

Transcript of the meeting of the Metropolitan Police Authority held on 27 May 2010 at 10 a.m. in the Chamber, City Hall, SE1.

Present:

Members:

Kit Malthouse (Chairman)

Tony Arbour, Jennette Arnold, Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman), John Biggs, Faith Boardman, Christopher Boothman, Victoria Borwick, Cindy Butts, James Cleverly, Dee Doocey, Toby Harris, Neil Johnson, Jenny Jones, Clive Lawton, Joanne McCartney, Steve O'Connell, Caroline Pidgeon, Graham Speed and Richard Tracey.

MPA Officers: Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive), Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive), Bob Atkins (Treasurer) and Nick Baker (Head of Committee Services).

MPS Officers: Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner) and Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner).

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Good morning ladies and gentleman. Welcome back after our short break. Welcome back those of you fresh from the field of political battle; I hope not too many injuries taken. We come back to a fresh, rather interesting and different new world about which, no doubt, more later. So, let us crack on as we have a fair amount to get through. Kirsten [Hearn], is not here so we have no need to go round the room. We have had apologies from Kirsten [Hearn] and John Biggs will be late.

Jenny Jones (AM): As usual!

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Valerie [Brasse], sorry, will not be here either. Declarations of interest?

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): Chairman, just to mention that I will be withdrawing for Item 8.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Withdrawing for Item 8. OK, thank you. Anybody else? Good. Minutes of the last meeting; any points on that? Yes, Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I would just like to make a point about page 16. Dee [Doocey] asked a question about overtime and the Addendum to the Commissioner's Report says that she was provided with information. Just as a matter of course, if information is provided to one Member, could it be circulated to all of us?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I thought that was what was supposed to happen. Has it not been circulated? We will check and if it has not we will make sure it goes out.

Victoria Borwick (AM): A very good point.

Clive Lawton (AM): Chairman, in relation to all of those items actually, it is not just the question asked by Dee [Doocey] on overtime but the other matters where it says that the Deputy Commissioner will speak to Jenny [Jones]. I think when a question is asked in open forum we should all know what the responses are.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The only thing I would say there, and I am quite happy to provide that, is that sometimes it is said in this meeting, “Can we have a conversation afterwards?” and that would make a very bureaucratic situation. I am happy to supply whatever people want.

Clive Lawton (AM): Well, maybe we want to differentiate between these things. Different ones of us will have a different view. I am not too bothered about knowing the numbers of cycle thefts but I am quite interested in knowing about the consequences of the G20 squatters and the illegal trial. So, I guess because Jenny [Jones] asked that question does not necessarily mean to say that others of us may not be interested in the answer.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Sorry, Clive [Lawton], I was not saying that.

Clive Lawton (AM): No, I understand that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If the response is in here it is because it is accepted by this Authority, there will be a conversation that takes place then that is what we will do, but if you want a different response then we will do a different response.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I guess a way forward might be that we have a chat afterwards with the Chief Executive and work out which bits would need to be circulated, which bits are not and if anyone then wants to ask some follow-ons we can do that.

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK.

Jenny Jones (AM): For the record I do not think Tim [Godwin] and I did speak about it afterwards, did we?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We had a conversation about a number of bits and pieces, but we have got written answers in terms of the squatters and various other bits so we can circulate that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, everybody happy?

Authority Members: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Good. Can I sign the Minutes then as a true record of our proceedings?

Authority Members: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thank you very much. OK, I have a quick update. Since we last met I have had around 70 meetings on police and related matters. There has

www.merrilcorp.com

obviously been a big variety, including a meeting with the Office for Security and Counter-terrorism (OSCT) at the Home Office; various briefings with senior police officers; attendance at the Stephen Lawrence Remembrance Evening; meetings with the various staff associations and trade unions involved in the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS); chairing the London Violence Against Women and Girls Panel meeting; obviously a meeting with the Police Federation; various catch-ups and briefings; and some quite productive member assessments which we are half way through. I have also met with the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) to discuss ongoing cases and more latterly with the new ministerial team at the Home Office. Yes, Joanne [McCartney]?

Joanne McCartney (AM): I wanted to ask you a question. It is about this body and the proposal of directly-elected mayors, because that certainly seems the coalition agreement that that is going to happen. I am assuming that this body will no longer exist and there will be some other organisation put in its place. I know, Kit [Malthouse], you have previously said that you would favour a board, perhaps on the basis of a Transport for London (TfL) model where the Mayor appoints. I am just wondering what work is going on with regards to that; how far advanced it is and when we are going to get sight of what may in fact be the oversight structure of the police as it is being developed really.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. Well, obviously as you will appreciate that that was the major part of the early discussions that we have had with ministers. The truth is, I think, for most of the country their plans are forming up. I do not think there is anything particularly definite in it, other than they want to strengthen and have a directly-elected and direct democratic link between people in an area and the police that serve them. In London we have submitted, prior to the election actually, some suggestions for structural change which are along the lines that you said. I think they were released during the election campaign as part of a general Mayoral power, sort of mini manifesto.

What is unsure yet is how much of that is going to through on the coalition agreement, but my understanding from ministers is that they definitely want to strengthen the direct link between the Metropolitan Police Service and the Mayor and that they are interested in the notion of an appointed board with scrutiny going to the London Assembly. They see the sense of splitting out the executive and the scrutiny side of it but nothing is yet definite. The other thing that is not definite is into which bit of legislation any changes would fall because there is obviously a policing bill which will cover the rest of the country into which we could fall, but there is also a local government devolution bill that, I think, is coming onto the cards quite quickly that is about their localism agenda. It may be that they decide to put some measures in that around the Authority as well. I think one thing is for certain, that over the next 12 to 18 months there will be structural change in London. It is just not entirely clear yet what that is going to be.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I would like to ask on that that you said that you had sent in some proposals. Was that from the Mayor's Office rather than the Authority?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, that is from the Mayor's Office. That is right.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Also, obviously if a board is worked up, there has been some rumour that the Mayor might try to establish a shadow board that would run alongside the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) at the same time. Is that something you are looking at?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, you know more than me. No, I have not heard anything along those lines.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Well, part of what we are doing now is recruiting a new Independent Member as well and it is what we look at to the future and whether it will work.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No, there is no intention to have a shadow board. Jenny [Jones] was next.

Jenny Jones (AM): You said that the Mayor wants to strengthen his contacts with the police, but I have not noticed many meetings in his diary with the police at the moment.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): There are quite a significant number of meetings with the police in his diary at the moment. He has doubled the number of meetings that he has with the Commissioner.

Jenny Jones (AM): With the Commissioner, yes, but not with trying to get to know the rest of the Metropolitan Police Service. Never mind, I will pick this up with the Mayor; sorry. I would like to ask you as well how are you, as Chairman, going to make sure that this Authority does not wither away in the next year or two years before the board actually happens? Once something has got the axe over its neck then it is likely to be a less-effective body and there are staffing concerns and so on. It is a little bit worrying, so presumably you, as Chairman, will deal with that?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, I think so. Obviously I assume you are all dedicated and committed public servants and, therefore, will work to your utmost until the last moment. I understand what you are saying and we will just have to keep an eye on it. Obviously once the structural change becomes clear and once the timetable becomes clear then we will know a little more how we can deal with whatever transitional arrangements may be required, but none of that is clear yet and we do not even know how long it is going to take. So, it is slightly premature. Toby [Harris]?

Toby Harris (AM): I was just wondering what advice you have given your colleagues on the Board of the Association of Police Authorities (APA) on the stance they should take on the proposed legislation and how you intend to work with them in developing their position.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, I have made it very clear right from the start that I do not agree with the line that has been taken by the Board of the APA. We were not consulted on their letter to the paper and we have made it very clear that we have reserved our right to give an independent view and that is what we will be doing shortly. Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): I was wondering if you have got any plans for the MPA to try to feed into the process that eventually appears because I do not think we should just sit here like ducks and wait for the shots to arrive. Apart from anything else, because we have got the experience of how this body works, I think we should be doing everything we can to influence what ministers come up with. In my experience it is much better to get in on the ground rather than to wait for proposals and then say we do not like them. Frankly, if we do

that, we deserve whatever we get. We might be able to influence the shape of what comes out.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, I agree. That is why we are very keen to establish very good early connections. Ministers have given undertakings that there will be discussions, proposals and consultations around whatever structure is brought forward because they recognise that it is a sensitive area and they absolutely want to get it right. Obviously, what I expect is as those proposals become more concrete from their side we will bring papers and briefings to Authority Members so that they can make their views known.

Dee Doocy (AM): That is fine. So, it will not just be a question of you giving your own personal view which may not necessarily be the same as your view as Chairman of this body?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): No, absolutely. OK?

Dee Doocy (AM): That is what I wanted to establish. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): Just one last thing. I do not want to do any special pleading obviously and my admiration for Elected Members is both unbounded and uncritical but Independent Members, I think it is generally agreed, do contribute something to the work of the MPA. So far in all of this discussion - the perfectly legitimate political discussion about the role of elected people - nobody yet, as far as I can see, has made any statement about the value or otherwise of unelected people. I think it might be quite attractive if the Chairman of the MPA could come out as one of these leading folk in this debate to say something about the value of Independent Members.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, Clive [Lawton], if you were aware of the proposals that I have made, and made my view very clear right from the start, my view was that the MPA should move to full Mayoral appointment. That means it should be entirely independent members, non-executive directors - whatever they may be - people appointed from outside. Now, the Mayor may decide to put, or will certainly I hope have the right to put, elected people on there, borough leaders, London Assembly Members, whoever he may decide. It also allows him to go for a board that is much more skills based. In those circumstances independent members who do have particular skills that are of use to the organisation would obviously be useful. So, it is not actually a devaluation. If anything it is a strengthening because what I think it needs is a structure that can bring in much more varied and appropriate skills from outside, not saying that there are not skills around the table amongst Independents, but it tends to be a bit random at the moment in that you pick from a field that applies rather than being able to go out and look for the skills you want and recruit them.

Clive Lawton (AM): I am pleased you say that Kit [Malthouse], but it rather nuances the debate, does it not, really, because at the moment the whole argument is about the tremendous attractiveness of elected folk to be in rich contact with the police, representing the people and so on. What you have said is the tremendous product of this is that one would have one elected person and no others which rather turns it from a thing about elected representation to, in fact, less elected representation. So, I understand why then nobody is being too explicit about this thing.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, it depends what you think the elected representation is there to do. I am not saying there should not be any elected scrutiny, check and balance. Part of the proposal is that the London Assembly should perform the scrutiny function and should have checks and balances upon the power of the Mayor in policing. That separation of the two I think is key. As I have also said right from the start, the Metropolitan Police Authority is a conflicted organisation: we sign contracts and then we scrutinise them. I just do not think that works functionally; it certainly does not work at local authority level where they do have this division and a, sort of, Chinese wall between the two and we do not have that. I think it would be sensible to do that.

Also, frankly, by separating it into two organisations you create a natural democratic tension which is often required to get some of the best scrutiny going and we saw that under the previous Mayor in this building where quite a lot of stuff was flushed out, to his detriment, that would not have been in an organisation that was similarly conflicted as the Metropolitan Police Authority is. So, I can see a benefit from separating out the two and I can see a benefit from having a direct line of accountability through the mayor of the city from the Commissioner through a board of highly-skilled, advisory, non-executive directors who are able to help in the management of what is a huge organisation, albeit under the ever-watchful eye of the London Assembly.

Clive Lawton (AM): I find that very helpful and I think it would be helpful then for a much more explicit statement to be made more widely. I know you have said it along the way but I do think that the debate has become very focussed on a very narrow single-slogan word.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, as I said in answer to Toby's [Harris] question, my views will be known shortly in response to the APA. OK, all happy?

Authority Members: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Thank you. Good. I am glad that is clear. OK. Item 5, Commissioner's Report. Sir Paul [Stephenson]?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Good morning everyone. As this is the first time we have met since the end of the performance year I thought I would start briefly with the overall picture in 2009/10's outcomes and then move on to the current year's crime figures and, of course, we have only got one month of validate figures so we have to treat those with a degree of caution. So, if we look at last year's crime figures' performance, total offences for 2009/10 were at the lowest level since 1998/99; more serious violence in London was reduced by just short of 5%, some 559 fewer offences; the homicide rate, well publicised, continued to fall - I think it was the lowest since 1978. With that, total homicides caused by a knife or a sharp instrument reduced by 34% - I always find the percentages, as I have said many time before, somewhat unhelpful when you are talking about small numbers - that was 26 fewer victims and gun homicide reduced by 4 fewer victims, that is 20%. Serious acquisitive crime was down by some 3.5%, but of course there were also problems last year and we have discussed them quite a good deal.

There was also a good story to tell relating to confidence and satisfaction; good story as far as it goes but it is not where we want to be. The good story was that we continue to improve our

www.merrilcorp.com

performance against the Home Office's single confidence target. 53% of people now agreed the police and local council are dealing with antisocial behaviour (ASB) and crime issues that matter in their area, which is a rise of 5% on the previous year and we are on pace to achieve our target set by the Home Office. Of course, we would want that to be far more. I also think you will recall that we still, in the MPS, believe that the actual way the target is measured is flawed because we think whilst it is about encouraging partnership between police and the local authorities, actually that does not give an accurate reflection of confidence in the police alone. That is an ongoing debate.

In addition, our own public attitude survey, which takes into account views of over 20,000 people here in London, shows that Londoners' overall perception of antisocial behaviour in their local areas has dropped by over 10% in the last year, which again is good news but we want to be a lot better yet. The 78% of people who tell us that are satisfied with the service they receive is at a consistent level. 78% is good news - it would be good news for many organisations - but, of course, that means 22% are not, which is not good news. The level of satisfaction for white victims and black and minority ethnic (BME) victims has, in parallel, improved but the gap is still there. We have discussed that before and the gap remains at around about 5%. So, both have improved but the gap remains. We have had quite a detailed discussion about that before and I remember picking it particularly around burglary and the different constituent elements there.

Because of the difficulties we have had in the past, the well publicised difficulties, between the Metropolitan Police Service and Metropolitan Black Police Association (MetBPA). We are having some very good discussions with them at this moment in time and their strategy to improve and assist us with that gap is an excellent strategy. We are working with them in detailed consultation at the moment, certainly about developing Project Voyage which we think all along has been a superb effort by the Metropolitan Black Police Association to actually achieve increased confidence in the BME communities. We are really pleased with the ongoing work we are doing there and Tim [Godwin] has been leading on that. So, I think that is really good news and I think also, in a wider sense, good news of getting beyond the problems that we have had in terms of relationships and actually getting on with some business with some people that can really help policing in London.

At the same time we did face significant challenges. Gun crime was up significantly last year by 14.2%, that is 429 more offences. Whilst that was against a reduction of the previous year, 25%, nevertheless it was disappointing we slipped back at that 14%. Again, recorded rape offences were also up by over 30%, 31.4%. I think we have discussed that on a number of occasions and no doubt we will come back to it. On the back of significant reductions in previous years, just at the end of the year we started to see that worrying increase again in knife crime and serious youth violence. Knife crime was up by over 2% at the end of the year, that was 266 more offences, and serious youth violence was up by 1.6%, 105 more offences. Actually the figures are less important for me there. The fact is from a big reduction we have started to see that increase again and that is very concerning.

I will talk about our efforts to combat particularly that last element in a moment, but I will go straight on to current performance, start with the good and then go on to the challenging, as I normally do. Again, I have got to say, we are just comparing one month's data here so we have got to be really careful. I think what we can do is look at that one month's data and,

where it is linking in with just that trend, we are seeing at the back end of the last performance year a good reason to take action.

Serious acquisitive crime rate continues to fall, that is down by 1.4%. Burglary is down by 7.2%, of which obviously I am particularly pleased. You will remember half way through last year we were 10% and rising. I think at one point many areas were 14% and there was a prediction we were going to finish the year at 17% increase in burglaries. You will also remember we launched Operation Bumblebee and we saw very, very significant falls from 1 September 2009 onwards and those falls continue into this performance year. I am delighted about that.

Motor vehicle crime is marginally down. If you remember, in our total crime offences motor vehicle crime was the big volume area where it was coming down year on year. It is still down, but it is down by less. Of course, I have always said about motor vehicle crime, whilst there has been very, very good action by the police and many of the partnerships, we have also benefited significantly from improved engineering, improved security through the motor vehicle industry, largely coming about by pressure through Government, local authorities, agencies and the police on the motor vehicle industry.

Most serious violence importantly remains on a downward trend. In the first month - and I stress, again, it is only a month - that is down by 22.1%. Of course, we continue to watch knife crime and gun crime very closely. Serious youth violence is up in that first month of this year, up by about 65 offences, and overall knife crime is up slightly on that month compared with the same time last year. That is up by about 5.6%, that is 57 offences in total.

The good news within that is most serious violence where a knife is used has gone down by about 9% and crimes where a knife is used to injure has gone down by just over 2%. So, there is a kind of mixed picture in there. Knives being used to cause serious injury is coming down but overall knife crime is going up and, of course, overall knife crime ranges across a wide range of offences including being caught in possession. That does not mean to say that I am not concerned about it, I am concerned about it. The recent action we are talking about - and I will come on to it in a moment - in Operation Blunt II and Operation Verano, we are now seeing a reducing rate of youth violence and knife crime which is what I would expect to see with the increased focus we are taking.

Gun crime is stable; it is just about level. I think there are two more offences of gun crime in that month than there was in the same month the previous year. It is stable but, of course, that means it is stable at that slightly higher level, not back to the previous year's level but that slightly higher level we had last year so we cannot be complacent about that but at least I am pleased it is not going up. I am acutely aware of the recent spate of youth homicides. Again, because we keep talking about figures and I always have to say one is just far too many and behind that is just the horror and the trauma. Of course, since this Authority met in March 2010, six teenagers have lost their lives to youth homicide in this city.

Over the 2010 calendar year, and we get back to talking numbers again which are obviously difficult, we are actually in the same position as 2009. So, the calendar year is identical 2010 to 2009, but this performance year, in other words the last four, five or six weeks, we have seen a spate. In other words we were going to be significantly down but in the last few weeks we have seen these homicides. That is just hideous and we have to respond to that as it is far

too many. So, what are we doing about it? We continue to maintain our tactical focus through Operation Verano which is a much wider operation, daily intelligence reviews driving all our other activity and that is proving quite successful and that is why I think we are seeing a reducing rate of knife crime and youth violence in the recent weeks.

With the help of the local community members and independent advisers we have drawn up action plans to address the areas where we see gun crime and knife crime being the most acute, which is what you would expect us to do. We are increasing the coordinated use of stop/search. Again, we have significantly stepped that up because that is what we did last time and we saw a significant reduction and that is what we are doing now. We are trying to get the message out again that this is a hostile environment for the carriage of knife and any weapons. Our tactic has always been the same on this and that is to convince young people that if they carry a knife or if they carry a weapon they are likely to get stopped, searched and they will get charged. I will come back to the charge rate and where we think we need more assistance around this in a moment.

There is a rolling programme of knife arches and handheld scanners across London as a preventative tool. We would look for the support of everyone, including schools, colleges, academies, local authorities, local politicians right the way from Government through the Mayor to encourage those areas that actually do not want to use knife scanners to actually reconsider it. We do see the targeted use of knife scanners, particularly in schools, is something that through our research is supported by students - it makes them feel safer. We know that schools in particular are very concerned about being labelled but if we see a wider deployment of this, this is about protecting kids and young people and I think we have a responsibility. Where a tactic is proven to actually work in terms of the perception of students but also work in terms of reducing violence then I think we have a responsibility to examine it and, where we think it is the right thing, to encourage it.

I have said before we cannot do this alone. I have said before that what I am engaged in is the back end of the issue here. This is suppression tactics. I guess the really depressing thing is we are here discussing again what we do about suppressing the carriage of knives, the carriage of weapons and kids who choose the wrong family; kids who have an opportunity to choose the right family and choose the wrong family, which is the gang or bad associations. If it is not a boom and bust economy we are discussing numbers at the back end. The real issue - and it always has been the real issue as far as I am concerned - is how we prevent it, what we do in the early years, how we encourage the parenting, how we do something for these kids who are coming from the most difficult areas of London and discourage them from taking the wrong option in the first place.

One area where we are looking for further activity and assistance is in the courts. A dip sample of knife crime offences that have gone to court - and before they go to court we charge about 90% now of all knife crime which I think is where we want it to be going back some time; a significant increase - suggest further work is needed with court partners to embed the existing sentencing guidelines. There is little point in having sentencing guidelines if they are not followed. Tim Godwin, who sits on the Sentencing Council for England and Wales, is far more knowledgeable about the sentencing guidelines. I think, Tim [Godwin], I am right in saying - and no doubt I will get this wrong - that the sentencing guidelines for knife crime, at the lowest end of knife crime, starts with an expectation of 12 weeks imprisonment?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): For adult offenders.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): When we do the dip sampling, out of 604 cases, 18% resulted in a custodial sentence, 39% of those were suspended. 7% of overall cases were, therefore, suspended and only 11% went to prison. Now, I have got to caveat that to be fair to the court services. That figure includes acquittals which is a natural part of our criminal justice process. A fairer figure would be in the region of 30% or somewhere around about that. You will correct me if I have got that wrong, Tim [Godwin].

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, it is just over 30%.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): So, it is a better figure than 11% but, frankly in my opinion, it is still not good enough. So, that is just one area where we are having further discussions. We know anecdotally from the past that where a significant sentence is giving out it does have an effect on the minds, particularly of young people - and we are talking difference here between adults and young people - and Tim [Godwin] has an anecdote going right the way back to the street crime initiative and what happened there on one particular sentence. So, it is a wider societal problem. I do not try to evade the responsibility the Metropolitan Police Service has but, of course, some of our tactics can cause problems. Our tactics are out there to try to stop young people killing young people. We have to be very concerned of six murders of young people since this Authority last met. So, we have stepped up those tactics and we are determined to bring those figures down, but I still go back to my main message and what we should be talking about in the wider sense is agencies and authorities on that preventative aspect of how we can stop the need for such intrusive tactics. No doubt we will come back to that in a moment.

I will just touch on the budget because I think you would expect me to. It is a real challenge for us. I think, as we all know, we live in the real world and the Metropolitan Police Service is no different. We live in very challenge budgetary times and uncertain times for us. The Government has made its initial announcement for in-year savings, so that is this current financial year, confirmed at £125 million across the Metropolitan Police Service. From recollection, I think some £10 million of that is capital and the rest is revenue. We do not get a lot of capital support, it has to be said, from Government so I am less concerned about that, although our capital budget has been a problem, has it not, for some time. I do not think, unless you have got information this morning, Tim [Godwin], that we still know precisely our share of that £30 million which is a little disappointing but we will get it really quickly. In all honesty I expect it to be a pro rata share across the Metropolitan Police Service. Whether that is fair or otherwise because, of course, London has particular problems and we have the Olympics coming up and various other issues, I suspect in the speed that this had brought about to come up with a more sophisticated distribution of those savings probably is not going to happen. I am guessing that unless, again, Chairman, you have got different information than I have at the moment.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): There are conversations ongoing.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Good, I am delighted there are conversations ongoing because I do not want to lose any. So, that would leave us in the region of, I do not know, £25 million to £30 million which would be our pro rata share out of that with a small

element of capital and most of it, maybe £25 million to £28 million, probably being revenue. That is what I am guessing that we are going to get.

It remains my ambition that within that level of cut, and we have to come back to where it is going to go, to maintain current levels of officer numbers. However, that has got to be caveated by a number of things. We cannot predict the consequences of cuts to other agencies and other authorities. For instance, the Borders Agency; in effect we contract with them and they buy additional activity which equates to additional police officers. We do that with local authorities. I am hoping local authorities see the huge benefit of buying additional police officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and certainly that has been the feedback we have had in the past from those authorities who have done it. So, I am hoping for an increase but, to be fair, local authorities, I guess, are facing their own financial restrictions so I do not know the affect of that.

There are discussions with TfL and they contract significant police officers from us in activities which we are very happy with. They have got a cut and I am hoping that does not affect various other agencies that could affect the total number of police officers and I cannot predict the outcome of that. It remains my ambition within our share of the cuts that we think we can do something around that without affecting total police office numbers. We will bring a report back on that through you, Chairman, about how we think we are going to do it; obviously we are having to do a lot of work. We have long-term savings planned and, of course, that is being discussed with the Metropolitan Police Authority, but this is short-term in-year savings.

The easy way that the Metropolitan Police Service has generally dealt with short-term in-year savings right the way across the country has just been simply to turn the recruitment tap off for cops. We think we can manage that by some star chambers around supplies, cuts in services but actually we are looking at the hire car fleet -things that will hurt us and things that we will find painful to do, but doing it in the right way and not touching police officer numbers at this time. However, that does not deal with the fact that the current Government is talking about a 50-day budget, which I guess we are not that many days off. Then we have the CSR round that we are rather hoping we will have the outcome of that by October 2010 because anything later than that will be extraordinarily difficult for us to deal with.

I am rather hoping the combined effort of this Authority and politicians will avoid significant further cuts because we do have unique challenges in London, not least the Olympics - and we have discussed before the way in which we are approaching the Olympics to try to keep the cost down - is actually level of opportunity cost that we do not want to go beyond for London. If there are additional significant cuts I think we have got to come back to the simple fact we have a budget where 78% of it is on people pay line. I want to avoid cutting our operation capability but I cannot predict what will come out of further negotiations. Clearly I am looking for the support of this Authority and the Mayor in intervening and getting whatever is the right result for the Metropolitan Police Service. That is what I am hoping for; the right result, however one might describe that.

Additionally, the Government has announced a cut of £10 million - I hope they have announced it otherwise I have just announced it - in the counterterrorism grant. Of course, we are significant spenders of the counterterrorism grant and I think it works out at something like a 50%-spend. So, one can anticipate that out of that there may be something

www.merrilcorp.com

in the region of £5 million that we are going to have to find out of the counterterrorism grant and the counterterrorism grant also buys additional police activity outside the Specialist Operations (SO) command through the Territorial Support Group (TSG), through Dogs. So, proper legitimate additional activity because it is counterterrorism work. That, in itself, could have an effect so you can see it is not yet a very clear picture, but our determination will be not to reduce police officer numbers but it is a determination based on my £25 million to £30 million bit. I am not yet sure of the effects of the rest but, again, I will work that through and bring it through you, Chairman, through this Authority as to what we are going to do. I thought at that point, having depressed you sufficiently, I would stop.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, great. Thank you very much, Sir Paul [Stephenson]. Right, we will move onto submitted questions. John Biggs was first but we will wait until he arrives to do his question. So, Richard [Tracey], could you give your question so that the people watching at home know what it is?

Richard Tracey (AM): I have two questions, Chairman, as you know. Do you want me to take them separately?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, please.

Richard Tracey (AM): Well, the first question to the Commissioner is: what will the Metropolitan Police Service do to enforce the law on cycling, particularly now that London will see more cyclists on superhighways and the growth of the Mayor's cycling scheme? Could you outline expected action to stop cyclists jumping red lights, riding dangerously on pavements and treating other road users with scant respect?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Richard [Tracey], well the Traffic Operational Command is working closely with TfL on both security of cycles and, more importantly, safety of cyclists on our road. The Traffic Operational Command Unit (OCU) run a multi-agency cycling fatalities working group where, alongside cycle safety such as antisocial behaviour and other offences by cyclists, we are trying to address. It is not an easy thing, Richard [Tracey] to address - I think as you would acknowledge. It is not very easy to identify, you have got to have assets in place to do it and it is all that sort of thing.

As a result the Traffic OCU, together with various Safer Neighbourhood Teams, undertake cycle enforcement campaigns, trying to tackle errant cyclist behaviour using a fixed penalty notice (FPN) for cyclists. This is coupled with a revocation scheme whereby that notice can be discontinued if the offender takes part in cycle safety presentations. In other words, trying to get the message through that, actually, we do not want to fine people, what we want them to do is actually obey the laws which will keep them safe. That is the real issue here.

Traffic OCU are also in the final stage of developing a rider improvement scheme and TfL have prepared enforcement proposals for the cycle superhighways that will deal with both motorist and cyclist behaviour. Red light violation will be addressed for both motorists and cyclists using education followed by enforcement at key locations and of course police officers and PCSOs can, and do, issue FPNs for cycling on the pavement but, of course, they are not going to be there when most people are cycling on the pavements so I think we have got to be realistic about that. A safer Transport Command Cycle Taskforce is soon to be launched for teams to deal with the issue. I think the more important issue is safety.

I think we all want to encourage more cycling for all sorts of reasons, but the streets of London are difficult for cycling as they are not designed for it. So, I have asked my people to review all measures - just a drains up approach - what other measures might we be able to suggest to TfL and the Mayor to improve cyclists safety and they are currently working on that for me at this moment in time.

Richard Tracey (AM): Yes, thank you for that. I accept, as you say, that cycling is a good thing. The trouble is though, and this question reflects the sort of messages, emails, telephone calls and, indeed, personal conversations one has with members of the public about the increasing dangers of the way that cyclists behave by riding on pavements, and they do. They ride rather fast on pavements when they need to go on them at all. This is extremely dangerous for elderly people and those that may not have perfect sight and so on. Pavements really are not a place for cyclists and so we do get constant complaints and it is followed up with, "Why don't the police do something about it?"

Now, I accept what you are saying about manpower but, of course, now the use of fixed penalty notices will send out a very clear message to those cyclists who do transgress. It is a minority, I am sure. I am sure we are going to hear from other colleagues around here that it may well be a minority of them but cycling on pavements, jumping red lights, this sort of thing, we will see more of it, I am sure, with the cycle superhighways - and I have one of the first going through my constituency. It really does require some firm action and some very obvious public action I think.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Well, Richard [Tracey], we are doing that. The real issue here is education and the real approach is doing this in this way will either damage your health or someone else's health. That is the right way forward on this. The likelihood of the police or PCSOs being in the right place at the right time to deal with the majority of this is limited towards nil. I think we all know that but the public do have a right to hear from me what are we doing and we are giving fixed penalties. We will not solve the problem through that. The problem is better solved through education and the problem is best solved through the right education and road engineering coming together to actually keep people safe both on the pavements and off the pavements. Then we have got to prioritise the enforcement action we do with the issues I have just spoken about, which is knife crime and gun crime. That is not saying that is all we deal with.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Do you want to do your second question?

Richard Tracey (AM): Yes. Sorry, I do not want to sound as though I am hogging it. The second question is: what action is the Commissioner taking to lobby the new Government for laws changes to deal with seized dangerous dogs which are currently costing the MPS and the taxpayer millions of pounds to provide kennels while legal channels are cleared?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I do know that certain Authority Members have different views on how we should deal with this one. We and the various agencies concerned do not believe that we need significant changes to legislation to deal with the problem. What we perhaps need is consolidation and rationalisation of what already exists to make a better effort. The reality is we cannot deal with this problem alone. A combination of partnerships between statutory and welfare organisations is the way forward. It is a hugely

www.merrilcorp.com

different issue but it is not a hugely different answer to the previous answer, Richard [Tracey]. It is about educating people about dog ownership and then discouraging through that criminal use of these attack weapons that Members of this Authority have raised and actually said, “We need to do something about it,” which is why we now have the Status Dogs Unit which has been very, very successful, but the problem with the Status Dogs Unit is we have this huge bill.

I have to be honest, Richard [Tracey], I do not know how to solve that. I really do not know how to solve that because it is a proper issue for us to address, it is a proper issue for us to seize these things. Perhaps the way forward is to work with other agencies to ensure that there is greater speed through the Criminal Justice System (CJS) to deal with it so there is a proper disposal. No one wants to see the inhumane treatment of animals and dogs - that is the last thing we want to see - but neither do I want to see significant amounts of public money through the MPS being diverted to kennelling and looking after dogs when I can spend that money better somewhere else. I do not have the answer at my disposal, Richard [Tracey].

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Just in terms of the answer on lobbying, there was obviously quite a big effort in this building and we have already meetings and the Home Office has talked about it. In fact, the responsibility for new legislation, which I think there is a commitment to do, is going to fall with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). I have got meetings with the Defra Minister I think next week or the week after to talk about exactly this.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Other people doing things, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) are leading on a draft bill to consolidate and strengthen the laws, which is that rationalisation piece, the Justice (inaudible), to be fair to them, have completed, and I quote “an introduction to the case management of dangerous dogs cases”, so, in other words, to assist in the guidance of how these things could be progressed more effectively through the court service; and, as you said, Defra are leading in their consultation on dangerous dogs. Hopefully some answers will come out of that. I think we all share the same ambition. I do not want to spend millions of pounds being a caretaker for dogs. I think we have got better use for our money.

Richard Tracey (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thanks, Victoria [Borwick]?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Does the Commissioner welcome the new Prime Minister dispensing with police outriders and can this saving possibly be extended to other very important persons (VIPs)?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Of course, Victoria [Borwick], there are different ways of describing things and we would not refer to them as police outriders; they are part of a security contingent.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Excuse the shorthand but I was trying to get the scent of the question into the shortest possible time.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I know, but on occasions I have disagreed with the wording used by different Members of this Authority for different things particularly around vehicles. So, I think it is right to do so. I suspect you know the answer that you are going to get on this one, Victoria [Borwick], and that is it is a well-established practice that we would never comment on the security arrangements of protected persons, in particular the Prime Minister --

Victoria Borwick (AM): It appeals to my sense of humour!

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): -- but we do work with them and we are working with those principles to ensure that we do a proportionate and balanced response to the risk that some of our public officials do face. Of course, it is right that we are concerned about that, but it is right that we work with those principles to make sure we put the right arrangements in place, which is what we are doing at this moment in time.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Moving onto the second bit of the question, which was: possibly could we, therefore, reduce the cost of protecting other VIPs?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Again, I do not think we should discuss that particular subject because that would, again, draw me into what we are doing to protect that particular principle.

Victoria Borwick (AM): No, I was keen to avoid that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Generally, of course, I would like to see any legitimate reduction without reducing the safety that we offer to people who are doing public service. Of course, I think the bigger issue for the Metropolitan Police Service - and it is something that has gone into papers that I have written on; I know this Authority have taken a view and the Mayor has taken a view - is we would like to see the proper remuneration to the Metropolitan Police Service and the MPA for the amount of security that we do give, and we do not feel we get that reflection in the budget.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Well, I am extremely pleased that you have used this opportunity to air your views again.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thanks for the opportunity.

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

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): My first question is what training to police officers receive on working with vulnerable adults?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Well, we aim to provide the highest possible standards of care with vulnerable adults. Officers are trained to deal with vulnerable adults and that includes the initial training of how to recognise, secure and provide additional assistance for victims and witnesses. Diversity training focuses on the need to provide a quality of service to the individual based on their needs and their particular assessment. Then ongoing training includes officers taught how to recognise and manage risks around vulnerable suspects in custody -difficult area and we have seen something recently on that -

www.merrilcorp.com

such as those suffering from substance abuse or in need of psychiatric help - we would need specific training on that - and how to best serve vulnerable adults in the Criminal Justice System, particularly to get the best evidence because that is what the system is all about.

The course equips officers to record visual statements from vulnerable victims and witnesses; facilitate an interaction between police officers and people with actual difficulties, trying to get a better respect and understanding so that we actually serve their needs within that justice system. Serious and complex crime investigation courses offers to our investigators the skills and knowledge of how to take statements and how to cooperate with other agents in doing so. Experienced officers who staff community safety units have additional training to provide more specialist help, that includes going into deeper context, including safeguarding adults at risk, vulnerable adults, abuse barriers, use of intermediaries, types of abuse and partnership working.

Of course, as you would expect, custody officers, designated detention officers and custody nurses are there to actually recognise and help provide that care within the custody process. We are determined to provide the highest level of service but it is difficult. Of course, we have got to make sure in future years with the increasingly constrained budgetary situation that we are facing that we do not just take a dip sampling approach to training so that we tick a box; we make sure we provide the best and most focussed possible training to the people who are going to need it most. That will be part of a wider discussion I will be bringing back to this Authority at some stage about how we maximise the benefits of training but minimise the cost. So, we do provide a lot of training but it is a very difficult area.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Have you revised the training since the tragic Fiona Pilkington [mother who killed herself and her severely disabled 18-year-old daughter, Francecca Hardwick] case up in Leicestershire, which I think might still be investigated by the IPCC? The coroner showed that on no fewer than 33 occasions in 7 years the police had been called and other agencies were clearly involved and that the police and other agencies had clearly failed this family. I am wondering since that really tragic case what analysis maybe you have done across the Metropolitan Police Service, whether you have looked at whether there are other similar patterns of cases that you could link up that you should be doing some intensive work on and whether there is any training from that?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Tim [Godwin], do you want to say something?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): One of the things that we have done is not so much training but actually putting the systems in place to identify repeat victims and repeat callers around antisocial behaviour, which actually sometimes does not feature as a crime. Where you look at the systems at the moment under crimes you identify repeat victims and what we have actually done, led by Deputy Assistant Commissioner (DAC) Lynne Owens, is that they have looked at how our Central Communication Command (CCC) identify repeat calls for ASB so that we can actually then make sure that we identify early anyone at risk of following the same tragic pattern as occurred in Leicestershire. So, the processes have changed and the policies have changed around antisocial behaviour.

In terms of the vulnerable adult training, one of the key drivers has actually been the Bradley Report [an independent inquiry by Lord Keith Bradley, a British Labour Party politician and

www.merrilcorp.com

life peer, into diversion of offenders with mental health problems or learning disabilities away from prison into other more appropriate services] and obviously with the Pilkington case there with a daughter that had learning difficulties, etc, there is a resonance there as well. One of the things that we are picking up through the response that came out at the time from the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice to that is about the role of police officers in terms of linking in with mental health and having a greater awareness of mental health issues and the needs. So, that is being picked up as well as part of our training programme.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): In terms of the review you have done then and you have changed processes, how have you identified several sort of households that you need to go and visit and have local Safer Neighbourhood Teams been doing that? I know, for example, Dee [Doocey] had taken up a case in Kingston which you could potentially link as a similar type of case and I am wondering whether that is properly being followed up rather than people saying: “Oh, it’s the Housing Office to deal with that,” or whatever.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I mean each is looked at in its own right as a problem and in terms of where it goes. The responsibility is with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams, but equally it features as part of the Designated Decision Maker (DDM) in terms of the departmental management meetings that take place at the Borough Operational Command Units (BOCUs) as well. The key issue for us was that care system is not overly useful in the sense of how it does it so there has had to be some changes and we do get quite a few antisocial behaviour calls in a month. We deal with something like 175,000, etc. So, as a result of that it is a fairly mammoth volume task but certainly there is a lot of effort there and I can ask that Lynne [Owens] brings a report on antisocial behaviour, if you like, to the Strategic and Operational Policing (SOP) Committee.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I think that would be very interesting if the Chairman agrees to that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, next question?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes, you have got the question there. It is about budgets that are available for a marketing promotion of Safer Neighbourhood Teams and panels really. Really, what the budge is for this and what were the actual outturn figures for it.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Well, you recall the research that Betsy Stanko [Senior Advisor for Strategic Analysis with the MPS and Honorary Professor of Criminology at Royal Holloway, University of London] did actually identifies the most important things for local people that actually drive confidence - No1 is engagement, No2 is fairness, No3 is antisocial behaviour and No4 is how we deal with crime. So, engagement is the top issue for them. I think what you are talking about is how we actually market that engagement.

Funds for promotion and marketing for Safer Neighbourhood Teams, including local liaison are available at the corporate level and the local level. At the local level between £19,000 and £27,000 is available per BOCU totalling, if my maths is right, £720,000 across the Metropolitan Police Service and Borough Commanders have devolved responsibility for how they use that and deciding how the funds are managed. From centrally managed budgets an

additional £100,000 is available for London-wide projects which, just one example, we used part of that in the recent promotion of the London-wide Youth Survey.

With regards to outturn figures, regrettably the financial systems are not set up to give us the outturn figures, but the good news is for you the Corporate Finance Team, I am told, are currently working on a solution so we will be able to provide the output data that you request. I would suggest that the even more important figure - we will get that figure; they are going to work on a solution for that - is the outcome figure. I will take the opportunity to promote Safer Neighbourhood Teams here for any wider audience. The outcome figure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams is about confidence and we have already spoken about how confidence in policing and dealing with antisocial behaviour here in London has been improving over the last 12 months. The significant driver of much of that, in my opinion, is the embedding of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, the familiarity of Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the work that they are now doing. That is the benefit and the benefit of promoting the panels and that dedication really does have a big effect on that outcome of confidence, but we will work on a solution for outturn figures.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): What I think is that there are issues around spend and I think it is really important that you are spending to promote not only the work of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, but the panels and how people can get really involved in those. I do not think the money is being spent. I find it surprising that you cannot actually tell us how much was spent in a year or over a couple of years. If your financial systems do not allow you to show what your spending that is kind of worrying really.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I do not think so. We do run a devolved organisation. I suspect the Borough Commanders can tell you precisely what they are spending and that is their job to do so.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes, so we can collect that. That will be useful but I think it is really important the message is out that we want that money actually being spent to really promote the work that is going on there.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We do, but we have to be very careful not to ring-fence budgets otherwise there is no point having Borough Commanders with devolved responsibilities, Caroline [Pidgeon].

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

Joanne McCartney (AM): Yes. My question was relating to a point which Sir Hugh Orde [second Chief Constable of the Police Service for Northern Ireland] said about the role of PCSOs. To Members, the way my question is phrased, the quotation marks and the attribution has not appeared so it looks I have done a very long ramble before my question. My question is: can the Commissioner confirm if he agrees with Sir Hugh Orde that PCSOs should be there to reassure the public, visible 90% of the time? Could you just confirm that PCSOs are undertaking those roles currently and that there is no mission creep? We have had debates, and I think myself and Dee [Doocey] have both raised, about the danger of officers and PCSOs, with budget cuts, being pulled back off the frontline to man desks.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Joanne [McCartney], I prefer using PCSOs to the best effect for why we created them within, in the future, a declining budgetary situation and I think the evidence that we are doing that goes back to the confidence figures I have just quoted. They are one of the mainstays of our Safer Neighbourhood Teams and we have seen the effect of their deployment out on our streets and in our housing estates. There is no question of disagreeing or agreeing with you as we all make statements and speeches and we all answer questions in media that can then be taken about of context. For me, where he talks about the brand of PCSOs, the brand is about the Metropolitan Police Service and New Scotland Yard; that is the brand. Within that we employ people to actually ensure that that brand is properly delivered and properly supported.

You know, we are absolutely satisfied that PCSOs in the Metropolitan Police Service are being used for their primary purpose and so is the Home Office and they are watching us to make sure that we are using the money that is currently ring-fenced for PCSOs in accordance with their rules. I happened to think ring-fencing of that budget is wrong. As we go into a more difficult budgetary situation, my argument back to Government will be: "Stop ring-fencing budgets so we can make sensible decisions for ourselves here in London," but, nevertheless, it is ring-fenced, there are rules for the use and it is about visibility and front-facing. That is how we use PCSOs here.

PCSOs in London, as you know, are primarily based in Safer Neighbourhood Teams. A small number of additional Community Support Officers are employed to work within front-counters and victim-contact roles and it is all in line with Home Office guidelines. All Metropolitan Police Service PCSOs are employed in roles that play a significant part in reassuring London and it runs across the following lists: Safer Neighbourhood Teams, where the vast majority are; Safer Transport Teams; Safer Parks; Safer Airports; Government's own counterterrorist patrols; transport hubs, stationary section officers and victim care units. All of those roles have been reported to this Police Authority as we develop them. So, we do believe they are doing what they are supposed to do and that is victim, front-facing, civilian-facing roles.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have a couple of quick follow-ups. The first is that we have raised before the strains on boroughs and cutting their 5% next year - at the moment it looks like 5%, and the strains that Borough Commanders are having saying: "Well if we can't reduce the numbers of police officers, we are going to have to pull them back because we are at the strains." Is there actually good oversights so they actually know what is happening and what the tensions are on the BOCUs?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, I think, just to say, staffing is not devolved to the Borough Commanders so they do not have any influence. So, the 5% would not come out of that because they do not have any influence over the staffing numbers.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will ask Tim [Godwin] to comment on the 5% in a moment, but here is the good news: the vast majority of PCSOs are on Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and we do measure the abstraction. Over 2009/10 the abstraction was at 1.73%, which I think you would agree is quite extraordinary. So, in other words, they are doing the job they are placed there to do - they are doing what it says on the tin. There is a wider issue about savings. We cannot, as we go forward into a more difficult financial future, constrain ourselves with ring-fencing and the way in which we have managed things

in the past. We are going to have to be showing more flexibility and we are going to have to concentrate on outcomes. So, I think we will be having further discussions here with this Authority, as we did budget builds with this Authority, of how we show that flexibility and how we are not constrained by the ring-fencing of the past. We massively value PCSOs and the roles they have got. We will have to look in the future at what money we get and how to best spend that money to keep Londoners safe.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I would like to ask then on that because we had Mayor's Question Time last week and the Mayor was talking about his new Routemaster bus and the fact it has got a hop on and hop off back with a screen that can be drawn. It is just that the screen can only be opened if there is a uniformed presence on the bus. It was suggested to him if he meant police officers and Safety Transport Teams helping customers off with their luggage and on. He suggested it would be. Now, would that be a valid use, to your mind, of PCSOs in your Safer Transport Teams?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The way in which the officers and PCSOs use the Transport scheme, and particularly hopping off and hopping on and closing doors, is a level of detail I have not even thought of Joanne [McCartney]. Would I like to see my officers in every part of public life? Yes, on buses, off buses, in cafes, in supermarkets, on streets and in people's homes when they are invited in there. We are not doorkeepers and that is not the way we are going to be used but, nevertheless, where there is somebody on transport and they see somebody in need I would expect them to assist somebody in need, but that is not to say that we will be deploying people to open and close doors.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You would not expect them to stay there at the rear of the bus and not move.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I would expect them to do what it says on the tin and where they employ Safer Transport Teams be there to make people feel safe.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Do the job of a Safer Transport Team. Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Jenny [Jones], shall we rattle through your six questions?

Jenny Jones (AM): Oh, rattle? Right. First, can I say, Commissioner, thank you very much for publishing the Blair Peach report. Obviously I think everybody through it was long overdue; 31 years after it all happened. So, thank you very much for that.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC) report in March 2010 gave the MPS a poor rating for reducing road deaths and casualties but improving. What action has been taken to improve in this area?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, Jenny [Jones]. I think the use of poor actually goes, in my opinion, to prove how the way in which the HMIC judges forces at this moment in time is not yet a thing of beauty. I think it is an entirely inappropriate use of the word poor. If you look at it, HMIC grades performance by way of direct comparison between peer forces and, as you know, our most similar forces are those other big - but nowhere near as big as the Metropolitan Police Service; in fact just does not approach the Metropolitan Police Service -metropolitan forces. HMIC figures are based on the baseline

www.merrilcorp.com

back in 2006. That shows the number of people killed or seriously injured on London roads fell between the 2006 and 2012 figures and the 2008 and 2012 figures more than the other metropolitan forces, depending on how you measure it, but remained significantly above them because we have a different starting point - we are a different city.

If you look at the Metropolitan Police Service starting point for road death and injury per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled - which is not a phrase that just springs off the tongue - the 2006 to 2010 figure was 11.9 for London; Greater Manchester was 5, West Midlands 6.7 and West Yorkshire 7.1. Of course, that should be of concern to authorities here in London but that is the baseline. Our progress since then has seen a greater reduction in road death and injury per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled than those other forces. So, therefore, to describe the Metropolitan Police Service activity as poor, I think, is misleading, but we are doing an awful lot as you know.

What we are doing, is the Mayor has set a stretch target for Key Performance Indicator (KSI) reduction in the capital of 50% and 60% child KSIs. Our current reductions are 53% for all KSIs and 73% for child KSIs - that is what we are doing. The Traffic OCU, the Traffic Criminal Justice Unit (CJU), the Safer Transport Command and BOCUs are all involved in enforcement and partnership activity. We are now prosecuting road-traffic offenders at a rate of 55,000 per annum and that has been made possible by our partnership with Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and court services and a well-developed system of traffic courts in the excess of 4,000 offenders per annum. Our research shows that most of these, that is 79%, have criminal records and by circulating their details to BOCUs we are able to arrest those drivers in breach of disqualification making our roads safer. We are doing an awful lot. My point would be we are making real progress; we want to make more progress but to describe the Metropolitan Police Service as poor when we have made such progress and more progress than our other comparators seems to me to be somewhat misleading.

Jenny Jones (AM): I was more impressed with your answer to Dick's [Tracey] question. First of all Londoners use their cars less than anywhere else so actually to talk about deaths per kilometres is a little bit --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We have got a massively different baseline to start with.

Jenny Jones (AM): All right. Going back to cycle safety you did say you have spoken to Transport for London about making roads safer. Because, of course, one of the ways to get cyclists off the pavements, and I agree totally with Dick [Tracey] that it is unacceptable behaviour running red lights and so on, is to make the roads safer and, for example, protect things like the advanced stop lines which are for cycle safety. Are you talking to TfL about measures like that?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I have asked my people, a drains up, to think of anything they can think of, including the wild and the whacky, that makes cyclists more safer than I want to see. If it is at all feasible, even in the wildest imagination, then I will be putting that forward to TfL and the Mayor because we have to be concerned about cyclist safety in the city. I say again, we all applaud cycling, we all applaud improving it for all sorts of reasons but we have to be concerned at the potential for further fatalities of cyclists in this city. We have got to be concerned right the way across the country, because right the way

across the country our roads were never set up for this in the way that other roads were set up for in the continent. We have to be concerned and make sure we do everything possible within our mean. Within our means means cooperating with all those other agencies, authorities and politicians who can make a difference. We have got to be looking at the road engineering and we have got to be looking at the presence, in my opinion, of the rate of reduction of those railings around corners - is that happening fast enough with local authorities? I think we could all look round and say in some areas perhaps not.

Jenny Jones (AM): Other countries do have an aim of having zero deaths on the road and here in London we rattle along at about 200 every year which, to me, is totally unacceptable.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Jenny [Jones], you will get no argument from me that it is a shocking carnage right the way across this country on our roads, but it has been massively improving through road engineering, vehicle engineering and enforcement activity by the police and other partners. Obviously, as we have had this debate in the past, the resources we put to that will have to be proportionate with all our other responsibilities but we do not, in any way, underestimate the importance of this issue.

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. Shall I go onto my next question?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, please.

Jenny Jones (AM): What is the total cost to the MPS of protecting VIPs?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Protecting VIPs?

Jenny Jones (AM): Have you not got these questions in front of you? I hate to think these are being sprung on you.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I have got Papal visit, but for some reason I do not have the cost of protecting VIPs, Jenny [Jones]. I have not got the total cost of protecting VIPs here but it will probably be shown in the budget lines and I will go away and have a look at that.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK, that is fine. I expected you to say you could not possibly tell me for security reasons.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Well, I might come back and tell you that, Jenny [Jones], but if you give me the opportunity to think about the answer.

Jenny Jones (AM): I just never understood why we cannot have the headline figure. I have never understood that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Jenny [Jones], you are asking me why when I have not yet decided whether I can give you the headline figure or not. So, let me go away and disappoint you.

Jenny Jones (AM): Can you provide an early estimate of how much the Papal visit to London is going to cost?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Papal visit, a very significant event in the early stages of planning. The cost needs to be confirmed but I am estimating at this moment of time the cost to the MPS will be at £1.8 million including approximately out of that £0.8 million in opportunity costs. Opportunity costs means people not policing the estates and the roads and doing the other things we have been talking about. It is up to £1.8 million but do not tie me down to that because lots can happen before that visit happens yet.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, of course, but thank you very much for that rough figure. I am happy to skip the question on the Scottish model of the DNA [deoxyribonucleic acid] database. We do want the information but I think number five will be a bit quicker. Will you issue a directive to require that when a case against someone is dropped or they are acquitted they are provided with information about how to apply for their DNA to be removed from the national database?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Obviously there are rules under the National DNA Databases (NDNAD) in terms of how we actually apply for the removal of profiles from the database. The Scottish model works upon conviction and on conviction then it gives time limits of three limits and two years if you go to a sheriff, etc. The previous bill that was going to change the DNA database was moving it to a six-year retention of a profile and then it would be removed. In terms of the rules of how you actually get your name and profile removed from the DNA database, if we were to send out a letter to everyone that has had a profile taken from having been arrested then that is quite a massive bureaucracy, it is reliant upon court information that comes through, etc, and would be quite an administrative issue. The one thing that we do do is that it is well publicised on websites, it is well publicised in terms of internet sites, both from Government, Home Office and ourselves. What I need to do in terms of looking at that is makes sure that the material on our website is very clear in telling people what they can do to remove it rather than create a bureaucracy at a time we should be reducing costs of that sort of bureaucracy. I think that is how we would answer it.

Jenny Jones (AM): I wrote to four police forces in the UK that had got a faster removal rate of DNA samples. One of the ideas that they had had, which they used and found effective for speeding up the process, was when somebody's DNA sample is taken they are actually just handed a leaflet there and then about how, were they not arrested and charged, they could get their DNA sample removed. Is that something you would consider?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We would certainly consider it. One of the things that we are trying to do is remove paper, printing and photocopying mainly because we want to keep police officers rather than bits of paper. So, there are other ways of accessing that information but we will look at it and see what it costs.

Jenny Jones (AM): Not everybody has access to the internet. My last question is just about the Human Resources (HR) computer system that has been in the news. I just wondered if you would give us an update on it.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Obviously, Jenny [Jones], we want to launch that system with the minimum risk and disruption to the Metropolitan Police Service. It is a very big system, as you know, and it was the right decision to do this when we made the decision with the Authority going back a number of years. Much of the solution is in place.

84% has been delivered but the issue is it needs to be tested. The decision not to launch on 31 May 2010 was disappointing but it was based on the need for that further testing to make ensure we have got the confidence that this will be robust and we can rely on it. The allowance for additional testing is going to incur costs. We are working with our colleagues across the Metropolitan Police Service, our suppliers and yourselves to ensure that those costs are kept to a minimum but we have got to be honest that will be a cost to us. Big systems sometimes do have delays like this and we have got to be prepared for that. We are re-planning at present, when we have that clear understanding of additional costs we will report it back to you.

We are expecting to implement the whole system in the second half of this year, and I think it is right to be that broad on it rather than to excite to disappoint. The idea we are in crisis talks - we are not in crisis talks. We are having some detailed and some very robust talks with partners to make sure there is a clear expectation that what we are paying for is going to be delivered. I have been involved in those talks internally but Tim [Godwin] recently led discussions with the supplier, with (inaudible), and we expect to deliver in the second half of this year.

It is, of course, the case that we have already saved £11 million per annum by going in this direction. I think some of the reporting has been unfortunate. It is unfortunate we have not delivered it precisely to time, but when we do deliver it it will deliver the savings that we promised in the first place and it is the right direction of travel. Thank goodness we did it when we now look at the financial situation we now find ourselves in. Had we not done it three or four years ago then I think we would be regretting it. Part of our problem actually, Jenny [Jones], if I am going to be honest about it, was courage - certainly not by me - by people involved in the Transforming HR programme (THR) when they actually took the cost out, and you might think this unwise, before we were absolutely there in terms of testing and delivering the system.

Now, we have benefited from that in the budget. We have reduced the cost. Of course, that has put great strain on us and it is my opportunity to publicly say thank you to a whole bunch of people in the Metropolitan Police Service who have stuck with us and got us through a difficult period, and are still doing so, in the most difficult of times because we have had to have a bridging situation where people are not necessarily in the right jobs and people know there is a very difficult future for them. They have had faith in the Metropolitan Police Service and they are doing this through a difficult time. So, I am deeply grateful to those people for assisting us. That is the consequence of taking the decision to take the cost out which we thought we had to do. In hindsight we would have been wiser not doing that but we have saved the money.

Jenny Jones (AM): OK, thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, great, those are all the pre-submitted questions. So, we now move to people who have signalled. Cindy [Butts], you were first.

Cindy Butts (AM): Thank you very much. I have a couple of questions. My first one relates to the satisfaction levels between white and BME individuals who I know you have talked about today and you have also talked about on many occasions when you have presented at the Full Authority. For me that demonstrates a real commitment of yours to not

www.merrilcorp.com

just understand it but also to drive it down. I was, therefore, rather surprised to learn, not at our last Communities, Equalities and People (CEP) Committee but at the CEP Committee before that, that you are actually intending on getting away with that target and measurement. I wondered whether you could say something about that because I think it is quite surprising given that you have been so committed to wanting to work with that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think this is about a broader debate about what we call targets and what we call performance indicators. I have the general view that the more targets we set the less priorities we have. I think we set far too many targets. I think we have made that mistake in the past and actually it is meaningless. At the moment I think we have, I have got to be honest with you, a target to reduce - I cannot remember if it is total overall crimes by 3.2%. What does 3.2% mean? My mission is to reduce crime full stop. The target actually I think becomes somewhat meaningless. We still have a performance indicator about that disparity. That performance indicator remains as important as it always was whether we put a target on it or not. Our job is to reduce it. We would like it to be a zero disparity so we have still the same level of concentration and the same level of effort. The fact that it does not have a Police Authority target, for me, it actually means nothing whatsoever. It might mean different for the Authority but not for me, Cindy [Butts].

Cindy Butts (AM): OK, but you can give a commitment that it remains as a performance indicator and, therefore, will be measured in terms of how well you are doing against, not quite a target, but what you want it to be?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, I think you are trying to suggest some confusion, Cindy [Butts].

Cindy Butts (AM): No, I am not. I am just trying to understand --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, I think you are.

Cindy Butts (AM): I am not. I am trying to understand it. Do not be so defensive.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am saying if there is no target to me it is irrelevant. The same amount of effort was given to performance indicators and that is why I am able to report to you precisely what has happened with that performance indicator and why we are still disappointed.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Additionally, the amount of work that is going on with an action plan to close it in terms of the work that actually was very graciously attributed to me leading on it but it is actually Bevan [Powell] [General Secretary, MetBPA] from the BPA doing the work - I am just supporting him and sponsoring that work - which is to look at how we can get in to use it. There is a significant financial commitment through that process plus there are other interactions that are going on within neighbourhoods where we have a higher gap because that is an average gap across London and how we do it. So, it is a very high priority for which I am held accountable by Paul [Stephenson] in terms of my diversity responsibilities.

So, it is very clear; we have got to do something about it. When they are both going up by the same amount they are both going up in terms of satisfaction levels and that makes it

harder. If one was coming down it would be a bit easier but we do not want that to happen. So, it is a challenging piece and it is often about interactions of things like front counters - there is a difference in reporting behaviours and all the rest of it - and our front counters are still a challenging area. We have more than anywhere else in the country, in terms of front counter hours, etc, so there is a whole range of activity led by Lynne [Owens] in that sense. So, there is a lot of work going on.

Cindy Butts (AM): I completely understand that and I started with congratulating you on the work that you have done and the fact you provided a very eloquent analysis in terms of the differentials in relation to the burglary. I think one of the understandings that we have when it comes to disparities between satisfaction levels is sometimes there is very good reason for that and it can be explained away. We need to know where those explanations exist and where those differences are. So, I just wanted some clarification on it; that is all.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): The performance indicators will still be there, Cindy [Butts].

Cindy Butts (AM): OK. Moving on then, you talked about six young people having died since we last met. That is just a shocking fact and, of course, it is a tragedy for those young people, their families, the communities and where those crimes took place. I think we would all want to share in our surprise at that fact and disappointment really. I do want to go on to ask you a bit more about what you said in relation to knife arches in schools because I am aware that that is quite a departure from previous Metropolitan Police Service policy, which is not a bad thing in itself because you can change your mind and think differently, of course you can. I just wondered what was driving that change in stance and whether or not figures existed, for instance, which show the rise in crimes involving knives within school premises, what are the figures in relation to young people taking weapons into school premises, what is the evidence that sits behind it, also you talked about young people who have said that they would like that to happen because it would increase their feelings safety.

I would like to know a bit more about the consultation engagement that has taken place, with whom, what questions were asked and just to get a feel for the evidence base behind what is quite a substantial shift. I think we need to understand the potential implications of that because, of course, while it may make some young people safe, it may also desensitise the issue of carrying knives, it may also demonise and ghettoise particular schools and areas. So, I just wanted to get a bit of an understanding around it and I understand they are quite detailed questions that I am asking, so I would welcome that at another sort of time, but you might want to say something immediately.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will happily bring back a report, Cindy [Butts], on that to the appropriate committee. We have been using knife arches in schools for some time now on a selective basis with the cooperation of schools. What is driving my comment is that when you talk to some Borough Commanders, one Borough Commander with discussion is getting significant cooperation with schools across the borough and then when we do survey work the young people who are going to those schools actually support them - we are happy to bring that back - because it makes them feel safer. Part of what is driving it is actually a lot of the work we have done with young people in various surveys to actually say they value that, they want to feel safe. I think, as you know, it

is the young people that have been driving the fact they want to be made to feel safer in London. So, that has been driving much of it. We will bring some reports back on that.

When you look at another borough when we were in the middle of this dreadful increase in murders we invited schools in to see us very quickly to say, "Can we discuss this before Easter?" - I think it was before Easter, Tim [Godwin]. A lot did not turn up. That worries me; that really does worry me. There can be no doubt in this city that there is real concern and angst about young people killing young people. Yet when in one borough we get very significant cooperation with schools and in another borough some of those schools do not even turn up for a meeting, and we have to try again to talk to them, that just sends a signal to me that maybe we are not getting the message across to all schools that this is all our problem and to be able to have that discussion with schools to try to settle their mind as to what we are trying to do here and get better cooperation, that is the support I am looking for. We will happily bring back a paper on that. Tim [Godwin], do you want to add something to that?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Just very briefly in terms of the strategy of it. When we launched Blunt II it was actually about creating the perception of those that might carry weapons in the street that it was a hostile environment to actually carry a weapon and that your chances of getting caught were high. So, there was a lot of activity. It was not actually designed to catch lots of people but it was actually to increase the perception that you will get caught because most criminological theories would say it is the fear of getting caught is the greater deterrent than the actual capture itself. So, we needed to create an environment in that way and we used stop and search arches and all the rest of it as a very visible piece of the fact you can get caught.

One of the things we did though when we did that and put those moveable arches in front of schools was the amount of weaponry that was actually dumped before they got to the arches and we used to then have to go and clean up and clear up. So, we had evidence that people were carrying weapons at times of going to school, etc. So, it is part of that policy of your chance of getting caught if you carry a knife is high so do not carry one, that is our intent. In terms of the other bit that we have where it went back up we did stop that very visible activity. We reduced the amount of Section 60, the amount of stop/searches and that visible presence combating the carrying of weapons in our streets and it did come back up. Now, criminologists would argue, "Well, cause and effect; is this right? Is that the outcome?" What we do know is that when we are visibly active in areas where we believe people are more likely to be carrying knives based on our intelligence there is an impact in terms of the amount of injuries that we suffer. This is part of that process.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): If you extend it to our experience over many operations in different parts of the country, if we put strategies in place to create the hostile environment for the carriage of guns, knives, whatever, in other words the bad guys - the people carrying knives, the villains or whatever - feel unsafe carrying the weapons then they have got to go to stashes and hives. That gives us a real investigative opportunity because then we can get the intelligence going and then we can find where the stashes and hives are. So, it is about trying to discourage the carriage which gives us the better opportunity to catch and recover.

Cindy Butts (AM): Yes, it was just to try to understand some of that detail. I am aware of an operation that went on outside Hammersmith Tube Station some time ago where they

recovered a whole host of knives and weapons. Again, I just wonder how much more beneficial is it when you do random operations. It is just trying to get an understanding for the evidence; that is what I am trying to do.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Let us bring back a wider report on how that impacts on Blunt and all the rest of it, and maybe include some stuff on stop/search as well because our debate around stop/search in this Authority is not going to end. We have been engaged in some debates with various bodies about disproportion around stop/search. Let us properly understand it and stop jumping to some easy conclusions, so maybe a wider report back on the whole bit.

Cindy Butts (AM): Am I allowed one more teeny-weeny question?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, I am just conscious that I have got a long list of Members to ask questions and we have only got sort of 40 minutes left.

Cindy Butts (AM): Could you maybe come back to me if we get through it?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Possibly, if we get time, yes. So, if we can keep questions and answers nice and brisk now, that would be great. Joanne [McCartney], you wanted to ask about this specifically, did you?

Joanne McCartney (AM): It was to Sir Paul's [Stephenson] last comment about one the schools in one borough not seeming to want to take part. We had this discussion in SOP and it was suggested to us that that was a borough where there was lots of academies so there, perhaps, was not the same partnership working. I am just wondering if that is a pattern and if there is a concern that with many more schools likely to be going to academies, whether there is going to be extra efforts needing to be taken.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am not actually even blaming the schools because schools are very concerned about their image and labelling and all the rest of it, but it is worrying either because we are not engaging the partnership, whatever the cause of where we do something like that with the publicity around the number of kids being killed that we end up without the result you would expect, whatever the reason for it. There is fantastic partnership work going on in all of the boroughs with schools and, of course, our deployment of Safer Schools Officers in schools has been a very real success. Of course, there are schools that do not have Safer Schools Officers and we could not possibly afford to do it right the way across.

So, we have got to keep examining have we got the right schools, have we got the right intelligence from schools. We have got to be careful saying anything because in at least one of the case I have got in mind is sub judice but it was a big signal event in this event. You have got to start asking the questions of where we have young people who are actually trying to get out of an area and go to school in a different area because they want to escape it, does that lead a school into being a little complacent on occasions thinking they do not have a problem, then suddenly, surprise surprise, we do have a problem? So, it is about trying to make sure we get maximum cooperation from all schools so that we can, if it is going to benefit from a knife arch or something else, then we can put that in place.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, great. As I say, now briskly if we could. Jennette [Arnold]?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Sorry, I cannot be brisk because this is as important a subject as anything else we have covered. I wanted to get some feedback from the Commissioner about the new Government's proposal to reintroduce anonymity for those accused of rape. Now, it is surprising because it was in neither of the parties' manifestos. I do not know; this must have come through the deal making. Needless to say, campaigners of organisations and individuals like myself, who have campaigned on this area for years, are absolutely appalled at the idea that we will be going back to the pre-1976 Sexual Offences Act which, I am yet to do my full search, I do believe that the Metropolitan Police Service were fully in support of it.

So, have you been asked for any comments about this proposal? If not, will you be lobbying Government to actually put forward the evidence that this service has, and I am thinking particularly of cases like John Worboys [arrested for raping a passenger in his black cab], Owen Oyston [served 3½ years for the rape and indecent assault of a 16-year-old girl in 1986], Peter Martin [jailed for 20 years in 1996 for the rape, indecent assault and taking of indecent photographs of teenage girls], John Duffy and David Mulcahy [rapists and serial killers who attacked women at railway stations in the south of England in the 1980s]. It is my understanding, and I do hope that you can confirm that today, that the fact that the identification (ID) of the serial rapists and number of murderers in there were made public - I do not say they would not have been caught - enabled more victims to come forward. Then we were able to see the actual extent of the horrors that they were perpetrating.

So, what have you done? Did you know anything about it? Do you not agree with me that this will have a severe effect on the Metropolitan Police Service's ability to collect evidence against alleged rapists?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think, as you are aware, Jennette [Arnold], our efforts to identify victims from Worboys continued post-conviction and continues to this day to make sure that any victim comes forward so we can actually try to - I hesitate to use the term closure because it is not closure - properly deal with those offences.

In terms of have I personally been asked? No. Frankly I would not expect to, but I would suspect the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) was but I have no idea what ACPO's contribution to that was. They have the lead for this offence on rape and they have been involved in heavy discussions over a long period of time as you know because Assistant Commissioner John Yates used to be the ACPO lead for rape committed nationally. The question of giving anonymity, if you are asking for my opinion, is a balance between the undoubted distress caused by being falsely accused and the stigma remaining with someone even if they are acquitted against the benefits of not, as you just outlined, having anonymity. It was a balance that was clearly taken account in the Government's thinking. It is for them to come up with the outcome of that balance.

My job is a bit like lots of other debates where the Metropolitan Police Service, I think, have got it wrong on occasions when it looks like we are trying to put ourselves in the position of deciding what is the balance within security and freedoms. Sometimes we almost suggest that we should be the arbiters of that when we should not. Our job is to make sure the debate

is properly informed for taking these difficult decisions, then it is for parliament to get on and do their job. It is a balance that they have got to take into account. False allegation was one of the issues which was recognised in Baroness Stern's [Senior Research Fellow at the International Centre for Prison Studies (ICPS) at King's College, London (KCL). She is also Honorary President of Penal Reform International (PRI)] report, you will recall. In a recent interview she recognised it and asked for more work to be done. In her report I think she indicated that somewhere between 8% and 10% of allegations can be --

Jennette Arnold (AM): Said it was relatively rare compared to this.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think I am saying 8% and 10% are construed as false. That is what she estimated. It seems to me Baroness Stern took the view it was her job to properly inform the debate and I think that is why she did not make a recommendation on it but asked for further research and further work to be done on it. I have not been involved with Government on this issue. I think it is a really difficult issue, it is an on balance issue; they have made their decision. I do not know whether ACPO was consulted. I would anticipate they were but I can find out for you.

Jennette Arnold (AM): So, are you saying that the ACPO team would have picked up an issue like this and not had a conversation with the MPS in any way with lead officers in one of the largest parts of the Metropolitan Police Service of this country?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, I do not, Jennette [Arnold]. The way that ACPO works is that they have business areas and they pick up issues and we lead on many of those business areas and they will consult with all forces including the Metropolitan Police Service. I do not know whether ACPO were involved in this issue or not. I am saying I just do not know.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Well, are you interested to find out whether or not the Metropolitan Police Service --

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Jennette [Arnold], we make recommendations or are consulted on hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of issues every year and I would expect, if we are consulted - and the Metropolitan Police Service plays a large part in all those discussions and decisions - on a lot of very serious matters and a lot of heinous offences, I could not sit here without notification and tell you what we were consulted on, what was the product of those consultations and what were our recommendations without knowing about the question in the first place.

Jennette Arnold (AM): It was late for me but I did inform your office that I would be raising this matter today.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I found out just before I walked in, Jennette [Arnold].

Jennette Arnold (AM): I would then like to ask for a request that any request and follow-up submission from the MPS on this matter be circulated to Members.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will happily share with this Authority any advice that we will give on this.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Thank you.

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

John Biggs (AM): Yes, I had written question. I apologise to everyone for being so dreadfully late. Do I need to read it out and remind everyone?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, it would be helpful for the people watching at home.

John Biggs (AM): For the millions watching out there the question is: what role does the Commissioner see for Special Constables as a pathway in the recruitment of police officers? I do understand this was considered at one of the committees because there is a report that inspired me to ask the question and that they did ask that it come from a longer debate at the Full Authority. So, I was interested in a pre-statement perhaps.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Thanks, John [Biggs]. I think Tim [Godwin] is going to answer this one, John [Biggs].

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Brief statement - and I know the report is coming. There has been lots of debate about costs and on-costs, and reducing business of all costs in terms of police services - not just the Metropolitan Police Service. One of the issues that has been raised across a number of forces is if you want to become an accountant you have to go and get educate and trained as an accountant and then you apply for jobs; if you want to become a lawyer you get qualified as a lawyer, etc. We are one of the very few services where actually you join purely as a raw recruit and then get a lot of training which we pay for and you are paid a salary whilst you go through training and then you qualify as a police officer.

As a result of that some forces have implemented a further education college partnership whereby people who want to become a police officer have to first apply to get on to the course - I think it costs somewhere around £800 - and then they qualify to get a certificate of police studies and then they are taken into the police service. As a result they do not have that initial costs about matters of law and procedure and all the rest of it. We were being encouraged to consider that particular option in terms of reducing our recruit costs. We identified that actually, disproportionately in our equalities impact assessment, it would disproportionately effect BME communities in terms of their access to further education and the cost, etc, and equally the amount of time in terms of fulltime education and we did not think that was an appropriate thing for us to take forward in the Metropolitan Police Service.

One of the things it did make us look at is the way we actually use our volunteers. Special Constables are Constables; they hold all the powers of police officers. We have the highest recruit rate of both people from BME communities and women joining the Special Constabulary, the only thing they have to give in terms of getting that qualification is time and time is a cost in terms of our current recruit process. It offers other opportunities as well. Firstly it is an incentive to come in and join the Specials. We also know as to why we recruit more BME officers into the Special Constabulary than we currently recruit into the regular

service - it is a difference of 18% to 19% regular versus 36% in terms of Specials - that is because a number of people come in to actually look at whether they actually want to do the job, actually whether they like the organisation, whether they suits them and they fit, and whether we fit for them.

As a result of that we thought that there was a very big opportunity here for us to do two things: one, to get to know people before they come in and join us and, two, train them in their time but actually at the same time encourage and instil the ethos of volunteering as one of our main bits of being there for London. Outcome of that is that work is ongoing and it will be come back. There have been a number of challenges of: What about single mums? What about busy people? The vast majority of our Specials are busy people. We have not got the data around things like childcare issues, etc, but we do know we have a lot of young mums in the Special Constabulary and we need to take back and ask their advice as to what that means. We have currently got 3,125 Metropolitan Special Constabulary (MSC) Officers; we want to get to 10,000 - that is our aspiration. There is a very good pool there that we can bring in.

We have currently got a 4% wastage rate in probation; that is a cost of £1.5 million and one of the things by actually getting to know someone who has then trained up as a police officer before they then join us means that we should eat into that waste as well. Total saving will be somewhere in the region of £12 million but there is probably more on top in terms of estate. So, that is why, for us, it seems to offer lots of benefits and, at the same, reduces the pressure on getting people through further education before they come to the Metropolitan Police Service.

John Biggs (AM): I hesitate before asking a supplementary which will not open a floodgate of other supplementary questions from other Members - and I think this is coming back for a longer discussion.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): This is going to come back.

John Biggs (AM): Just very briefly then to clarify the concern that underpin my asking the question. There is a massive difference between encouraging people who are motivated to become Specials to then consider becoming a fulltime police officer and go through full supplementary training as they may need it and defining a career path, which says the primary way in which one becomes a police officer is by becoming a volunteer in the first instance. My reading of the report is that it was edging towards that second option. Can you clarify whether I was misreading the report?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): No, you were not.

John Biggs (AM): So, we are actively considering moving towards a position where the primary route of recruiting a police officer would be, in the first instance, as volunteers. My concern is that that might create as many obstacles and unintended consequences as it may solve, but I think this will come back for a longer discussion.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I think anything that would change means that there are challenges and hurdles to overcome and there are issues that we need to consider. One of the things is greater entry in terms of people in universities that are outside

of London in terms of the Universities & Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) type distribution and we would have to do something for them. There are issues about our PCSOs in terms of accessing the Metropolitan Police Service and our staff and there are other issues because PCSOs are specifically excluded from being able to become Special Constables by regulation. Additionally, there are things such as servicemen and women who are returning after their tours of duty and all the rest of it in terms of transiting through.

So, there are a number of issues that we are picking up to look at those exceptions, but predominantly the benefits of encouraging people to join the Special Constabulary, find out whether it is right for them, find out whether it is right for us and to actually get them trained when they come in reduces our costs, increases our pool and it means we make better choices. So, that is why it will be coming back for that longer debate.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thank you very much. Toby Harris?

Toby Harris (AM): Yes, I would just like to make a general comment about the conduct of the meeting before I ask the questions. My comments arise directly from either previous questions or from the Commissioner's report and I just wonder whether, in the interests of the flow of the meeting, we actually ought to try to look at it in terms of topics and subjects. Perhaps you would like to think about that and come back to us on that.

Firstly on relation to the questions that were asked about cyclists, could I ask whether thought has been given to doing some sort of risk matrix analysis of the resources that are applied to this, because Jenny [Jones] will tell us every time that there 200 deaths on the roads in London per annum, more than double the number of murders. I do not know what the relatively number of deaths of cyclists is compared with the number of deaths from knife crime in the capital. It would be interesting just to think about how we allocate resources between the various types of risk and why we make the judgments that we do in terms of the balance of resources. It is maybe something you would like to think about rather than that, but I think it is something that we need to come back and look at.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I will take your comments away, Toby [Harris], and have a look at it.

Toby Harris (AM): OK. The next was I was interested in what the Commissioner said about dogs. I was particularly interested that you were suggesting it was not so much new legislation that was required but that this was about the resources and the way it was managed. I had understood that one of the problems with the legislation is this requirement to identify what breed some ghastly mutt is and, therefore, say it qualifies as something rather than something else. Surely legislation which focussed on whether the animal was perceived as being dangerous would provide a better mechanism for dealing with this? I would just be interested in the Commissioner's comments on that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Do you know, Toby, I find myself at a loss for words. I am not an expert on this. I know the existing legislation is confusing and difficult. I think what all of the experts tell me on this is that there might be a need to rationalise and amend existing legislation to try to address the issue that you are talking about. If it is of any help - it probably will not be - I am told that of those seized approximately 80% were of the Pit-bull type, which is apparently a Section 1 of the

Dangerous Dogs Act (DDA); 200 dogs seized for being dangerously out of control which is Section 3 of the DDA. So, we do seize dogs for being dangerously out of control, which is separate from the type. I think the advice from the RSPCA is that there needs to be a rationalisation of legislation with maybe some addition, rather than a new raft of whole new laws, but I am far from being the expert on this and I think I acknowledged previously that I do not have the answer to this.

Toby Harris (AM): Yes, you gave the impression of being a little bit too positive about the existing legislation.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, sorry, if I did that than that was a mistake on my part.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Just for clarity, the GLA position is that the current legislation just needs some tweaking, that actually quite a lot of the failure of the Dangerous Dogs Act - or perceived failure - has been about resourcing and attention to it. What we have seen in the Metropolitan Police Service is that one resources and attention is given to it a lot of dogs are removed actually under the Act and dealt with appropriately. So, it can be made to work although there are some cost implications with it that need some twiddles and changes to the Act.

Just to say, there is a general debate in the community that sort of look at this about “deed not breed” which I think is what you are implying - if the dog is dangerously out of control rather than just targeting particular breeds of dog - but the truth is there are particular breeds of dog that tend to generally get chosen. They do not chose Labradors; they chose the Pit-bull type dogs and so we have to recognise, in the same way we would not allow people to carry a weapon and only arrest them when they use it, if people are using these dogs that are capable of greater harm that we have to view them in a different way.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I would just like to add something to what you have just said there, Chairman. It is a case that you put resources to it and you start to do something about it but the problem, it seems to me, is when one part of the system puts resources to it and the other parts of the system do not. That is suddenly when we have these costs, properly dealing with something that is causing real concern out there on the street but actually leaves us with the problem that we do not seem to be able to resolve.

Toby Harris (AM): There was a specific issue raise at the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee about the fact that at one stage there was one court which dealt with these cases and, therefore, that actually made it easier to process them and you did not have quite the same long delays. Clearly that is something which has changed and that is about resources elsewhere in the system and the system could look at that collectively.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, we have put pressure on the London Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) to do exactly that and there has obviously been training in magistrates as well to try to improve the speed of throughput. Although there are a large number of dogs that have been taken off the street and a huge increase, the actual population in kennels has not increased that much which would indicate that the throughput has smoothed out.

Toby Harris (AM): OK. I had two more points I am afraid.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Toby Harris (AM): One was in relation to what Jenny [Jones] would call VIPs and motorcycles. I would be interested in the Commissioner commenting on the additional risks which are posed, not so much to the person being protected but to passers-by, the dilemmas which would be placed on protection officers in the event, for example, of someone who would otherwise have had the traffic cleared for them being stuck in traffic and somebody approaching, perhaps with no malign intent but appear their intentions not being clear. I would be interested whether the Commissioner recognises that in fact this is in danger of creating a situation which protection officers might have to make a very rapid judgment which might end up being wrong and might result in casualties on the street which would perhaps have been avoided.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Making sure that I do not stray into the territory that goes beyond not commenting on things that I should not comment on and not comment on specific cases, I think, as you know, Toby [Harris], protection officers are dealing with imprecise situations at all times. That is why they are there. They have to make very difficult and balanced decisions. There is no one perfect way of giving security where you do not choose one option then you might implement some other options. Some of them are more expensive than others and some are more effective than others but, over time, you have got to negotiate that with the principle as well. The final decision on security should always be with those people who are having to be there but you have got to negotiate that with the principle. I am very happy with your vetted status and your access to SO to have a further discussion about that, Toby [Harris], to satisfy you on that matter.

Toby Harris (AM): OK. My final point is about the budget. Clearly there are issues in terms of local authorities will maybe be making midyear cuts and/or they may be making cuts in future years which may lead to reductions in the numbers of PCSOs and so on that they fund and clearly that is an issue will which have to be addressed by this Authority. My question was really the other way round, in that the coalition has embraced this concept of what I believe is called the big society. So, what would be the Metropolitan Police Service's attitude when, say, a residents' association says that they would like to commission from you a team of five patrolling police officers and a dozen patrolling PCSOs? How would the Metropolitan Police Service respond to what would essentially be a big society response to the reduction in public expenditure?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I always start from the point of view of encouraging all communities to engage with us in making their communities safer. Where there is a legitimate source of further revenue that can be sustained over a long period of time so we do not have a boom and bust, then that is something that is worth exploring. I would also want to cooperate with any community that wants to actually add to their security by looking at what can they do. I think we would have to have a very careful consideration of how we move that particular issue forward because I suspect we would get into the situation where a group of individuals on a housing estate might want to do that this year but not next year. As you know, we cannot suddenly turn the tap on and turn the tap off to actually assist in that way.

I think it is one thing dealing with responsible local authorities who understand actually what tale you need to actually reverse certain decision, I think it is another thing to do that with different housing estates across the capital. I would be keen to explore any option that puts more money into this Authority that can be legitimately used to actually increase the safety of our citizens but I think we have got to look at long-term sustainability if that sort of scheme was brought forward.

I would also add I would also encourage them when they are looking for additions to talk to us because there might be other opportunities, such as Special Constables, such as Safer Neighbourhood Watch and all those other opportunities that are there and already exist.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Great, thank you. Clive [Lawton]?

Clive Lawton (AM): First quick point on your comment on schools, Sir Paul [Stephenson], which does not surprise me at all insofar as there are some schools that clearly see themselves to be part of the local community and, therefore, respond in one way and other schools and their leaderships that clearly see themselves to be oases or havens from the local community and will respond in a different way. Recent political initiatives may have some impact on that one way or another. A quick question about VIPs and then I want to say something more specifically about the report in general.

On this VIP thing - and I realise you could not possibly comment - is there some kind of diplomatic protocol that says that the President of Outer Irrelevant comes to Britain and he gets automatically, because he is a president, six outriders and nine limousines - and that costs us and we get a general allowance from the Home Office but we end up having to pay for these protocols - or does each case get precisely risk-assessed and the President of Outer Irrelevant, who nobody cares about and, therefore, gets a taxi ride from Heathrow and that will do? How does that work? Do we end up having to pay for systems imposed upon us even if we do not believe they are really necessary or can you access each one of these things?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think, in an attempt to be fair to the Home Office and Government, we should not just look at the amount of money that is given to us for dedicated security posts and VIP protection, because, of course, the Home Office would point that it gives a significant allocation of money to this Authority for capital city functions. We would always argue it is not enough by the way but they would point to a broader fund than just dedicated security posts. Decisions like that are made on a case by case basis and it would not be imposed upon us, Clive [Lawton]. We are part and parcel of those decision-making processes and we are central to them.

The dedicated security post, which is the more consistent position, is determined through a committee called Royal and VIP Executive Committee (RAVEC) of which we are on it but we do not chair it - I think there is an ex-Employment Secretary who currently chairs that - and works through the difficulties of who gets protection and who does not get the protection and what that protection maybe should look like. We are very much part of that process but we have always said we do not get sufficient money. Similarly on any particular operation we will be central to the allocation of security to any visiting dignitary and we would be part of that decision-making process.

The money is not insignificant, of course. The difficulty for us is where it is late notification for visits. I am saying nothing different to what I have said in the past. For G20 we got three months' notification and that was a significant cost. These might be very necessary things for Government to do and we have to bear the cost because we police the capital. Similarly on the Afghan war conference and things such as that, it is the late notification that becomes very, very difficult for us but each one is decided on its merits and dependent on the risk.

Clive Lawton (AM): Thank you. More generally then about the report and, as a new style of report, two aspects of it make me uneasy. The first, which I found interesting and engaging, was the collection of stories and events but in the end it felt to me anecdotal rather than helpful. I would be very interested in events and stories which were consequential beyond themselves, that is as a result of this operation we are changing our process of operations or this has led to significant reduction in that - whatever it may be - and I am not sure that I could understand quite why particular stories were there, except that they were good news stories and great to hear of those success. I would be more interested, I think, in things which could be defined to be more broadly consequential and something that might lead to a change of policy or a deeper insight into practice or something of that sort.

I was very interested in the business of the KPIs and the simplification of them. I thought it was great that we were going to have a chart that tells us how things are proceeding. I know you do not type these things out yourself on your little typewriter, so somebody did this for you, but whoever they are, they may be clever but they are not wise. Appendix 1 is almost entirely unhelpful I think. If we take an example, 2B, the target for 2009/10 was not available; the target for 2010/11 is to improve on 2009/10. How does that help us? 5A: in 2009/10 we are supposed to reduce the KSI by 50% by 2010 and in 2010/11 we are supposed to reduce it 50% by 2010. We are told that we are supposed to be dropping things from the baseline but we are not told what the baseline is. In a couple of occasions, 4B and 4C, the second element is an improvement of the sanction detection rate but the figure is not given, etc.

So, whoever produced this was not thinking to produce a document which actually is informative, they were simply giving figures without a baseline and without a total, whether it is a percentage total or a numerical total. Telling me that it is going to be reduced by 3% is of very little use. Is that reduced by 3% from 10% or 3% from 90%? So, I would please request that this - and I realise it is the first time - rigorously looked at that a chart like this, which could be very helpful, actually does think about how the figures tell a story and whether they make any sense to somebody who does not already know what the answer is.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK, Clive [Lawton], on the vast majority of what you have just said I agree. I will share with you a personal grief over this report in a moment. On the appendix where we are going through these various figures, of course, to be fair to the people who are doing them, they do sit within a context and that context was, I am told, a lot of detailed negotiation with this Authority about what should be targets and KPIs, etc. I have to say I disagree with the choice of this Authority but it is your choice and it is your plan. I think some of the things, in terms of what the public think are important, actually do not hit the mark. I think some of the things that we are talking about in here are fairly meaningless to the man and woman on the Clapham omnibus.

Cindy Butts (AM): Like what?

www.merrilcorp.com

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I think a lot of your targets. I think they should be --

Cindy Butts (AM): No, you said that we are talking about here.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, this report. I think a number of the things that are in here are fairly meaningless to the man and woman on the Clapham omnibus. That is my view and you discussed that view and you decided to have a different report. At the right level that should be discussed. I think we should be discussing the big crimes that matter to the public here and the big issues. That is my view. In terms of style of the report, Clive [Lawton], I think it does need to change. I do not think it is very informative, so I agree with you but I have a difference on opinion on what should have been in your plan in the first place. That is a dead issue; you have got what you want.

In terms of the style of the report, I do not think it is a very good style at all. I think people have worked very hard to try to be more informative and frankly I do not think it hits the buttons for me either. I regret that and we will be going back to something more like what we were doing previously because I think that was about more to do with strategic issues rather than, as you used the word, anecdotes. I had a difference phrase for it but you used the word anecdote. I think people have tried very hard but I do not think it hits the button; I do not think it is a strategic report.

Clive Lawton (AM): Well, I certainly hope and expect that successes in one borough, for example, may well have consequences on the practice in other boroughs. That would be very interesting.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I agree.

Clive Lawton (AM): We certainly would be interested in that.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): There is a place for good news and I think previously we brought a good news report. Maybe we need to do that separately so that people are aware if it because people do need to get recognised for good work, but I think that is separate from a strategic report.

Clive Lawton (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. We have now got Faith [Boardman], James [Cleverly], Dee [Doocey], Chris [Boothman] and then we are drawing a line. Faith [Boardman]?

Faith Boardman (AM): A key strategic issue for us clearly over the next three years is going to be the pressure on resources, so thank you for adding to the report in your oral update on that. Some of my previous experience had been in the Treasury and working on budget and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) type reviews and then again in leading the design and the delivery of productivity improvements for public services between 30% and 100%. That experience suggests to me that we are in something of a phoney war at the moment and we will be until we get the CSR results. If we do not get those until

October 2010 we have precious little time in which to jointly plan how we deal with them. I am sure that you are already working on that and we need to be working on that.

It also tells me that we need to be thinking much less about the first year and much more about a three- to five-year productivity improvement plan (PIP) and that we need to really think fundamentally about value for money (VFM) frameworks and to sharpen up jointly our approach to some of the indicators that we look at as part of that. I will give you one or two examples that are going through my head. We are always banging on about officer numbers. They clearly are important but actually the fundamental thing is how productively each of the officers we have is actually working, what proportion of their time are they spending on the right sort of things as distinct from bureaucracy? We need to get some more sophisticated measures of that type in order to really see that we are not just meeting the financial issue, the budget issue, but also continuing to improve the service quality.

It also tells me that we are increasingly going to have to move way beyond the back office and support functions, which is where we have rightly started over the last year or so with the Service Improvement Programme (SIP), and we are going to have to think about frontline operations and how the efficiency of those can be improved. As part of that we are going to have to think about processes and the sorts of approaches which are epitomised by **Lean and Quest(?)**, which colleagues will have received today some background briefing from one of the Authority's Treasury officers. Those are really relatively new to the police world and they take a bit of understanding and putting into practice.

I would agree with your own feeling that we have to take some calculated risks as we have done on THR and we have to avoid the temptation to ring-fence everything we are keen on and pile all the cuts into all other areas. My question is: do you agree with that broad analysis and critically what are your timescales for doing that plan before the CSR result actually lands on our desk? Critically, as part of that, what are your timescales for beginning the discussions with the Authority so that we can feed in, question and challenge some of the basic assumptions early enough for that to really influence the outcomes?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): OK. In general I agree with much of what you have just said, Faith [Boardman]. It feels like a real war although it is a small part of the war. The initial £25 million to £30 million is not easy but it is just the early skirmish. So, I entirely agree with you and we have got to look over a much longer period and we have been doing. That is exactly what we have been doing in terms of providing savings going forward in the Savings Improvement Programme. Things have been discussed with various committees of this Authority, and I will ask Tim [Godwin] to add to that in a moment.

So, I largely agree with that. The one thing that we are intent on doing is trying to put pressure on to get the information as early as possible because I think you are absolutely right, but October 2010 is an improvement on certainly some of the initial informal discussions we were having. I know that Tim [Godwin] intervened only in the recent weeks to actually say, "Anything after October 2010 leaves us in a terrible, terrible difficulty," for the simple reason if we have got to hit the ground running on 1 April 2011 if we have big consequences around the number of people in this organisation and we need at least a six-month lead in time to do that sort of thing, so the original suggestions did not hit the ground and so the feedback has already gone back in that we need it early as certainly

November 2010 is not good to us and October 2010 is the latest. So, we will keep the pressure on there.

When you talk about the need for different measures I entirely agree. Within the policing process and indeed the political process the concentration is often on numbers. Numbers are used, a bit like crime figures, like the bomb that gets thrown between competing warring trenches and that is unfortunate. We should be concentrating on outcomes. You mentioned some outputs that are important but actually we should be concentrating on outputs into outcomes and we do too little of that in my opinion.

Where I would disagree, although I am not entirely sure as I think it was just an indication of your thinking, if the cuts are very significant and that is a matter of how effective this Authority - if I am going to be blunt about it - and the Mayor is in protecting the budget, because we do have this thing called the Olympics coming up that causes me concern and we have already predicated a lot of our opportunity costs on the existing police numbers that we have. If the cuts are very significant then obviously we are going to have to look at overall numbers but my ambition is not to cut our operational capability because that is what London would expect from its Commissioner, and from this Authority actually, to have that ambition.

I would not want to give any indication out to the Metropolitan Police Service that whilst we have been concentrating on back office rightly, as you rightly say, that that is over. I actually do believe that there is more to come from back office; there has to be. We are still too expensive in certain parts of our business support function. That is not going to be easy because there are some obvious consequences if you follow that statement through. Interestingly, had we not done THR it would have been massively too expensive in the HR part of it, difficult though this is. I think that applies to a number of other business support processes.

Faith Boardman (AM): I agree.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): We still have problems. We have problems on regulations and controls that we have spoken to central government about where we have a significant number of restricted duty officers, very fine people but if they cannot do a full employment and there is no proper exit plan, and there is a debate whether that is right or wrong, then they have to be employed in need-to-do roles not like-to-do roles. That has real consequences and knock-on implications for the police staff and civilianisation processes that used to be called back then. So, we need to rethink all of that and we need to be lobbying Government of what are the rules, regulations, conditions and constraints that will stop us actually behaving in the most effective manner with the money we get to deliver safety in London.

So, I would not like to give a message out that back office is OK now. It is not in my opinion. I think Londoners have a right to expect us to do more before they see any effect on the number of officers they have got on their streets. I think numbers are important but visibility is and we have failed to recognise that too often in the past. I do believe in visible uniformed governance of the street; it makes a difference, it increases confidence and it allows people to go out there and enjoy their space.

There are a number of processes that can be helpful but I do not think we should overstate some of those processes. Quest is useful; we use it in certain parts. It is a fairly straightforward process of engineering; nothing more than that. It is assisting some organisations where they do not have that capability, so I do not think we should overstate that on occasions. There are a number of other processes ongoing.

As for when we discuss it with you, we are making preparations at this moment in time as to where we might go with the long-term savings and that is what we have been doing. We have been doing it through the medium-term financial planning which we have been sharing with this Authority but we now need to look again at what is the engagement, through the Chairman and this Authority, of what discussions do you want as we try to hit the ground running for, at the latest, I hope, an indication in October 2010 that it will not be a skirmish but the full issue for us.

One thing I do agree with you is the bigger and more important issue for us is not this year. I am not being complacent about it but we will sort this year and we will manage it. I have got a confidence we can do that. The real issue for us is 1 April 2011 and onwards for the next three years. I still come back and say in the middle of that is the Olympics and that makes London unique and different to certainly any of the other police forces across this country or in the public sector.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thanks. James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): I have actually done a little back-office deal with our new coalition partners. So, I would like to swap the running order, if I could, with Dee [Doocey].

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Dee [Doocey]?

Dee Doocey (AM): Thank you very much. I have got to catch a plane which is why we did the deal.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. On Assembly business?

Dee Doocey (AM): No and I am paying for it myself.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, good.

Dee Doocey (AM): I wanted to ask the Commissioner about the budget, if I may, and in particular if we could have early sight of any proposed reductions, but with sufficient detail that would allow us to make informed decisions. I would give you just one for example. Last year one of a list of things that we got fairly late was a reduction of 5% in devolved budgets for Borough Commanders. I am not reopening that but it took quite a while for us to realise that the devolved budget on a Borough Commander is around £6 million if you divide the total up - I know it is not exactly that - and that 84% of it is on staff and overtime. So, I think if we had had that information when we were making the decision, it would have helped the decision-making process. I find that it is quite difficult. It is perfectly possible to get information when you ask for it but I think we should get much more upfront information that helps us to make informed decisions.

I would also like to ask the Chair, yet again, if we could look at zero budgeting. I know you have made a variety of promises over the years that we would and never got round to it, which is not like you. I would urge you to take this a bit more seriously because I think if we continue, and this is a totally genuine point, to salami slice we are going to end up with a complete mess. What we have got to do is we have got to look at each piece of expenditure with no sacred cows, and I mean from the top to the bottom and not just the bottom, and we have got to see what we can take out, what we need to do and what we do not need to do. I am just concerned that we will, at a late stage again - and I know that the Mayor has asked for it to be brought forward, so the timing is even more difficult - just get a list, "These are the proposals," and we all think, "OK, if we do not agree to these the kid gets it!" I am trying to find a way that that does not happen.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Early consultation, I guess. I think that was part and parcel of what Faith was asking, of how we bring that forward, and I want to have discussions of how do we have that conversation.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We are having conversations around how we can get the timetable to work.

Dee Doocey (AM): With the figures?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am happy to do that and share it and we will comply with any timetable that is brought forward. That is quite simply the issue. On the issue of zero budgeting, we have had the exchanges here before and I think --

Dee Doocey (AM): I will never give up.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): No, and neither should you and neither would I expect you to do. My view is zero budgeting is useful in certain parts but in terms of the total organisation, in all our experiences we do not think it is useful but, nevertheless, that is a separate debate. The one thing I can give you some assurance on is your statement of "salami slicing will not cut it" is absolutely shared by the Metropolitan Police Service. That is why we are not salami slicing. There will always be an expectation, no matter how we do it, including zero budgeting, that everybody should make efficiency savings. I happen to believe that the mantra for the Metropolitan Police Service and any other public service is actually reducing the unit cost of delivery at the best outcome. That is what we should be about and everybody every year should be making efficiency savings no matter what. So, that is the way I think we should be looking for things. We are not salami slicing now. We are making, through the SIP programme, long-term change to the business processes to ensure that we have leaner and meaner business processes and we take the money out of the right place. We have been guilty in the Metropolitan Police Service of too much salami slicing in the past. So, I entirely agree with you on that, Dee [Doocey].

There should be no sacred cows and there are not. So, whatever used to happen in the past in the Metropolitan Police Service, and there are various rumours about business groups, that is not going to apply to the business group now. There is a different atmosphere there and the message about the difficulties we are now in, we have concentrated so hard in the last

12 months of getting that message and those of you who came to the Service Improvement Programme, I think, will recognise that that message has got home, but not yet realising what is the extent of what we might have to do. There are no sacred cows and not only is it not just at the bottom as far as I am concerned, simply because it never has been just at the bottom, and it will not be in the future.

Dee Doocey (AM): OK, good. I am pleased to hear that and I look forward to having much more detail when we get the possible reductions at a much earlier stage so that we are not pushed into taking decisions in a silly timescale. It is not the time now to reopen the thing about zero budgeting. I am not asking you to zero budget for the entire budget but I do want to urge yet again and put on record that it will not hurt anybody to do a pilot and let us see what it looks like. If I am wrong I will say, "I was wrong and we will not bother again," I will never mentioned it, but it is entirely possible that I could be right and if we do not try you will not know.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I would like to just say one thing. In terms of the consultation and all the rest of it we have raised it with the Government and the Home Office in the sense of earlier notification, give us an envelope in which to work. We have obviously got the Mayoral guidance that comes out in terms of budgeting but in terms of a CSR, at the moment we have to make planning assumptions based on our information and intelligence in order to have those contingencies in place to start early on in October 2010 as soon as we get some indication in order to make the savings for 2011/12.

As a result of that we are not salami slicing, I can guarantee that, and we are building a whole range of VFM issues from OPMs and all the rest. Importantly it is not just the Metropolitan Police Service, we have a very big meeting coming up on Thursday week with the Ministry of Justice partners and the CPS as to how we drive our whole system efficiencies and there are sensitivities about things in their world, such as court closures, etc, which means that the sharing of information is not sometimes just ours. There are things that we will do which will give them a benefit which we then have to negotiate and some of that is quite sensitive stuff. Additionally, where we are working off an envelope of assumption, we could scare some of our people if we work on the worst-case scenarios where we are talking about loss of jobs and all the rest of it. So, it is a tricky one for us to manage but we are going to have to work that out with the Authority about how we bring that forward to get you involved and how that information is then used because it is very sensitive and very tricky in terms of where we have not been at this level of cuts as we are going to get.

Dee Doocey (AM): Sorry, we are the Authority, who are you working it out with?

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the Authority officers in terms of the process of how we bring it forward.

Dee Doocey (AM): Oh, the officers. Oh right.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, as to how we bring it forward and all the rest of it in order to get Members involved, but it is about using that information sensitively for our partners and our people.

Dee Doocey (AM): Right.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): James [Cleverly]?

James Cleverly (AM): I am conscious that there is a fair bit of detail tied up in the question; I did not have an opportunity to present it to you beforehand so I am not expecting a detailed response now, but I want to lay down a marker of something I perhaps want to develop a little bit later. I am also conscious of the fact that this is something that might have been touched upon in the HR Committee, so this is almost as much of a question to the HR Committee as it is to yourself, Sir Paul [Stephenson].

A question I raised at Mayor's Question Time was about the proportion of officers on restricted duties and long-term sick and it was one of the things that you mentioned actually in your response to Faith's [Boardman] question. I think it is worth noting that we are certainly not the worst and we are not the best either, but looking at a quick borough breakdown there is a variation of percentages between borough commands is quite stark. Particularly in my own area we have got Bexley at 1.97% of their total force and next door, Bromley, at 6.89% and then we have Havering at just shy of 8%. So, between 2% and 8% is a huge variance and obviously we are talking a lot about overall police numbers and how that is not necessarily the best metric for volume of policing.

What I would like to see is what are we doing to harvest lessons from the boroughs which perform best in this area? What are we doing to try to drive this down overall? You mentioned about the utilisation of officers on restricted duties, would there be a case for perhaps having, I suppose, like a holding pool for officers on restricted duties so that the numbers of officers on boroughs are actually the numbers of officers available to that Borough Commander to deploy? As I say, I appreciate there is a fair bit of detail in that question. If you are not able to answer it all I completely answer.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I am happy to bring back detailed reports back on all those issues through the appropriate committee, James [Cleverly]. Let me take the opportunity in referring to your question to actually share some good news. You say we are not the worst but we are not the best, actually our sickness figures are - I think I am right in saying - probably the best we have ever had and are right at the top in UK policing in terms of officers' loss of time on the streets. So, I am actually really proud and that is a reflection of some of the work that has been done through HR and in **Kyle Canning's(?)** unit; some phenomenal work has been done. I think that touches on your issue of learning lessons from the best and the worst boroughs.

Actually what has been happening, and it is detailed work, is working with these people through Welfare and through HR with different boroughs to reduce the long-term sick because a lot of these things are about process, how do you get people in front of the Monitoring Officer (MO), how does the MO understand what people can and cannot do. There has been real success where they have concentrated on certain boroughs of reducing the long-term sick. If that has not been shared with the Authority then I think it should be shared with the Authority because there has been some really good work done. That is the way to share the best practice. There will be different rates of long-term sickness dependent upon different boroughs because it is the case that there are some boroughs where there are some people of different age ranges seem to graduate to. I know to my cost that things

started to creak a little bit more the more mature one gets and that ends up with a different balance and that is difficult to manage in terms of central and outside.

I do not believe in holding pools for restricted duties because I think all you are doing is you taking the problem from somewhere, putting it in a pool and then it tends to get forgotten about. What we have to do is make sure that every person in the Metropolitan Police Service is doing a need-to-do job, whether you are on full duty, restricted duty or whatever you are doing. We have to have people in jobs that have to be done, not in just like-to-do jobs as perhaps we could afford to in the Metropolitan Police Service in the past. That cannot happen any more. That has big implications

If you look at what we are going to have to do in the future, undoubtedly we are going to have to reduce management on-costs because I think we can and we should, but we cannot exit those managers. The people who will be exited are the people we have not recruited so the front end would end being reduced and the management stays the same. To actually deal with that those people are going to have to do jobs and if they are no longer doing the policing management jobs and we cannot exit them with dignity and all the things one would wish to do, then they have to be retrained to do jobs that have to be done. That has implications the way we see police and police staff and I think we need to retread some of our thinking on this because the one thing I do know is we are not going to have as much money as we had in the past and we are going to have enough to do what we want if we carry on with that way of thinking. I do not think the way to do that is putting the restricted holding pool. We need to make sure that everybody out there has a job that has to be done, whether you are full duty, part duty or police staff. I will happily bring you a wider report back through HR.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thanks. Chris [Boothman]?

Christopher Boothman (AM): Sorry, going back to dangerous dogs I just wondered, Sir Paul [Stephenson], if you could tell us whether any work is being done to quantify the number that are in circulation in London, but, more importantly, to track the rate of increase, and also whether you are satisfied that the approach to dangerous dogs is consistent with the approach to guns and knives. Now, I ask those questions, the first question particularly, about my experience travelling around London that there seems to be a massive increase in the numbers of young people who are carrying, what I call, dogs which are instruments of intimidation. In some parts of London that I travel virtually every other young person is carrying one of these dogs.

The other thing that disturbs me slightly is that in terms of gun and knife crime the approach seems to be to try to restrict their availability and to try to restrict who carries them. I am not satisfied that is happening in relation to these dogs. One of the most challenging things I see in my travels is the number of young men hanging around outside the Jobcentre Plus with dangerous dogs. I just really struggle to understand how people who are unemployed who are looking for work can be carrying dogs which, on the face of them, look quite expensive dogs to look after and maintain.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I certainly cannot help you with the number or the increase; I just do not know. I think that is why we have done what we have done issues - and I have to say brought forward by Members of this Authority; Cindy [Butts],

www.merrilcorp.com

Kit [Malthouse] and other people - in the past that we were not doing sufficient around dangerous dogs. That is why when you say is our response consistent with what we are doing on gun and knife, well it is in as much as our response should be about where there is a priority problem we then dedicated some aspect to that priority problem and that is what we have done by forming the Status Dogs Unit, which interestingly has brought the issue out into the open because it is costing us now £10 million to house these dogs because we cannot get rid of them through the process.

I do not know the scale of it. I share with you, it is a problem that was not there in the past and, therefore, you have to think it is increasing. I think you raise some issues that are much wider than policing or the Metropolitan Police Service in terms of how can people who are stood outside Job Exchange, etc, afford these very expensive dogs. I think that is a wider question and a wider issue than the policing remit and I think it should be posed in various quarters as to how that can happen. How do we properly look at the people who are on various benefits? How do they afford those dogs? I do not think that is my business; I contribute to that.

Christopher Boothman (AM): If we have got no idea about how many there are or the rate of increase then actually down the road there is a potential for having to spend more and more and more in terms of tackling the problem.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): There is a case for wider research into this problem. What I do not think there is a case in is the Metropolitan Police Service expending a significant amount of its assets, or maybe we need to think more imaginatively of those research organisations that would be willing to actually use their asset to research what seems to be a growing social problem. I agree with you, Chris [Boothman].

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The RSPCA have been collecting a lot of data around this particularly from dogs that they take and they have seen, and can point to, a huge rise in the number of particularly bull type breeds that are ending up in their hospitals and that they are having to deal with. It has gone from sort of low double digit percent, 10% to 12%, to over 50% now and Battersea Dogs Home exactly the same. So, it is undisputed from a statistical point of view that there has been a massive rise. Interestingly not just in the UK. In Denmark they have had a massive problem that has gone from 5,000 dogs in the country to over 20,000 in 4 years.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I suppose the only other issue, and I am not minimising the problem because it is clearly a problem that disturbs a lot of people, and I know you are not suggesting this Chris [Boothman] is a lot more people are still killed by gun and knife crime than are by dogs, but dogs is a growing problem. If there is a body out there to provide the research then they should.

Christopher Boothman (AM): I am not suggesting it is a bigger problem as knives and guns or even road-traffic issues.

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): I know you are not.

Christopher Boothman (AM): I think, from my perspective, the difficulty is the more pressure you are putting on people to stop carrying guns and knives, the more, I think, they are going to have these dogs as an alternative. So, we just need to keep an eye on that.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, great. Are we all done?

Jenny Jones (AM): No.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Jenny [Jones], you wanted to ask one final question? I am just conscious that people are drifting off.

Jenny Jones (AM): Yes, I realise that. I appreciate the fact that the Democracy Camp on Parliament Square was policed extremely well and I congratulate the Mayor's Office on a very low-key approach to it until, obviously, the court case. Arresting Brian Haw [peace protester campaigning outside the UK Parliament for peace and justice since 2001] and those dreadful photographs? The only way those photographs could have been worse is if they had shown the crutches that he has been hobbling around on for the past month or so. Can we not give him some training in how to spot bombs in his tent or something? Is there not some constructive way of engaging with him so that it is not necessarily --

Cindy Butts (AM): He can become a Special.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I like it, Cindy [Butts]!

Jenny Jones (AM): Is there not some way of just avoiding that sort of confrontation? I know it is very difficult, I am well aware, but is there not some way of not getting such bad publicity?

Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner, MPS): Let me make a general comment first. The whole issue around Parliament Square, Democracy Village - and in some ways I am sort of thinking back to some of the comments I have made in the recent past - is very difficult generally, it is complex. The real issue is not who is responsible for it; the real issue for me is Parliament clearly sorting out what is acceptable and what is not acceptable in that area around Parliament and I look forward to the Government doing that.

As for Brian Haw, he has been charged, as somebody else, so I am not going to comment. It is sub judice. Let me put it this way. When we do security operations, if we do not do it well and properly then who is going to be criticised? It will be the officers who fail to do it well and properly. On the other side to what you are presenting and what you see as dreadful pictures we have had significant comment from a lot of people of just how smart and how well they performed on the opening of parliament. They looked superb, they looked smarter than they have ever done before, they were all dressed, they all had their epaulets on, they all had name badges on, they all had hats on and they looked like London police officers should look. So, we have had massive compliment about that operation. I cannot comment on Brian Haw; that is a matter of sub judice.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Let us congratulate you on your appearance then.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, Members, thank you very much; Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, thank you very much. We are done with you for the moment and we will see you next time.

Right, ladies and gentlemen, before everybody drifts off for lunch let us crack through the rest of the business. We are onto Item 6, which is Met Forward one year on.

Jane [Harwood], I think you are going to introduce on this.

Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive, MPA): Yes, just a very brief introduction. The Authority approved Met Forward in April 2009. What we wanted to do today was to bring forward an update report in terms of how we have been delivering in the programme and what the plans are for the future. As a result of the restructuring we have created the capability to be able to actually work on a project that exists within Met Forward and, as a result of that, we are now in a position where we have actually got project initiation documents for all the projects that are within Met Forward. We will be putting those on a newly created Member intranet site so that you have got access to all of those, and the projects are going through the various committees so that you have got oversight of the work as well on that basis. We are also working on a benefits realisation plan in order that we can be very clear about what we are achieving and the adding value that we are delivering to policing as a result of the MPA mission in terms of Met Forward.

In terms of the refresh, because we are conscious it has got to be a living document, we will be looking at that later in the year. Obviously as the emerging demands come through from new priorities we will be looking to refresh the document as we go ahead.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thank you very much. Do people have comments or questions? Yes, Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Two things: on the Safer Neighbourhoods bit it talks about the scrutiny. I have seen the draft proposal. How are we supposed to feed back our thoughts on it because I do not know what is happening about it, but I am not happy with it at all as it is and I had some comments to feed in on that. Secondly, the Equality and Diversity section does not mention the Race and Faith Inquiry anywhere. I think we were supposed to have it in September 2009; where are we now? May/June 2010. I am wondering when that is ever going to emerge.

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): On Safer Neighbourhood we are going to have a meeting next week with officers as to the amount of --

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Who is "we"?

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): Kit [Malthouse] and myself, I think. Then we will have a look at what has been produced so far and how we then get other Members involved. So, you will be hearing from officers fairly soon, I think.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): If you have got comments already by all means send them in.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Who would I email with my comments on this?

Jane Harwood (Assistant Chief Executive, MPA): If you send them through to me, Caroline [Pidgeon].

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): To Jane? OK. The Race and Faith point?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Race and Faith; I think, Cindy [Butts], you were indicating July 2010, is that right?

Cindy Butts (AM): I noted that it is not in this report either so that ought to be.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right, we need to stick it in there.

Jennette Arnold (AM): What do you mean July 2010? Does that mean that there will be a copy circulated to Members before the July 2010 Authority meeting so Members could perhaps see and read this document?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes.

Cindy Butts (AM): Yes. Of course; we would not expect to table it.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Well, we have given up all expectations from this report given that it has taken so long to come through.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, well we have an end date now so we will get there in July 2010, but it will be released beforehand, yes. Anybody else on this paper? Any other comments? No? OK, good. Thank you. Treasury Management Policy statement; Bob [Atkins], did you want to say anything about this? This is our annual renewal, is it?

Bob Atkins (Treasurer, MPA): Thank you, Chairman. Yes, under the SIFA code this I one of those annual documents which the Authority has to approve itself. As you will see it has already been to the Resources and Productivity Subcommittee and to the Finance and Resources Committee so it has already been looked at in quite a lot of detail. The key point really is that it deals with the fact that at the moment within the Metropolitan Police Service there is a vacant post of the Director of Finance and so we have had to adjust the delegations within the document to cope with that vacancy in the interim period. So, that is reflected within the document before you but apart from that happy to take any questions.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. All happy?

Authority Members: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thank you. All done. Right, finally, Reports from Committees. Catherine [Crawford], I think there was one decision you wanted to make, is there not?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes, Chairman, the general report is, as ever, a synopsis of what has been happening and the chairs have been able to discuss that except that one has just removed himself because he has an interest. The matter for decision is a recommendation referred to the Full Authority from the Standards Committee, it was on

www.merrilcorp.com

page 49 of the agenda and it is a recommendation to alter the Members' allowance scheme to take account of the fact that we now have a Vice Chairman and that was not previously allowed. The proposal is that the allowance should be the same as the chairman of the committee, but that is if the Vice Chairman, as he is currently, is also the chair of a committee that one further Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) can be claimed. So, I am asking for the Authority's approval to that suggestion, Chairman.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): This is a positive recommendation by the Standards Committee?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes. All happy to agree that? Caroline [Pidgeon]?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): What about the other issues from Standards as well because there was some stuff that has come from the GLA?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): Perhaps it would be sensible to approve the specific recommendation to the Authority and then move onto discuss that?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): This is the decision that the Standards Committee has asked us to take. So, we are just asking on this decision; we can talk about the other stuff in a minute. All happy with that decision?

Jenny Jones (AM): Well, I voted against having them so I could not care less. I do find it offensive that the Standards Committee cannot even work out what our name is. I mean there is no such thing as the Greater London Assembly. It is just so sloppy and if they are that sloppy how else are they sloppy that we do not see?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): At the moment we are looking for a decision on whether Reshard [Auladin] should be allowed to have an allowance as Vice Chairman of the Authority.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): We are just asking for that to be agreed at the moment. Are you happy with that?

Authority Members: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Right, other issues then: can we get the name right?

Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive, MPA): I believe that was the wording that came through from the GLA letter and we quoted it in "sic" as they say.

Jenny Jones (AM): I just find that unbelievable after ten years.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Caroline's [Pidgeon] issue?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): There were two. The second bit of this is about whether the Vice Chairman can claim an SRA in addition to any other FA chairing a committee. I find it is

very unusual in any scheme I have ever seen in any authority, but others may have wider on that, but that is very unusual.

Toby Harris (AM): Chairman, I would like to explain the thinking of the Standards Committee's Members. It was that we currently have a Vice Chairman who serves as chair of a main committee, however, we might have a Vice Chairman who did not serve as a chair of a main committee and those differences ought to be reflected. So, the purpose of that was the fact of being Vice Chairman would attract a special responsibility allowance, but if that person in addition took on responsibilities for a subcommittee or a committee that would be recognised. It was to avoid a situation where you were automatically paying a rather larger special responsibility allowance to a Vice Chairman who was in fact just a nominal Vice Chairman. That was the logic of the Standards Committee's consideration.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, does that make sense to everybody?

Jenny Jones (AM): No, you lost me actually.

Steve O'Connell (AM): We have just agreed it anyway, have we not?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK.

Cindy Butts (AM): Chairman, can I just have a reassurance that in future all of the papers from the committees and the subcommittees get reflected here because there are some missing?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Are there? Which are missing?

Cindy Butts (AM): Citizens Focus Group, CF, CEP, CE.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): All right, apologies if that is the case. We will make sure that we have a comprehensive coverage next time. OK. Happy?

Authority Members: Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Pass that through. Any other business?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Only to say that the Civil Liberties Panel have met and it was very interesting. One of the things we have learnt is that obviously you cannot protect race, creed or colour from the DNA sample which I think many of us felt reassured as we would have been concerned at that. The problem with the Scottish model, which has been talked about --

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am not sure that is true.

Jennette Arnold (AM): You can get markers that are absolutely race specific.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I have been told something completely different, specifically in relation to one very, very high profile investigation

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Well, I think the other concern that we have that if we go for the Scottish model then we will be looking for qualitative analysis rather than how guilty of how innocent somebody is. I think Members of the Committee shared some reservations about that.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Totally rubbish. You can tell racial type from DNA.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I am very assured you will not be able to tell I am a Conservative then. All right, thank you very much. Thanks for that.