issues, 'cause whatever questions we're asking, it was seen as adversarial and of course, not being acted upon and at times, not appreciated. So there's, there is a time when you said, Well, how are you going to get the attention of the MPA, the MPS, the GLA and other stake holders? How are we going to get people to have this conversation, which they haven't. Now. I was Chair of the BPA when we raised the boycott, once the Morris Inquiry was in and taking people on their word that certain things were going to be acted upon. Now, I know, it's reluctantly having to bring back this tactic, but it's to hold people's attention to these issues and that's why it hasn't been raised since the – this Inquiry has been taken place. And I think it will be looking – we'll be reviewing it all the time and looking at the performance of how the recommendations from this Inquiry are being implemented; how they're being operationalised. How they're being held to account. How people will be rewarded for what, acting on these recommendations and sanctioned on these recommendations, because, at the end of the day, it's a reputational issue for the Met and, we need to recognise, no pain, no gain. It's painful for all of us, but it's a way of us recognising, we're not very well, we need to go to a doctor and get the solutions and we need to do it fast.

CB But what about relationships? Is that - I, I hear everything that you're saying about the boycott and you'll lift it once you see things are being done and it's a way of keeping the, the issue on the Agenda and all that kind of stuff and, you know, I take your point on that. But, but what I want to, to get an understanding of, is the relationship between yourselves as the BPA and the organisation and, in particular, the Senior Management Team. What was it that was so bad about the relationship that led you to – to introduce the boycott? I mean, we – we've heard from various individuals about the, you know, the way in which they take, they value staff associations, take on board their views; there's S.A.M.U.R.A.I, there's a way of bringing all of the staff associations together, there's opportunities for staff associations to inform and to influence policy and to act as – you know, critical friends. What's wrong with that relationship is it? Is that all farcical?

Let me an—answer that. Just

CB (inaudible) or, or is it, or is that relationship there with staff associations, but just not the BPA?

First and foremost, we have good relations with other staff associations and, in fact, we're very supportive and in fact other staff associations come to us for support and then, because of our infrastructure, but S.A.M.U.R.A.I, which, in actual fact, they were, was very much



involved in the formation of S.A.M.U.R.A.I, basically, has turned into a, a talking shop. As a prime example, just last week and the reasons we pulled out of S.A.M.U.R.A.I in Janu— February 2007, was because of the fact that we found out that we're, we're really looking to be a tick box for the organisation, so that they can have diversity cons—consultation. It was described last week, another staff association described exactly the same scenario; they came to realise that, actually, this is a talking shop. It doesn't really mean much, in relation to the structure of the organisation, or its future development. Our relationship broke down, in fact, when more and more Management Board members were being pulled in to situations and individual cases, whereby they needed to be held to account - and it wasn't happening. Now, that's partly in relation to the Met and the way that the systems and processes can be manipulated at that level, but there's also an accountability to the MPA when, if we're putting over these things and saying, X, Y and Z is happening, but in fact nothing is being done about that – so it's, it's very much down that, that line. The other thing is, is that when you do have Senior Management involved in particular cases, regardless, be—besides the point of the argument whether they're right or wrong, or anything like that, there is an impartiality issue that's turned up; from their perspective, you'd expect them to think they're right. Regardless of what we may think, or anything like that, but it must come above that, to hold them at, to account and there is cloudy lines as to how that is actually done.

CB It's very much about the relationship that led up to the boycott. What's the state of play now?

We, we certainly started having discussions. As a matter of fact, we met with the new Commissioner as well? And –and various member of the Senior Management Board, so we are discussing. I think it, you was yourself who asked the question of the – the previous Commissioner, as to why they want to talk to us and I think you used the term, isn't that childish, not to be engaging with us. We always want to engage, but relationship is a two way thing. I'm not a second class citizen. I'm not sub-human and I don't want to be treated like that and it's a two way thing, on an equal footing. If we're going to address these issues, let's seriously talk, sit down and address it properly. But we can't constantly being ignored or insulted and expect to take it. I'm not here for that.

Just to build on that, I, I, I think it's really important that mutual respect is the key and it's how you manage those relationships. Now, I, you know, credit where it's due, there's certain people at Manage Board, Mana—Management Board level and Chief Officer status, recognise the importance of managing those relationships, but they are those who are into lip service. If you look at the drivers, within the organisation, that have really moved on the diversity Agenda when it's Diversity Excellence model, the Diversity Climate Surveys, the introduction of a Communities and Cultural Resource Unit, you will see that the Met BPA has

been pivotal, in how th-- those have been created, implemented. So I, I, I think we've proved ourselves

Okay

..without a doubt, but if it's not recognised as moving the organisation on and it's disrespected by, certain time, how even our Chair is actually being dealt with – you know, there should be that mutual respect to say, He has got a mandate for his organisation; treat him with respect.

CB Okay. Look, I'm going to hand over to Bob in a minute, but let me just play devil's advocate here. They can't stand you, they treat you as if you're sub-human, they don't respect you, they don't value your input. On the flip side of that, you get more money than any other staff association, they support you to the hilt on some of your youth programs, the voyage, the this, that and the next; wh—what's going on here? Are, are they schizophrenic?

Okay

CB Do they sometimes like you and sometimes hate you? I mean, what, what's go—I want to understand the relationship, 'cause I'm, I'm not, I'm not convinced that it's as bad as you say, in terms of the organisation not recognising some of the good things that you do. You - help me to understand that.

Okay. First and foremost, the point I explained last week in relation to the finance. We fought for every single penny we got.

(inaudible)

And, and we got it. But the truth is, is that we had to jump through some hoops for that. Right up to a month ago, where, in fact, our concert was actually threatened, due to a complete mix-up inside Procurement. That had absolutely nothing to do with us, yet still, it was threatened. We are constantly jumping through hoops; we are constantly justifying our existence.

End of Cassette 1 Side A

SIDE B

.. whereby our expertise within the BPA. We're, we're fortunate. Even in relation to other BPAs around the country, leadership wise, we are by far the strongest and it is very, very difficult to resist – the, the way that we put things forward, our experience is vast; even against those that we're actually applying to. It becomes very difficult. Now, we are talking about the fact of – and the word that was used was *mutual respect*. In relation to climate, this is (inaudible) question of, how we're put forward, to endorse the organisation's diversity claims. Now, it's a question of how we're used, how we're recognised. The achievements that Leroy spoke about, actually they're all there, to, to, to be seen. What recognition, from the organisation, has actually taken place for that? In all the things that have taken place from the boycott, has anything been said about that, at all? And that's why it played some sort of prominent role. We felt that, if we didn't say it, no-one else would. Now, if we're looking at mutual respect, that's what we're talking about, appreciation; I can sit down here and say that there's - there is a lot of things that have actually changed in the Me—Met, ever since Macpherson. Now, there's a lot of things that have changed since I joined the Met, in 1985. A lot. But, at the same time, I spoke specifically, in that boycott and the specific things that I said – divers it di--, the diversity issue's in relation to progression and discipline and even the Runnymede Report confirms that (inaudible) our, our actual concerns are correct. Where has been the admittance from the organisation that that's (inaudible)

Chair, it's

CB That, that's fair enough but I, I do want us to – I'm going to hand over to Bob. He's going to – talk to you about various other bits and bobs but I do want to try and preserve some of this session at the end, for getting down to the nitty gritty, in terms of what you think we should be recommending. 'Cause you, to date, you've only said two or three things amongst a plethora of analysis, which is all fine and good and thank you very much, but actually, you know, we're, we're kind of conversant with those things, so that how do we move the organisation on and forward? What are some of the key things that we should be recommending? Where are the blockages? That's where I want us to get to.

Well, one of –

CB Because you, you've accepted that the organisation has come a long way. It's got way – way, way further to go, but what should we be doing about that? So we'll, we'll return to that in a short while, if – if, if you feel okay with that. Right, Bob has a range of questions to ask.

BP Yeah, thanks very much indeed. First of all, want to – I want to use this opportunity, now, to go forward. Like Leroy, I'm from another generation and was actually at the first meeting, when Straw made those statements, so I don't need a history lesson; that's – that's the point I think you, you know that. But there's some, been some interesting things and I want to start off by talking about, around those areas of leadership, because I think there's two things. One of the things that you haven't said yet, because, to me, it's a – but you've hinted at it – it's about ownership and it, you can't have leadership unless you've got ownership of something and we, we'll, aware of that. So, in relation to those employment experiences, since the Lawrence – that's what I want to talk about. Those changes. There's been a, a, a load of recommendations that have been made. First of all - and I mean, have you categorised any of those? How many of those have been met? Who's got that responsibility for ticking that off? What's still left to do that has been – doesn't need this Inquiry, we've been invited to be radical, but I think that, first of all, if there's a load of things that have still yet to be met. Have those been done? Have you done that? And pass it on to the leadership.

I'm glad that you've mentioned that, there, Bob; I, I was one of the people on the - just a quick example, one of the people on the Steering and Working Group of the Morris Inquiry, in relation to the Metropolitan Police's response and one of the things that I actually did was look over past reports and reviews that have been done. I'm a firm believer there's no point in re-inventing the wheel; that is one of our concerns in relation to this Inquiry and how much – and, and what it would actually do. The interesting thing, at that particular point – and I will refer it to now – was that finding out that Viridi, Lancet, Taylor reports at the time – we couldn't find the leads. Any lead that we could find was on the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry but on all the others, we couldn't. So much so, that, after three days of looking around, people started to ring us, thinking that we were the leads on it. Now, what struck me, in relation – the iro—irony of that fact was that, when you guys interviewed the current Commissioner, he said that the lead on diversity was, in fact, AC John Yates. First we ever heard about it. Never heard about it; we've had few meetings with AC John Yates. Never around diversity and where that's been thrown into question is that, at a recent S.A.M.U.R.A.I meeting, you had DAC Alfred Hitchcock, who said he was the leader on diversity. It is a disjointed approach to diversity. It's never really been got hold of by the organisation and that clearly demonstrates the disjointed nature of that relationship and what they're dealing with those recommendations. But I quite agree that there's one of our frustrations were, I think that there have been some excellent recommendations, especially

through the **Viridi** report – excellent recommendations that have come through and, really, if we had basically gone much closer to completing those recommendations, frankly, I strongly believe there wouldn't have been a need for this Inquiry.

BP So, should the starting point be to actually address all those existing recommendations that have not yet been met? Should that be the starting point?

I believe so. Because – to be perfectly honest, otherwise it's more work for this Inquiry than is necessary. If I'm really honest, we're, we – we're in agreement with those recommendations. We all were. Not just the BPA; I'm talking about the organisation as well. But we're talking ten years down the line, here. We're talking a few years down the line for some of these other recommendations that have come through. What's happened? Who are the leads on that? (inaudible)

Could I just

Who's really taking the definitive point forward?

Yeah. Could I say – all the recommendations, going back from Scarman and we've said that, over and over again, if all of those were implemented, right up until now, there'd be no need for this Inquiry.

CB (inaudible) I think we're getting back to culture and we're getting back to people and I think it's where you started, when you, when you started giving your evidence, which is that the policies and the practises is are all in place

Mm

CB ..but the key issue is around the people and the culture. Now, this – I think there's a, there's a reason why, that some of those sort of – I hate to call them softer issues,

Yeah

CB ..but cultural issues, are – haven't moved on as much as we would like, because they're bloody difficult to do.

(inaudible) the, the si—the situation here, Cindy, is not about – yeah. You've got the policies in place. We're saying that we've got the policies,

CB Yeah

..all we're saying is about the implementation. Now, one example: if – a lot of the policies we're looking at, for instance, progression

CB Yeah

.. and that was done properly, they listened to us and we'll work together on this, going out recruiting and we're looking at the retention, progress, progression

CB Right

..issues. It's been a lot better, if that was being done, so we're talking about implementation here. I know Alfred has mentioned that we've got a plethora of policies and I agree. Look fantastic, but it's the implementation.

CB Okay. Bob.

If I also just add as well, it's also about the monitoring of that. The, the whole point of going back to those leads is that, it's a point of contact to go back and say, How are we on this? Where have we got? Where's the milestones in that? Well, actually, how is the, what is the outcome of that recommendation in the work environment? Those questions aren't actually being (inaudible)

As a matter of fact, you did ask, I think, the Commissioner, or whatever, about an audit—have they done an audit, a race and div—and, you know and the, the first time one has been done is the Wolfenden Inquiry, the Dialogue to Delivery. We weren't aware of any others before that. Maybe my colleagues can help me, but that's the only one I'm aware of and, and I think you've got a copy of that document, or one version of it.

If, if, if I can just build on this. Again, I – I think we need to recognise that there needs to be a health check – a real, rigorous health check of the organisation, because, again, it's the accountability; it's all well and good having the leadership and the ownership, but if you're not held to account on a regular basis, it's part of your PDR, your performance, because, to be quite honest, how are appraisals written, on a borough? Invariably, I know on your placement, you pu—you put forward your, your evidence and the Manager will just countersign, with a small comment. No-one really gets through to the evidence in a – meticulous way. Maybe because they haven't got the time. An example – we, we sit on various forms, where we see Borough Commanders being promoted, ACPO officers being promoted and you think, Well, hold on here. Look at the, the wreckage they left behind in people's lives, in terms of fairness at work, people not benefiting, people not actually being promoted, so I think, yep, it, it, it's very important that we start to be a lot more meticulous. I think transparency is really important, so I, I think there needs to be a, a, a, a real roll-out of, o--, of the MPA to re—have regional discussions around this and you will re—really get the rank and file police officers and police staff view on this. And this is where the MPA can show real leadership, to say listen, 'cause this is what Morris was supposed to do. That's why I like history lessons, Bob, because sometimes, you just need to check yourself, because Morris was supposed to do this a year later and he, and he did various road shows across the country, but I really think the MPA has a (inaudible) one of the main recommendations that go on – at, maybe not on a borough, borough, borough by borough but a cluster basis. Get the cluster Commander and really start to do some cross cutting analysis on how they have dealt with a lot of their employment tribunals, civil actions, because we've all been on Inquiries where boroughs and ACPO members have a very defensive stance to this; you know, they say, Okay, let's have a gold group. Not to say, Well, listen, let's build on the relationship, let's build on where the commonalities are. It, it's invariably, how they're going to defend the organisation. How they're going to be adversarial. And, and I think it's in – in that sort of focus. Now we're willing and able to work with anyone who recognising how much we bring to the party. We've brought a lot to this party. If you – and in closing, the waiting room we're, we're in was not much bigger than the first BPA office we had, in 1993 and fortunately through the expertise and tenacity and determination of that founder Executive and various f—Executives since, we have got in to that position where we do have a certain amount of resources. But we've shown the business, moral and human case for that, because of what delivery we've done internally, as well as externally and I think it's – we, they know, the organisation knows, what we do in preventing more people from leaving this organisation. You know, it, I think you – we need to, we're not just fire fighters to prevent the heat. We're there to cool people down and say, Okay, we hear you. We will be your advocate. We will assist you, but a lot of the times

when we're doing that, we are getting so much aggression and sometimes, can be more than just verbal. You get this whole stance and this posture, that people think, Who are you? Who are you self appointed upstarts to come into my borough or come into my unit?

CB So, so, so you accept Bob's suggestion about the audit and you've gone further than that, that – so thank you for that, Leroy. Back to Bob

(inaudible)

CB ..and then I'll bring you back, I'll bring you in

Okay

CB .. (inaudible) after.

Right.

BP Thanks. Some reaction to one question! 'Cause I was going to go on and say, Okay, if it is about the recommendations of – of the way forward, what are the drivers and the barriers, then? How do we now move on that? And let me just make some points, because, yeah, you, you, you've referred to the Dialogue to Diversity. I just want to - (inaudible) Dialogue to Delivery, say. Having gone through that and looked in the progression area, I mean, there's a significant – and I don't want to – I don't want a history lesson of what we haven't done yet, in this bit. I want to go back to how we move on. How do we get more people to Inspectors? How do we get more people to Chief Inspectors? How do we get some progression? How do we remove the barriers that are there? And one of the barriers might be the very fact, the, the very methodology of getting there, not just changing people on the Board. Changing the Board (inaudible). If we're going to be radical. And if the recommendations haven't worked, or it's a culture, because just on one thing to throw in about culture, you've got a really good – and bring us right up to present – with Taylor, there's a really good opportunity to change the culture. That's about behaviour; that's about getting consistency behaviour at every managerial level. Down at the managerial level that we're talking about – Sergeants, Inspectors, Chief Inspectors, to get the Management Board, so, how do we do that? What are your views on that? Is that a way forward?



One of the examples that we provided within our written submissions, we're saying this experience of this officer who didn't get promoted (inaudible) basically went and applied once, but he noted a – a very specific thing and difference, between here and the Force he went to and that was the use of independent interviewers. There are a number of pressures, understandable pressures, on the Metropolitan Police, because of the new pressures, figures, you have to produce, you have to show these figures, you have to show what you're actually doing. And sometimes, the actual individual and their development is the thing that actually goes aside, plus the fact that you add this Old Boys' network that has been mentioned beforehand. Actually, it can be very well controlled inside the organisation, so – absolutely. So basically, I'm talking about one of those methods to move forward is independent people to use in a – in promotion (inaudible).

CB Is that exclusively independent people, or you saying, In addition to – you know, who you'd have from the Met?

It's, it's got to be in a, in addition to - to the Met, but have something that is more accountable to the MPA, so that they can come back and actually play a part in that.

BP Just bring that point up about the MPA, because this Inquiry is also into the MPA, not into the MPS. And I'm not anything to do with the MPA, in that sense. You've made reference to the fact that you don't think they've been as rigorous in their scrutiny and oversight role that they should have been. What should they be doing now, to make sure that those Managers, who have that responsibility, to positively promote equality and diversity, actually do it?

Bob, you've been on – I'm not sure if you're still on Police Authorities, but, having worked in the Home Office and see the relationship between Chief Officers and Police Authorities, I was quite worried. It was almost incestuous. And, and that, for me, has and I, and, and I would go as far as to say that seems to have been the case, with the previous Commissioner and, and the Police Authority and somehow, that's got to change, in, in, in that sense. I'm not saying that close relationships, in terms of helping about policing and how it's done, in – in London, but you can't have a system whereby, almost, where you've got the tail wagging the dog.

BP The, you, you're saying there's not a clear enough separation s—of roles between the MPS and the MPA?

I'm saying that it needs to be defined more properly and make sure that whoever and Leroy touched on it before and I'm sure he's going to speak again, as to the accountability and how that is done, so, you know, if the Chair, sorry, I'm not sure – that if the Chair – of the, the Authority wants to hold, for instance, the Commission to account, he or she's not afraid to do so. And, and, and, and, do so and things but – the other point I would like to make. What – what are the sanctions, or what, what's the carrot and the stick? You know – if someone refuses, or ,haven't done what they're asked to do, I mean, again, we heard earlier on and, from us, whereby, you know, if, if, if – if, if someone is not, you know, hadn't come up to scratch with their figures on their crime, you know, how they're held to account. So that's something that you would need a carrot or a stick and I like the idea, personally, where I certainly I'm discussing my colleagues in New York and if somebody's not doing their job, you know, you fire them, or something and get it sorted.

Can I just add to that? Okay. I, I think we need to – you want some radical, yeah? Okay. And this is where I think you, it's the signals you send to the community, as well. I think – we've got different leadership in the MPA. Now, I'm not here to be a Boris Johnson fan, but he's very good at making his opinions and thoughts known and he has called for this Inquiry and he's appointed you as Panel, to report back to him. Now I think there needs to be a summit, at the GLA, where the GLA takes ownership as this – of, of this as well, to look at the recommendations – you know, with all the meetings, because that's one of the other things from Morris, hence another history lesson, you just slowly run in to main stream. The only thing is, the stream's dirty and that's why it got lost and only certain things were picked up round leadership, but not to the depth and rigour they should have. So I think there needs to be a – a real, open, transparent summit, seminar, whatever you want to call it and really start to say, Okay, we have learnt from the past. We are recognising that you're – that not only the organisation has moved on, but society's moved on. And we need to recognise the importance of our leadership in all of this, openly, within not just the organisation, but to be the leading authority across the country, because you are holding to account the largest Force area in the country, okay? And, in all honesty, I don't think you can do all of that yourself. You need to bring in some key minds, some key academics and key advocates, who can assist, to hold the, the organisation to account 'cause I, I'm very proud of the organisation, to be part of it, but I'm still disappointed in how it has not taken the, these clear issues more importantly and left it to wither on the vine. So I think that's just one thing you can do and I would like to think you'll have more Board members in that summit than there are in this room.

BP Do you think that they should be more robust in questioning the MPS's internal diversity figures and progression in particular?

Not only the questions, but the audience.

B--Bob, there has to be something at the end of it, 'cause you can be robust, you can be accountable, whatever—but what happens if people are not meeting the targets, not doing what they're supposed to do? And I think that has always been the issue, because if I feel that yes, I'm going to be challenged, yeah, I give the answers and that's it. You know, I still keep my job, still get on with life as it is, go home and sleep and don't worry about anything. Then, what's the point?

BP But HMIC have set targets, there – there are targets that have got to be met, they're going to be inspected by 2009, 2010, so it really is question of whether or not it's robust enough at this moment in time, to meet those, because there, there could be sanctions at the end of the day, emanating out of that.

Yeah. What I'm trying to avoid is us coming back, in ten years' time, to make another suggestion after the robustness. Because I certainly not going to be around; I'm, I'm retiring next year and I certainly don't want to see some of my colleagues sitting behind here, coming here, in front of another panel, trying to discuss the same issue.

I think a – very good point, as well, is the – who is the credible voice to speak on race issues inside the Metropolitan Police Service and I think that that's a really valid point. Are we down to a situation where the majority culture will decide whether we are, or are not, doing well, (inaudible) actual fact, does it require, which I believe that it does, the buying of minorities? I'd rather be standing next to the Commissioner and saying, Yeah, there's a few problems, but we're working together to resolve that. That's not happening. We're working separately.

CB Sorry. What do you mean by, you don't have a credible voice?

That – that is, I'm not talking about us in the Met BPA,

CB Yes

I'm talking about the Metropolitan Police Service; who is the credible voice that speaks on race? I spoke earlier of the fact that we didn't even know who AC John Yates

CB Right.

..was the head of Diversity. Lead. That's what we're saying about the credible voice in relation to race and how the organisation views that.

Just a-- two quick things, that, that I, we, we must clear up, I think and it's -- it's regarding PDRs and mentoring, so I just want a - quick answers, I don't want a potted history, again, of them -- and we've got your evidence that's been submitted and we've had evidence from the focus groups. I just want to clear up two points on it. One: in mentoring, because there seems a difference here, between some of the things we're hearing, which is, mentoring is for the benefit of the mentee, rather than the mentor. The mentor rather than the mentee, sorry. So there's a tick box factor for some people and yet you have, Leroy, you were talking about, you know, your mentoring in a very genuine confidence building. So I'd like something quick on that. The other thing is, measurement. You've made reference, in your submission, about, you know, what gets measured gets changed. PDRs are meant to be a -- a measure of determining development needs, as well as measuring how you've met that in the past. Now, what I want to say is this. A, is it effective and is it effective at every level, because if we have the evidence that you're submitting last is that managers are failing, but don't they have PDRs? Don't they get measured, as well?

The, I think the -- the real question is, is that you're right--I couldn't really ask you, answer you there, because we don't know what indicators they're measured against, so I'm -- and, and that in itself is a, is a real problem. As -- if I give myself as a prime example, you're, you're right. PDRs are supposed to be developmental. They are supposed to be able to give you a blue print to go forward and develop. Who's my line manager? I have no idea -- I've not had a PDR for four years. It just basically blows that apart. As a staff association -- I, I have no line manager. Actually, we'll try, I try to work within the bounds of the organisation, yes, but in actual fact, who has been my line manager? Who has been doing my --? I have nothing. I have nothing. No one has assessed my work as the Chair of the Met BPA. How genuine is the organisation's commitment?

Could, could I just remind Alfred that he has a very robust Executive that holds him to account, so he does not

Yes. Absolutely

..do whatever he wants!

(inaudible)

And, and in fact, in fact I, I, I, I think Pat will emphasise that, because she's the most rigorous person on the Executive and – especially when, in terms of her Treasurer role. And, and, and following the lead of past Treasurers, I might add.

Can, can I just say that, around the mentoring. A lot of it is around the shared and common experience of the mentor with the mentee. I'm not saying it's the be-all and end-all, but if I have an affinity I, if I have a great understanding of how the – the cultural and experiential issues that leads that person to this point and I can identify with certain issues we're talking about, then it's a lot more of – there's a lot more synergy in that mentor and mentee arrangement. And I'm not saying my majority culture colleagues don't have that. However, there is still those who go in to the mentoring process with, Well, CVs in mind; well, this shows my, my diversity evidence and I can show that, on a PDR and on application form for promotion or – or, or selection of one form. Without being called to account, because, as a Supervisor, when I've had officers, as well as police staff members, putting evidence before me, I will say, Okay, what was the outcome of that? Okay, you've had that conversation with that person, you've helped them along; what was the outcome? Not just the outputs, 'cause that, I think that's the other thing. The organisation are very task orientated, very management focus around outputs. Technically, we're brilliant. You know, when it comes to technical output and the glossy packages, no one could touch us, world-wide. But when it comes to evidencing the outcomes, the life changing experiences of those individuals, well, the jury's still out on that and I recognise PDRs are critical, but I come back to a question I put before, rhetorically on (inaudible) who's writing the PDRs? A lot of the times, people are submitting their evidence within the PDR form and the Manager, depending on how many people that person has to supervise, is just going through it quickly and then putting a management (inaudible). Absolutely.

BP (inaudible) I just have one final, burning question 'cause having read all your submission and, and having i--knowledge of some of them,

Sorry, Bob, could I just interrupt there - I think Pat was just going to say something.

BP Sorry, Pat.

Something quick on the PDR: boroughs are very, very busy; a lot of supervisors don't supervise as they should. A lot of officers write their own PDRs and then the supervisor will sign it at the end and also, when you apply for an internal application, there's a, there's a – there's a tick box to say, Have you completed the PDR but you don't need to (inaudible) with the application to the respective department, so it's, it's a, it's a waste of time, (inaudible).

BP I, I've, the – again, having read all this and having knowledge of a lo—a lot of what you've done in the past, if you have such, if there is such compelling evidence of ju—different treatment, why have you, as the Met BPA, not been able to have that required impact on change?

I actually think that's an extremely relevant question and something that we ask ourselves, despite the fact that we have been bringing this up and despite the fact that they've said this, we just put a (inaudible) of cases on there, but in actual fact, PDRs actually take up a tremendous amount of support time. Tremendous. Truth is why hasn't it? We've had several systems – different systems of PDRs – I'm go back to pay related PDRs, I can go back before then. And throughout the time – I remember the times when in fact three PDRs had to be sent along with applications in relation to promotion. All of that has been scrapped. What has been happening? These are the problems that are there, but I think that, if I am correct, the Director of HR actually said it, you know, questioned here, that in fact they're looking at the PDR systems and, and looking to change, but it's always been looking at the PDR systems and looking for change. We - and to be fair on the Met, it is always a, a, quite a contentious issue within several organisations, just not the Metropolitan Police Service, but in relation to these specific problems, that we've been raising for some time and at previous Inquiries, the real question needs to be asked to the organisation and to the MPA, we'll hold the organisation to account as to why these problems are always coming up.

Could I, I

Just add, add one thing. Sorry. And, and, and the impact of change can only really be realised if the organisation accepts and acknowledges what is being put before them because, as I said, when we have given clear evidence of issues around retention and progression, we have been seen as trouble-makers, bottom line. And unfortunately, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies really tie your, the MPA's, hands behind their back,

because they will actually legitimise a lot of the evidence that's – put by the organisation without the rigour and, I must admit, if, if, if the HMIC was doing the work they're supposed to be doing, we wouldn't be in this place and going over the same issues as we did ten years ago.

The, the, the other issue, too, if I may say so – the, we'd never dream of, in the year 2009, of a group of men, only men, who are going to sit down to decide policies for the benefit of women. And we seem to have that issue in terms of the police service, where a group of European descendants who are going to determine what's best for all the people of London, despite a forty per cent population of people of colour and something cannot be right in there and that's what I'm saying, that if you have a group of people who either ignorant, don't want to know, don't - who hasn't got an understanding, then how're we going to get changes? Because racism is all about privilege, power and prejudice, isn't it?

CB (inaudible) one (inaudible) sentence there. Can I ask you one final question before I hand over to Margaret? We focussed a lot of our discussion around progression and I've asked you a number of times, you know, what should be done, what should we be recommending, what are the solutions. And I, I'm, I'm struck by the fact that not one of you have said that one of the solutions to this problem is Equip to Achieve and I, I'm surprised because whenever we ask the Met, What's the answer to this progression problem? And they say, the golden nugget is Equip to Achieve. That is going to deliver like you wouldn't believe.

(inaudible) well, Cindy, you shouldn't be surprised. After the recent (inaudible) the Chief Inspector's Board, lot of those Inspectors were on this thing. They've come back to me said, Abe, it's not worth it's written on and ev—even when this thing was being devised, I, I can look around to my colleagues – they all nodding their heads - none of us were involved. So, for me, you know, you can't desi—as I said before, you're not going to go round designing something without involving the people that it's supposed to be for.

CB (inaudible) about the Equip to Achieve 'cause I'm, I'm, I'm conscious, when I ask that question, the whole of the back row started to chuckle, you know ..

Precisely!

CB When I, when I said Equip to Achieve!

Cindy, what, one of the things that

CB What, what, what is wrong with Equip to Achieve?

The problem is that most of our people don't need more developing. They're developed out of their ears. And they're sitting behind me and there's others out there. They develop out—they've been on courses, lot of them have degrees, including Doctorates. It's not a case of developing. It's the, it's the case of make sure that, when the people apply, that you know, we've got the right people who are doing the Boards, so make sure the right people. We want meritocracy. (inaudible) - we want meritocracy (inaudible) in the MPS and we're not getting that at the moment. At the moment I can see a type of Affirmative Actions for whites. And I'm sorry – that has to change. Let's call it what it is and that's not happening, for one reason or the other and we're saying that it's going to – you know, and that's why I agree that bring Affirmative Action. Let's have a level playing field. Wherever there's a level playing field, people of colour do very well and at the moment it's not level. We do not have meritocracy in the MPS.

CB Affirmative Action, an example of that is Equip to Achieve, but you're saying it's

It's not worth the paper it's written on and

CB So, so, do you want Affirmative Action because you believe that BME individuals need further assistance, or don't

No!

CB ..you? Because, because this is what's it, you're saying different things; and I'm just trying to understand it.

If I, if I just come in here. First and foremost, we are already equipped. The reason why I made the statement in March was because it was in response to the fact that extra lessons were being provided to help minorities through Promotion Boards. I felt extremely insulted



by that. That is not the problem, in fact that passes that on, to something else. Affirmative Action, as well, is not about providing extra assistance. (inaudible) make this really clear; Affirmative Action is about taking people who are qualified and putting them in the right places, at the right times. That's what Affirmative Action is. It is not about dumbing down; in fact I have – we, none of us are an advocate of positive discrimination whereby we, we, we put forward—people forward who aren't skilled. We want h—standards to remain high. What we're saying is, is that despite the fact of standards are high amongst people of colour, they're not getting through. That's what this argument's about.

(inaudible)

Well, I'm always burning. 'Cause I'm hot!

(inaudible)

Again, Affirmative Action has been on the Agenda of the – the Met BPA for over a decade and there's enough evidence to, to show where it needs to go; not just to level the playing field but the ish—the issue around confidence and, and we need to, again, recognise: you've got to change the Board room. You know, the Board room yet has not moved on. I, I, I would say the Management Board in, in terms of their, their knowledge of the issues of diversity, in particular race and equality, has not really moved on. I remember when Ian Blair was Diversity Board lead and trying to get even half a day training for the, the Management Board around these issues, took months. I question whether they've had any training around these issues, since then. So that's another quick win. Get some training. An, an, an awareness rating of, of not only these diverse issue, but in particular around, what Affirmative Action is all about, 'cause I, I hear a lot of Management Board and ACPO members and the equivalent police staff talking about it, but they don't have that understanding and I (inaudible) think that's the – that's what's lacking here.

MB I want to talk a bit about the Diversity Directorate. One would expect – I mean, I know that a number of you were here when we met with Martin Tiplady and with Denise Milani and an interesting discussion on their perceptions of the functions (inaudible) role (inaudible) one would expect that they have a critical role (inaudible). And what I want to do is, I want to ask you a (inaudible) is that better? Yeah. I want; I want to ask you sort of a four part question. Can you give me your views and perception of Diversity Directorate, in terms of function, role, delivery outcomes and placement within the organisation?

(inaudible)

I think I'll just start off here – sure my colleagues would wade in. It's – diversity is often said by the organisation that it has been main streamed, so what is it doing in the TP HQ? Why isn't it part of Management Board? Why isn't it actually involved, at top level decision making but - and filtered down, instead of somewhere in the middle of the organisation, not in the right place at the moment and it doesn't reflect the commitment to those diversity issues that we speak about. I can honestly say, as well, with regard to diversity, I am rather confused about the Metropolitan Police's commitment to that. Exactly how is that been main streamed? How is that filtered all the way through? And I'm confused as to what part they play into when things aren't working. If they're not in the right position to effect change, then really, you have to question as to whether they should be there at all. I believe that they should be there. I believe that the lead of diversity is extremely important to the racial credibility of the organisation, but the organisation doesn't see it that way, judging by where they put them.

CB Balancing what you've just said, and just put a suggestion to you. Do, do you think the Citizen, the, the Diversity and Citizen Focus Department should almost have a kind of Inspectorate role within the organisation, to be able to jump in, in various places and put the world to rights

Ab—absolutely

CB ..and blah de blah?

And I, I think, not only having that Inspectorate role, but having the teeth to ensure they're implemented. That's key. I'm, I'm, I'm determined to say, let's learn from our previous experiences. Stephen Lawrence Report – John Grieve took on DCC4 Board, the Race and Violent Crime – Race and Violent Crime Unit, or something equivalent

Yes.

.. and it – there was a DAC, who had – he was not an overnight convert, but he, he recognised the, the operational requirements of diversity. Diversity in action. And if there's anything (inaudible) CSUs and FLOs

Yeah, yeah.

..all of these things, okay? Operational using (inaudible) the life skills of members of, of the organisation to assist in service delivery and I think that is a key part of what they should be doing. Showing diversity in action. The CCRU, again, shows diversity in action, where officers of all backgrounds can show their life skills can assist in service delivery; got clear examples of that, but they also need to have the capacity and capability to do all of that, 'cause at the moment, because it's not on the Agenda, the resources are not there; so, even they were, if they are going to have that Inspectorate role, they need to have the capability to do that, not just having the – the questions to ask, but also having the – the, the rigour to say, Hold on here. We need to look into this a bit more, in depth and, and, and last, I think it's around recognising the difference between outputs and outcomes, because, again – and I've been part of this organisation over twenty-five years – we're really good at selling ourselves. That's what we do and, and, and why not? We are good. But it's also getting people within Boroughs to assist Borough Commanders because, especially on a borough level, Borough Commanders are stretched and they need some real assistance, not just to ask the right sort of questions, but to be – have some form of body, buddy approach on how they – they, they implement these things. Because, unfortunately, it's not being held in the level that it should and I think it shou – in last bit in placement, I don't think it should be seen as a, a pink and fluff-- fluffy Directorate. It should be in Specialist Operations; we're the CCRU. We intentionally made sure the CCRU was in SO, because it's seen a totally different mindset. It's not seen as, Oh well, we just have to do that when we need to. That was a specialised unit, recognising the life skills of people within it.

(inaudible)

MB Sorry, I just (inaudible) to start (inaudible) somebody else wanted to add to what Leroy already said. 'Cause he talked about their place and I'm quite interested in your perceptions on their – their delivery outcomes and outputs in terms of their current role.

They, they actually – the, the way that (inaudible) the perception of the organisation's treatment is that it's a hot potato, to be honest; they're – the, the very nature of the Diversity Directorate and there're things that they're going to be involved with, is that they're going to be exposed to a lot of the stuff that's going to take place. But I think Leroy hit on a point that we've hit on for a number of years: teeth. Even HR – I, I've seen it in cases and s— (inaudible) submissions, whereby actually, HR have given excellent advice. Borough Commander decides not to follow it. That's it. And we end up getting into a

problem. Now, I have to say that, what is the point of having our experts in a particular location, wherever they may be, when they don't have the teeth, the authority to effect real change when it's necessary. We are, that's true leadership; it's being able to intervene into something and effect a change seriously. THR is a pivotal department, right now. Have the (inaudible) Race Impact Assessments taken place in there. Who's inspected those? Diversity Directorate? Who's inspected those? Why is it that they're able to take, now proposing to take the independent person out of Promotion Boards, within THR. Why has that been able to take place, when the actual fact, it's – there's no independent oversight on that. Now that's what I'm saying, in the fact of, where did the Diversity Directorate come in to the set-up of that? I, I've no idea.

(inaudible) so, the current perception is, is that it's a like an *ad hoc* at the mo- you know, it's like an add-on, if you like and not sort of integrated as it should be and that's why I mentioned earlier on, we've got a very capable Director at the moment, who I personally think should be sitting on the – the Management Board with (inaudible), but also, given recent the all-in targets, why not have targets right across the board, that they will inspect, like everything else, like we were mentioning about burglary crimes and that sort of thing and let them have i—if you like. That, that's the sort of teeth that they'll have. I'm saying, look, if you don't meet your targets it's what's going to happen, which is going to report directly back to Management Board. That seems to make a lot of sense. It, what I fear, even though we make the suggestion, that we've asked for the Director to sit on the Management Board, that she doesn't get shift sideways to something else and then it put somebody who's less capable in there. I'm worried about that, so I'm putting that on the record, that if it does happen, it was mentioned here first.

And I have to say that I also feel that they should be reporting back to the MPA, given the nature of the role that they've been doing. Again, it's all about containment classification, contain it within the Metropolitan Police Service, pacify the aggrieved. It doesn't go anywhere. It just makes the situation worse.

(inaudible) to me a bit about your experience of how the, the Directorate's Diversity Advisers work with, with front line departments.

Well, my current role is the Work Stream Manager for Community Engagement for the Olympics 2012, so I've, I've got a – I, I would say, a high borough approach around how the issues of diversity, which is part of my community engagement strategy, is being seen as business as usual and we're looking at, we're the Olympic additionality (inaudible). And one of the key things that we find is, not only having the expert advice,

END OF CASSETTE ONE, SIDE B

CASSETTE TWO, SIDE A

..how are we doing or not, as the case may be. It's in a monthly management report. All of the HR functions. Now I really believe that needs to be part of the health check within boroughs. That needs to be part of their management report and they have that expert input in, by the Diversity Directorate. But I would, wouldn't agree to that diversity expert just sitting on the borough, without that central co-ordination and, and that's, I think it's (inaudible). Do not al—just rely on boroughs to do it themselves.

BP Yeah, I, I – you know, part of the Inquiry is also in race and faith. And a lot of the evidence that we're, we're sort of gathering is that faith is less than a – a factor than race, in the perceptions of discrimination. But also, we've heard that it, it would have, there's some evidence that the MPS is more proactive in producing policy around equality in religion and belief than they are about race issues. An—and that they're, you know, there—there's evidence of they're being more forward in terms of being more proactive around faith issues in terms of clothing and things like that. I mean, wh—what, what's the BPA's (inaudible) view on faith issues; a—and the other thing is, could you just, whilst she was writing in, Chair asked you to write on something else and I don't want anyone to collapse over this, but the High Potential Development Scheme – you know, per--, perhaps – perhaps rather than a verbal response, a, a, a written comment to, to us

(inaudible)

BP ...would, would be more, I think verbally we can get it; we'd like to read it first.

(inaudible) We, we're happy to – to supply that, but on a HPDS scheme (inaudible) just one sentence. Nineteen (inaudible). In relation to (inaudible)

I think this has been aligned to the times, because of terrorism. It has brought in the faith issues and I honestly believe that, had it not been for that, I think the situa—(inaudible) bad as the situation would have been, I'm not sure whether it would have been an Agenda item

here. But nevertheless, it has brought faith issues in, in a rather negative way, because it has been centred around terrorism, the Muslim faith and I do think that, and obviously stop and search, especially in the Muslim community, has gone up, in - and because of that. What you have is a lot more disgruntled people (inaudible) to their inter-actions with the police because of that. We feel that there are more internal issues developing in relation to faith as well. A—as, as in cases and how Managers view, in particular, (inaudible) in the fact that they're – they're receiving – it seems like, similar levels of abuse that we were – have been, have been receiving, as black people, but verbal abuse, but even in being held back as far as work is concerned and the way that they're generally treated. We are getting those complaints coming in through the door. And of faith, absolutely. And that has been a very distinctive shift and, generally speaking, the amount of times that in fact we have an Asian member of staff who has not been involved in anything, has no history of anything else, and in fact has a reputation for being extremely gentle, but they are now being pursued; there now seems to be a – an impetus to, to basically pick up on everything that they've actually done. A plethora of people that have come forward and it's (inaudible)

(inaudible)

CB Just want to ask you for (inaudible) specifics. When we saw Ali Dizaei, he talked about a very pervasive, a very clear anti Muslim sentiment that had developed within the organisation following on from 9/11, following on from 7/7. That's what he talked about. He also talked about this issue of vetting - and there was, there, there were emerging difficulties around that, how staff are vetted, were treated, as a result, possibly going home to see their families, you, you know, whether it's (inaudible). So he talked about that. What I'm trying to get a sense of, are there, are there specific things that the organisation – that th--those individuals of faith have suffered from, within the organisation? And if you could also say – if, in your knowledge, you know, if, if there are things that are happening in the outside world that – that have the potential to impact on the organisation, what steps are you aware of, that the organisation takes in order to mitigate against any negative impact of (inaudible)? So, for instance, what we've, what we've heard about, of late, is a – a rise in anti-Semitism (sic), yeah? We've heard that from the Jewish Staff Association. What, what I'm trying to get a sense of is, as a result of what goes on in the world, how does the organisation sense that, you know, are in, are the people that make up our organisation are also – you know – members of society and therefore how can you respond to (inaudible). Sorry – (inaudible) - do you understand what I'm asking?

Oh, absolutely;

Right. (inaudible)

..in fact, the BPA's been very proactive about this, over the last ten, twelve years, because we were involved in the first race conference in Durban in 2001 and we have been working with various organisations – various international caucuses, of various disciplines around this issue. And myself and Dave just come back from the first review of, of that conference in Geneva, last week. And we need to see – those conferences is like a microcosm of what's happening world-wide. We – we saw the issue of race being hijacked by issues of faith. We saw, similar to Durban, we saw anti- or Islamophobia and anti-Jewish, anti-Zionist demonstrations, so those demonstrations were actually preventing debate. And that conference got hijacked. Similar to 2001. Now. It's a question of how do you operate within that construct, because there's an operational need to address some clear issues in the, the Muslim community and to make sure that you're not seen as an organisation, MPA, MPS, police, right across the board, as being against them, but working with them, not just to protect and prepare, but also to prevent, right? And – and 'cause we already know how good they are at pursuing. And, and that is the, the real issue. We need to start recognising again, it's not just – when you talk about diversity, show faith in action, as well. Because I know the – the, the Muslim unit in, in SO has Muslim officers and Muslim police staff involved. But we're not seeing it being I and I know they have to be very clear of how much information it can give, but they're not seen as assisting the organisation, you know. And it comes across as if they're – they're, they're somewhat traitors and, and selling out and, and, and the organisation needs to recognise the importance of those issues - and then also, I was involved in the setting up of Samurai and we brought up the issue of faith and, and – and the Muslim Association joined and the Christian Association. Now, I know that we, we had some issues around how the Islamic related celebrations, Ramadan etcetera, were being perceived in terms of Christian faith celebrations. So we need to speak - talking the same sort of level of understanding and the same level of respect. Now, one other f—and, and I think it's really important, that part of this big opportunity you've got here is to s—to say for the first time, police authorities start to get a grip of this, so that when you have your very high profile seminar, or whatever - conference on this, bringing in all of those key players at ACPO level within the Met, start to really s—pinpoint how they have acted or not, on these issues, where they have not taken into account people's faith into the equation.

Just add a couple of points. As (inaudible) co-ordinator for, over the last three years, one thing I've noticed, our Muslim – not just our members as in the Muslim police officers and staff, but also non-BPA members who have come to us for assistance, is that none of them were of European descent and we do have European (inaudible) European Muslim members in the service. It's only (inaudible) people of colour, so that's something we've sort of certainly noticed, that's an issue and the one – one of the, the white, a Muslim guy I've spoken to, he said he's never had any issues as a result of his faith. That's one thing. But one of the biggest complaints we do get from Muslims and I think you just touched upon it earlier, but we have to emphasise it, is around the vetting procedures. Things have been much more stringent for them and of course, if they're travelling and recently we just had

two people convicted, who attempting to go back to Pakistan and do something. The question is, how much more (inaudible) staff who are from Pakistan ori—origins seem to be perceived in the same way and that could be a huge issue.

CB Very helpful. Just one last thing, which is to return back to the question I asked, which - the part that hasn't been answered, which is, how does the organisation respond when things out there happen, does it respond in a way that protects its black and minority ethnic staff or Muslim staff, or what, whatever the issue might be and does it send very clear messages to the majority of the organisation, about sort of behaviour and attitudes and (inaudible).

I think this actually comes under the heading of the, the (inaudible) with reassurance. Sometimes, it doesn't require the organisation to take out big reviews and to spend money. Sometimes, just a message of support would be helpful. There's a lot of negative Press out there and some set directly impact upon not only our staff, but (inaudible) our ability to deliver the service to the people of London. And when we have asked for those things, they have been completely and utterly rejected. Message of support from the Senior Management Team. Because something has come out in the Press. We've had some direct comments as (inaudible) and put in to the submissions. Terror moles inside the Metropolitan Police Service. These are all things that affect – mai—mainly visible minorities. When these things actually take place, sometimes low level, nothing more than that. Just as we do for, in fact, (inaudible) white officers and white staff, when situations turn up, before you know it, (inaudible) there's a, a message of support on the Intranet system. It doesn't happen, for minorities.

I just say another form of reassurance – it's quite easy.

Mm?

Briefly.

I really think, e--even if part of their training (inaudible) the Management Board really looks into their awareness of these issues, because I, I, I know they're relying on the junior members of, of the organisation below them, to advise them and I, and I, I think you're only as good as the people you're surrounded by and I, I think they need to know from their own perspective what's required. And an example. Every day we put on our computer, there's the Intranet page. And it's amazing, the images you see. It might be good, Bob - you, you



get a terminal and have a look - and, and we've found there was so much issues that were seeing race and faith in a negative context. So much so, we had to give feedback and there's a bit more of a balance. Now if you didn't have an organisation like us to say, hold on. Excuse me, organisation, that's just a, a very simple point. And, and I think that takes into account the whole communications unit, DPA. How is that being held to account? Where are the Equality Impact Assessments around the messages that they send internally and externally? And how they have impact on briefings, because it's amazing. If anything happens to us, within the BPA, the Press know it before the rest of the – the organisation. That, that is amazing and I would really like to know how that happens and if you can help me on that, I'll be a much better person.

Very briefly there, Cindy, I think it's well it's been demonstrated and without going into any detail, but recently we've had senior officer, senior visible minority officer, suspended and their details placed on the Intranet system. Unprecedented. Unprecedented. And it goes to show, there's surreptitious use of those very powerful media resources, that are actually used to speak against any kind of (inaudible) mention of equality that takes place.

And I would go as far as to say, that's another unit, which again, Senior Management Board entirely white.

CB Well, look. It's now half past eleven. I don't think anyone can accuse us of – of, of not having a – a good session and tossing around various really important issues, so, that was extremely useful, thank you very much; there are a number of things, funnily enough, that we haven't touched on, that we would like to have touched on, so if you are agreeable, which - sorry, I, which I also should say, which are not contained within your written submission, that we would really like answers to. Then, if you're agreeable, we will certainly forward those to you. I think Bob, Bob mentioned HPDS; there's also, you know, role of MPIA, you know – what we haven't talked about is the, the organisation's approach and the way it does equalities and diversity and the impact that has on service delivery, which I think is an important link that we would certainly want to major on, within the – the, the report, so some of your sort of views and perceptions on those issues would be extremely useful. W--we would also, I think, want to try and push you even further, around some potential solutions around progression in particular, but also in terms of some of the specialist units, as well; possibly recruitment, but - I get the sense that recruitment is much better, not perfect, but much better, that it's actually more, the issue is more about what happens once we (inaudible) inside the organisation (inaudible). So there are some of those issues as well, that we'd love you to – to be able to comment on, so we'll make sure we get questions and we hope that you'll respond to them in due course. I think that's it!

Could I ask a, one question, (inaudible)

Mm

I've asked you before and – and I know you're getting, maybe tired of me asking, 'cause I've asked twice. How you going to ensure, whatever you're doing here and its recommendations, that we're not going to be going over this again, 'cause I'm sick and tired of being sick and tired of going through this over and over and I'm sure it's not just a, us sitting here but some of our folks behind us. How're you going to ensure, whatever recommendations you're going to put forward to the MPS, that they will be implemented and we're going to get some tangible changes

Sure

..in the near future?

(inaudible)

Please, please. Want some reassurance, because

Sure

.. I have no intention

Sure

..of coming back here again.

CB And we have no intentions of – of either coming back, or – or seeing the fruits of our work just vanish to the side lines. We want to see change and delivery and that's why we're all

here. I guess the, the, the, the, the best answer is around the quality of the recommendations that we make and what we would hope to be able to do is, not just recommend, but try and, within our recommendations, try and ensure that there is no wriggle room so – and there is no opportunity to not take those issues on board, so we would hope to recommend around accountability, around monitoring, to ensure that we strengthen the organisation and the resolve of the MPA, on being able to hold the MPS to account.

(inaudible)

CB And it's about the recommendations and it's also about being able to recommend better ways of holding the organisation to account for delivery.

Will that include primary, primary legislation if, if required? Or if necessary?

CB If, if it needs to it will. If it needs to, it will. I, I think Bob, Bob, Bob articulated it very clearly earlier on; there is nowhere where we will not go, where we will not venture, so I hope you'll be - rest assured that we are here to ensure that the fruits of our work and of, of those who have come before us, see positive and – and lasting changes. So, thank you ever so much. You will get the transcript in – as I say, in maybe a week or two's time and we will send you further questions, (inaudible) thank you for coming along.