

Witness Name: **Catherine Crawford**

Statement no: **First**

Exhibits: **CC28**

Date: 29 February 2012

THE LEVESON INQUIRY

Exhibit CC28 to the
Witness Statement of **Catherine Crawford**

Metropolitan Police Authority: Website archive

Warning: This is archived material and may be out of date. The Metropolitan Police Authority has been replaced by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). See the [MOPC website](#) for further information.

Minutes - draft

These minutes are draft and are to be agreed.

Minutes of the meeting of the **Metropolitan Police Authority** held on 27 January 2011 at City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA.

Present

Members

- Kit Malthouse (Chairman)
- Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
- Tony Arbour (items 1-7)
- Jennette Arnold
- John Biggs
- Victoria Borwick
- Valerie Brasse
- Cindy Butts
- James Cleverly
- Dee Doocey
- Toby Harris (items 1-7)
- Kirsten Hearn
- Neil Johnson
- Jenny Jones (items 1-7)
- Clive Lawton (items 1-7)
- Joanne McCartney
- Steve O'Connell
- Caroline Pidgeon
- Amanda Sater (items 1-7)
- Valerie Shawcross
- Graham Speed

MPA officers

- Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive)
- Annabel Adams (Deputy Treasurer)

MPS officers

- Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner)

- John Yates (Deputy Commissioner)
- Anne McMeel (Director of Resources)

56. Apologies for absence and announcements

(Agenda item 1)

56.1 Apologies for absence were received from, Christopher Boothman, Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive) and Bob Atkins (Treasurer).

56.2 In noting the apologies for absence from Catherine Crawford, the Chairman informed members that she was that morning at Buckingham Palace receiving her OBE for services to the metropolitan police service. Both he and members asked that their congratulations be passed on and noted.

57. Declarations of interests

(Agenda item 2)

57.1 No declarations of interest were made.

Resolved – That

1. **the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table above, be noted;**
2. **he gifts and hospitality received by members, as set out on the Authority's gifts and hospitality register, be noted; and**
3. **all members declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above items listed in the table above and including any interest arising from gifts or hospitality received in the last 3 years or which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality.**

58. Minutes: 25 November 2010

(Agenda item 3)

58.1 Members considered the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 25 November 2010.

58.2 In considering the minutes, members asked that they only be approved subject to it being noted that agenda item 13 Policing London Business Plan – supplementary report should not have been considered as an exempt and that it be redacted and a revised version of the report be published.

Resolved – That, the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 25 November 2010, subject to the requested amendment be agreed and signed as a correct record.

59. Chairman's update

(Agenda item 4)

59.1 The Chairman informed the Authority of a number of meetings/events that he had attended since the last meeting of the Authority.

59.2 The Chairman congratulated a number of MPS officers who had received New Year's honours. These included: PS Danny Hill (SO14) who received a Member of the Royal Victorian Order (MVO) for services to Her Majesty the Queen and PC Kenneth Coid (SO14) who received a Royal Victorian Medal (Silver) (RVM) for services to Her Majesty the Queen. Gary Pugh, Director of Forensic Services, who had received an OBE for services to Forensic Services and Dr Sanjoy Kumar, MPS Senior Forensic Medical Examiner, who received an MBE for services to police. The Chairman also congratulated DCSU Hamish Campbell, OCU Commander Homicide & Serious Crime, CSU Dominic

Clout (TP), DAC Rod Jarman (HR) and PC Ivor MacGregor (Havering Borough) all who had received a Queen's Policing Medal for services to policing.

59.2 He added that he would also like to congratulate Lynne Owens on her successful appointment as Assistant Commissioner Central Operations.

59.3 The Chairman then turned to a number of recent MPS successes which included:

- The smooth policing of the New Year's Eve celebrations in London and fireworks on the Thames, which had involved the deployment of 3,200 officers and 68 police staff.
- In order to improve communication with protesters, the MPS had successfully developed and distributed a leaflet to protestors to inform them what to expect from the police at the demonstration on 19 January and how to avoid getting caught up in violence and disorder.
- He congratulated the MPS Waste Advisor, who had been highly commended by the Mayor's Responsible Procurement Awards 2010 for her work establishing the Swap Shop initiative.

59.4 The Chairman then informed members of meetings since the last Full Authority at the end of November that he had attended and these included.

- The Authority holding a highly successful national symposium on multi point entry to the police service in response to a recommendation from the Race and Faith Inquiry commissioned by the Mayor. He stated that he was delighted to welcome a broad range of speakers and delegates to this symposium, including the Acting Commissioner and the Policing Minister, who opened the event. From delegate feedback, it was clear that there is a strong appetite for change and he had publicly stated that, at the very least, there should be exploration of the possibility of a pilot scheme and the Mayor is supportive of this. A report is currently being produced and will be presented at the March full Authority.
- Attendance at the Police and Crime Commissioner Transition Board, chaired by the Policing Minister in mid January.
- Discussions had been ongoing to secure the maximum funds available for policing in London.
- Appearance with the MPS before the London Assembly Budget & Performance Committee as part of their investigation into front line policing in December. And with the Acting Commissioner at meeting with HMIC as part of their Police Governance in Austerity support and challenge programme.
- Attending the remaining MPA road shows and chairing the Joint Engagement Meetings (JEMs) with Islington, Hackney and Hillingdon boroughs since the last Full Authority.
- Attendance at the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) to discuss partnership working to combat violent crime, violence against women and girls, and reducing re-offending. The board would steer developments to enable local partners to plan, deliver and re-shape services towards better outcomes.

59.5 The Chairman informed members that a report would be submitted to a Strategic Operational Policing Committee on the issues related to the recent 'don't snitch' posters that were being circulated and associated matters, including how informants are treated and handled.

59.6 He also informed members that the Counter Terrorist and Protective Services Sub-Committee had considered the principle to the redistribution of the three national domestic violence extremism units from their current position within the structures of ACPO to sit within the governance and accountability framework of the MPS. He

confirmed that a report on these proposals would be presented to the appropriate MPA committee in March.

59.7 The Chairman concluded his report by reminding members that the date of this month's Full Authority, 27 January, is shared with Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD). It was on this date in 1945 that the largest Nazi killing camp, Auschwitz-Birkenau, was liberated. HMD remembers the victims and those whose lives have been changed beyond recognition of the Holocaust, Nazi persecution and subsequent genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia and the ongoing atrocities today in Darfur. As well as honouring the survivors, it provides opportunities to look at what's happening today and learn from the lessons of the past.

60. Petition

(Agenda item 5)

60.1 The Authority received a petition from Zain Sarder (Young Greens National Coordinator) which sought the MPA to ban the tactic of containment. The petition had been signed by over 1,400 people (of which there are over 100 who either live or work in the London area) and stated.

"We the undersigned call for the Metropolitan Police Authority to ban the tactic of containment (kettling) of demonstrations, where there is not the threat of violence between conflicting groups of protesters, as it damages the community's trust in the police and confidence in the right to protest."

60.2 The Deputy Chief Executive responded:

'Firstly, can I thank the 'Young Greens' for bringing this petition to the attention of the Authority. Any information, about public confidence in and public concerns about policing in London is of particular interest to us.

It is, I believe, generally accepted that the police should not use containment in situations where violence is not taking place or anticipated. However, the police must also consider other issues such as actual or potential widespread criminal damage in balancing the rights of protestors and the wider public.

I need to clarify that the Police Authority does not have any power to ban the use of this tactic since this falls within the Commissioner's discretion to make operational policing decisions. However, we do hold the Commissioner to account for the delivery of policing and we have debated the issue of containment on many occasions, in this meeting and through our Civil Liberties Panel.

Containment is legal if it is carried out in good faith, is proportionate and necessary and remains in place for no longer than is required. Additionally, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and this Authority have made recommendations about the use of containment including the release of vulnerable and, where possible, non violent protestors from cordoned areas and about the importance of communicating with demonstrators during any period of containment.

Both we and the Commissioner agree that the misuse of containment damages public confidence and is likely to deter some people from exercising their legal right to protest peacefully. We are seeking ongoing reassurances from the Commissioner that when this tactic is used it is done so legally; with reference to HMIC and MPA recommendations and that all possible alternatives were considered before its deployment'.

60.3 In accordance with MPA standing Orders Zain Sarder was invited to make any further comments. He stated that while containment, in very limited cases where potential clashes between demonstrators should take place, the majority of people were opposed to this tactic. He added that the use of containment of demonstrators on Westminster Bridge, where large numbers of people, many of them peaceful protestors, were contained for many hours in very cold conditions, was wrong and could have led to major injury or people falling into freezing water.

60.4 Members were invited to comment on the petition and comments included:

- In acknowledging that the police had to deal with a very violent and demanding demonstration some members felt that the use of containment was counter-productive and that there was a need for improved leadership and supervision of demonstrations.
- Some members stated that containment was often referred to as a 'last resort option', but members felt that there was no clarity around what the other options are and were they ever considered prior to implementing containment.
- Members also suggested that there was a need to fully understand what the alternative tactics for policing violent demonstrations, which may bring the use of containment into context.
- Members praised the development of issuing demonstrators with information (a leaflet) that outlined what options were open to the policing of demonstrations. However, some members felt that the information provided lacked clear detail around containment and that the language was poor.

60.5 The Chairman added that the MPS have to police a large number of demonstrations throughout the year most of which pass off peacefully. He thanked Zain Sarder for presenting his petition and suggested that the points it raised, and members' comments, could be considered by the Authority's Civil Liberties Panel.

Resolved – That the report be received.

61. Commissioner's report

(Agenda Item 6)

Performance issues

61.1 The Acting Commissioner presented a report summarising recent performance in the MPS, as well as operational and initiatives designed to tackle crime and make London safer.

61.2 Prior to presenting monthly performance figures, the Acting Commissioner took the opportunity to present performance figures over a ten year period, which coincided with the existence of the MPA. He stated house burglaries had fallen by 18% since 2000, that working with the motor industry, motorists suffer far less crime with theft of their vehicles down by 58% and that theft from vehicles came down 31%. He added that the MPS has taken high profile action on violent crime. Work includes: Operation Blunt 2 (tackling knife crime); school visits to highlight the dangers of youth violence and gang involvement; Operation Protect to deal with after schools violence; a website to deter youth offending; and a joint anti-weapons campaign by Operations Trident and Blunt 2.

61.3 The Acting Commissioner added that robbery had decreased by 32% and homicide was at its lowest rate for at least a decade with 16 incidents per million inhabitants. He added that during the past decade robberies had reached their highest level in 2001, and are now 32% lower, representing 16,000-plus fewer victims a year. He suggested that these reductions were achieved alongside the unique challenges of policing the capital city, including routinely policing over 4,500 events every year - and most recently a series of high profile protests - and preparing for a safe and secure Olympic and

Paralympic Games. Operational changes, such as the single patrol initiative increasing visibility and presence on the streets, and a raft of reforms in support functions are positioning the service to face the challenges of the next decade with a significantly reduced budget.

61.4 In relation to performance, the figures referred to in the report were for the period from April-November 2010 compared to April-November 2009. The Acting Commissioner also provided performance information for December at the meeting.

61.5 The Acting Commissioner in presenting the figures reported that Total Notifiable Offences were down with a total of 622,511 offences, 4,832 fewer offences than and continues to be the lowest level of total offences since 1998. Violence with Injury (VWI) was showing a reduction of -5.7% for the FYTD, which is 3,104 fewer offences. The Acting Commissioner informed members that the number of victims of Serious Youth Violence was also down, by 45 offences (-0.9%). He added that while these were small numbers that can fluctuate they were positive in terms of the hard work undertaken to help keep young people safe in London are paying off.

61.6 The Acting Commissioner also provided members with details on:

- Overall Gun crime down by -16.6%, 429 fewer offences (total of 2,152 down from 2,581) as were instances where a firearm has been discharged, which were down by -8.2% (47 fewer offences, total of 527 from 574).
- Knife crimes where a knife has been used to injure which were down -4.6%. That equates to 150 fewer stabbings on the streets of London.
- Other reported hate crimes which had fallen when compared over the same period as last year. Racist and religious crime is down by 913 offences (-11.7%) from 7,776 to 6,863 and homophobic crime is down by 49 offences (-4.4%) from 1,113 to 1,064 offences.
- Reported domestic violence had fallen when compared over the same period as last year. Offences are down by -4.9% a reduction of -1,963 offences from a total of 39,716 to 37,753 offences.

Counter Terrorism

61.7 The Acting Commissioner provided members with an update on counter terrorism. He stated that December saw some significant operational activity involving MPS Counter Terrorism Command. SO15 had been integral to December's CT network investigation leading to the arrest and charging of a number of people based across the UK for conspiracy to cause explosions and other offences.

Key Challenges

61.8 The Acting Commissioner then moved on to inform members of a number of key challenges and these included:

- a rise in Motor Vehicle
- Serious Acquisitive Crime which has shown a slight increase of 1%.
- An increase in rape – a 20% increase in reported offences, up by 409 from 2,047 to 2,456. Although a rape and serious sexual offences continued to be under-reported crimes.
- Teenage homicides – since the last meeting of the Authority in November there had been regrettably five deaths.
- Knife crime with overall knife crimes up by 4.9% which is driven by the increase in knife enabled robberies.
- Knife enabled personal robberies which had increased by 13% a rise in intimidated offences and threats (up by 22% and 12% respectively).

Other matters

Investigation into phone hacking

61.9 The Acting Commissioner informed the Authority that following new significant information, from News International, the MPS were re-opening the investigation into alleged telephone hacking. He confirmed that the Serious Crime Directorate, under DAC Sue Akers, would be conducting a rigorous investigation.

61.10 The Acting Deputy Commissioner, provided members with a brief background to previous investigations and confirmed that no new material had been uncovered in July 2009 and that following allegations made by the New York Times in September 2010, the MPS in conjunction with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), found no new admissible evidence. He reminded members that the MPS had always stated that if any new evidence had been found then the MPS would have conducted a new investigation.

61.11 The Acting Commissioner, in response to members, stated that he was confident in the MPS ability to carry out the new investigation and did not support the suggestion for an independent investigation. He also confirmed that the CPS would be providing advice to the MPS during the investigation.

61.12 In response to members question about informing potential victims that their phone had or may have been hacked, the Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that whilst acknowledging their frustrations and concerns, the MPS were unable to release information gathered during a criminal investigation without a court order and therefore the individuals would need to seek disclosure by a court order. In noting this response, some members felt that the MPS should have relayed that message to those individuals. They also suggested that the MPS should consider establishing an informal advisory group, as done in high profile cases, to offer constructive advice about the conduct of a new investigation.

61.13 Members asked the Acting Commissioner to comment on relationships between investigation officers and staff at the News of the World. The Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that officers met with News of the World staff on a number of matters and the Acting Commissioner added that further details could be provided to members.

61.14 Some members raised concerns that initial investigations had not been given the priority it should have had and that this perception was mainly due to information on the initial investigation came from the media and that details had not been shared with the MPA. It was therefore felt by some members that the new investigation needed to have everybody's confidence and that justice has been seen to be done. Therefore, some members questioned the MPS investigating and that it should be undertaken outside of the MPS. Some members also asked if during the first investigations if anybody had refused to provide help. The Acting Commissioner reiterated that he was very confident that the MPS investigation into the new allegations would be robust. The Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that he could not discuss or expose victims in a public forum without their permission.

61.15 Members asked if the new evidence was evidence that should have come to light during the first investigation or was constrained during it, but the Acting Commissioner stated that he was unable to make a comment on that at this stage. Members also asked to comment when rumour and speculation became intelligence and the Acting Commissioner clarified the process on how evidence is gathered.

Undercover policing

61.16 The Acting Commissioner reported to members that he had appeared before a Home Affairs Select Committee to apologise for inadvertent misinformation that the Committee had received last year in relation to undercover operations and that the Select Committee were content with the explanation.

61.17 He confirmed that in relation to media reports about a MPS officer on secondment to Nottingham Constabulary, this matter had now been referred to the IPCC for

investigation and he anticipated that they would be reviewing aspects of management of officers seconded to the National Public Order Intelligence Unit (NPOIU). He also confirmed that another incident dating from the late 1990's that involved an MPS officer was being investigated by the MPS's Directorate of Professional Standards.

61.18 The Acting Commissioner was aware that a number of members had received a briefing on the deployment of undercover officers and he reassured members that the majority of undercover officers were deployed to operations against serious criminal activity and counter-terrorist activities.

61.19 The Chairman noted that a member had submitted a question on this matter and agreed that it should be put to the Acting Commissioner.

61.20 The question asked that following the recent court case involving covert activities, members asked what role/oversight had the MPS had, if any, in the covert activities of Met officer Mark Kennedy, during his secondment to the National Public Order Intelligence Unit? Members added when the work of the NPOIU is transferred to the MPS, what scrutiny and democratic accountability would be put in place to ensure effective oversight?

61.21 The Acting Deputy Commissioner suggested that there was a vacuum in the governance of NPOIU, particularly around developing intelligence and confirmed that there had been negotiations from the MPS to undertake this governance. The Chairman confirmed that this was being looked at by the Finance and Resources Committee in March. In response to members concerns about the definition of domestic extremism, the Acting Commissioner confirmed that there was a HMIC review and that IPCC would be reporting on individual conduct matters. Regarding, the MPS not knowing that undercover activity had been authorised the Acting Commissioner stated that public order commanders often only received sanitised information nor did they always know the intelligence source.

61.22 The Acting Commissioner was asked to provide members with the number of undercover police officers that had been deployed during the G20 and student demonstrations. The Acting Commissioner said that he could not provide that information in a public forum. He added that transfers to the NPOUI were made in the MPS and national interest.

61.23 Members asked the Acting Commissioner to comment about the definition of an undercover operation and if there was mission creep with security service work. The Acting Commissioner stated that this had been covered in the recent members briefing, together with issues of officers having to become unprofessional or unlawful. He agreed to arrange for this information to be shared with those members that had not attended the briefing.

Issues raised by members

61.24 Members had submitted a number of questions in advance of the meeting.

61.25 In order to allow full consideration of a number of other items on the agenda a number of members agreed to receive a written response to their questions to the Acting Commissioner. These included the submitted questions on:

- Flexible hours
- Youth attitudes to law
- Deaths after police contact
- ACPO Value for Money
- Student Protests
- Project Herald
- City Airport

Forensic Science Service

61.26 Members asked the Acting Commissioner what did he think would be the long and short term effects of closing the Forensic Science Service (FSS) on justice and crime in London? He was also asked if he could give practical examples of ways in which the service is likely to be improved, weakened and/or altered.

61.27 Members also asked if there was a general consensus amongst police, who have had to work with the FSS, that the current system was inefficient?

61.28 The Acting Commissioner stated that the MPS were working with the Home Office, ACPO and others organisations to manage this change and any risks. He added that the focus would be on the timeliness and quality and that the MPS was reviewing how FSS are delivered. The Acting Commissioner stated that there was currently a very competitive market, which should drive down costs.

ACPO Value for money

61.29 Members asked the Acting Commissioner to comment on possible changes to the role of ACPO and he thought ACPO was value for money.

61.30 The Acting Commissioner suggested that the government was currently reviewing ACPO's role. As the ACPO Criminal Justice Business Area Lead Criminal Justice lead he felt there had been huge benefits of working alongside ACPO. He added that the ACPO coordination function provided value for money and provided a national professional voice and that ACPO could possibly fill NPJA roles.

61.31 In response to some members about the status of ACPO as a public limited company, the Acting Commissioner stated that this would form part of the review

Guidelines

61.32 Members asked for an update since, previous questions on practical steps have been made to reduce the plethora of police guidelines?

61.33 The Acting Commissioner explained that in September 2010 ACPO and the NPJA had agreed a new approach of 'Authorised Professional Practice'. He said that in support of this ACPO had carried out a full review of existing guidance to reduce the volume. Regarding the MPS he confirmed that a review of guidance was taking place and discussions taking place with partners including seeking support from partners such as the Sentencing Council, to help achieve this a sensible usable product. Members asked that in parallel to this work, a 'bottom up' approach also be taken to ensure practices are embedded.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams

61.34 The Acting Commissioner was asked how many sergeants are there currently in Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) across London, and how many have you budgeted for next year. He was also asked what plans were there for the use of Special Constables within Safer Neighbourhood Teams?

61.35 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that there were 630 sergeant posts in SNT, with an expected 5% vacancy factor due to the normal churn of personnel. He added that the planning assumption was that there would be a reduction in SNT supervision costs over the next three years. He clarified that the supervision structure was very high and the MPA SNT Review was considering this issue. He confirmed that the plan was to reduce the number of sergeants by 100 in 2011/12 and then a further 200 by 2012/13.

Update on investigation into the attack on vehicle carrying members of royal family

61.36. Members asked when the MPS internal inquiry into the attack on the car containing the Prince of Wales and Duchess of Cornwall on 9th December 2010 would be shared with the MPA. What were the outcomes of this inquiry, and what lessons learnt?

61.37 The Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that the details of the review had been shared with the MPA Counter Terrorism Sub-Committee. He clarified that the broad

issues where lessons had been learnt were in relation to the planning process, coordination and protection in a public order dynamic environment.

Containment of demonstrators on Westminster Bridge

61.38. Following the containment of demonstrators on Westminster Bridge on 9 December 2010, Members asked the Acting Commissioner what assessment had the MPS made of the safety risks to demonstrators prior to containing them, did any risk assessment change during the containment and did he agree with reports that indicate that those contained in this incident were crushed and held in an unsafe and extremely dangerous environment?

61.39 The Acting Commissioner explained events leading up to the containment on Westminster Bridge and the associated risk assessment which was undertaken. He confirmed that the risk assessment had included the use of the Marine Support Unit (MSU), mobile CCTV and Air Support Unit (ASU) and that those in the containment had been constantly monitored and there was an immediate release plan if it became necessary. Regarding any injuries to demonstrators he added that two female demonstrators who had fainted were removed and received treatment.

61.40 Members asked if the MSU had been deployed due to the risk of people falling off the bridge and the Acting Commissioner stated that the MPS were just deploying the relevant assets. He added that he could not give assurances that containment on bridges would not happen again.

61.41 In relation to this question members asked what advice officers are given regarding disabled people; as they felt that there was a community feeling that disabled people would not be safe at protests. The Acting Commissioner confirmed that this issue was covered in Level II Public Order Training. The Acting Commissioner thanked members for community contacts, specifically those from the disabled community, which he was sure the MPS seek advice from to reassure members from that community when attending demonstrations.

61.42 Those issues that the Commissioner undertook to report back on to members have been circulated in the form of an addendum report and are appended to these minutes at Appendix 1.

Resolved – That the report be received.

62. Policing London Business Plan

(Agenda item 7)

62.1 This report was not circulated within the statutory five working days and therefore the Chairman agreed to receive it as urgent. The grounds for urgency were that the Plan paper was late in being produced due to the ongoing work to try and bridge the budget gap. The report needs to be considered at this meeting in order that the Authority can respond to the Mayors consultation on the budget for which the authority has already been granted an extension.

62.2 Members received a report that outlined amendments to the draft Policing London Business Plan 2011.

62.3 Members in noting that a considerable amount of work had been undertaken on the Plan did not feel that it included enough detailed information for members to give it proper consideration. Members felt that the headline figures needed to be supported by specific details and there was a need for further discussion on the key performance indicators.

62.4 The Chairman, in noting member's comments reminded them that Budget guidelines had been issued requiring a draft budget to be submitted to the Mayor by end of September 2010. The Authority had negotiated an extension to the end of November and that no further extension could be negotiated as the information was needed to inform the statutory consultation process. He added that at the meeting in November the Authority agreed that the draft proposals could be submitted to the

Mayor in support of his consultation timetable but that they were neither endorsed nor approved by the Authority. The Mayor had now gone out to consultation and the MPA were now required to submit a response to his consultation. He informed members that should have been done already and that the responses to the formal consultation process would then be used to inform the final GLA budget that will be presented to the Assembly in February.

62.5 In noting the timescales for submission of the budget, some members remained dissatisfied with the level of detail in the report and felt that they could not endorse the recommendations without this information.

62.6 The Chairman in noting members' views suggested that officers could arrange a lunchtime briefing for members to be able to discuss key performance indicators and a further informal briefing meeting on the budget before the February Authority meeting.

62.7 In light of members comments it was agreed to amend the recommendations in the report to reflect this.

62.8 Caroline Pidgeon and Dee Doocey requested that their agreement to the amendment to the recommendations in the report be noted.

Resolved - That

1. **Members noted the amendments to the Policing Plan since submission to the Mayor in November 2010, principally on the revised budget gap following the Police Grant Settlement and the publication of the Mayor's draft budget for consultation. However, in noting the amendments members agreed that the papers reflected the work in progress on the preparation of the budget and that it be submitted to the Mayor's office to comply with the legislative requirements, while recording that the contents are neither agreed nor endorsed by the authority as further details are still required. In addition, the transcript from the authority has been included, as part of the submission, in order that the Mayor is clear of the issues raised by members in response to the consultation document (and is also given at appendix 2 to these minutes);**
2. **Approve the amended MPAs response to the Mayor's draft budget proposals as contained at Appendix 3 and**
3. **Note that this report has been shared with the Mayor pending formal consideration of the budget and business plan by the Authority.**

63. Policing and Social Responsibility Bill

(Agenda item 8)

63.1 This report was not circulated within the statutory five working days and therefore the Chairman agreed to receive it as urgent. The grounds for urgency being the need to include in the report the up to date details of the committee stage of the Bill, which commenced on 17 January 2011.

63.2 A report was received that provide members with an update on the progress of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill and a brief overview of plans that had been put in place to deliver the implementation of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the abolition of the Metropolitan Police Authority.

63.3 Members noted that update reports on the Bill would now form part of a standing item on the agenda of the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee and the Chairman agreed to also seek other members' advice, in addition to the membership of the Business Management Group on developing/implementing of the proposed MOPC.

Resolved – That the report be received

64. Treasury management half year review 2010/11

(Agenda item 9)

64.1 Member considered a report that invited them to review treasury management activity for the period 1 April 2010 to 30 September 2010 and approve amendments to the MPA investment counterparty list and prudential code indicators.

Resolved - That

1. **the half year review of the Treasury Management function and the 2nd Quarter update be noted**
2. **the statement of assurance from the Treasurer and Director of Finance be noted.**
3. **The amendments to the MPA counterparty list for investments as flows be approved :**
 - **Increase the individual lending limit for UK counterparties from £30m to £35m, as set out in paragraph 21 of this report**
 - **The addition of Clydesdale Bank to the counterparty list, as set out in paragraph 22 of this report.**
4. **to raise the prudential code limit on variable rate borrowing from 15% to 30%, as set out in paragraph 26 of this report be approved.**

65. External Audit Annual Audit Letter 2009/10

(Agenda item 10)

65. The Deputy Treasurer reported that the District Auditor had submitted the annual audit letter for 2009/10 and that the letter had been submitted to the Corporate Governance Committee in December 2010, which it was recommended that it be formally received by the full Authority for approval.

Resolved – That following consideration by the Corporate Governance Committee, members receive the external auditor’s letter for 2009/10.

66. Reports from committees

(Agenda item 11)

66.1 The Authority received a report outlining key issues that had been considered at recent Authority Committee meetings. The report covered the following meetings:

- Joint Strategic and Operational Policing/Finance and Resources Committees – 11 November 2010
- Strategic and Operational Policing Committee– 11 November 2010
- Finance and Resources Committee – 18 November 2010
- Corporate Governance Committee – 2 December 2010
- Strategic and Operational Policing Committee– 9 December 2010
- Finance and Resources Committee – 16 December 2010
- Communities, Equalities and People Committee – 6 January 2011

66.2 Members were asked to consider a recommendation from the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee to amend the terms of reference of the Professional Standards Cases Sub-Committee.

Resolved – That

1. **the report be received; and**
2. **the amendment to the terms of reference of the Professional Standards Cases Sub-Committee as outlined in the report be agreed.**

67. Any other urgent business

(Agenda item 12)

67.1 There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 1.40 p.m.

Appendix 1

Addendum to the Commissioner's report

Report by the Commissioner

This report follows up on the actions and commitments made verbally by the Commissioner at the Full Authority meeting on 27 January 2011.

The Commissioner committed to provide an update to Members on the following issues:

- Written response to questions from Members
- Telephone hacking
- Undercover Policing

Written response to questions from Members

1. Members asked for written responses regarding the below questions

- Flexible hours
- Youth attitudes to law
- Deaths after police contact
- Police bonuses
- Student Protests
- Project Herald
- City Airport
- Special Constables within SNT

Responses sent the MPA on 2 February 2011.

Telephone hacking

2. The Commissioner agreed to provide Members with details meetings between investigating officers and the News of the World. Information to be sent to the MPA.

Undercover Policing

3. A further informal briefing to Members regarding undercover policing is planned on 5th May 2011. A brief response to a specific question from John Biggs will be provided to the MPA by 22 February 2011.

Report author: Zara Ryder, Strategic Relationships, MPS

Background papers None

Appendix 2

Extract from transcript of the MPA full Authority meeting held on 27 January 2011

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, great, thanks for that. Does anybody have any other questions on the Acting Commissioner's report? No, OK.

We will move on to our next item, which is the Policing London business plan. First of all, some words from me, first on process. I owe you all an apology. It is entirely my fault that the papers for this budget were issued so late. It was a function of the fact that in agreeing this budget this year, as I know you will appreciate, we have been faced with an extremely difficult situation, both in terms of the decisions that are having to be made, but also in terms of the timing, in that the Government settlement and the

timetable around the budget has been extremely tight, and even now, we still do not have complete clarity on where we are, both in terms of final grant settlements for counter-terrorism, Dedicated Security Posts (DSPs) and one or two others. We still have some uncertainty from local authorities around third party income, as well as dealing with some unexpected items which arose at the last minute, not least the Europe, the Middle East and Africa (EMEA) cuts being made permanent and the grant settlement increasing our gap. All of that meant that the negotiations required both with the Government and with the Mayor and between the authority and the service dragged on and on, because there were some very critical decisions that needed to be made in terms of presenting some indications to you today of the direction of travel on the budget. That did not conclude until late last week and hence the work required to put the papers together meant that their issue was a delay. That is entirely my fault. I held them back to make sure that what we presented to you was as complete a picture as possible, so apologies for that.

Secondly, also because of that delayed timetable, you have not - and a number of Members have pointed this out to me, quite rightly - been provided with the detail at this stage that you have been in the past. Now that the work is moving towards complete on the budget - and this is not the end of the process, do not forget, I will talk about that in a minute - that detail in terms of the savings and growth can be made available, because what we are doing today is not agreeing the budget, but agreeing the response to the Mayor's consultation. Following the meeting today, if we agree or if we do not agree, there will then be a joint meeting of the Finance and Resources (F&R) and Strategic and Operational Policing Committee (SOP) on 10 February, which will look in detail at the budget. It then comes to the full authority in February for final approval. That will be after the Mayor's draft budget has been issued, so we will have some clarity from City Hall in terms of where we are on that budget. As I say, the Mayor's negotiations on his budget are still ongoing, and hence our fate is not entirely sealed either from that point of view. So all we are doing today is agreeing the response to the consultation. The Mayor then issues his draft budget, which is presented to the Assembly on 10 February for consultation and he does not finalise it until later in the month. So in terms of process, that is where we are, and the apology and the fault is all mine in terms of the delay.

The second thing I would just like to say is to reiterate to you that although it has been delayed, there has been a huge amount of work over the last six to nine months by a number of Members of the authority, and indeed, officers and senior staff at the service, and I am extremely grateful. It has been very difficult, and much more difficult than any budget round that I have been involved in terms of the level of detail. Chairs of committees, notably Steve, Reshard, Faith and others, Graham on estates and one or two others who have been involved in the process as appropriate have put in a huge amount of work, and we have been through the process line by line over the summer, growth and savings, making sure that we were in good shape. That has resulted in the broad indication of the numbers where you are.

Just in terms of the overall thrust of what is being presented to you today, it has been agreed by the authority at previous meetings that our overriding ambition was twofold: first of all, to maintain operational capacity, particularly in the light of the approaching Olympic Games, but some of the crime charges being faced by the City, and that meant seeking to maintain police officer numbers in particular where we could, but also a secondary ambition was to reduce the number of managers and administrators and increase the number of doers, people out on the frontline, whatever that may be, to make sure that that operational capacity, that public-facing operational capacity and that crime-fighting operational capacity was maintained. There are a number of changes that have enabled us to do that more effectively, not least the removal of the ring-fencing on some particular grants and you will see in terms of the numbers that are presented to you the forecast on Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and staff

numbers across the piece does go some way - or goes a long way - towards maintaining that capacity and fulfilling that ambition. Getting there has not been easy, and there have been a lot of decisions that need to be taken, some of which we discussed at our last authority meeting, not least around borrowing, around our reserve strategy and one or two other issues which have been incorporated into this paper.

You will remember that at the last meeting, we were presented with a gap in the budget and we agreed at that meeting that we would go away and look at certain measures that we could take to close that gap. Pleasingly, the gap has now been reduced very significantly, but we still face a budget gap of about just under £12 million, which on a budget our size is actually a huge achievement. As I said, negotiations are still ongoing about closing that gap, not least with the Government and with the Mayor about their contributions to what we do, not least around the Olympics and one or two others, and I am confident that we will be able to reach a conclusion on those before we come to the February meeting, when we will be completing the budget.

Overall, there will always be issues of detail, which as I say will be provided where people may make finer judgements about the odd Detective Inspector (DI) here or there, or where certain units should be or whether they should be amalgamated or not, but the overall thrust of the budget I think is extremely positive and we are in a much better place budgetary-wise than many other forces across the country in terms of our ability to maintain that critical capacity out on the street. So on that basis, I commend the report to you with the apologies and the caveats that I have put in place, but as I say, just to make clear that we are not agreeing the budget today, we are just agreeing a response to the Mayor for him to enable him to issue his budget on 10 February for consultation, pending final agreement and ratification of the detailed work that will need to take place in committee and at this full authority in February. So that is it from me. Tim or Anne, I do not know if you wanted to say any words of introduction or whether we should just go straight into questions.

Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I think you covered it, perhaps.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Dee?

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes. First of all, can I say that I am completely sympathetic to the process that you have had to go through, because of the delays in grants and I do not for one second underestimate the amount of lack of sleep that Anne and her team must have had. So I understand all that. However, we are a scrutiny body and it is our duty to scrutinise the budget which goes forward in our name. You have just said that we are not being asked to agree the budget today, but just to agree, I think it is appendix 3, the Catherine letter, it contains a paragraph that says,

"The MPA/MPS has considered a number of options for reducing the core budget gap of £61 million. These options are set out in the attached support and have been approved by the authority."

The difficulty is because we have not had anything other than headline figures and we have not had any of the detail that are underlying these headline figures, how do we know first of all if the £61 million should be £200 million, because we simply do not know, and how on earth could we possibly agree that that is correct or not correct? My prime concern, I do not know who takes the decision about what information is given to what they have sent out, but if the information was not available, I would understand, but there is no way that the finance team can produce headline figures without having the underlying information, because the summary sheet follows the detail sheets. This is not about getting into the detail and wondering if it should be a DI or a Detective Sergeant (DS); that is not relevant.

I have got particular problems with the recommendations 1, 2 and 7 and if I could just very briefly go through them, recommendation 1 asks us to note and comment on the amendments since November, but the plan that went through in November was not agreed by the authority, because the up-to-date figures were not available, so I cannot

see how we can possibly comment on a paper which was not agreed. That seems to me to be very, very odd.

Recommendation 2 asks us to note that the budget maintains operational capacity, but we simply do not have the information on which to base this assumption or on which this assumption is based. For example, one of the few pieces of information we have got is a table that shows territorial policing going down by £56 million this year and a proposal that it will be reduced by a further £50 million in the next two years. Now, that may well be a very sensible suggestion, but without having any clue as to where these reductions are supposed to come from, I cannot possibly say whether that is possible, so I cannot see how we could possibly do recommendation 2.

Recommendation 7 is the Catherine letter which I have already referred to. My other point, and it is something that concerns me, but it might not concern other Members, I understand, and indeed you have also reiterated what we already knew, that a number of people from this authority have spent a lot of time on this, I think you said over the summer and since then, and have put in a lot of work and that is great. However, there does seem to me to be a situation whereby some Members have been totally and fully immersed in this and involved in it, and others of us have not been involved at all. Now, I am not suggesting for a second that the budget is dealt with by committee, which would be a complete disaster, but I do think there is a little coterie of people in the know who have had the opportunity to look at all of these things in detail, and then there is the rest of us, who have been given headline figures with 24 hours to look through them and been asked to recommend and to accept these recommendations. I simply, personally speaking, would not feel able under any circumstances to agree this, and I shall vote against it, which I think is a great shame, because it was not necessary.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK. Two things: first of all, it is the nature of the authority that detailed work is often done by smaller groups than the entire authority, so for instance, you are deeply immersed in Olympics funding, no one know more details about that than you.

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): The philosophy of the organisation is that because of the nature of the organisation, we delegate that authority to you and your committee agrees those business cases in detail and then reports up to the authority in headline terms. That is just the nature of the way it works and we do the same with the budget in terms of finance and resources. The Chair of the Financial Resources is delegated with the same authority that you do in terms of agreeing it. Having said that, you are quite right.

Dee Doocey (AM): Sorry, can I just come back on that point, because the fact that the committee that I chair has got delegated authority to do things has been through the authority and has been agreed, and everyone around this table knows who the Members are knows that authority. What I am saying is this is an ad hoc Committee that nobody knows about and nobody knew was happening until you have just announced it today. I think there is a slight difference.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Well, I think that is a little unfair, since we have done exactly the same thing for the previous two years and have reported.

Dee Doocey (AM): I complained in the previous two years as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): In any event, you are quite right. The timing is not ideal and we have not been given the time that is normally required and it has not been done on the usual timetable. So we are in a bit of a bind, frankly. What I am saying is that in many ways, in terms of the budgetary process, we are going through a formal process now which is not entirely necessary, really. The detailed work will come at the F&R and SOP and then we will agree our budget in February. We have shared information informally with the Mayor to allow him to put his budget together. There is no reason why we cannot do that. We can put in Catherine's letter, if you wish, a line that says, "We have not yet had, as Members, enough detail to allow us to properly scrutinise this,

and as long as you are aware of that and that things may change, this is the general direction." But as I say, this has been a both delayed and odd budget process in terms of the fact that things have moved, may still move, so to get into the process has been a bit of a game of musical chairs, and I am afraid this is the best that we have been able to do. So I can only apologise again. Toby was next.

Toby Harris (AM): I am moving the discussion on, which may be your idea, Chair, but I wanted particularly Anne McMeel to comment on what she regards as the risks in terms of this particular budget. It seems to me obviously various judgements have been made, judgements about reserves and so on and so forth within it. It would be useful just to get a statement from her now and perhaps something further when we look at this in more detail on what are the biggest risks in terms of delivering this budget, given the assumptions that are being made within it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Anne?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): Yes, Chair. Clearly this is a particularly difficult budget at the start of the current spending review round over the next four years, and some of the risks are that we got information very late. As you can see from the movement from November, we had some big changes in what we thought was a gap that we were bridging going forward. In terms of finance, which is the main risk that I would be looking at, the risks are that it is a large programme of reductions that we are trying to move through the organisation. Quite rightly, we are trying to keep the focus of those reductions on shifting our costs out of inanimate objects and reducing down our business model, and as has been said, to try and protect the operational capability of the organisation. In an organisation as large as the Metropolitan Police Service, actually shifting some of those costs out and getting those programmes in place to deliver can take a considerable amount of time.

Having said that, a number of the areas that we have focused on are programmes of change that as a service we started looking at two or three years ago, because we knew that whatever happened and whichever Government was in place coming through into the next spending round that there was going to be a tightening fiscal environment within which we worked, and even if there was not, we wanted to be able to shift our resources into areas of operational capability and therefore if there was growth to be had, that we could still reduce down our overall costs in terms of running the business in order to put that resource back out into those frontline services. So in that sense, we are in a good position, ie better position than we would have been. I think we have been very careful to try and build in some resilience into what are ambitious targets in terms of delivering savings. So we have given the business groups those targets, but are holding within the proposals in front of Members today some resilience centrally, because we feel that there are higher risks in some areas than in others. As is always the case in a budget like this - and I would say particularly this year - we have had to make planning assumptions in terms of the scale of reduction that we can make and the timing of implementation, and indeed, as has been said to Members before, a number of the areas that we have had to make those planning assumptions are subject to ongoing reviews, and we do not yet know the outcome of those reviews. So we have built in some resilience, but we have given some very ambitious targets to the service to actually start delivering on these reductions.

What I would also say, and particularly given some of the issues that have arisen since November, which are explained in the report, in order to move the gap down from the £61 million to just about £12 million, we have had to look at financing changes to current policy, and one of the things that we are asking the authority to look at is the current policy of holding a general reserve at least at 2% of net revenue expenditure. Now, if I had been in the authority five years ago or in the service five years ago, I would probably not have been asking the authority to look at that, because we did not have the resilience in our balance sheet in terms of earmarked reserves in terms of some of the risks that we carry. We think, as a service, at the moment that we could

take that risk in terms of bringing down the general reserve balance to about 1.5% against net revenue expenditure on the basis that we do have better internal control in place within the service now. We have better controls in terms of ensuring delivery on what we say that we are going to do on some of these programmes, and we have built up some earmarked reserve resilience in terms of known operational or business risks to us.

One of the other risks that we have said within the proposals in front of the authority now is that whilst at the moment we are forecasting to be broadly on budget this year - and Members will remember that was having to deal with a £28 million reduction in year because of in year grant loss - we are saying that as a service in this last quarter of the year, we will start taking positive management action to try and drive down those costs and generate an £11 million under spend in the current year in order to help protect the position over the next three years.

The other one I suppose we have said to Members is that we, at the moment, do invest to save and some of our programmes have changed through revenue contributions to capital, because we are never quite sure at the start of the year what the split is going to be between capital and revenue on some of the programmes that we are taking forward. What we have agreed with the Chair is that in the current year, we were looking at a revenue contribution of about £28 million to capital, and what we are suggesting is that we could actually borrow for £20 million of that and therefore release that revenue to support the revenue position over the next couple of years.

As I have said, all of those are managing our financial risk. The risk that we have is that we do not introduce new programmes of change to deliver permanent cost reductions over that three-year period in terms of replacing those financial mechanisms by real cost reductions. The reason why we are and have been working with the authority with this package, I would say two things on that. One is that the service is very clear about what it needs to do over the next three years, but as I said earlier, it can take a while for us to get from concept to delivery on some of these programmes, because they are just big programmes, and therefore this gives us that space to actually get the next wave of change programmes in place and delivering. I would also say as well that we will not be in this position next year, because we will have a much better idea than we do now over what our financial framework is going to be over the next four years, which we have not in this current year.

The other issue that I would say in terms of the risks that we are carrying on some of the things that I have mentioned is that we are using that resource over three years and therefore if our planning assumptions do not turn out to be quite right, we have not used all of our resilience financially in year 1, it gives us the ability to look at how we are moving it forward into years 2 and 3, and of course we will be monitoring this very closely as we go forward to ensure that spend is in line with what we are talking about in terms of the budget, and we are looking at how we can change some of our monitoring arrangements to get a much better linkage into some of these big change programmes versus subjective spend.

Could I just make one comment about the comment that I think has been alluded to about us not including business group information here? That was a decision that we took at this point and it is partly in fact, it is wholly - because whilst we can see at the moment what our position is subjectively across the group, we have had to put some health warnings against that, because we still do not know some of the implications of specific grants and other income streams like that. I know it does not help Members, it does not help me in this sense, but actually, those specific grants cut across all of our business groups, so I would have to so heavily caveat anything that I gave you as a business group at the moment until we have actually built up the budget in detail on that that we have not provided it at this point in time. If Members want it with the caveats, we can certainly provide it as it is at the moment for 10 February, but with the proviso that it could change substantially between now and March, when we bring back

the final version of the budget, but in terms of financial risks and management, I hope that has helped. What I would say is that the processes within the Metropolitan Police Service are much stronger now in terms of having a very clear focus from the management board down as to what has to be delivered on these, and monitoring what we are doing so that we can have some surety of delivery.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, thanks, Anne. There is a helpful paper from Bob [Atkins] and Annabelle about robustness and estimates, which we thought would be a useful illustration to you of where we are. Caroline?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Yes. Following on from what Dee said, really we are a scrutiny body, but also a decision-making body. I think if I were to make a decision today, given what everyone has said, there are issues within the paper, things I am concerned about that I do not really want to support today. There are issues around the Basic Command Unit Fund, basically saying, "Well, all that work will have to stop, as it has now been mainstreamed." Actually, that is a lot of partnership work; there is a lot of diversion work. I have concerns about that. I am concerned following my question earlier that your assumptions are you are halving the sergeants and Safer Neighbourhood Teams, which are really supported by local communities, despite the fact your consultation process is still ongoing and our scrutiny is still ongoing, which is why I knew from the start not to go on that, because the decision had already been made and this is just trying to have the paperwork and paper trail to actually justify it. As Dee has already mentioned, over £100 million is coming out of territorial policing, yet we are supposed to say the operational capacity, as far as practical, is being maintained. We do not have the evidence to show us that and that is a huge concern for us. Given the comments Tony was making earlier about Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), actually how much do we fund ACPO?

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): £185,000.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Well, maybe I would like us to have that as an option to take that out of our budget. I am not sure that really is value for money.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): There is an option to increase the MPA savings by that amount.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): So I think that there are lots of issues like that in here. There is also the issue of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) we were asked to look at, and I am quite concerned, particularly around sexual offences, in that area, and I am sure we will have a greater debate about that at some point. You suddenly said today do not worry, you are going to make the decision on 10 February. Well, 10 February, Assembly Members here are spending the day looking at the Greater London Authority (GLA) draft budget through a plenary. We are not going to be able to get to a joint SOP and finance meeting at 2pm. We just will not be able to get there, so we are not going to be able to.

Steve O'Connell (AM): You will be able to get to both. I will have to be at both.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Well, we cannot get to both. Well, one will have to be a lot later, because it does go on.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Clearly, there is time for you, Chair.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I was speaking, actually, Steven. It does go on throughout that day, that meeting, it is not just a morning meeting, because I remember last year having to shift something I had in the afternoon with the Chief Executive of this place. We were going to speak at something at 2pm and we could not.

But finally, I am not happy with this. I will not be able to support it today and I am going to be asking for a named vote so that can be properly recorded in the minutes at the end of the meeting.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, thanks. Jenny has gone. Graham?

Graham Speed (AM): Yes, thank you, Chair. Four points, if I may, but I think first of all to start off by saying that clearly overall we are in a very difficult position. We have a scrutiny role and we have a decision-making role, and as you would have said previously, there is a conflict in there somewhere, but nevertheless we have got to

progress matters. Whilst I can see that there are still things to talk about, there has been a huge opportunity to discuss and review this at the various meetings, joint meetings, full authority briefings that get us to this stage, and clearly it is a dynamic situation that we are in. It is unfortunate we did not have the papers earlier, but it is as dynamic as that, the information, and that is what we have to work with.

The first of the four points relates to paragraphs 22 and 21, and to pick up on Anne's point following Toby's question, and that is in relation to the use of reserves. It does make it quite clear that there is no statutory guidance, but the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), which is the best guidance I suppose we are going to get, is talking about a 2% to 5% range. Hitherto, we have talked about 2% and we are now talking about going to 1.5%, so we are taking a 25% reduction in our reserves, and I think Anne made the point that a few years ago she would not have been suggesting that, but I have some anxiety about a reduction of that sort of level. It does not allow us much of a margin, it seems to me, with further difficulties that may yet arise. There is an argument to say that reserves are there to be used on a rainy day and this is certainly a rainy day situation, but I just wonder whether it really is as prudent to take the reserves down as far as that.

The second point is in relation really to, I think, paragraphs 35 and on to 38, and it is back to this next question of what we define as frontline policing, and I think that is one we are never going to win and we are never going to understand. I have never seen an acceptable definition of that yet, but I do think it is important that we emphasise particularly paragraph 38, which is that there is a preoccupation with frontline policing, frontline officers, whatever that means, and we must not and should not lose sight of the work that goes on across the piece in terms of what policing provides to the people of London.

The third point is in relation to one of the appendices, which I do not quite understand the point that is being made. It is on 6, on page 26, described as, "New initiatives/operational initiatives under CO." It describes a reduction in cost recovery from sporting events, and I was trying to understand what that meant, whether it was an issue that was causing us a problem. Our objective would surely be that you would be looking to maximise what we can in terms of income from policing sporting events, and my understanding was that a lot of work had gone into and was continuing to go into that, but potentially, as I see it, we are not succeeding, and I wonder if there is anything further that we could do with that particular matter.

The last point, Chair, is on appendix 5 of the proposed corporate indicators with the new KPIs. I recall that we have spent a lot of time discussing this this time last year, and I imagine we are going to have relatively little opportunity to discuss it here and now, but nevertheless it is a fundamental change in the approach that is being taken to the monitoring of KPIs. We are asked, I think, in one of the items - I think it is 6 - to comment on the options and the approach to target setting. Just as a suggestion, Chair, I wonder if this might be better tackled at one of our lunchtime sessions, where we might have a better opportunity for a briefing as to the logic behind this and to allow a fuller discussion as to the logic behind it.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): OK, that is a good idea. I think we will do that. We have already agreed that, I think. Anne, did you want to respond on the other points?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources, MPS): A point of clarification, and apologies if the drafting is not clear enough, but in terms of CIPFA and balances, the recommendation for 2% to 5% was actually in a Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) document valuing the policing, which said that CIPFA recommended 2% to 5%, but actually, in the CIPFA bulletin, CIPFA do not accept a case for introducing a generally applicable minimum level of balances and that the chief finance officers should make their own judgements on such matters. So it is down to individual organisations within the context of their overall financial position to take the proper and prudent judgement on what should be there in terms of balances.

The only other one that I would comment on is the CO income. That is not a new initiative in terms of us wanting to have less income. What that is is a reflection that in the past we have put an income target in and as actually CO have got better at some of these events and have less abstraction, we cannot charge as much in terms of cost recovery around that. The income target sits with CO and they cannot now make that target, and therefore it is trying to realign the baseline to a realistic cost base for them.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, just on reserves, in the end, general reserves are broadly for two functions, one to cope with the unexpected, but two to smooth fluctuations in income. One of the issues that we are facing is the frontloading of the savings that we are having to face, so the use of reserves to smooth that with a view that we might in the future hopefully be able to build them back up seems to me a legitimate point to use. The fact that we are maintaining 1.5% is, in my assessment - but also I think in Bob and Anne's - enough to cope with the unexpected that may well come, but at the same time, all of these figures are an estimate. You are making a guess. You just do not know what may hit. There is a philosophy that says you should not carry any reserves because what is the point? It is like self-insuring, but in any event, that is broadly where I think we feel safe. Jennette?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes, Chair. I have just got a general question and that was in the narrative in the section about changing demands from a changing population. Are European Union citizens viewed as minority ethnic in terms of growth? Why I say that is I have been looking at some figures, certainly across the north-east, and the growth there around the police demands has been within a number of Eastern European countries, and if you are putting them into minority ethnic, then that makes sense. If not, I do not know where they are, and I am just not comfortable with throwing in the growth of London black and minority ethnic communities - their communities are predicted to grow faster than others - and then linking it with a growth of criminality, in a sense, it is saying to me. So I just wanted to flag that up, that there are some bits in this that need some further work.

Then can I just say that I am not going to repeat what my colleague Caroline has said, and I think Graham touched on, I welcome your explanation, but that explanation does not take us over the test about governance as an authority. It does not meet the test if we are going to come in behind these recommendations here and it certainly does not meet our test in terms of our role as scrutineers if we do not have the information. As a member of the Olympics Committee, I do not think there is any comparison between the work of that committee, the way it functions, with what we are required to do as an authority. This is not about the Chair being able to be at a place and those Members who are free join in, whether that is the Chair of the authority or the Finance Committee or SOP. This is the most important piece of work that we do as an authority.

Can I just finish by saying also in the context of where we are, where it will be another body that will be charged to scrutinise the documentation that will be coming out of this authority from today, and therefore I do not think that this is a satisfactory situation to be asking for us to sign up to this. So I will be supportive of Caroline's call for a named vote, and also looking to see if we cannot come to any accommodation here regarding these recommendations from (a) to 7, then certainly I will not be able to support the paper in front of us.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Val?

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Yes, thank you, Chair. Yes, I am also going to support Caroline's call for a named vote and I do not support these proposals. If I can comment on the process and the substance, I think I object to the fact that there are massively major cuts being made to the Metropolitan Police Service in London, and I also object to the way it is being done. That is not a comment on you, Chair, but to say that I think the Government has left the Metropolitan Police Service and MPA grappling with a degree of massive turbulence and uncertainty, which has gone on top of what was already an incredibly challenging situation. It has rubbed salt into the wound. I mean, to

have bumped the Metropolitan Police Service's grant down by a further £26 million in December does seem to me to be potentially throwing the Metropolitan Police Service's planning processes into a chaotic situation, and I think it is credit to the staff, the team we have got here that they have managed to pull almost anything from the fire.

I think, very sadly, the way that, Chair - if I may make a comment about your chairing - you have dealt with this, I can understand it, but I do not agree with it, because I think you dealt with it in November, the fact of the massive uncertainties and turbulence and lack of knowledge by trying to keep information out of the public arena, and that was not just unlawful, but I think it is wrong. I think morally it is wrong and I think this occasion what has happened is it has been dealt with by the information not complying with the statutory publication periods. It ought to have been in the public domain earlier, and the reason why I think that is wrong is that actually the public have got a right to know how difficult this whole planning process has been for the Metropolitan Police Service. People should have a window into what is going on with their public money and their public services and that it has been so incredibly difficult, and I do not think you should be ashamed, Chair, of being able to say to the community, "We do not know these things, and actually it is wrong that we do not know these things at this stage" and just to say on the substance of the matter.

I know it will be debated elsewhere in detail, so I am not going to go into too much detail, but I am looking at a paper where it is telling us that the staffing establishment in the Metropolitan Police Service will fall from 53,000 to 49,500 during the end period. I cannot support that. I think the Acting Commissioner said earlier on how the excellent partnership work and preventative work had gone on in London because of the policing over recent years and how effective that has been. I think everybody I deal with in the community would agree with that. The police are enjoying massive public support, in my experience, for the really great work that is going on in the communities in partnership and in prevention. The reason they have been able to do that really good quality work is because the numbers have been there and I will not accept an argument that says it is only about efficiency, it is not about numbers. Numbers matter in terms of being able to do quality work and preventative work and let us be honest about that. I am on the Finance Committee with some of my colleagues and you will know that on that Committee we are really hard on inefficiencies. I want to help this become a really efficient, well-managed organisation. I do not think it is efficient and well managed to cut back essential staff and to do it in such a chaotic way and have to do these cuts so rapidly. Public services cannot make that degree of cuts so quickly without there being real damage done and actually without you losing opportunities for doing well-made efficiencies and reinvestments that allow you to continue good service delivery because of investment in things like IT.

So I regret very much the pressures that have been put on our colleagues here and I have to say I have full confidence in Anne and the Acting Commissioner and their team in dealing with it but this is no way for a government to treat London's Police Service and London's community.

John Biggs (AM): I start by saying I am a sort of two-headed beast as indeed are other Assembly Members here because at the Assembly, I promise to hold the Mayor to account when his budget is not presented and covering the whole range of his responsibilities whereas in our role here as Police Authority Members, our job is to work out, in my opinion, whether the police budget has been properly considered and is a reasonable one that can be presented to the Mayor. So there is a certain sort of contradiction in that relationship obviously.

For that reason and for another reason, I look forward, I think, to the abolition of the Police Authority and the main reason I look forward to its abolition is because I think, inadvertently or otherwise, when the government allows the Mayor to directly appoint the Chair of the Authority, it meant that with the wrong sort of Chair, the Police Authority could be held essentially in contempt by that Chair. I think that is what has

happened on this occasion and I hesitate before saying that but I do believe that is the case and I think the reality is, for good political reasons -- I understand, I am a politician -- you have done this stuff in the background and brought it to us late in the day. I do understand that there are late announcements about budgets. I do recognise this is a very political process as well but I think the reality is that the Police Authority, for the continuing months of its existence, has a legal responsibility to pull together a budget and I do not feel sufficiently equipped to consider the budget, given the shortage of time and, in my view, a lack of information. I do understand that and the Police Authority Finance 'bods' have the will to try to facilitate a good discussion with the Police Authority. It was going to be very difficult.

Secondly, I would reinforce the point that Caroline made that not only will many of us be unable to attend that joint SOP & LR meeting because it clashes with the Assembly but we would be in a somewhat bizarre position that the Police Authority will be ostensibly agreeing its budget after the Assembly has debated and considered the budget that it has thought was being submitted to it. I think that that potentially holds the Assembly and the Mayor and the Mayoralty in contempt because you are, on the face of it, agreeing a budget after you have pretended to present it.

Perhaps that again reinforces the artificiality of the position we are in, which again goes back to my point that I think we are halfway through a transformation and the sooner we are in a more clear position where we can have clearer new accountabilities, maybe the better.

I have two questions of Anne and/or Annabel and they are about matters in the budget. First of all, as a Police Authority Member, I strongly support the resumption of recruitment of police officers because I think there is a real problem for the Service if we have big gaps. It creates a bumpy profile with the employees. It does not bring the right new experience at the bottom and so on, so it is very important; a very welcome development. We have not, as an Authority, had an opportunity to discuss this and whether that is the right decision in all the circumstances although my tendency is to support it as an important development. The question to our Finance people is whether that is a sustainable decision. It may be good management sense from another point of view, as I say, given the other medium-term financial pressures we face with the government's budget settlements going in front of us. The other part of the question is that is part-funded by the deletion of a number of posts and the question is whether there are anticipated to be compulsory redundancies as part of that process.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): I think the answer to the first one is we do not know yet and the answer to the second one is we cannot say yet.

John Biggs (AM): You have had the privilege of many detailed meetings with our Finance Officers but we have not so that is why I am asking in this meeting.

Kit Malthouse (Chairman): Yes, I understand.

John Biggs (AM): I am asking you as Chair conducting the meeting rather than some sort of mouthpiece to allow the Finance Officer to answer the questions.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources): Chair, clearly, the Service was very clear early on in the current year that we were facing a particularly uncertain financial landscape, particularly over this first year of the four-year planning cycle and we did take a decision within the Service to pause both officer recruitment and PCSO recruitment and we did instigate a star chamber approach around all other staff recruitment to ensure that we were not just filling posts without the view to what might be happening in future.

That has given us the ability to maximise, if you like, the prospect of redeployment within the landscape that we are now looking at. It is a difficult one and we have tried to look at this holistically rather than in different categories of staff or officers and one of the issues that we did highlight in November and on which you see more meat on the bone of in this proposal is the fact that the Service, given what is facing, does feel that it needs to maximise its police officer capacity going forward and by doing that, we have had to make some choices with how that would be delivered.

Therefore we have not just taken out some other posts, particularly around PCSOs and traffic wardens. We have actually kept the money from deleting those posts to look at how we can reconfigure the overall policing model to give us that maximum resilience but what that has also done, particularly with the PCSO cadre, is to give us the opportunity and what we are suggesting in this paper, if we get some certainty around the overall budget package, is that we could now start doing some limited officer recruitment, particularly in respect of those PCSO officers who earlier on in the year got partway through the process but did not get an offer.

Now if we do that and we are looking at what the redeployment options are, we are clearly working with our staff and our unions if at all possible to avoid compulsory redundancy. This is why we have tried to look at how we can re-deploy and give the opportunity, either through recruitment to the officer posts or redeployment within the PCSO cadre and other posts that are vacant to see if we can manage that through the system. We cannot obviously give absolute guarantees but we have tried to take the necessary steps to be able to work with the unions to maximise the opportunity in terms of avoiding compulsory redundancies.

John Biggs (AM): As far as traffic wardens are concerned, they will tend not to have the skills to translate into police officers and they will tend to have a higher risk of facing a possible redundancy. Would that be correct?

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources): What I would say on that, John, is that I am not suggesting that all people displaced would go into the officer cadre but actually if you get PCSO officers going into the officer cadre, you then create more flexibility on what is left in terms of the PCSOs. We also have detention officer posts. We have other posts within the organisation and we would work with the unions to maximise the possibilities of redeployment.

As you are aware as well, in December, with the agreement of the Authority, we ran the first voluntary redundancy scheme, the Metropolitan Police Service's one, and indeed through that, some traffic wardens took up the opportunity of taking up a voluntary redundancy and we will be bringing back now that the civil service scheme has been re-launched by the Government. We will be bringing back proposals to the Authority shortly about the next programme of voluntary redundancies in order to maximise the opportunity for redeployment in terms of people who do not want to take redundancy.

John Biggs (AM): Obviously I am sure we would all agree that certainty and ending uncertainty for staff is very important as part of this, if at all possible. The final part of this then is about what you might call a medium term financial strategy which we ought to talk about, sustainability and recruitment in the context of that. The way I read it is that if there was no recruitment we would lose 1,000 to 1,100 officers at the current rate each year. By having limited recruitment, if this were to continue, we will be reducing the service by the order of 600 or so officers each year. Obviously it is one day at a time. Government budgets are a bit like alcoholism I think; it is one day at a time and we do not know what money we will receive next year, although we have a hunch.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources): In terms of 2012, 2013?

John Biggs (AM): Yes.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources): The settlement from the Government in terms of general grant is fairly definite for years one and two. It becomes more of an issue around three and four. We still have uncertainties because we do not know what will be happening for example with the abolition of the National Police Improvement Agency or the creation of the National Crime Agency, and what that would do to budget, particularly over years three and four. I think

John Biggs (AM): We probably are managing a downward movement in police office numbers, given the budget pressure.

Anne McMeel (Director of Resources): The current proposals at the moment in terms of our overall position is a reduction in numbers, but clearly we have looked at how we can minimise that. As I said earlier, what we are focussed on is how we start creating the

next programmes of change that will deliver a reduction in the cost base, always with the aim of trying to maximise our operational capability.

John Biggs (AM): Thank you.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, Valerie Brasse.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Look I will be brief, because I am out of the political arena so I can be. I just wanted to make the obvious point that if we are looking to sign off a budget or agree a budget that is about maintaining or ensuring operational capability we clearly cannot do that without the information that sits underneath it, so I look forward to seeing that in full. I always wanted to make a plea for what I call internal consistency and coherence around this, and how the public perceive all this. One on the hand we have potential cuts and you highlighted the basic command unit fund. Yet, what did you say to us before, Chair? We have the super-über group, the London Crime Reduction Board, whose priority is around partnership working to reduce violence against women, re-offending, so on the one hand we are dropping the means by which we can deliver the priorities of this super über group called the London Crime Reduction Board.

My substantive point was around the corporate headline, KPIs, whatever we want to call them. I am grateful for Graham's suggestion because I do think these need a lot more working through. The reason I say that is because they are headline indicators only. I would not want to sign up to anything that did not also generate the suite that sits underneath that, so that every time we discuss, and how often we discuss - whether it is sexual violence or youth offending, whatever it is - we will see the entire package and agree those at the same time. So we do not agree the top ones, albeit they have to be in the business plan, without knowing exactly what comes in the wraparound with all the indicators underneath. I hope that would not be difficult.

I would also want to say there is nothing magic about having 7, 10 or 12; they really need to say and do what they say on the tin. We hear a lot about VOLT, Victim of (inaudible) Time; none of these indicators seem to pick that way of working up. We are going to be delivering policing around that. We do not talk about re-offending, re-victimisation rates, the number of hotspots where crimes are happening in spades. It does not link to what we say we are about, so that is a plea for the discussion that is going ahead rather than just looking at the individuals.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): That is all for the next stage. Joanne.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I have some sympathy with the timing of this, but I have to say that I have watched some of the budget meetings at the Assembly, and I have seen you, Kit, saying that we are closing that budget gap and you are very confident. I think it is just a shame that we were not updated, as Members of this Authority, as to how you were closing that budget gap. I think, Anne has said that she has to give us some figures that have heavily caveated words to them, but of course incomplete information is actually better than none, because it leaves us all in the dark.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Not necessarily, but I take your point.

Joanne McCartney (AM): But I have concerns, and I have concerns particularly around the prevention agenda that I know all of us feel very strongly about. Other people have talked about the BCU fund and that £8 million that is going to partnership work. If I look at the Safer Schools activity I can see that we are actually losing 32 officers and I incorporate PCs and PCSOs because you are getting rid of all the PCSCs, putting in PCs but not enough. We are losing 32, so that implies to me that 32 schools are going to be losing their Safer Schools Officer or they are going to have to share it. I went to residents' meeting last night and a teacher from Camden said to me they have already been told that their Safer Schools Officer is being shared with another school and it is giving them real concern about their children's safety once they are out of the school gates in particular.

I also note in this same section that deletion of PCSOs are going from diamond districts, which again is a big preventative agenda and there is no information as to whether they are being filled with PCs at all. Today, and I would not have got this from reading this

document, but I have just discovered from Caroline's question that in actual fact over the next two years we are going from 530 sergeants to 230 sergeants in Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and having sat this morning looking at our Safer Neighbourhood scrutiny and trying to make recommendations on it, it just seems to me that has been totally shot out of the water. So I want to know, on that, are you taking that number of sergeants out as an exercise purely in financial savings, or have you actually done the work to say that that reduction in sergeants is going to work and deliver the quality of service we have. Because as I understand it you are still taking part in your review, so it does seem to me to be jumping the gun rather.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, Faith?

Faith Boardman (AM): Thank you Chair. I would like to begin by endorsing the hard work that I know has gone in to getting us this far. Particularly I think from Anne and her team. This is not an easy situation in any sense. Having said that I think I would like to flag up three areas where I would personally like to know more, because we come to the point where we take the final decisions. The first is on the issue of reserves, which is clearly where we are being asked to make quite a significant change in policy. My own feel for that is that I am more content with feeling able to take a decision around the first year than I am around the potential continuing reductions for the second and third. I realise that is very much tied up with the fact we still have gaps for those years to meet, and I am sure we have sufficient time over the next budget round to finish that process. Nevertheless, I would like to understand more about the structure of the reserves, about the risk entailed in that.

My second area was about the numbers which have been helpfully included from paragraph 40 onwards about police officer resilience and officer and staff numbers. I found this helpful but I would still like further detail on it. Partly because in judging whether we're really making the best efforts to keep that resilience, it is not just a matter of pure numbers, there are lots of other factors which are also involved. Just to flag up a few that go through my head. We know is a proportion of officers at any one time that are on back office, rest and recreation-type duties. We know that that is quite high in the Met as compared with other police forces; what are we doing about that? We know that there is work going on on shift patterns, which I very much welcome. That is quite critical to how much of the officer numbers are actually out there on the streets and doing the work that we want them to do at any one time. We have also mentioned management structures about Safer Neighbourhood Teams. My own feel is that actually they are rather more transparent in that area than they are in some other areas and that overall there are some questions to be raised about whether we are perhaps rather more top heavy than other analogous forces, and looking to the second and third years, whether we could actually make some quite legitimate savings in those areas.

There a number of others, but I think we need more depth of information as well as just the headline figures. Perhaps that is something which we could also return to in the lunchtime session that Graham has suggested, which I very much support. I think it is important we do have that lunchtime session on the KPIs because I share a lot of the concerns that have already been raised by colleagues. I would add to those concerns specific ones around the value for money area, where actually we are only being offered the prospect of receiving a balanced budget for which I am grateful, but I think again there is a lot more around how you actually test value for money. I would like us to go further in getting a package of measures that can test that in a fuller sense and draw on the benchmarking with other forces in doing so.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, Cindy?

Cindy Butts (AM): I would like to endorse Faith's earlier comments about the work that has gone into this. I think everyone has acknowledged the complexity and difficult position that everyone has been in. I wanted to particularly take up and extend Caroline's point around the lack of opportunity we have had to really interrogate the

detail behind this and I wanted to extend it to the issue of equality and diversity. The report on page 15 I think quite rightly identifies the potential for significant equality and diversity implications, and talks about the number of Equality Impact Assessments having to rise as a result of all of that. I just think again, it is one of those issues where it is shame that we do not have more detail in relation to the Equality and Diversity impact so we can reassure ourselves as much as is possible that we are doing all we can to mitigate against any negative effects. That might be in relation to the representative nature of the service which we have all worked really hard to develop and would want to maintain, or whether it is about female employees as a result of the changing shift patterns and carers. There is a whole host of things that really we would want to reassure ourselves on, notwithstanding the fact that there are a number of, I think, programmes that are still in development. So there will be answers to some of the questions that will not be there now, but I think there are a great deal more issues that I think we would want to be aware of upfront. I think it is very difficult.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): There is more work to do, there is no doubt about it, but we are at a stage in a process that is not of our making. Well I suppose we have two options really. We will have to take a vote on the current recommendations and if that is not agreed then we will have to either send a response saying, "Here are the numbers as are but we have not had chance to look at the detail yet. We will be doing that over the next month", or just send no response at all. We can decide.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I asked for a named vote, which is in the Standing Order.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, I heard you the first time. What is a named vote? Can we not just put our hands up and see?

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): No, because it will not only be recorded who has voted which way, so you have to do a named vote according to Standing Orders.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): I think we can probably predict, but okay.

Jennette Arnold (AM): (inaudible) this have got an alphabetic list of numbers, they just call us by our names.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We will go round since a lot of people are not here.

Cindy Butts (AM): In view of people's comments are there not any suggestions that you would wish to make in relation to any amendments to the recommendations or are you sticking with them?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): As I said before, if people turn down the current recommendations as they are then we can talk about amendment. Let us vote as we go round. James, do you vote for the recommendations or not?

John Biggs (AM): As the chair, you have responsibilities over the conduct of the meeting. I would have thought, if you are simply saying that you are just going to note everything that has been and to hell with it then that is a pretty significant non-statement if you like.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, that is not what I said.

John Biggs (AM): Are you in no way, as Chair of the Authority which has a duty to this board, if you like, persuaded by any of the arguments you have heard that you should look at the timetable, consider whether we need to have an emergency meeting? What are the options in your mind?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Well I said all that at the start and during the meeting. I know you popped out for a while but I have said that. What I have said is that I think we should go round, we can decide whether we

John Biggs (AM): Specifically then, if there is to be a meeting after the Assembly has received the budget that does seem a bit sort of ridiculous, so how would you address that concern? The fact that you are holding the Mayoralty of Assembly in some contempt.

James Cleverly (AM): My understanding is that we are going to vote on the proposals. If those are not agreed then we are going to discuss how we do move forward, but we have in front of us an option to move forward, which from some of the conversations,

Members are not happy with. We are going to vote on that and if they are not agreed then we can discuss how we do move forward.

John Biggs (AM): Okay.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Caroline asked for a named vote on the proposals, I am going for the named vote on the proposals, un-amended, because I presume she wants to make a point, as you do. So let us have the named vote.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Sorry, can I just ask Chair, are we actually asked only now to look at the MPA's response to the Mayor's draft? Is that what is being asked of (overspeaking)

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes.

Valerie Brasse (AM): un-amended, or are you offering (overspeaking)

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Everything else is nothing.

Valerie Brasse (AM): No, are you offering an amendment to that response/

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, hold on.

Valerie Brasse (AM): Okay, as is, all right.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Let us just get this clear. My assumption is, Caroline asked, right at the start, for a named vote on the recommendations as they currently stand and the letter as it currently stands. That is what we are going to have. We will then talk, I am happy then to offer options, about something that people may be willing to do, but there are lots of people who want to make a point here today. We are all alive to that, this is a very political situation, people want to make a point. Far be it for me to suppress people's press releases.

Cindy Butts (AM): Which is why I asked whether or not you wanted to make amendments first, because there are some of us who do not want to get involved in that.

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): Chair, can I just say that there are some of the recommendations that we do not need to vote on today. For example, the sixth, which is the draft KPIs. Taking Valerie's point, that can be discussed at the later point. So today it is mainly about the finances people are concerned about.

Steve O'Connell (AM): To be helpful Chair, I think we do need to look at that list of recommendations and then ask Members to pull out the ones that we are not actually making a decision on and actually drill down on the ones that we need, particularly noting Catherine's letter.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): There is not much difference there.

Steve O'Connell (AM): I know it is a bit convoluted but ... and we need to have a chat about the timetabling, which is an important point.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): It seems a bit odd to me, but okay. Dee?

Dee Doocey (AM): On a point of information, first of all, the reason I am not going to vote for this is not political. It is because I have not had the information on which to base a judgment. It is absolutely not political, I will say that in front of anybody. It is because I do not feel that I can carry out my scrutiny role. So please do not just do a throwaway remark that we are doing this for politics. I am not and I can speak for my colleague Caroline who is certainly not. Others can speak for themselves. The other thing which you have just said to Valerie - that we are only voting recommendation seven - I think you need to clarify, as Reshard has just said, whether it is just recommendation seven or if it is the other recommendation. Finally, before we vote, because the reason Caroline has asked for a named vote is so that we can say that we are not voting for this because we cannot carry out our scrutiny role, is there nothing - to take the point that Cindy made - that you can do to change this letter to say that we cannot possibly say whether it is right or wrong because we have not seen it?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Well that was the second stage I was coming to. Maybe I have misinterpreted people's motives, but there has been a lot of

Dee Doocey (AM): I think you have.

James Cleverly (AM): Why a named vote?

Caroline Pigeon (AM): It is the only it is recorded in the minutes.

Dee Doocey (AM): We want to record that we will not vote for this

Kit Malthouse (Chair): You are making a point.

Dee Doocey (AM): if we do not have time to scrutinise it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): All right, look, I am relaxed about it from that point of view. My assumption was that a lot of the proposals are about noting, which is, you can note it, it does not necessarily mean you agree with it but you note it. There are a couple of substantive things in there that are to be agreed, so for instance, the change in policy on general fund balances; recommendation two needs to be agreed; we can agree, not agree or amend the letter; I was going to come to that as a second stage. If you want to take a named vote on each of the eight recommendations and then try and amend the ones you do not want I'm not clear about what you are after.

Dee Doocey (AM): Sorry, I promise you, this is the last time I will speak. We cannot note number two, that despite a challenging fiscal environment, the budget proposals maintain operational capability, because we do not know if they do or they do not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Right. Okay.

Dee Doocey (AM): So it is just a question of, we can just note everything. You cannot note something that do not have information on which to base a judgement.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): Just vote on the lot unless you have no suggestion; just vote on it en masse. Unless anyone wants anything pulled out, I do not see ...

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Well, the issues I suppose are that we could amend the letter to put in the caveat around the fact that we have not yet done the detailed work and that will be done over the next month. We could put a line to that extent in the letter if people are content that satisfies the niceties of what we are submitting.

Dee Doocey (AM): Maybe what Catherine came out with the last time might be appropriate, I do not know.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Maybe we could put in,

"The MPA agreed that the papers reflected the work in progress on the preparation of the budget and that it be submitted to the Mayor's office to comply with the legislative requirements, while recording that the contents are neither agreed or endorsed by the Authority as further details are still required. In addition a transcript from the Authority has been included as part of the submission in order that the Mayor is clear of the issues raised by Members in response to the consultation document."

Dee Doocey (AM): That is perfect.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Happy? All right, we will put that in letter. Number one then is noted. Are we happy to note number one?

Sorry, are we taking these item by item or en bloc?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Well what I am trying to do is get to a position where we can have a named vote. You are now confusing me. Maybe I am being thick and tired, but I thought we wanted to get to a position now, I am being told by Members, where they would like a compromised position to vote on.

Steve O'Connell (AM): Indeed, and I think we should work through the recommendations accordingly, which you were just doing.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): So we will take them one by one and then we can decide. So number

Dee Doocey (AM): Okay, fine.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): So number one, we note the comment on the amendments to the Policing Plan, principally on the revised budget gap following the police consultation on the publication of the Mayor's draft budget for consultation 2010(?).

It was not agreed.

Dee Doocey (AM): We cannot comment on amendments that we do not have the details of.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, but there is a form of words now going into the letter that caveats

Dee Doocey (AM): The letter refers to recommendation seven.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes. Well we can put the same caveat in number one if you like.

Dee Doocey (AM): Yes.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Number two, we note that despite the challenging fiscal environment the budget proposals

Valerie Shawcross (AM): I have no idea what we are voting on now. Was that a vote or not Chair?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Can we say, vote

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Chair, can I propose that we start off by a vote en bloc?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, everybody said they did not want to do that, Val. So we are not going back to that.

Valerie Shawcross (AM): Well I do not want to vote on something unless I have the wording in front of me.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Right, number two, we could say, the budget proposals seek to maintain operational capability.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): Do not know if they do. Absolutely not.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Do you just want to take number two out?

Dee Doocey (AM): Absolutely.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Number two is out.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Number three, agree the proposals to manage down although not close completely the budget gap over the planning period and the need to identify and deliver permanent cost reductions as quickly as is practically possible to close the budget gaps in future years (several inaudible words)

No.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Not happy with that?

I want to vote against it.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): You know the wording, Jane, that you just read out to go in the letter? Could that not just be what we approve today? I would forget all of these and just that wording is actually our

Dee Doocey (AM): Everything.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): It says we do not agree this.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Hold on a minute, let us just continue the process that we are in. So three is out, we will take out three. Subject to recommendation two we cannot agree that because two is out. Five, note that work continues to identify options to close the current budget gap.

Dee Doocey (AM): We do not know what the gap is.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): No, but we still note that work continues. We can leave out the number. We are not commenting on KPIs are we?

No.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, that is out. Approve the MPA's response to the Mayor's draft budget as amended, with the insertion of the agreed words.

Dee Doocey (AM): The wording of that recommendation needs to be changed to reflect the wording that Jane has come up with.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, that is what I am saying. We approve the MPA's response subject to the insertion of this wording.

Dee Doocey (AM): No, we do not approve it

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We are approving the response.

Dee Doocey (AM): We are sending forward the response, I think, rather than approving it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Agree to send forward the response as amended. Note the report that has been shared with the Mayor pending formal consideration of the budget, detailed budget and business plan via the Authority.

Dee Doocey (AM): I think that should come out. I do not think that adds anything. (overspeaking) an issue of fact.

That is an issue of fact, yes.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I just check that recommendation one stands but at the end we are adding the wording again, about not endorsing it.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes.

Jennette Arnold (AM): So you have ended up with one and eight, is that right?

Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman): One, seven and eight.

Dee Doocey (AM): Seven as amended.

Jennette Arnold (AM): Can you read the amendment.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We have agreed the amendment, do you want me to read it again?

Jennette Arnold (AM): Yes please.

"The MPA agreed that the papers reflected the work in progress on the preparation of the budget and that it be submitted to the Mayor's office to comply with the legislative requirements, while recording that the contents are neither agreed or endorsed by the Authority as further details are still required. In addition a transcript from the Authority has been included as part of the submission in order that the Mayor is clear of the issues raised by Members in response to the consultation document."

John Biggs (AM): I really do not want to delay the meeting, but is there not a question about our legal duty to produce a budget at some stage? Is there not a legal duty for us to provide one to the Mayor?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): We will satisfy our legal duty when we agree the final budget at the Authority meeting in February.

John Biggs (AM): So after the Assembly has

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Although more likely March. As long as we do it before the beginning of the financial year we are fine.

John Biggs (AM): So after the Assembly has considered whatever budget we send to them

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Well no, the Assembly will consider the draft budgets on 10 February; that is not the final. The final budget comes later, as you know. There is a second meeting when the Mayor

Dee Doocey (AM): We do need to do something about the timing.

John Biggs (AM): This is quite legally important because if the Assembly - it is unlikely this will happen - was not to make any amendments to the budget on 10 February then that will become the final budget, so we are submitting to the Assembly a budget which is not a final budget.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): What the Mayor does is tell us how much money we have. The Mayor just gives us the envelope. It is for us to decide, and we can do nothing about that. I have been putting forward a case we should have more money and I won some of that argument and we will have more money from the Mayor. Us saying we are going to set a budget that is more than the Mayor is going to give us then we have a problem. The detail that Dee is saying is about the decisions; do we spend it on this or do we spend it on that? Those are the details that I presume people want. That does not affect the overall envelope that we are given and as long as we set that budget within that envelope before the beginning of the financial year, we are fine. I have been doing budgets for many years John; I have not yet fallen foul of any legal problems. I do not intend to this year, subject to your cooperation.

Okay. On that basis

Dee Doocey (AM): Sorry Chair, five was also agreed but we took out the figure.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes the figure is coming out. So on that basis do we still need the named vote?

I think we should.

What is the point?

Kirsten Hearn (AM): I am totally confused. I would like you to read out the recommendations we are now agreeing, slowly, because I do not have what you have

now got in front of me. I am having huge difficulty with this process because like the rest of my colleagues, it is difficult. If we do not have information how can we make the decision, and my information has not been accessible.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, well I am happy to read it out again. We have got basically three recommendations. The first recommendation reads:

(1) Members note and comment on amendments to the policing plan since submission to the Mayor in November 2010, principally on the revised budget gap following the police grant settlement and the publication of the Mayor's draft budget for consultation in December 2010. The MPA agreed that the papers reflected the work in progress on the preparation of the budget and that it be submitted to the Mayor's office to comply with the legislative requirements, while recording that the contents are neither agreed or endorsed by the Authority as further details are still required. In addition a transcript from the Authority has been included as part of the submission in order that the Mayor is clear of the issues raised by Members in response to the consultation document." Recommendation (2) will be to approve the MPA's response to the Mayor's draft budget proposals as contained in appendix 3, although appendix 3 is now amended with the inclusion of that same paragraph that begins, "The MPA agreed that the papers reflected the work in progress". So that goes into the letter from Catherine. Then the final

Joanne McCartney (AM): There is a paragraph to be taken out that that then replaces?

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Yes, absolutely. Then the final recommendation is that, members note that this report has been shared with the Mayor pending formal consideration of the budget and business plan by the Authority. No we are not including that anymore, and that's it.

Caroline Pidgeon (AM): I withdraw my request for a named vote but I would certainly like mine and Dee's votes to be recorded accordingly, which can be done according to Standing Orders as well.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): For or against? Right, do I have agreement to those recommendations?

All: Agreed.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Okay, and we record that Dee and Caroline specifically agreed.

Dee Doocey (AM): Voted in favour will do Chair.

Kit Malthouse (Chair): Can I just make one final point on the budget that when we come back to the detailed work on this, if people have particular problems or objections to items that are in the budget that they think need changing, they need to come with the other side of the entry. So it needs to come with a growth and a saving; it cannot come with just the growth.

Dee Doocey (AM): Provided we have the figures on which to base that.

Metropolitan Police Authority: Website archive

Warning: This is archived material and may be out of date. The Metropolitan Police Authority has been replaced by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). See the [MOPC website](#) for further information.

Minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the **Metropolitan Police Authority** held on 24 February 2011 at City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA.

Present

Members

- Kit Malthouse (Chairman)
- Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
- Tony Arbour
- Jennette Arnold
- John Biggs
- Victoria Borwick
- James Cleverly
- Dee Doocey
- Toby Harris
- Kirsten Hearn
- Neil Johnson
- Jenny Jones
- Clive Lawton
- Joanne McCartney
- Steve O'Connell
- Caroline Pidgeon
- Amanda Sater
- Valerie Shawcross

MPA officers

- Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive)
- Bob Atkins (Treasurer)
- Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive)

MPS officers

- Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner)
- Anne McMeel (Director of Resources)

68. Apologies for absence and announcements

(Agenda item 1)

68.1 Apologies for absence were received from, Christopher Boothman, Cindy Butts, Graham Speed and the Commissioner.

69. Declarations of interests

(Agenda item 2)

69.1 No declarations of interest were made.

Resolved – That

1. **the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table above, be noted;**
2. **the gifts and hospitality received by members, as set out on the Authority's gifts and hospitality register, be noted; and**
3. **all members declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above items listed in the table above and including any interest arising from gifts or hospitality received in the last 3 years or which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality.**

70. Minutes: 27 January 2011

(Agenda item 3)

70.1 Members considered the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 27 January 2011.

70.2 As a matter arising, from minute 63 'Policing and Social Responsibility Bill, members asked the Chairman to ensure that there was engagement with members on the transition from the MPA to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). It was agreed that the Chief Executive would ensure that members had access to Business Management Group notes and the Chairman reminded members that this issue would be a standing item on the Strategic and Operational Policing Committee agenda.

Resolved – That the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 27 January 2011, subject to the requested amendment, be agreed and signed as a correct record.

71. Chairman's update

(Agenda item 4)

71.1 The Chairman congratulated the Commissioner and his team on a number of recent successes. These included the policing of a number of significant protests, including the student protests at the end of January which was successfully managed despite escalation to a political protest outside an embassy and a march through the West End.

71.2 In acknowledging a number of pieces of excellent work undertaken by the MPS officers, the Chairman highlighted two examples including.

- The partnership award gained by Newham for work between local police officers and the Ahmaddiya Mosque.
- The team from Operation Rize, (the investigation into the use of safe deposit boxes to hide criminal assets), which won the Keith Hughes Team Award for excellence in financial investigation. In doing so it was noted that Operation Rize had to date resulted in over 130 arrests and the return of £13 million of criminal assets to the public purse.

71.3 The Chairman then proved a brief update on the progress of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill (PRSR). This included:

- The House of Commons committee stage of the PRSR Bill concluded last week. A team of MPA officers attended the sessions on a rota basis to track the progress of the Bill and senior MPA officers continue to meet with Home Office officials to explain potential consequences of the Bill. The internal MOPC implementation programme continues to progress and a London working group has been set up, chaired by the MPA Chief Executive, which would report to the next ministerial PCC transition board in March.
- An amendment was tabled during the committee stage of the PRSR Bill to allow compulsory alcohol sobriety be given as a court order during sentencing. Whilst the amendment was withdrawn, there was a useful discussion which the Mayor hopes will continue as the Bill progresses through Parliament. A paper on the Mayor's compulsory sobriety proposals was on the agenda for this meeting.

71.4 The Chairman informed members that the MPA was contributing to the shared service agenda and one very positive outcome to date was that the MPA are about to enter an agreement to provide internal audit service for the GLA.

71.5 He confirmed that he had attended the launch of a knife bin in Victoria and met some of the Bexley special patrols with the Mayor. He also added that he had chaired a productive Joint Engagement Meeting (JEM) with Camden borough.

71.6 He concluded his report by informing members that the work of the London Crime Reduction Board continues to progress well and the Board is working with the GLA to ensure effective dispersal of the Community Safety fund and other funding received for a new youth crime programme from the Home Office.

71.7 Members sought from the Chairman clarification on how the proceeds of crime are allocated. He confirmed that one sixth of the money was returned as part of the incentivisation scheme around the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA), 50% goes to the Home Office, two sixths goes to the Ministry of Justice and the Crown Prosecution Service, with a third going to the MPS. This third goes to a disbarment group which report to the MPA. The Chairman added that he felt that the current arrangement was not advantageous to the MPA/MPS, given that the cost of recovery falls to the organisations. He added that there were ongoing discussions with the Government about review this current allocation.

71.8 In noting the award to Newham for partnership¹ between local police officers and the Ahmaddiya Mosque, members wanted to note that whilst, front line policing was important this award reflected the equally important issues of prevention work and engagement with the community.

71.9 Regarding the effective disbursement of the Community Safety Fund and other funding received for a new youth crime programme from the Home Office, members asked the Chairman if he felt that this process was contrary to the localism agenda. They also asked if there was an overall reduction in the Community Safety Fund and if so, would this be allocated to boroughs pro rata. The Chairman confirmed that the Fund had been reduced by approximately 20% and that as this had arrived late in the budget process. He had written to borough leaders saying that the intention was to allocate the money to boroughs, pro rata, but there was a need for them to inform the Authority on what they planned to spend the allocation on. He also informed members that he would be discussing with local authorities how to better spend money together more strategically to try to deliver some joint outcomes.

71.10 Members suggested that they had seen some information that indicated some boroughs (Enfield was specifically cited) would be receiving 'nil' from the Community Safety fund. The Chairman said he did not believe that any borough was receiving 'nil', but asked that this is checked. Members asked the Chairman to clarify what pro rata allocation of the Fund meant and was it based on the previously used Home Office

criteria. The Chairman acknowledged that some boroughs might have already budgeted the money from the Fund and that this would cause some problems, but stressed that it was important that from a governance point of view there was clarity on what it was being spent on. The Chairman agreed to circulate to all members a copy of the letter that had been circulated to borough leaders.

71.11 In response to members, the Chairman agreed that he would append details of meeting he has attended in his capacity as Chairman of the Authority to future reports and that when undertaking visits to borough ensure that MPA borough link members are informed of those visits.

71.12 Following a further discussions on the possible in put by members in the transition of the MPA to the Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime (MOPC), the Chairman agreed that once the Policing Reform and Social Responsibility Bill had progressed further through Parliament, it would be useful to hold a members away day to discuss this matter.

71.13 The Chairman proposed that in light of the forthcoming Royal Wedding on 29 April 2011 and the need for senior officers to be involved in preparations for the policing of this event the full Authority meeting on the 28 April 2011 be cancelled. Members agreed to this and asked if the meeting could be bought forward, a week to 21 April. It was agreed that officers would check members availability for that date but if a significant amount of members could not attend that date then there would not be a meeting held in April.

Resolved – That the report be received.

72. Acting Commissioner's report

(Agenda item 5)

Performance issues

72.1 The Acting Commissioner presented a report summarising recent performance in the MPS, as well as operational and initiatives designed to tackle crime and make London safer.

72.2 The Acting Commissioner informed members that total crime performance was slightly down and highlighted the following areas:

- Violence with injury – down nearly 6%
- Knife crime, where an injury has occurred – down nearly 3%
- Overall gun crime down to nearly 18% (514 fewer offences)
- Firearm discharges down by 8.3%
- Domestic violence shows a reduction of 5.2%
- A decrease in hate crime (but there was a caveat of underreporting).

72.3 The Acting Commissioner informed members that the MPS remained committed to maintaining community safety units and reminded them that there were currently 569 specialist hate crime investigators across the 32 boroughs. He added that following the murder Ian Baynham, the MPS were focusing on making contacts with various groups and communities to ensure that they had the confidence to come forward and report any hate crimes in order to prevent such incidents occurring.

72.4 The Acting Commissioner turned to a number of challenging areas.

72.5 He reported that burglary remained a concern. Whilst burglary was declining by 1.5%, there was concern around serious acquisitive crime. He stated that Operation Bumblebee was focusing on those that are committing this crime.

72.6 There was concern around serious acquisitive crime, which included vehicle crime and robbery, the Acting Commissioner confirmed that this had increased by 2.5%, which had increase for the first time in quite some time. He believed that vehicle crime

increased could be linked to scrap metal values and that Territorial Policing are looking at this.

72.7 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that the MPS were revisiting Operation Blunt 2 initiatives in order to maintain the commitment towards taking weapons off the street.

72.8 The Acting Commissioner was sad to report another youth homicide, that of Daniel Graham, which bring the total to four so far this year. He reassured members that the MPS remained continually focused on this matter in order to prevent any further deaths.

72.9 A counter terrorism campaign to raise awareness and vigilance, focusing on re-publicising the MPS anti terror hotline had been launched. He was pleased to report that there had been a 40% increase in calls from March 2011 compared to March 2010.

72.10 The Acting Commissioner informed members of a number of public order events, including protests at the Egyptian and Libyan embassies, sporadic events involving UK uncut and the planning for larger events such as the Trade Union Congress march on 26 March 2011.

72.11 The Acting Commissioner noted that there was an item later on the agenda regarding the budget, but confirmed that it was the MPS intention to re-commence recruitment for police officers from 14 March and a starting point will be taking existing Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). He confirmed that there were 210 PCSOs who had passed the selection process and who had been waiting for recruitment to begin. He added that the MPS would be encouraging other PCSOs to apply, after which the MPS would be looking at the new scheme involving Specials as well as PCSOs.

Issues raised by members

72.12 Members had submitted a number of questions in advance of the meeting.

72.13 In order to allow full consideration of a number of other items on the agenda a number of members agreed to receive a written response to their questions to the Acting Commissioner. These included the submitted questions on:

- Mounted police
- Impact of cuts on youth crime prevention

Reducing bureaucracy to increase visible policing

72.14 Members asked the Acting Commissioner that as well as rebalancing the proportion of managerial positions to frontline policing in SNTs, what else could be done to reduce the amount of bureaucracy and inefficiency in the MPS

72.15 The Acting Commissioner noted that the question referred to a wide remit and outlined a number of initiatives where the MPS had or was working to reduce of bureaucracy and inefficiency. This included the introduction of evidence by video conference link to Croydon Court, which should free up approximately 1,200 police days a week and work being undertaken to streamline forensic process. He agreed that a more detailed briefing could be provided around efficiencies and reductions in bureaucracy.

Sergeant Meeke & local policing

72.16 Members drew attention to the work of Sergeant Kyra Meeke and her emphasis on local policing, on Arnos West estate in Southgate Green Ward, Enfield. In congratulating Sergeant Meeke, they asked the Acting Commissioner what lessons could be taken from the example set by Sergeant Meeke.

72.17 The Acting Commissioner also congratulated the work undertaken by Sergeant Meeke and that he would be speaking with the Enfield borough commander about this excellent work by the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and how and where this good practice could be shared. Arising from the discussion, members felt that this type of initiative working highlighted the excellent partnership work undertaken by Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams

72.18 Members asked a number of questions regarding Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) and these included:

- What is the total budget for SNT in 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13, broken down into total staff costs, and any other on costs, Safer Neighbourhood Bases and any other associated costs?
- What are your future plans for the work currently being carried out as part of the Diamond Districts initiative? What provision is there within the budget for 2011/12, and 2012/13 for this work?
- Are decisions about the structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, the levels of supervision, and the numbers of officers and PCSOs, an operational matter?
- Will a directly elected police commissioner be able to direct the police numbers allocated to every safer neighbourhood team, or is this an operational matter for the Commissioner?

72.19 The Acting Commissioner provided members with a breakdown of the total budget for SNT and agreed to circulate these to members. The Acting Commissioner added that the current medium term financial plan would see a reduction of 100 sergeants for 2011/12 and 200 sergeants in 2012/13.

72.20 Regarding the diamond districts initiative, the Acting Commissioner, confirmed that an evaluation of this initiative was being concluded by experts and criminologist soon. He added interim work was already taking place with government about the future of diamond districts and if they could be maintained going forward into the next financial year. He acknowledged that there were areas that had shown a great deal of good practice, but stressed that 'one size did not fit all' in the matter and that there might be a need to look at working with re-offenders with community input, but at this stage he awaited the outcome of the evaluation.

72.21 The Chairman added that there was a scheduled members' briefing taking place on 10 March on diamond districts.

72.22 In regard to the questions relating to safer neighbourhood team structure and numbers and if these were an operational matter, the Acting Commissioner said that that there had been a lot of discussion at Authority meetings on what does operational independence mean. He reminded members that parliament was currently discussing proposals for governance of policing and that this may include what is meant by operational independence. He added that the issue for the MPS was that direction and control along with the conduct, use and deployment of staff should be a matter for the Commissioner.

72.23 In relation to PCSOs, the Acting Commissioner stated that there were no clear demarcations. The MPS, with the Authority, had established PCSOs and both organisations were passionate about this form of policing. As this form of policing was reliant on funding negotiations between the Authority, the Mayor and Home Office in order to deliver it there had to be proper negotiations. In response to members, he added that, it would be foolish in terms of decisions taken not to go through the process of engaging with the Authority and coming to a joint conclusion, as evidenced with previous safer neighbourhood discussions.

Use of CS spray

72.24 Following an incident where CS spray was used against a protester on Oxford Street on the 30 January 2011, members asked the Acting Commissioner if he felt that this was necessary and proportionate and if he was concerned that this may set a precedent for this response in future.

72.25 The Acting Commissioner stated that it was a decision made by the officer who was accountable to show that the use was proportionate based on the perceived threat. As this matter was sub judice the Acting Commissioner would not comment further

Safer Transport Command/ Red Routes

72.26 Members asked the Acting Commissioner what the replacement of traffic wardens and PCSOs and traffic wardens with officers in the Safer Transport Command would mean for road policing and enforcement. Members also asked for information regarding TfL red routes and PCSO powers to legally conduct enforcement, how would the MPS going to meet its obligated to TfL to do this work. Members also asked the Acting Commissioner how red route enforcement would take place without traffic wardens.

72.27 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that there would still be traffic PCSOs within the Safer Transport Command and that the 2010/11 contract to provide Safer Transport Command included 210 traffic warden posts. The 210 traffic warden posts would be replaced by traffic PCSOs and by police officers and the traffic warden PCSOs would have the same powers as a traffic warden and more. He stated that this would mean that they could deal with such issues as cycling on the pavement, bylaw offences and other nuisance and anti social behaviour offences and this would include a wider range of powers including enforcement of red routes. The Acting Commissioner confirmed that there was a review of the service delivery model for roads policing and enforcement activity with TfL and initial responses indicated that TfL were content with the revised model.

72.28 In response to members, the Acting Commissioner stated that the proposed model would see approximately 89 fewer people, but there would be people with more powers than current traffic wardens who would be able to enforce more issues such as safety and antisocial behaviour, which are a key objective set by the Authority.

72.29 Members asked the Commissioner if this change was going to cost more and would they require extra training. The Acting Commissioner confirmed that the amount of money being paid by TfL would be slightly less than in previous years and they would require additional training. He agreed to circulate to members details of the business case for the Safer Transport Command and replacing traffic wardens.

Other questions raised by members

Increase in knife crime

72.30 As outlined by the Acting Commissioner in his performance information to members, members noted and asked for further comment on the increase in knife crime. In particular members suggested that prevention is detection and a key deterrent that people would think they would be caught. They also asked the Acting Commissioner to comment on what he thought were the challenges in this area.

72.31 The Acting Commissioner reiterated that the rise in knife crime was linked to robbery and that this was a challenge to the MPS. He also informed members of a number of initiatives to tackle this crime and this included Blunt 2, which had seen a reduction in weaponry on the streets and which in certain hot spot areas, had seen the reintroduction of Section 60. He confirmed that Territorial Policing was looking at the offender make up in those robberies where an intimidated knife threat was made (this is a recorded as a knife crime) and that the MPS knew that there were in the region of 130 individuals probably responsible for approximately 950 robberies. He added that in this respect a great deal of work was being undertaken with partners to address this increase.

72.32 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that detection and arrest rates were now increasing. He agreed with members that detection as deterrent was an aim, but this remained a challenge in terms of how those individuals were processed through the criminal justice regime. He added that it was about working to disrupt offenders and

ensuring that they were held to account for their activities, with a main emphasis of focusing on prolific offenders.

72.33 In response to members he confirmed that the detection rate was currently around 20%, but there was reluctance, mainly from young people, to stand the test of the process in terms of fear as a witness and the MPS were working on this issue. He agreed that the change in the economic climate could be a factor in this increase in knife enabled crime.

SNT Sergeants

72.34 Members informed the Acting Commissioner that at a recent meeting the Mayor called for 'a new geometry of Safer Neighbourhood Teams'. Some members felt that this represented a reduction of 100 sergeants from 2011/12 and the 200 the following year. The Mayor had also suggested that 'only experienced sergeants would be tasked with the leadership or supervision of two or more Safer Neighbourhood Teams'. Members asked the Acting Commissioner if there was an agreed definition covering the roles and responsibilities, competencies, training and time spent in the service that would constitute an experienced sergeant. Members also asked the reorganisation of Safer Neighbourhood Teams could see a loss in consistency from sergeants. They also sought reassurance around the tenure of teams under the proposed arrangements. Members indicated that if the Acting Commissioner was not in a position to answer all the questions they would be happy to receive a written response.

72.35 The Acting Commissioner stated that in terms of experience he anticipated that this would form part of the selection process in future and he agreed to circulate to members any supporting criteria for doing this. In terms of consistency and tenure for officers, he stated that at the outset of safer neighbourhood policing the aim was to ensure teams stayed together for two year tenure. In terms of every neighbourhood having a sergeant, the proposal was that this will remain but that sergeants may have more citizens than they had before and he hoped that they would still have the same availability and accessibility. He added that this was about reducing management on cots which, in the current financial climate was something the organisation had to do.

72.36 Members asked the Acting Commissioner if this proposal was already being put in place, particularly as the MPA review of safer neighbourhoods had not submitted its findings.

72.37 The Acting Commissioner reiterated that the proposals were a management on cost reduction and that the budget for 2012/13 was very much work in progress. If the safer neighbourhood review was to present different outcomes then there would be a need to reconsider this.

72.38 Members asked the Acting Commissioner about how was transparency to the public about these developments being expressed. The Acting Commissioner confirmed that proposal for SNT were being submitted through the Authority's Strategic and Operational Policing Committee.

Diamond districts

72.39 Following from the submitted question on diamond districts, members asked the Acting Commissioner to comment on the initiative by the Ministry of Justice, which was being piloted in Manchester and Croydon and Lewisham, around a payment by results scheme. The scheme aimed to work with partners aiming to reduce reoffending and which acknowledged that offending did produce a significant cost across society and boroughs.

72.40 The Acting Commissioner informed members that, working with the Authority, the MPS had for sometime been making a case in London about the term justice reinvestment. He stated that of the 16,000 offenders released, approximately, 60% to 70% would reoffend in the first year and it was important that this cycle must be broken. He added that one of the challenges round diamond districts was that contact

between offenders on release was with the police with most arrests around possession of Class A drugs.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams

72.41 Arising from the submitted questions on safer neighbourhood teams, members referred to comments made by the Chairman of the Authority on the Politics Show on 10 February 2011, where he was asked if both the Mayor and he could guarantee safer neighbourhood teams would remain in every ward. Members asked the Acting Commissioner if safer neighbourhood teams were guaranteed in every ward why had that decision not been shared with the Authority.

72.42 The Acting Commissioner reiterated that he awaited the final outcomes of the review of safer neighbourhood policing. In terms of operational independence and safer neighbourhood teams as mentioned previously this would be an issue particularly around funding where there would have to be negotiation. For other matters such as abstractions and deployments these were operational matters for the Commissioner. In relation to the make-up of safer neighbourhood teams the Acting Commissioner stated that he had to be aware of the need to change if there was evidence to that effect and following the outcomes of the review that would be negotiated through the Authority.

MPS meetings with News of the World

72.43 At the last meeting of the Authority members had asked for details of meetings held between MPS officers and staff from the News of the World. Members had been sent a list of meetings that had taken place where senior officers had meet with the News of the World.

72.44 Members now asked the Acting Commissioner if any further meetings between those officers investigating the telephone hacking allegations and the News of the World had taken place and, if so, if details of those meetings were available. The Acting Commissioner stated that he would need to check if that information was available and if so he would provide it. Members also questioned if senior officers should have been meeting with the News of the World, particularly when a high profile investigation was in progress. The Acting Commissioner stated any meetings would have taken place with the full knowledge of the importance of confidentiality and matters that were sub-judice. He also added that despite the on-going investigations there was a need to continue with business as usual with the hierarchy of organisations. He also agreed that where possible to provide further details of meetings between officers and senior executives of News International.

Key Performance Indicators

72.45 Members asked the Acting Commissioner to comment on the comparisons with similar forces outlined in the key performance indicators of his report. Members indicated that the report showed that in 16 of the 18 areas the MPS were in the lower half of the table. Some members suggested that one approach to improve this would be to add them as a key performance indicator that was based on the end of a three year period.

72.46 The Acting Commissioner stated that there was a robust discussion taking place with HMIC as how to the measuring process should operate and he hoped that there would be one which was based against resident populations. Giving an example that a person in London could say that as a resident of London you have the lowest risk of being subjected to a violent crime, this statement would be true if were using the British Crime Survey. Alternatively using MPS recorded crime data would indicate the opposite. He felt that resident populations against crime figures were not fair to London and that London should be judged on how it has performed against London before. He also added that this is based on the assumption that resident population figures for the country were accurate.

Police Officer recruitment/numbers

72.47 In noting the lifting of the police officer recruitment freeze, members asked the Acting Commissioner, if he was confident that PCSOs/Specials were best placed to fill the new vacancies and if those who had been placed on waiting lists had been properly informed of what the current recruitment process is in terms of it applying to existing PCSOs and traffic wardens only.

72.48 The Acting Commissioner outlined the proposals for the recruitment of police officers from current PCSOs/Specials, adding that they were representative and although they would require further training they already possessed a wide range of skills. He clarified that there were a number of people who had partially completed the selection process. These people were not on a waiting list and had not been given an offer of a job. They had been contacted not encouraged to become a Special Constable to have access to the new recruitment process.

72.49 Some members raised concerns that the Mayor had made misleading statements that about the number of police officers, stating that the proposed unfreezing of recruitment would see an increase in police officer numbers. Members stated that under the current Mayor there would be 32,510 officers by May 2012, up from 31,398 when he took office, however, in November 2009, numbers had reached a peak of 33,404 and that this was following budget plans laid out by the previous Mayor. They added that since the recruitment freeze and increasing numbers of officers leaving the number had fallen. Some members added that the MPS figures showed that between 2010/11 and 2011/12 there would be a fall of 581 police officers (from 33,091 to 32,510), with similar decreases in PCSOs, traffic wardens and police staff numbers.

72.50 The Chairman clarified for members that there were two sets of figures, establishment and strength figures. Strength figures were the figures of police officers on the pay roll and the establishment figures were those that go into the budget. He suggested that the Mayor had stated that numbers were falling due to the hold on recruitment and now that the freeze on recruitment had been lifted this could rise to 32,500. He did not believe he was using the establishment figures. He agreed that the figures may be confusing, but he did not believe they were misleading.

Safer Schools Team

72.51 Members asked the Acting Commissioner how the reduction in headcount of Safer Schools Teams will affect the service offered to schools.

72.52 The Acting Commissioner reminded members of the development of the safer schools initiative and the subsequent links developed by safer neighbourhood teams and schools. He confirmed that Territorial Policing was considering as part of its review how it could continue those school partnerships and this work was ongoing, but he added that at this stage it was possible that there would be an increase in police officers in schools, but a decrease in PCSOs. He assured members that the Territorial Policing review and safer school partnerships would be brought back to the Authority. He also agreed to make sure that any changes in the establishment of officers in schools would be shared with the appropriate MPA link member.

72.53 Those issues that the Acting Commissioner undertook to report back on to members have been circulated in the form of an addendum report and are appended to these minutes at Appendix 1.

Resolved – That the report be received.

73. Policing London Business Plan

(Agenda item 6)

73.1 This report was not circulated within the statutory five working days and therefore the Chairman agreed to receive it as urgent. The grounds for urgency were that the report was late following the need for it to be considered at the joint Strategic and

Operation Policing/Finance and Resources Committees the previous week and the need to include members' views and comments

73.2 Members considered a report in conjunction with previously circulated reports to the joint Strategic and Operation Policing/Finance and Resources Committees held on 17 February 2011. The report summarised progress to date on the draft Policing London Business Plan 2011-14, following the publication of the Mayor's draft budget, notably the closure of the previously identified budget gap of £11.9m for 201/12.

73.3 Some members expressed disappointment that having put forward a number of amendments to the budget they had not received any feedback on if any had been accepted or refused and if so the grounds for refusal. The Chairman, whilst acknowledging members' frustration, stated that there had been considerable time constraints around the detailed work budget and it had not been possible to provide feedback before the budget came for consideration. He also added that not all negotiations had been concluded and that when there was capacity to do so those proposals could be looked at in relation to future budgets. The Chairman added that where he could he did hope to inform members of why amendments had been declined.

73.4 Members asked in terms of the final budget paper being presented to the March Authority meeting it would be useful if those papers were clear around police numbers. Members also asked for clarity around those officers that are match funded by boroughs.

73.5 The Chairman confirmed that negotiations were on-going with boroughs on match funding for police officers. He added that the current budget makes provision for 54 officers that are part of this scheme and available for deployment. If there were further demand for match funding posts, additional funding would need to be provided.

73.6 In response to members, the Chairman confirmed that the key performance indicators would be presented to the March joint meeting of Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committee and he asked that the final version of the Business Plan be circulated in good time for members to consider it at the March full Authority.

Resolved – That

1. **the draft 2011-14 Policing London Business Plan as submitted to the joint Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees on 17 February and the revised funding limit as reflected in the Mayor's draft budget for 2011/12 be noted;**
2. **the outcome of the extraordinary member briefings on Key Performance Indicators and the budget; the joint Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees held on 17 February; and the process for finalising the 2011-14 Policing London Business Plan set out at that meeting be noted;**
3. **the final version of the letter sent from the Chief Executive to the Mayor on 1 February (attached as Appendix 4) be noted; and**
4. **the actions underway to take forward the points raised at the 17 February joint meeting of the Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees be noted.**

74. Draft borrowing and capital spending plan 2011/12 to 2017/18

(Agenda item 7)

74.1 This report was not circulated within the statutory five working days and therefore the Chairman agreed to receive it as urgent. The grounds for urgency were that the report was late following the need for it to be considered at the joint Strategic and Operation Policing/Finance and Resources Committees the previous week and the need to include members' views and comments

Resolved – That

1. **proposed funding plan for 2011/12 to 2017/18, subject to the proviso that the spend and funding outturn for 2010/11 and its impact on 2011/12 by project slippage has yet to be determined. (Appendix 1 of the report refers) be approved;**
2. **the Capital Programme be limited to those projects noted as essential (Appendix 2 of the report refers) and that the approach to managing the capital programme is adopted within available funds (paragraph 25 refers) be approved;**
3. **projects on the Reserve list (Appendix 3 of the report refers) will not be progressed at all during 2011/12 and may be deleted from the future programme unless a more robust business case is constructed or additional funding identified be noted;**
4. **the Borrowing and Spending Plan 2011/12 to 2017/18 for inclusion within the Policing London Business Plan 2011-14 (paragraphs 8 - 12 refer) be agreed;**
5. **the funding of feasibility studies to facilitate prompt starts on the 2011/12 programme with the aim of reducing year on year slippage. (paragraph 23 refers) be approved; and**
6. **funding of the Hendon Rationalisation Project beyond 2011/12 is subject to further deliberation (paragraph 21 of the report refers) be noted.**

75. Mayor's proposal to develop a compulsory alcohol sobriety scheme for London

(Agenda item 8)

75.1 Members received a report that provided details of the Mayor's proposals to develop a compulsory sobriety scheme for London

75.2 The report, which had been prepared by the GLA, indicated that the proposed scheme advocated an enforcements approach providing specific powers for the courts to mandate sobriety as an order for alcohol related violence offences. Members were informed that the Mayor has tabled an amendment to the Policing and Social Responsibility Bill for changes in the current law to enable the courts to make this order. They were also informed that compulsory alcohol requirements would involve twice daily testing and failure will result in immediate breach and sanctions, such as custody.

75.3 Members asked if the Chairman if the compulsory scheme was dependent on the Mayor's tabled amendments being accepted and would the scheme have to be formally accepted by the Authority.

75.4 The Chairman confirmed that the Mayor's amendments to the legislation were to give specific powers, one of which was that the testing was self financing, so to an extent it was dependent of those amendments being accepted. He agreed that he would be looking to bring any final scheme back to the Authority, but added that this was a Mayoral initiative. The Chief Executive added that this was an opportunity for the MPA to take a collective or independent view and suggested that the appendix to the report could be used to share with borough partners.

75.5 A number of members sought clarification around the breach rate, which in South Dakota had was very low, and if that was the case was it tackling the right people. Members also asked about reducing reoffending.

75.6 The Chairman provided members with details of academic research, which included that approximately 66% of people and complaint and 17% fail once and then pass. He agreed to circulate these finding to members.

75.7 Some members had reservations about the individuals having to pay for the testing, particularly those not being able to afford it. Members also asked about a

business case for the scheme and asked for some clarification around young people and if there would be parental permission would be built into the scheme. Members also suggested that there was a need to understand the different cultural difference between South Dakota and London and the effects on success of the scheme if initially there are low levels of compliance.

75.8 The Chairman confirmed that the business case would be presented as part of the legislative process in the House of Commons and would be available. In response to members, he also confirmed that if the scheme was introduced then it was likely to be on a pilot basis. In relation to parental permission, the Chairman stated that the scheme was designed for those who were convicted of a crime. In terms of the young people, some amendments deal specifically with young people

Resolved – That the report be noted.

76. Reports from committees

(Agenda item 9)

76.1 The Authority received a report outlining key issues that had been considered at recent Authority Committee meetings. The report covered the following meetings:

- Strategic and Operational Policing Committee– 13 January 2011
- Finance and Resources Committee – 20 January 2011

Resolved – That the report be received;

77. MPA calendar of meetings 2011/12

(Agenda item 10)

77.1 Members were asked to consider the MPA Calendar of meetings for its formal committees meetings for September 2011 to July 2012.

Resolved – That the calendar of meetings given at Appendix 1 to the report be agreed.

78. Action taken under delegated Authority

(Agenda item 11)

78.1 Members received a report that provided details on action taken by the Chief Executive under delegated authority on the grounds of urgency.

Resolved – That the report be received.

79. Any other urgent business

(Agenda item 12)

79.1 There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 12.40 p.m.

Appendix 1

Addendum to the Commissioner's report

Report by the Commissioner

This report follows up on the actions and commitments made verbally by the Commissioner at the Full Authority meeting on 24 February 2011.

The Commissioner committed to provide an update to Members on the following issues:

- Written response to questions from Members
- Efficiency Initiatives
- Meetings with News International
- Commencement of Recruitment

- Safer Transport Command
- SNT Sergeants
- Safer School Teams

Written response to questions from Members

1. Members asked for written responses regarding the below questions

- Mounted Police
- Impact of cuts on youth crime prevention

Responses sent to be sent to the MPA by 30 March 2011.

Efficiency Initiatives

2. The Acting Commissioner agreed to provide Members with details of efficiency initiatives that best serve the interest of justice. Briefing note to be provided to MPA Members by 30 March 2011.

Meeting with News International

3. The Acting Commissioner agreed to circulate, if still available, details meetings between senior officers with senior executives of the News of the World and News International. Information to be sent to the MPA.

Commencement of Recruitment

4. Members asked for information about the commencement of officer recruitment from PCSO / MSC and information provided to applicants regarding the new system of entry into the MPS. The Acting Commissioner agreed to circulate this information to Members.

Safer Transport Command

5. The Acting Commissioner agreed to provide information regarding the business rationale for the new service delivery model within Safer Transport Command. This information will be provided to the MPA by 20 March.

SNT Sergeants

6. The Acting Commissioner agreed to provide information on the criteria for selecting sergeants for future Safer Neighbourhood Teams. This information will be provided to the MPA by 30 March 2011.

Safer Schools Teams

7. The Acting Commissioner agreed to provide information on plans for Safer Schools Partnerships and how Members will be updated when changes are made to the current establishment. A Written response will be provided to the MPA by 25th March 2011.

Report author: Zara Ryder, Strategic Relationships, MPS

Background papers None

Metropolitan Police Authority: Website archive

Warning: This is archived material and may be out of date. The Metropolitan Police Authority has been replaced by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). See the [MOPC website](#) for further information.

Minutes - draft

These minutes are draft and are to be agreed.

Minutes of the meeting of the **Metropolitan Police Authority** held on 31 March 2011 at City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA.

Present

Members

- Kit Malthouse (Chairman)
- Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
- Tony Arbour
- Jennette Arnold
- John Biggs (items 1-5)
- Christopher Boothman
- Victoria Borwick
- Valerie Brasse
- Cindy Butts
- James Cleverly
- Dee Doocey (items 1-5)
- Toby Harris
- Neil Johnson
- Jenny Jones
- Clive Lawton
- Joanne McCartney
- Steve O'Connell
- Caroline Pidgeon
- Amanda Sater
- Valerie Shawcross
- Graham Speed

MPA officers

- Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive)
- Bob Atkins (Treasurer)
- Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive)

MPS officers

- Tim Godwin (Acting Commissioner)
- John Yates (Acting Deputy Commissioner)
- Lynne Owens Assistant Commissioner (Central Operations) (Items 1-5)
- Anne McMeel (Director of Resources)

80. Apologies for absence and announcements

(Agenda item 1)

80.1 Apologies for absence were received from Faith Boardman, Kirsten Hearn and the Commissioner.

81. Declarations of interests

(Agenda item 2)

81.1 No declarations of interest were made.

Resolved – That

1. the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table above, be noted;
2. the gifts and hospitality received by members, as set out on the Authority's gifts and hospitality register, be noted; and
3. all members declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above items listed in the table above and including any interest arising from gifts or hospitality received in the last 3 years or which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality.

82. Minutes: 24 February 2011

(Agenda item 3)

82.1 Members considered the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 24 February 2011.

82.2 It was noted that members had been circulated details of meetings between senior MPS officers and News International journalists, it was suggested that this was not a complete list and the Acting Commissioner agreed that this would be checked and if necessary re-circulated to members.

Resolved – That the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 24 February 2011 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

83. Chairman's update

(Agenda item 4)

83.1 The Chairman provided members with a report that updated them on the key successes and meetings since the last Authority meeting. These included:

83.2 Congratulating both Mark Simmons and Steven Kavanagh on their recent successful appointments to the rank of Deputy Assistant Commissioner.

84.3 He also highlighted a number of awards and commendations that recognised the excellent work of the MPS and individual officers and staff. He noted that a Trident family liaison officer had been awarded 'FLO of the year' in recognition of his efforts to support the family of a south London murder victim. A number of special constables had been recognised by senior officers for having shown exceptional dedication and achievement at a recent ceremony and Hero's week took place just after the last Full Authority meeting. Commissioner's commendations and Royal Humane Society certificates had been awarded to officers and members of the public who showed

extreme bravery in their actions to protect the public and save the lives of the people of London.

83.4 The Chairman acknowledged the call handling support that the MPS provided to the Japan earthquake and tsunami operation noting that MPS staff dealt with 850 calls over 51 hours from concerned friends and relatives.

83.5 The Chairman informed members that the Police Reform and Social Responsibility (PRSR) Bill was currently at its third reading and was being monitored by MPA officers. In relation to this he had attended the ministerial PCC transition sponsorship board in March and gave an update, with the Deputy Chief Executive, on the feasibility of early implementation of the new arrangements on London. Discussions with the Home Office to ensure that there are no obstacles for this implementation continue.

83.6 He informed members that discussions to finalise the Policing London Budget and Business Plan have been ongoing and is again an agenda item for this meeting.

83.7 Members were reminded that the second round of Joint Engagement Meetings, which focus on violent crime, continue to be a success. Since the last Full Authority he had chaired meetings with Hounslow, Wandsworth and Newham boroughs.

83.8 He had also attended a useful training session on the new Equalities Act 2010 and the implications for the MPS and MPA along with other members.

83.9 For members information the Chairman added that he had continued to attend a number of meetings as Chairman of the Authority. A list was included at Appendix 1 to the report.

83.10 In conclusion the Chairman stated that the London Crime Reduction Board had met in early March and considered a number of issues, including a piece of work intended to scope and secure adequate provision across London of refuge spaces for women and girls suffering domestic violence, progress of the multi-agency anti-violence partnership and the Ministry of Justice financial incentive model pilot (payment by results) being developed in six London boroughs. Officers are also discussing a community safety funds project, which will consider and develop options for the allocation across London of the funds by the MOPC from 2012/13 onwards.

Resolved – That the report be received.

84. Acting Commissioner's Report

(Agenda item 5)

Daniel Morgan

84.1 The Chairman informed members that the family and friends of Daniel Morgan were in attendance at the meeting and he was joined by members in expressing his and their sympathy and disappointment following the collapse of the trial into Daniel Morgan's murder.

84.2 The Acting Commissioner added that members would recall that Daniel was murdered in 1987 and over the past 24 years the MPS had failed to achieve justice for the family and for Daniel. This culminated in the recent acquittal of one person and others following a trial. He informed members that he had written to the Morgan family to express both his concerns and apologies for this failure and he then read the following extract from that letter:

I am deeply sorry that the MPS has failed to bring to justice those responsible for the murder of Daniel. The MPS has accepted that police corruption, in the original investigation, was a significant factor in this failure. As you know, corruption in its various forms formed a major line of inquiry in the most recent investigation.

I recognise how important this is to both you and your family and that this is acknowledged publicly. You are entitled to an apology not only for this

failure but also for the repeated failure of the MPS, my organisation, over the many years following Daniel's murder to accept that corruption had played such a part in failing to bring those responsible to justice. Furthermore I am also very sorry that, for many years, your concerns regarding the failure of the MPS to bring those persons to justice were not properly addressed, and they were not. I recognise that this apology cannot alter the deep sense of loss, frustration, anger and distress that you and your family experience and have suffered since Daniel's murder.

The MPS is a very different organisation now to the one it was at the time of Daniel's murder. That said, we accept that there are lessons to be learned arising from the discontinuance of this latest trial. To this end, and together with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), we are now engaged in a joint review to ensure that relevant issues, particularly in relation to disclosure and the handling of tainted witnesses, are understood and addressed as soon as possible. Above all, we recognise the consequences of the repeated failure of the MPS over the years to confront the role played by police corruption in protecting those responsible for the murder to be brought to justice.'

84.3 The Acting Commissioner added that in October 2009, the Serious Crime Directorate had taken responsibility for the investigation into Daniel's murder and that this had resulted in the recent trial and subsequent acquittal. He concluded by stating that he was deeply sorry for this failure and again offered the family his sympathies.

84.4 At the invitation of the Chairman Jennette Arnold made the following statement to members:

'Twenty four years after Daniel's murder the MPS has finally admitted that its first investigation of this crime was crippled by police corruption. We were aware of this within three weeks of the murder. We said so then and we have been saying so ever since. Through two decades and more of police protest, meeting with police officers at the highest ranks, lobbying of politicians and pleas to the media we have found ourselves lied to, fobbed off, bullied, degraded and let down time and time again. What we have been required to endure has been nothing short of torture.

When we last came to the MPA in 2005 [and many Members sitting round this table will remember when I raised this matter on behalf of the family then] we had been told by the MPS that we could not look to the criminal justice for anything more after four failed investigations. We had also been told by the Home Office that we could not look to them for any scrutiny of what had taken place. We then approached the MPA to seek support for our call for a judicial inquiry into the handling of Daniel's murder by the MPS. The response of the MPA, at that stage, was, to its credit, for the first time in two decades, we found persons in authority who were not afraid of taking responsibility for the implications of the police corruption that had blighted our lives. It was in that context that the MPS announced that it had decided to reopen the case and, after much hesitation, we again offered it our full trust and support.

Six years later after a collapsed prosecution and millions spent from the public purse a full judicial inquiry into the handling of this case by the MPS is even more urgently required. The family therefore calls upon the MPA and returns to this body again today to seek support for their call for a full judicial inquiry. Mindful of the words uttered by Assistant Commissioner John Yates at a meeting with Kit Malthouse, our Chairman, and Mayor Boris

Johnson in February 2009 [and I was there to witness this statement], "This case is one of the most deplorable episodes in the entire history of the MPS. This family has been treated disgracefully".

84.5 A number of written questions had been submitted to the Acting Commissioner regarding the 'Morgan Case' and these included:

- Following the recent collapse of the Daniel Morgan murder trial, members drew attention to the comments made by Detective Chief Supt Campbell, who said 'This has been a long and difficult ordeal for the family, and we have offered them our heartfelt sympathies'.
- Members asked if the Acting Commissioner agreed with them that any statement on this matter should have come from his office, and would he today make a statement on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service.
- In addition members stated that the family of Daniel Morgan feel that they were left with no option but to call for a full judicial inquiry into the handling of the case by the Metropolitan Police Service and the Crown Prosecution Service and asked what is the Acting Commissioner's response to this. Members also asked if the Acting Commissioner, on behalf of the MPS would support the Morgan's family request for a judicial review.

84.6 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that both the Crown Prosecution Services and MPS were reviewing the outcomes of this case. He felt and stated that the Morgan family themselves had indicated that the MPS were a different organisation, but acknowledged that this was too late for them. He suggested that some time public inquiries can slow down a process and he was not sure if this was the right way to move forward, however, the matter of inquiries were the remit of the Home Secretary.

84.7 Members felt that this matter had been going on for a long time and that despite the best efforts of the MPS, the MPS had failed to deliver the outcome that the family were looking for. In terms of moving forward there was very little that either the MPA or the MPS could do and the majority of members supported the family's request for support to make representations to the Home Secretary to initiate a judicial review.

884.8 Members requested that it be put to the vote that the MPA make representations to the Home Secretary to initiate a judicial review into the Daniel Morgan case. All members voted in favour.

David Emmanuel

84.9 Members acknowledged that the family and friends of David Emmanuel, also known as Smiley Culture, were in attendance at the meeting. MPS officers had attended Mr Emmanuel's house to execute a search warrant. Later the same morning an ambulance had been called by the MPS officers. An air ambulance crew had arrived but Mr Emmanuel died at the scene.

84.10 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that he had spoken to a member of David Emmanuel's family, who was in attendance in the public gallery, prior to the meeting and explained that as there was an ongoing independent investigation he was unable to discuss this case in any detail. As mentioned in relation to the discussion about the Daniel Morgan case, the Acting Commissioner, felt that the MPS had come a considerable way in terms of relationships with communities and the trust that now existed between those communities and the police and it was important that this trust was maintained and not taken for granted. Therefore, it was important that the IPCC did everything it could to ensure that Mr Emmanuel's family and friends were kept informed of the details of the on-going investigation. He concluded by offering his sympathy to Mr Emmanuel's family and friends.

84.11 Members raised a number of questions which included:

- Were the MPS satisfied with the links it had in order to ensure that the black community were kept informed about this case.
- Was he concerned about some of the information arising from the briefings that were being released about this case.
- As a Gold Group had been established why was there not any representative from the Lambeth Police Consultative Group on it.

84.12 The Acting Commissioner stated that the MPS had a considerable amount of experience of using advisory groups and reaching out to communities. He agreed with members that the Lambeth Police Consultative Group was a very effective and useful mechanism for bringing together the community and the police and in relation to representation on the Gold Group this was an issue he wanted to look at. He was not clear to what briefing was being referred to and was not convinced that those in the public domain were official briefings.

Due to a disturbance in the public gallery the meeting stood adjourned for 15 minutes.

84.13 Members, whilst acknowledging the improvements the MPS had made in its work and relationships with communities, stated that there was a need to do much more and avoid complacency. It was felt that there were strong links between the way in which the black community was policed and the kinds of demonstrations that had occurred in the public gallery during the meeting and that the two cannot be disassociated. It was felt that the day to day experiences by the black community were damaging public confidence, there had to be support for enforcement to deal with knife and gun crime, but this had to go hand in hand with both support and prevention work.

84.14 Members also suggested that in specific cases such as those of Mr Emmanuel's a statement that no comment can be provided due to ongoing investigations, whilst understandable in terms of not wishing to prejudice a case, might not always be appropriate and that thought should be given to meeting individuals so that this can be discussed in everyday language.

84.15 Members also raised concerns that changes to governance structures could leave a void and where would the visible answerability of the MPS be in these types of distressing cases

84.16 The Chairman informed members that he had regular meetings with the IPCC and that he would be asking that they ensured that they make sure that the investigation was conducted as swiftly and thoroughly as possible.

Delroy Grant – Operation Minstead

84.17 Members noted the recent conviction of Delroy Grant, for a series of burglaries and sexual assaults in south-east London.

84.18 Whilst welcoming this conviction members asked a number of questions which included; what went wrong and what lessons had been learnt from the investigation and recent conviction of Delroy Grant for horrific rapes and assaults on vulnerable elderly residents in south-east London.

84.19 The Acting Commissioner firstly apologised to the victims of Delroy Grant adding that he was extremely sorry for the trauma suffered by all his victims and the MPS's failure to bring him to justice much earlier.

84.20 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that after Delroy Grant was arrested it was identified that a mistake had been made in 1999 where an opportunity to apprehend him had been missed. The IPCC investigated this matter and words of advice were given to two officers. He added that the MPS had learned lessons from this investigation.

84.21 Members raised a number of questions and these included;

- Was the Acting Commissioner confident that supervision was enacted properly in this case.

- Why were the MPA never fully briefed on this case and members having to find out its information via the media.
- Whilst acknowledging this was a horrific case could the Acting Commissioner reassure members and the public that this was the last of these historic cases

84.22 The Acting Commissioner stated that he could not give reassurances around a similar mistake occurring in the future, particularly due to the volume of incidents that the MPS had to deal with. He added that the MPS worked very hard to have the best trained officers with the right values focusing on doing the right thing, but this could not guarantee that a mistake would not be made. Regarding supervision, the Acting Commissioner informed members that in 1999 the MPS established Sapphire, the creation of the Havens and an increased focus on work around serious sexual assaults. Supervision since 1999 was now considerably different. He confirmed that in terms of review processes there had been long periods where there had been no offending and that the review process had been built into the Serious Crime Directorate functionally. The Chairman added that in terms of information to members, link borough members had been provided with confidential briefings and he and the Business Management Group maintained a risk register which Operation Minstead was included and discussed.

84.23 Members noted that a number of males from the black community had voluntarily provided DNA samples to aid this investigation. Members asked for information on the process for destroying these DNA samples now that Delroy Grant had been convicted, and the Acting Commissioner agreed to provide this information.

84.24 It was agreed that members, following the completion of a case review should be offered a full debrief around this case.

TUC march 26 March 2011

84.25 Members asked the Acting Commissioner if he was satisfied with the MPS policing of the demonstrations on Saturday 26 March in central London.

84.26 The Acting Commissioner stated that in relation to the TUC march he was satisfied that the MPS had policed this event well. He thanked both those who attended the march and those who were stewards for ensuring that the march was peaceful.

84.27 He then moved on to discuss those groups that in his opinion had used the TUC march to splinter off and move around to different areas of central London which were not part of the official route and carry out acts of violence and criminal damage. He confirmed that a number of people had attempted to damage the Olympic clock in Trafalgar Square and this had lead MPS officers having to contain a number of people. If informed members of the number of arrests made following the breakaway from the main march and informed members of details of intelligence gather prior to the march.

84.28 Members supported the Acting Commissioner in noting that the TUC March had been policed well and asked that their thanks to the Commander and officers be noted.

84.29 Members asked the Assistant Commissioner for Central Operations for information regarding those people who had occupied Fortnum and Masons Store and in particular why where some told that they could leave only to be subsequently arrested and charged with aggravated trespass.

84.30 The Assistant Commissioner outlined the command structure for the march and stated that there may have been some communication issues and that she did not believe that there was a deliberate move to mislead people. She added that aggravated trespassing should not be minimised and was a criminal offence. The MPS had been supported by the Crown Prosecution Service around these charges and that these charges would be tested in court. The Assistant Commissioner confirmed that there were police officers in the store at various times during the occupation.

84.31 Members asked a number of other questions and these included:

- Following the extensive use of social networks to disseminate information during the demonstrations, had the MPS decided to use marking technologies.
- What were the elements of the offence of aggravated trespass?
- The Home Secretary had mentioned that she was looking at new laws to enable police to stop potential perpetrators before they get to locations, is this something that the MPS would welcome.
- A number of members raised concerns about the weapons used by the splinter groups.
- Members asked if the MPS were aware and in future going to stop demonstrators from accessing public house before going onto cause problems.
- Should known trouble makers planning to attend demonstrations, like known football hooligans, be asked to report to police stations.
- Can members be provided with details about the number of abstractions?
- Should there be a review of officers protective clothing, particularly those protecting the face?

84.32 The Assistant Commissioner felt that the question from members fell into four themes. Regarding intelligence matters and contrary to media comments, the MPS had been engaged in a considerable amount of intelligence matters. She added that in terms of having so many people in custody this gave the MPS a good starting point for intelligence and building on that in terms of moving to future events. In terms of offences, the Assistant Commissioner, suggested that she could circulate a briefing note to members, but added that the whole of the previous week there had been a series of peaceful protests including sit down protests which had ended without any arrests having to be made.

84.33 Regarding the use of new technologies and social networks, the Assistant Commissioner confirmed that the social networks were monitored and the MPS responded accordingly. The Home Secretary announcement of possible additional powers being granted to the police, she stated, was a matter for Parliament to decide. However, there were ongoing debriefs following the demonstration and there may be lessons on how to do things differently in future.

84.34 The Assistant Commissioner concurred with members that there needed to be caution around how stop and search might be used. She confirmed that mutual aid was used to police the demonstration and that officers did come under attack from a number of groups using weapons which included light bulbs filled with ammonia. In relation to the events in Oxford Street and Regents Street it was important where possible to have business as usual, but it was also important not to see what was happening there in isolation as moving officers on mass could have been detrimental to other areas.

84.35 In response to members concerns about protective clothing, particularly those protecting the face, the Assistant Commissioner, added that in order to facilitate peaceful protests, officers are not issued with the 'NATO style' helmets, which include Perspex visors, unless it is deemed necessary. In accordance with guidelines when a situation has calmed down helmets are removed and on some occasions officers have been subsequently injured.

Police recruitment

84.36 The Acting Commissioner was pleased to inform members that recruitment of police officers had commenced. He informed members that on 14 March 193 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were sworn in to commence training as police officers. He confirmed that recruitment would now focus on Special Constables and more PSCOs.

Issues raised by members

84.37 Members had submitted a number of questions in advance of the meeting.

84.38 In order to allow full consideration of a number of other items on the agenda a number of members agreed to receive a written response to their questions to the Acting Commissioner. These included the submitted questions on:

- Vacancies in Safer Neighbourhood teams
- Legal advice

Access to police databases

84.39 In relation to access to police databases members asked what mechanisms are in place to monitor unlawful access of police databases by serving police officers and police staff.

84.40 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that access to MPS database was granted on a need to know basis and all users were given training which included awareness of the policies that governed acceptable use. Users were required to renew their agreement to abide by these policies every three months. He added that the Directorate of Professional Standards operated a strong proactive and reactive investigatory capability to tackle misuse and any corruption and all MPS systems were subject to minimum standards of audit data quality. He also confirmed that the three highest risk systems were subject to dip sample transaction validation processes. He agreed to circulate to members the number of staff that had been disciplined for misuse of this information.

Membership of Masonic lodges

84.41 Members asked the Acting Commissioner, how many ACPO officers within the MPS are members of any Masonic lodge, and was there a requirement to declare any such membership?

84.42 The Acting Commissioner confirmed that the MPS did not hold a voluntary internal register and therefore there was no information for ACPO officers. He was aware that in 1999, Home Office guidance suggested officers should be asked to provide this information on a voluntary basis, but was not clear who or how this operated. He did recall the Authority discussing this matter a number of years ago, but was not sure if it was leading on this matter.

Community Safety Accreditation Scheme

84.43 Members asked the Acting Commissioner what rules and guidance were in place regarding the type of person/organisation that can become accredited under the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme. They also asked the Acting Commissioner what would be the effect of the Home Office decision to accredit 15 private security guards with 'limited policing powers' to operate around Victoria coach and train stations.

84.44 The Acting Commissioner informed members that the Police Reform Act 2002 allowed chief officers to accredit persons under Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS), with limited powers if considered appropriate for the purpose of contributing to community safety and in the co-operation with the police force for the area, combating crime disorder, public nuisance and other forms of anti-social behaviour. He also informed members of ACPO guidance to forces wishing to take part in CSAS and that the MPS had a standard operational procedure for those BOCUs wishing to take part in CSAS. Any company wishing to take part in CSAS in the MPS is required to be approved as being fit and proper company by ACPO CPI, the company set up by ACPO to act as their crime prevention arm. He added that all persons accredited under CSAS within the MPS would have to be vetted to the same level as police officers.

84.45 The Acting Commissioner stated that regarding Westminster developing partnerships with other responsible agencies, whilst it was essential to achieve an aim of

making Westminster a safer and more secure place and the scheme would have to be reviewed on a regular basis by the MPS.

84.46 In relation to monitoring and public complaints, the Acting Commissioner confirmed that quarterly monitoring reports would be sent to the MPS on a variety of activities including use of powers, impact on fear of crime and activity analysis. The employer and or organisation must have established and maintain satisfactory arrangements for handling of complaints. In addition, the MPS may require access to individual complaints records to satisfying itself that the complaints system was fit for purpose.

84.47 A number of members remain uncomfortable with powers being given to private security companies and the Acting Commissioner confirmed that the MPS would keep the scheme under review.

Uneven spread in police overtime

84.48 Members drew attention to recent comments that officers in the Metropolitan Police Service earn an average of £4,271 in overtime. They also stated that a recent article claimed one public protection officer received £67,000 in overtime. Members asked the Acting Commissioner for confirmation about how much, on average, does an MPS police officer in the VIP protection team earn and how much, on average, does an MPS police officer in a SN Team and an MPS response team officer receive?

84.49 The Acting Commissioner reminded members that the policing of London was a twenty four hours seven days a week operation and that as well as capital city responsibilities the services also had national responsibilities, which often lead to a requirement to work beyond normal hours. He added that in relation to close protection work this means that there are significant periods of overtime working to ensure on the principals of safety and that protection costs are in the main covered by Home Offices DSP Grant.

84.50 He reminded members that since 2005 the MPS had been focussing on the reduction of overtime and this had resulted in a significant reduction in the average hours of overtime worked each year per eligible officer. He confirmed that there was a 35% reduction in annual overtime expenditure and that this had equated to savings of approximately £60m, adding that reductions were against a background of increased public order pressure.

Online crime tracking

84.51 Members asked the Acting Commissioner if he would support a London online initiative, similar to Avon and Somerset's website TrackMyCrime, which would allow victims to follow up on crime investigations and be updated electronically.

84.52 The Acting Commissioner informed members that under the service strategy one issue under review was how can the MPS keep citizens better informed, particularly around crimes that affect them. However, due the size of the MPS it might be easy to implement such a scheme but may be difficult from a technical and cost issue. If these issues could be resolved then it was an initiative that the MPS would look at.

News of the World Phone Hacking

84.53 Members raised a number of questions regarding the on-going investigations relating to telephone hacking by News of the World journalists. These included:

- Could the Acting Commissioner clarify whether the MPS's understanding of CPS advice regarding the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 had any bearing on the way allegations of phone hacking were investigated by the police? If so to what extent.
- Could the Acting Commissioner clarify the precise details of CPS advice during the course of the original inquiry and subsequent review

- Could the Acting Commissioner disclose the two letters from the DPP in 2009 referred to by ADC Yates in evidence to the Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee on 24 March 2011.
- Did the MPS's understanding of the CPS advice have any bearing on how the MPS categorised actual and potential victims? If so, how?
- Why did the MPS not fully examine and collate 'bin bags' of evidence available at the time of the original inquiry?

84.54 The Acting Deputy Commissioner drew members' attention to his recent attendance at a Home Affairs Select Committee and that he had circulated to members a copy of the letters that he had submitted to the select committee which he felt outlined details of the inquiry. He also outlined previous advice that the MPS had received. The Acting Deputy Commissioner added that as there was an ongoing investigation he wanted to be very cautious about there being more potential suspects. In response to members' questions about possibly sharing advice he had received, the Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that these were not his to share and they were privileged to the CPS and at this stage he is seeking advice on permission to disclose them.

84.55 In response to members questions about potential victims and a wider definition of offences and did this mean there were a wider range of victims, the Acting Deputy Commissioner stated that this was a matter for the new investigation. Regarding comments made at the select Committee that the MPS did not fully examine and collate extensive pieces of evidence in 2006, the Acting Deputy Commissioner confirmed it was looked at and reviewed at the time by Counsel on the basis of indictment, possibly not in detail, but it would form part of the new investigation.

Other questions raised by members

Stockwell shooting

84.56 Following a recent shooting incident in Stockwell, in which a five year old girl and a 35 year old male were critically injured, Members joined the Acting Commissioner in expressing their outrage at this attack and for their best wishes for a speedy recovery to those injured to be noted. Members also asked the Acting Commissioner to ensure that the community were kept informed of the on-going investigation and to engage with the community in helping bring those responsible to justice.

84.57 Those issues that the Acting Commissioner undertook to report back on to members have been circulated in the form of an addendum report and are appended to these minutes at Appendix 1.

Resolved – That the report be received.

85. Policing London Business Plan

(Agenda item 6)

85.1 This report was not circulated within the statutory five working days and therefore the Chairman agreed to receive it as urgent. The grounds for urgency were that the report was late following the need for it to be considered at the joint Strategic and Operation Policing/Finance and Resources Committees the previous week and the need to include members' views and comments.

85.2 Members considered a report that proposed the final Policing London Business Plan 2011-14 and which summarised the main changes to the draft discussed at the joint Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees (SOP/F&R) on 17 March 2011. The report recommended that the Authority formally approve the Plan, setting out MPS priorities for 2011-14 and activity for 2011/12 within a legally balanced budget.

85.3 The Chairman confirmed that the report had been discussed at joint meetings of the Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees at which the key performance indicators had been negotiated and agreed. He confirmed that the alternative budget amendments were looked at but there was limited time to develop them into a full business case. He stated that there could be scope during the year to review these and incorporate them as variations.

85.4 Members asked the Chairman to confirm details of his discussions with ACPO around ACPO subscriptions. The Chairman informed members that discussions with ACPO President had taken place and he had outlined the benefit to the organisation of that subscription and the Acting Commissioner had also added further benefits that the MPS gets from this subscription. He added in light of the changes in structure and functions over the next year, he felt that this should be treated as a transitional period and a reduced subscription bit recommended. He suggested that this should be in the region of £120,000 which represented a very significant saving.

85.5 The Chairman asked members to approve the recommendations and following a vote of 14 for and 5 against the recommendations were agreed.

Resolved – That

1. targets for Key Performance Indicators (KPI) as requested by members at SOP/F&R on 17 February 2011 (Appendix 3 of the report) be approved;
2. the revised funding limit as reflected in the Mayor's draft budget for 2011/12 be noted;
3. for publication by 31 March 2011, the approved Capital Programme Prudential Indicators and Annual Statement of Minimum Revenue Provision (Appendix 2 of the report) be approved; and
4. the Policing London Business Plan 2011-14, to be issued by 31 March 2011 (Appendix 4 of the report) be approved.

86. Grant settlement

(Agenda item 7)

86.1 Members considered a report that set out the detail of the Government's announced grant settlement for 2011/12 and indicative allocations for 2012/13 to 2014/15 and the implications for the funding of the Authority.

Resolved – That the details of the Governments announced grant settlement announcement for 2011/12 and the detail of the settlement for the MPA be noted.

87. Treasury management strategy and policy statement and investment strategy 2011/12

(Agenda item 8)

87.1 Members received a report that provided details of the Treasury Management Strategy and Policy Statements and investment Strategy 2011/12.

Resolved – That

1. the 2011/12 Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy set out in this report be approved; and
2. the 2011/12 Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

88. MET Forward Two focused on fighting crime

(Agenda item 9)

88.1 Members considered a report that outlined Met Forward two, a refreshed of Met Forward the MPA three year strategic mission for policing priorities in London. Members were informed that Met Forward Two was a refreshed document that noted the

developments that had taken place and the achievements made in the last two years and that articulated the future priorities of the MPA.

Resolved – That the report be noted.

89. Reports from committees

(Agenda item 10)

89.1 The Authority received a report outlining key issues that had been considered at recent Authority Committee meetings. The report covered the following meetings:

- Joint Strategic and Operational Policing and Finance and Resources Committees – 17 February 2011
- Finance and Resources Committee – 17 February 2011
- Communities, Equality and People Committee – 3 March 2011
- Corporate Governance Committee – 10 March 2011

89.2 As the meeting of the Corporate Governance Committee held on 10 March 2011 was inquorate members were asked to approve minute 46 'Directorate of Audit Risk and Assurance 2011/12 Annual Plan'

Resolved – That the report be received and minute 46 'Directorate of Audit Risk and Assurance 2011/12 Annual Plan' of the Corporate Governance Committee held on 10 March 2011 be approved.

90. Any other urgent business

(Agenda item 12)

90.1 There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 13.10 p.m.

Metropolitan Police Authority: Website archive

Warning: This is archived material and may be out of date. The Metropolitan Police Authority has been replaced by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). See the [MOPC website](#) for further information.

Minutes - draft

These minutes are draft and are to be agreed.

Minutes of the meeting of the **Metropolitan Police Authority** held on 26 May 2011 at City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA.

Present

Members

- Kit Malthouse (Chairman)
- Reshard Auladin (Vice Chairman)
- Tony Arbour
- Jennette Arnold
- John Biggs
- Faith Boardman
- Christopher Boothman
- Victoria Borwick
- Valerie Brasse
- Cindy Butts
- James Cleverly
- Dee Doocey
- Toby Harris
- Kirsten Hearn
- Neil Johnson
- Jenny Jones
- Clive Lawton
- Joanne McCartney
- Steve O'Connell
- Caroline Pidgeon
- Amanda Sater
- Graham Speed

MPA officers

- Catherine Crawford (Chief Executive)
- Bob Atkins (Treasurer)
- Jane Harwood (Deputy Chief Executive)

MPS officers

- Sir Paul Stephenson (Commissioner)
- Tim Godwin (Deputy Commissioner)

91. Apologies for absence and announcements

(Agenda item 1)

91.1 Apologies for absence were received from Valerie Shawcross.

92. Declarations of interests

(Agenda item 2)

92.1 No declarations of interest were made.

Resolved – That

1. **the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table above, be noted;**
2. **the gifts and hospitality received by members, as set out on the Authority's gifts and hospitality register, be noted; and**
3. **all members declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above items listed in the table above and including any interest arising from gifts or hospitality received in the last 3 years or which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality.**

93. Minutes: 31 March 2011

(Agenda item 3)

93.1 Members considered the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 31 March 2011.

93.2 Regarding minute 84 'Acting Commissioner report' (paragraph 84.41/42), which related to ACPO membership of Masonic lodges. Members asked that it be noted that the Deputy Commissioner had agreed that he would consider if a register of membership of lodges was appropriate.

Resolved – That the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 31 March 2011 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

94. Chairman's update

(Agenda item 4)

94.1 The Chairman, along with a number of other members firstly welcomed back Sir Paul Stephenson to his first full Authority meeting since his period of absence and he also thanked the Deputy Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner Yates for their work during the Commissioner's absence. He then went on to update members on a number of key successes and meetings he had attended since the last meeting of the Authority. These included:

- Congratulating the Commissioner and his team on the successful policing and security operation for the Royal Wedding which had taken place earlier this month and which allowed the day to run smoothly and be enjoyed by Londoners without incident.
- The Chairman also highlighted several of the many items of good news and positive work undertaken by the MPS with the community. He informed members that at the end of April MPS officers and staff had taken place in a charity rugby match that raised £20,000 for Help for Heroes. Lewisham police station held a successful open day in early May and which had seen a record number of almost 1,700 people visited to find out more about what police officers do. Boroughs across London held

community engagement activities on 17 May as part of International Day against Homophobia, which aimed to raise awareness of homophobic and transphobic issues.

- The Chairman provided members with an update on the progress of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility (PRSR) Bill. He confirmed that the Bill had entered the House of Lords on 1 April and began Committee stage on 11 May. Debates were being monitored by MPA officers. He confirmed that he continued to attend meetings with the Home Office and updated the ministerial Police Crime Commissioner transition sponsorship board on plans for the London implementation at the meeting on 3 May. He had also met with the new Home Office Permanent Secretary earlier this month and the Home Secretary provided opportunities to discuss the progress of the legislation.
- Since the last full Authority; the Chairman informed members that he had chaired another two of the Joint Engagement meetings (JEMs) focusing on violent crime, this time with Barking and Dagenham and Greenwich boroughs. A number of useful action points for all partners were identified.
- At the beginning of the month the Chairman reported that he had hosted, with the MPS, a summit focusing on the impact of protest on businesses in central London. Businesses, business leaders and agencies charged with managing protest attended. The meeting had proved an opportunity to listen to businesses concerns and developed a number of actions supported by the various partners present. These were directed at developing improved communication, information exchange and intelligence. Westminster City Council has taken the lead and will be forming a strategic group to oversee and progress this work.
- Members were informed that he had opened a successful consultation event that took place at City Hall earlier this month. The event was to seek views on whether or not the MPS should continue to record stop and account encounters. The event was attended by over 150 members of the community and over 40 young people. The verdict from the majority of those that attended was that the MPS should keep recording stop and account to ensure that there is accountability to the public. Many of the young people who attended indicated that had it not been for the event raising the profile of stop and account, they would not have been aware of the importance of the consultation. The information gathered from the event, together with the results of an online survey seeking views on stop and account recording, will be considered before a report is submitted to the MPA with a recommended way forward.
- The Chairman had met with the Chair of Lambeth Community and Police Consultative Group and the Borough Commander of Lambeth to discuss community reaction to the death of David Emmanuel, also known as Smiley Culture. He had also met with the London and South East Commissioner of the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) who wrote to him after the meeting to confirm that whilst the matter was under investigation it is not possible to discuss anything in detail at a Authority meeting.
- At the Authority meeting in March the Chairman agreed to make representations to the Home Secretary on behalf of the MPA to initiate a judicial inquiry into the Daniel Morgan case. The Chairman informed members that he had received a response to his letter earlier in the week. This stated that the MPS and Crown Prosecution Service had embarked on a review of events leading to the collapse of the trial into the murder and that the Government would review any implications for the Serious and Organised Crime and Policing Act around the use of known offenders as witnesses resulting from the review. The letter also stated that it is the Government's view that a full inquiry is currently unnecessary while the review is taking place.

94.2 The Chairman was asked by members about some of the outcomes from the meeting with business representatives in central London. He informed members that some of the outcomes had included; developing better ways of sharing information, both before events take place and possibly allowing representatives from the two main companies who represent most businesses in the West End area to have access to the control room in order to disseminate information to their organisations quicker.

94.3 Members noted that the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) were currently investigating the death of David Emmanuel, also known as Smiley Culture and that it was not possible to discuss anything in detail at a Authority meeting until that investigation had been concluded. However, given the community's reaction to this case, members asked if the Chairman would consider writing to Mr Emmanuel's family on the Authority's behalf to explain the situation. The Chairman in noting the request added that the IPCC had a family liaison unit and would therefore have allocated a family liaison officer to the Emmanuel family. He confirmed that considering the sensitivity of this case the MPA had spoken with the IPCC and it has been confirmed that they are getting full support through a family liaison officer. Members suggested that he may wish to consider writing to the family on the MPA behalf and it be delivered through the family liaison officer.

94.4 Members noted the Chairman's comments regarding the consultation event on stop and account and reiterated the views of those who had attended that the MPS should continue to record stop and account encounters. They agreed that it was important that this issue comes to the Authority in order that a recommended way forward can be debated.

Resolved – That the report be received.

95. Commissioner's report

(Agenda item 5)

95.1 The Commissioner thanked members for their welcome back and also recorded his thanks to his colleagues who had covered his post in his absence.

PC Nigel Albuery

95.2 In introducing his report, the Commissioner provided the Authority with an update on PC Nigel Albuery, who had been stabbed whilst on duty in Croydon. The Commissioner informed members that he was pleased to report that PC Albuery condition had stabilised and had been discharged from hospital. The Commissioner added that this incident acted as a reminder of the dangers that police officers and police staff faced on a daily basis.

G20 – PC Simon Harwood

95.3 The Commissioner informed members that he wished to repeat the comments made by DAC Rose Fitzpatrick following the coroner's verdict into the death of Ian Tomlinson that this was a matter of deep regret, irrespective of any future judicial process or disciplinary process. He reiterated that it had always been the intention of the MPS to be open and transparent in this matter and the MPS would continue to cooperate with the Director of Public Prosecutions and the IPCC.

Royal Wedding

95.4 The Commissioner welcomed the comments from the Chairman on the policing of the Royal Wedding. He confirmed that it had been a complex operation with up to a million people in attendance. He wanted to record his thanks to his staff, lead by DAC Lynne Owens, who had contributed to the success of the operation.

Public Order

95.5 Whilst noting the success of the policing of the Royal Wedding, the Commissioner reiterated the right to peaceful protest which was a fundamental part of democracy and the MPS had been quick to say when they had got it wrong, as happened at Millbank in 2010. However, a 'council of perfection' often demanded in the media was unrealistic as there was no such thing as a risk free society. He stressed the importance of guarding against the narrative that was talked about that protest can take place, that there is a perfect intelligence system and guarantee no incident would take place.

95.6 With this in mind the Commissioner stated that, particularly as the MPS faces economic constraints, it would have to work hard at maintaining as many police officers as it could. He felt that this was important as London had to be in a position to have a 'surge capability' to respond to the 4,500 public events and often some a short notice

Performance

Confidence data

95.7 It was noted that the MPS had just published its end of year confidence figures as part of the public attitude survey. In addition to the information contain in his report to the Authority, the Commissioner added that the figure showed that 66% of Londoners thought that there local police were doing a good or an excellent job, which was a 4% increase on last year. He added that the performance for the quarter period four (January to March 2011), had been very encouraging with 70% of people thinking that local police did a good or excellent job compared with 64% the previous year.

Performance - Generally

95.8 Turning to performance generally, the Commissioner reminded members that there were now a smaller amount of key performance indicators (KPI) for the financial year. As this was the first month in to the financial year with these KPI figures and they were not that meaningful as this stage. The Commissioner therefore briefly touched upon last year's figures.

95.9 The Commissioner suggested that the headline was the reduction of notifiable offences and recorded offences. Although this was by a small percentage it equated to large number almost 7,000 fewer total reported crimes. Also pleasing was the progress made on the number of serious offences committed, with violence with injury which was down almost 60% or 4,330 offences. The Commissioner also added that gun crime had also reduced by 759 offences, with gun crime being discharged also down.

95.10 Regarding tackling serious and acquisitive crime, the Commissioner stated that knife crime and youth violence remain areas of concern with violence up by 81 offences. Knife crime was up by some 723 offences, although injury with a knife was down. He reminded members that last summer knife crime and youth violence went up and the MPS reacted with local borough having developed bespoke action plans and working with other agencies to elevate this increase. Despite this, the Commissioners confirmed that there remained pressure around this issue and in particular in relation to robbery offences and burglary. He informed members that despite some encouraging reductions in reported crime he could not ignore these pressures and he had asked Territorial Policing to ensure that there was significant asset devoted to this area. The MPS were still working through detail but were going to mount a significant operation drawing on resources from across the organisation. He was determined to try to make an impact on reversing the trends around robbery association with knife crime and robbery. Once final details had been confirmed he would provide members with a briefing note on this operation.

95.11 Regretfully, the Commissioner reported that since the Authority had last meet there had been two further teenage homicides, which so far this calendar year totalled six. Whilst teenage homicides were down, there had been ten at this period last year; the Commissioner reiterated that this remained six deaths to many.

Budget

95.12 In addition to challenges in performance the Commissioner reminded members of the significant financial challenge that the MPS faced. The approved budget for the financial year was based on delivering £163 million of savings against a background of increasing pressure. He added that the MPS needed to continue to do better for less and was currently in the process of developing the 2012/13 budget and business plan. In doing so, and understanding the constraints the organisation was under, it was important that a balanced policing model was maintained and which reflected the challenges the MPS faced, ensuring that resources were aimed at essential areas. He confirmed that with this in mind it was expected that spending would be reduced by approximately £600 million by 2014/15. The £600 referred to included £323 already identified, but there was a gap and there remained a challenge around that gap. He added that with Management Board colleagues he would be working on delivering an effective business and operational model and only then reducing operational officers, but with an aim of maintaining operational capacity.

Olympics/Paralympic Games

95.13 The Commissioner informed members that with less than a year till the games commencing, the MPS were working hard on preparations for this challenging event. He noted the collaborative work with the Authority on this and thanked members, particularly Dee Doocey as Chair of the Olympics Sub-Committee as well as AC Chris Alison for their contributions during a very busy time. He added that a group of international Olympic observers attended some of the security planning for the royal wedding and had been extremely impressed with the operation, describing it as flawless. He concluded by stating that this was what the Service was striving for regarding the Olympics to ensure there was a world class security operation.

Issues raised by members

95.14 Members had submitted a number of questions in advance of the meeting.

95.15 In order to allow full consideration of a number of other items on the agenda a number of members agreed to receive a written response to their questions to the Commissioner. These included the submitted questions on:

- ANPR camera locations
- Freedom of Information
- Victim Support in Enfield
- MPS arrests of children
- Crime growth in areas around nightclub/night time economy areas
- Policing Bill
- Police cuts
- DNA Database

ACPO officers' gifts and hospitality register

95.16 Members asked a number of questions relating to the MPS/ACPO officers' gifts and hospitality register. These included:

- In line with the existing practice of the Mayor and the London Assembly, would the MPS publish online, for all MPS ACPO officers, a rolling register of all gifts and hospitality accepted, detailing the date, description, and the donor/provider?
- Would the Commissioner also make this available for the last three financial years?

- Members noted that following a recent request for details of senior officers gifts and hospitality details it was noted that details of AC Yates meetings and hospitality received by News International appeared to have been redacted. Members asked why this information contain redactions and thus ensuring that full disclosure had not been made. They asked if the information could be provided without redactions?

95.17 The Commissioner confirmed that the ACPO gifts and hospitality register would be published on a quarterly basis and that the information for this would include that for the last three financial years and it did not include any redactions. He added that both the Deputy Commissioner and his gifts and hospitality were examined by the MPA.

95.18 Regarding the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner's gifts and hospitality, the Chief Executive, agreed to provide members with the details for mechanism for doing this and review this to ensure that full information was being provided on the register.

95.19 The Commissioner, noted members comments regarding the Director of Human Resources scrutinising the register for all ACPO officers and that he had now left the MPS it would appear that this has not been done for some time. He agreed to ensure that this was undertaken.

95.20 Members asked the Commissioner that as there was a disclosure in the ACPO register by an officer that he had a personal relationship with an individual and would he expect officers to obtain authority before meeting organisations or individuals that were subject to criminal investigations. The Commissioner, whilst not suggesting the individual concerned was under investigation, urged caution that the discussion did not name or potentially identify an individual that may be subject to any potential criminal investigation. He stated that his expectations were that officer would use wisdom and judgement when meeting people and to aim to be able to justify those meetings. He did not expect officers to seek authority, but did expect judgement to be exercised. He added that the specific meeting being discussed was a private social engagement, which made it slightly more difficult, as often as such event you may not be aware of everyone in attendance and therefore declaration was difficult. He confirmed that the Deputy Commissioner had undertaken due diligence on this matter.

Human trafficking

95.21 The Commissioner was asked how many investigations are ongoing across the MPS into human trafficking, and of those how many involve the trafficking of children.

95.22 The Commissioner confirmed that the MPS remained committed to providing a high quality response to all allegations of human trafficking. He confirmed that there were more staff than ever working on this issue, currently 37 and this had seen positives results with more arrest, charges and convictions last year. This remained a significant issue and also included team reviews of all cases of trafficking recorded in the anywhere in the MPS area to ensure opportunities for investigation had not been missed. At this current time the team were investigating 46 cases of which eight related specifically to children and there was in place a dedicated team which works to support victims and communities.

95.23 The Commissioner agreed to provide members with details on how many of the 37 dedicated team in human trafficking were involved in working specifically on the trafficking of children. He added that it was difficult to be specific around under reporting and that if a report was received of an allegation of child trafficking then it would be automatically assessed to see if it could be investigated and if so investigated to the best of the services ability.

95.24 Members asked the Commissioner what input had the MPS had into the Government's Human Trafficking Strategy. He was sure the MPS had provided an input but agreed to provide members with specific details.

Missing from sex register

95.25 Following a recent report that 121 registered sex offenders had gone missing from the London area. Members asked the Commissioner if he would provide a breakdown of the offences for which these people had been convicted and what actions are the MPS taking to locate these offenders.

95.26 The Commissioner confirmed that as of the 5 May 2011 the number of Registered Sex Offenders managed by the MPS was 4,665. This was a rise of approximately 25% since September 2009. Of these Registered Sex Offenders, 118 are currently missing. This had remained more or less static despite the increasing numbers of Registered Sex Offenders. He then provided members with a breakdown of their qualifying convictions and these included; 26 sexual and/or indecent assault on persons under 16 years, 16 sexual and/or indecent assault on persons over 16. He added that there were 29 sexual assault that did not go to penetration, 30 rapes, 13 exposures; four possessions of indecent photos. Six further offence types including voyeurism, unlawful sexual intercourse, inciting prostitution, possession of indecent photographs and outrage and public decency. He also added that these numbers would fluctuate on a daily basis.

95.27 He added that this number fluctuates on a daily basis and that as soon as it had been established that an offender was missing their details are circulated to police forces UK wide and to the UK Border Agency and lines of enquiry lines identified to trace and arrest them. All actions were reviewed by a Detective Inspector within 24 hours, within 7 days by a Detective Chief Inspector and every 28 days by a Superintendent.

This was to ensure lines of enquiry are being progressed and sufficient resource allocated. The Commissioner added that registered sex offenders MPS wide were also monitored and dip sampled centrally (by Operation Jigsaw) to ensure consistency and provide advice. He informed members that the intelligence indicated that 45 of these offenders may be living outside the UK. In these circumstances the MPS had a process to liaise with the relevant national force to share intelligence and consider extradition.

95.28 Members asked for further details about those offenders who were living outside the UK. The Commissioner stated that most other countries do not have a register or any systems for dealing with these people particularly if they have already been dealt with for their crimes. This was made more difficult as the MPS had to deal with different standards and legislation. However, he stressed that where an offender was located abroad the MPS worked with the Crown Prosecution Service on the most appropriate extradition process. The Commission added that the number of offenders missing from the register had stayed more or less static, despite a 25% increase in registered offenders since legislation had commenced in 1997. Of those missing in the UK some are missing for a short period some for longer periods and the Commissioner reiterated that when they go missing details are circulated to police forces UK-wide and the UK Border Agency. In response to members, the Commissioner confirmed that when an offender goes missing those that are considered high risk are assessed/prioritised urgently.

Safer neighbourhood teams/ Front counter vacancies

95.29 Members asked if the Commissioner would provide details on how many officers in the response team pilots in Lambeth and Brent had been redeployed in total, and how many of the total were now working with Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT).

95.30 Members were informed that the response pilots had involved the 'realignment' of a total of 255 police officers and that they remain on Lambeth and Brent BOCU and had not been redeployed elsewhere. The Commissioner outlined how the officers had been redeployed in a number of ways and stated that they were not just working with SNTs but had also been used, for example, to staff permanent custody teams and testing other aspects of the policing model. In Lambeth, 78 PCs were now working alongside their SNTs in Local Policing Team's and that these officers were led by the relevant SNT sergeant. In Brent, 12 sergeants and 62 PCs were currently working as part of two Local

Policing Teams. These teams had a number of responsibilities (such as delivery of appointments) but are also designed to operate in support of SN action to tackle crime and ASB. The Commissioner added that these pilots were testing new ways of managing emergency and non-emergency response. Comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of this approach is a core requirement of each pilot.

95.31 Some members raised concerns that some of the officers in the pilots in Brent and Lambeth were not undertaking front line SNT services, which was the understanding that they would, but were being used to undertake detention or front counter duties. The Commissioner stated that the aim was to see how the MPS can respond better and do that for less with less people and maintain operational capability.

95.32 Regarding the police officers filling counter positions rather than deploying Police Community Support Officers (PCSO), the Commissioner was asked if he thought this was good value for money and had he provided any guidance to borough commanders on redeployment to fill front line counters.

95.33 The Deputy Commissioner confirmed that it was not the aim to use fully fit police officers for front counter duties, but there were occasions where police officers had covered vacancies or due to absences or abstractions. He confirmed that there was a full review being undertaken around front counters which would have to consider the current financial climate and how best to operate front counters in terms of resources and issues such as opening times. The Deputy Commissioner stated that he was aware that police stations were iconic buildings and created the reassurance of a police presence, but there was work to be done in reassuring that there was a police presence if a station front counter was not open. In addition, as part of the review a key point that needed to be included was how the service could react to issues such as large public order events and provide reliance at borough level. The review, once complete would be shared with the Authority. He added that where possible, police officers on restricted and recuperative duties were currently used to support front counter duties and he thought this may be the case in some boroughs. Some members questioned that officers on restricted duties were being used and that police officers were undertaking these duties at the expense of police and questioned if this was value for money

Review of Public Access 'Channels'/ Contacting the Metropolitan Police Survey 2011

95.34 Following its launch on 11 April, members asked the Commissioner if he would provide details on what the MPS had done to publicise their Review of Public Access 'Channels' since its launched. The Commissioner was also asked if he would commit to publicising the raw response data as soon as the consultation closes so that MPA members could see what Londoner's thought of the plans. He was also asked if he was satisfied with the Contacting the Metropolitan Police Survey 2011.

95.35 The Commissioner confirmed that the MPS had launched the consultation on public access channels in April with the intention of seeking the views of the public and partners on accessing police services. As part of this process the MPS had written to council leaders, local authority chief executives, MPs, MPA members and London Assembly members. Boroughs have been engaging with their strategic partners and local groups and people to encourage participation, including SN Ward Panels, Independent Advisory Groups (IAG) and Neighbourhood Watch schemes. The Commissioner confirmed that at a corporate level, the MPS had also engaged with the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transsexual, Disability and Race IAGs and produced an online survey hosted on the MPS website, as well as the 32 borough websites. Boroughs had promoted the survey widely, through local papers and emails to local businesses and residents. All of our 630 SNTs have been raising awareness through their public meetings where paper copies of the survey were made available.

95.36 The Commissioner stated that the MPS remain committed to providing the public access to policing services through a front counter style service as well as through other means including the internet, Safer Neighbourhoods teams surgeries, telephone

investigation, appointments and police information points. This access would be provided at times and locations the public need it and is aimed at delivering improved customer service. He confirmed that the results would be published and raw data provided to members if required and that published results would form part of a report to the Authority's Strategic and Operational Policing Committee in September.

95.37 Members in noting the Commissioner's comments expressed some concerns relating the questionnaire and survey. In particular, some members had received a number concerns from constituents that the questionnaire was confusing. The Commissioner noted the concerns that had been raised and stressed that it was not the intention of the consultation to take decisions as to which front counters to close or not. He added that it was about a broader issue on how do people want to access policing services in the future and recognising that demographics and technology is changing. He added that as there are an increasing number of people reporting crime on line and there is a reduction in use of front line counter services and that there may have to be some difficult decisions. These decisions had not been made as yet and the Commissioner accepted that there may have to be some misunderstandings, which he regretted, particularly around the idea of a minimum service in boroughs. He agreed with members that co-location was an interesting option. He also reiterated that the questionnaire and survey were not about closing police stations and the Service needed to look at the results to understand best ways of serving London which had different needs and different communities.

95.38 Members asked and the Commissioner agreed that the results of the questionnaire and survey would be provided to members on a borough by borough basis.

Requests from Government Ministers/Case Reviews/Madeleine McCann case review

95.39 Members asked the Commissioner a number of interlinked questions on

- How did he respond to requests from Government Ministers for matters to be investigated.
- Following the announcement that the MPS would be undertaking a review of this case, following a requested by the Prime Minister and Home Secretary. Member asked the Commissioner what his understanding was that in future an elected police and crime commissioner would be able to request that the MPS to investigate specific cases in this way?
- Clarification was sought on the criteria used when deciding whether to reinvestigate/review cases initially conducted by other police force?

95.40 The Commissioner confirmed that he had received a request from the Home Secretary, which was supported by the Prime Minister, that the Metropolitan Police bring their expertise to review the Madeline McCann case.

95.41 He informed members that it was not unusual for the MPS to be asked to assist in this way and in all such requests, the following considerations apply, based on professional judgement

- It is it within our locus?
- Can the MPS add value with our expertise?
- Is this a skill that the MPS is uniquely or better placed to provide than another force? In many instances (such as this one) the MPS were asked for our 'review' expertise - in smaller forces they often ask outside forces to review their investigations, the MPS reviews its own investigations along with those of other forces. The MPS have this skill.
- Is this a case where the international reputation of the MPS and New Scotland Yard can be of assistance in opening doors?

- Is there funding available?
- Do we have the capacity to do this? Recently, we have seen a significant drop in homicide, and this together with the current financial climate meant that SCD had plans to decrease the number of Murder Investigation Teams. The funding available for us to take on this work, enabling the MPS to retain some specialist skills that we would not otherwise have done.
- Is there support from the Government? The MPS do not get involved in another country's jurisdiction unless we have been specifically asked to.

95.42 The Commissioner confirmed that on balance and, having taken all of these considerations into account, he had decided it was appropriate that the MPS respond positively to the request for assistance. He informed members that it was not unusual for the MPS to take on a piece of work such as this as the experience and expertise of the MPS has historically been used on a number of occasions to investigate and review investigations of other forces, both in the UK and abroad.

95.43 He was aware that some members of this Authority have voiced concerns that such a request breaches operational independence. Given conversations going on currently about the Police and Social Responsibility Bill, operational independence was rarely far from his mind, and he informed members that they would not be surprised that he had sought to reassure himself that undertaking this request would not be improper. He confirmed that this request was not that the MPA take over the hunt for Madeline McCann, but that the experts in our Specialist Crime Command look over the case and see if there are any gaps or any points of view that others may not have yet considered. The Commissioner added that some have questioned what this means for other cases of missing children. And he stated that it is that the MPS has undertaken reviews of other such cases and would always consider requests. This was a unique case however, with significant public interest. Under the circumstances, with the MPS able to offer expertise and funds available to allow the work to be undertaken, He felt it entirely appropriate to agree to the Government's request.

95.44 In noting members' comments, members asked if in such situations it would be more suitable to have a more formal protocol for making such decisions. The Commissioner reiterated that he felt the considerations based on professional judgement as outlined were acceptable and that he would not in such cases part with his impartiality or operational independence when making such decisions. However, he noted members' comments and would consider if he needed to look a more formal approach.

95.45 The Commissioner confirmed that the MPS had received some additional funding to undertake the review of this specific case, but was unable to provide full details as the scoping exercise had yet to be undertaken. He confirmed that the Home Office will have oversight of the review and that payment was expected to be quarterly in arrears. He did not feel that the request to review this case would impinge on other investigations.

95.46 Members sought further comment on other cases and how they are selected to be reviewed, if at all. The Commissioner confirmed that it usually occurred following a direct request, from Government, through the Foreign Office or other agencies and then the previously mentioned considerations would be considered.

Abducted/Missing Children

95.47 Members asked a number of questions about abducted or missing children and these included:

- how many unsolved missing (believed abducted) children cases have there been in the MPS district in the last 30 years?

- How many of these are 'live' as in still open to investigation and how many are closed?
- What criteria do you use to decide to close an abducted/missing child case?
- Has there ever been a service-wide review of abducted/missing children such as happens regularly for homicide reviews where a range of cases are looked at from an organizational as well as individual point of view?

95.48 The Commissioner informed members that there was a need to have care when discussing this matter as there was a range of issues around missing children and a lot of concerned families.

95.49 He stated that 'stranger' abduction of children is extremely uncommon, with the majority of child abductions being intra-familial and not committed by strangers. The term child applied to anyone under the age of 18. It included a wide spectrum of offences, from a divorced parent taking a child abroad on holiday (without the consent of the court or without the permission of the other parent) to a child snatched from the street. Unsolved cases are not closed and are not subject to an 'active phase' of the investigation. He informed members that if murder was suspected, then such 'inactive' cases would be subjected to reviews on a two yearly basis. All cases of murder and serious crime are investigated by the Homicide and Serious Crime Command, which were unsolved, are subject to a formal panel. This panel is chaired by the Commander Homicide and the Detective Chief Superintendent and other members include the IAG, Murder Review Group and senior investigators. Cases are regarded as 'inactive' when there are no further viable lines of enquiry to complete.

95.50 The Commissioner informed members that stranger abductions, which are extremely rare, are addressed at a wider national level. Such cases (e.g. Shannon Matthews) are discussed at a national level via the Homicide Working Group and fed back through the national SIO forums.

Child arrests in London

95.51 Recent figures showed the number of child arrests in London was 46,067 last year, 46,546 in 2009, and 49,292 in 2008. Members asked the Commissioner:

- What are your views on the figures in the MPS?
- Is there a reason these figures have decreased in the past two years?
- Could we be debriefed on the background to these figures? For example, could we be given information on:
 - Which parts of London these arrests took place;
 - What these children in the two sets of figures (14-16 and under 14) were arrested for;
 - How many were convicted;
 - How many of those arrested, were then arrested again for another offence;
 - How many of these children were considered 'at-risk' by authorities prior to their arrest.

95.52 The Commissioner was pleased to inform members that there had been a reduction in arrest figures for London's children and young people since 2008. He informed members that he wanted to see a reduction in crime, including youth crime which had become a challenging issue, but there have been successes such as Operation Blunt. He also informed members that it was important to see a reduction in the number of young people entering the criminal justice system and prevention work with partners has been particularly important in achieving this, given the limitations to resources. He added that it was an overarching aim to reduce the unnecessary

criminalisation of young people and to this end a number of initiatives have been implemented within the MPS which have no doubt contributed to a continuing decline in arrests: These included:

- Triage
- The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)
- Youth Restorative Disposals

95.53 In noting the successes, the Commissioner believed that there was no room for complacency and a strong shared need to maximise our efforts if young people are to be persuaded from making the wrong choices in life. He felt that initiatives such as the Mayor's Time for Action programme play an important role in the galvanising of prevention activity. He also outlined details of 'Triage' as a good example of reducing people's involvement in crime and reducing the need to arrest

Geotime mapping software

95.54 It is understood that the MPS have purchased this mapping software which enables comprehensive information about an individual's movements and communications to be aggregated. Members asked what governance arrangements have been/ would be put in place concerning the use of this software (e.g. security clearance levels for access and/or authorisation)? Members also asked:

- Has the Met already begun to use the Geotime software?
- What sort of uses do you envisage using the Geotime software for?
- Who will authorise the tracking of 'suspects', and what supervisory and governance arrangements will cover the use of this software? How will clearance to officers to use the software be issued and their use of it supervised?

95.55 The Commissioner confirmed that this software was currently not in operational use within the MPS but it is in the process of being evaluated and as such the MPS have purchased five licenses following the expiry of a free trial. The software brought together existing information held by the MPS on the location and timing of past events into a single, visual format to help build a clearer picture of what happened. Currently this information is stored but analysed using two different software applications. The MPS are not using it to gather information that it does not already have access to.

95.56 The Commissioner confirmed that if a decision is made to adopt the use of Geotime following the evaluation, the MPS would adhere to a series of stringent processes and standards that govern the introduction of any new technology. These would include:

- In terms of security, the MPS would adhere to Government standards relating to the governance of computer systems - Risk Management and Accreditation of Information Systems (RMADS).
- In terms of information, full governance arrangements would be considered in consultation with the MPS Public Access Office. Geotime could be used to analyse existing information - all the information the MPS use had already been gathered in line with Data Protection Act and Freedom of Information legislation.
- In terms of how we would use the software, at this stage the MPS have not decided whether to adopt this technology and if so how we will use it, this is dependent on the outcome of the evaluation and its potential.

95.57 He confirmed that there would need to be an evaluation process and he agreed to share that evaluation process with the Authority.

Emergency Equipment

95.58 In light of the issues raised by a recent IPCC investigation, members asked the Commissioner if he could confirm whether there would be a review of the arrangements regarding the lack of routine provision of emergency entry equipment in police vehicles.

95.59 The Commissioner stated that he did not think that it was realistic to place emergency entry equipment in every police vehicle as there was an issue around how many vehicles the MPS had, training staff and then replacing equipment when it was required to do so. However, the Commissioner felt that the key issue was to ensure that this equipment was in place in boroughs and he had asked AC Ian McPherson to look to see if this arrangement was in place. The Commissioner agreed to provide feedback to members on this matter.

ESD/ICEFLO

95.60 Members asked the Commissioner if he would confirm that there are sufficient ESDs (roadside breathalyser) and ICEFLO (cameras) available to fully equip the patrol vehicle fleet?

95.61 The Commissioner stated that there was sufficient available equipment for patrolling officers to have 24/7 access to ESD and ICEFLO but again it was not possible to equip every vehicle with one. He confirmed that access is available at every borough.

Reducing Bureaucracy

95.62 The Mayor and the Home Secretary had indicated that they want to reduce and eliminate targets and red-tape. Police officers say they want to get rid of targets and red-tape. In addition local residents state that they also wanted to reduce and eliminate of targets and red-tape, as do police officer and the Commissioner. However, all anecdotal evidence suggests that there has been no substantive reduction in targets and red tape within the MPS. The Commissioner was asked what was preventing this reduction.

95.63 The Commissioner noted that the question around bureaucracy had been raised at full Authority and other fora on a number of occasions. He stated that whilst he opposed unnecessary bureaucracy there had to be an acknowledgement that there would always be some level of bureaucracy to operate effectively.

95.64 He added that when questions have been previously asked about bureaucracy the focus had been on the national impetus for driving down bureaucracy and that work continued as the ACPO Reducing Bureaucracy programme focused on reducing the bad bureaucracy relating to risk, the criminal justice system, the impact of legislation, partnerships and internal processes. He reminded members that the MPS had undertaken some of the practical steps to reduce bureaucratic procedures and improve productivity, such as the introduction of Integrated Prosecution Teams and the increased use of Virtual Courts. There had also been work around developing technical equipment such as personal digital assistants (PDA in order to reduce bureaucracy). At a strategic level, maximising productivity was at the heart of what the MPS are trying to achieve and he confirmed that the MPS are closely looking at all its corporate procedures and processes to ensure the business model was as lean as is practically possible. He concluded by stating that a fundamental aspect of this was making sure the MPS are fit for purpose and reducing unnecessary bureaucracy was an important part of this as we analyse all of the MPS core processes and work continued on this matter.

95.65 In relation to PDA members asked how these and other electronic devices could help maximise efficiencies. The Commissioner confirmed that the PDA were helping to reduce bureaucracy, but he added a note of caution as at the moment there were six applications and there are issues around training and affordability.

Fortnum and Mason arrests and bail conditions

95.66 Members asked the Commissioner how many of the protesters arrested at Fortnum and Mason for aggravated trespass were given the bail condition of not being allowed in the area of Westminster and what was the justification for these conditions?

95.67 The Deputy Commissioner confirmed that 145 individuals were arrested on 26 March and 138 were charged with Aggravated Trespass in relation to Fortnum and Mason. Three further arrests in relation to Fortnum and Mason had resulted in charges for theft criminal damage and aggravated trespass respectively. The next court date is 27th June 2011 at City of Westminster Magistrates Court and he confirmed that the MPS were working with CPS in reaching the decision to charge and continue to do so.

95.68 The Deputy Commissioner confirmed that of the 148 arrested in Fortnum and Mason, 67 were given bail conditions to prevent further disorder. All have now had their bail conditions lifted either prior to, or at their first appearance. A number of other bail conditions were imposed on those arrested and/or charged with violence and damage after the disorder on 26th March 2011.

95.69 The Deputy Commissioner agreed to provide members with details of how many charges had been dropped for people who had been arrested for aggravated trespass.

- Year end crime statistics

95.70 On Friday 15/04/11, Members were sent a bulletin of the MPS press release on year end crime figures, complete with quotes from Commander Simon Pountain and Mayor Johnson. However, members were only given the accompanying statistics by request and the figures were not yet available on the MPS website. Members asked the Commissioner, in future, please can members automatically be sent the statistics before or at the same time as the press release.

95.71 The Chairman agreed that, regarding statistics, members should be automatically sent these,

Hollow Point ammunition

95.72 The Commissioner was asked what was the criteria you used to decide to purchase hollow point ammunition for use by fire arms officers in the MPS. He was also asked had anyone ever been injured or killed by 'collateral damage' caused by a bullet hitting the target and then passing through or bouncing off. Members asked what public messages are being put in place to manage the message that the MPS are now deploying ammunition deemed not to be suitable for use in warfare.

95.73 In response to the first part of the question the Commissioner confirmed that the MPS had carried out extensive testing of the ammunition looking to ensure the best balance between limiting over penetration and incapacitating hostile subjects with minimal fragmentation and increased reliability and performance. The aim of this extensive testing regime was to identify the most appropriate ammunition for the different calibre of weapons. The MPs also considered value for money, contract life consistency and legality as part of the procurement process.

95.74 Regarding if anybody had been killed by 'collateral damage' the Commissioner informed members that there have been no incidents reported following the use of firearms by the MPS where an individual has been injured or killed by a 'bullet' hitting the target and then passing through or deflection. He added, however, based on scientific evidence the MPS know that there was a risk of this happening. However, there was a legal and moral obligation to officers and any individual who might get caught up in such an incident to minimise the risk around the circumstances in which this could happen. Although this had never happened to a police officer, there have been cases where criminals have used firearms and injuries have been caused by over penetration and ricochet. He added that in any MPS firearms operation the primary aim is the protection of life and public safety. This new ammunition currently offers the best risk management in relation to over penetration. Confirmation was also given that the

MPS had consulted the Armed Police Reference Group which is multi-agency forum with representation from interested parties ranging from faith groups to disability forums. In addition, a press briefing had been given to the Crime Reporters Association, the new contract was openly reported in the Evening Standard and the Commissioner had also given radio interviews on this.

95.75 The Commissioner also wanted to make it clear that it was key to point out that the MPS is not deploying ammunition deemed unsuitable for use in warfare. A hollow point is not a 'dum dum' bullet. He added that from a policing perspective the need is to stop a subject immediately due to an immediate threat to life and also to minimise the risk to other persons through over penetration. This hollow round was designed to stay in one piece and not fragment thereby reducing the challenges should medical aftercare become pertinent.

95.76 In relation to costs the Commissioner confirmed that the testing procedure, which covered an intensive 12-week period done under controlled, scientific conditions, cost £80,000. He provided members with details of the testing procedure which included extensive ballistic testing into ballistic gelatine and also through barriers such as double glazing; windscreen glass; simulated vehicle body work and heavy duty clothing materials. In response to members the Commissioner could not confirm if this ammunition was the same as that tested in New York or elsewhere

Other questions raised by members

Arrest in connection with the Murder of Stephen Lawrence

95.77 Members noted that there had been two arrests made in connection with the murder of Stephen Lawrence. Whilst this matter was at an early stage, members welcomed the possibility that there was a chance of justice for the Lawrence family.

Stabbing of an Officer in Croydon

95.78 Members noted the previous comments made by the Chairman regarding the stabbing of PC Albuery and wished to also record their best wishes for a speedy recovery acknowledging the day to day challenges that police officers face.

Video of MPS officer

95.79 Members raised concerns that a video of relating to an ongoing disciplinary case had been passed to the media. The Commissioner informed members that there was an investigation into how this happened he could not add any further comment at this stage.

95.80 Those issues that the Commissioner undertook to report back on to members have been circulated in the form of an addendum report and are appended to these minutes at Appendix 1.

Resolved – That the report be received.

96. Race and Faith Inquiry

([Agenda item 6a](#) and [Agenda item 6b](#))

6a Update on recommendations & 6b Multi point entry

96.1 At the Authority meeting in November 2010, members considered a report that set out the recommendations arising from the Race and Faith Inquiry. The Chief Executive now introduced a report that provided an update on the progression of those recommendations.

96.2 In addition to the report on the progression of the Race and Faith Inquiry report recommendations (Agenda item 6a), members received a report a report that considered options for 'multi point entry into the police service.

96.3 Cindy Butts, as chair of the Race and Faith Inquiry stated that there had been some steady progress made in taking forward the recommendations of the Inquiry. She added that in some cases it was noted that the MPS had gone further than some of the

recommendations and that was welcomed. She raised the issue of lateral development, which she felt could be developed further and issues around capacity of the Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate, which she felt could be used more as an internal inspection. She felt that the Directorate could continue to be used as a centre for good practice, but also used to focus on those areas that require further work in the organisation. Another issue that she raised was as the Authority came to an end how issues from the Inquiry were going to be picked up and how they would remain legacy issues in any new governance arrangements.

96.4 Members welcomed the reports and in relation to the Multi point entry report (Agenda item 6b) drew attention to the suggestion of 'rank skipping'. This suggestion was broadly supported, particularly if all entrants continued to serve some time as a constable. It was noted that some members wanted to see reassurance that whilst some should be allowed to 'rank skip', that the organisation has in place sufficient ability to ensure that an individual does not have significant knowledge/experience gaps. Members also suggested consideration of this proposal should be supported by the development of independent mentoring. It was noted in the report that 'the challenge is to ensure equalities are mainstream through the new MOPC operating model'. Members felt that whilst it was acceptable to mainstream, they needed to be satisfied that internal work was being undertaken and on how the recommendations from the Inquiry were going to be taken forward.

96.5 The Commissioner also broadly supported the need to be more creative about direct entry, but added that the organisation needed to be careful how to get the right levels of experience and ensure that those people are doing the job and not put in position where they cannot discharge often challenging responsibilities.

96.6 In terms of how these issues are taken forward, the Chairman confirmed that the MPA had initiated the national debate by holding the symposium early this year. Multi point entry would require legislative and regulatory change and therefore this will be fed into the next stage of the 'Windsor Review'.

96.7 Members asked if rank skipping required either legislative or regulatory change. The Commissioner stated that it did not and reminded members of the high potential development scheme, which was more about speeding individuals through the service as opposed to 'rank skipping'. He felt that this was an opportunity to develop a national scheme that was more creative.

Resolved– That

1. **the approach to the implementation of the Inquiry Panel's recommendations set out in paragraph 4 of agenda item 6a be noted; and**
2. **the approach to the next stage of multi-point entry proposals set out at paragraphs 4-6 of the report and in Appendix 1 of agenda item 6b be agreed.**

97. The MPA's committee structure

(Agenda item 7)

97.1 Until such time as the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill is enacted, the Authority is operating as business as usual. Therefore, the Authority is required to hold an annual meeting and this will be held in June.

97.2 Members considered a report that sought agreement that the Authority until such time as the Bill is enacted the current committee structure, as given at Appendix 1 to the report, be confirmed. In addition, members were also asked to inform officers of any changes they wish to make at the annual meeting to positions such as chairs of and membership of committees and sub committees, together with all other appointments.

Resolved – That

1. **the current committee structure be confirmed; and**

2. **members inform officers of any proposed changes to positions of chairs and membership of committees and sub-committees, together with all other appointments prior to the annual meeting.**

98. Reports from committees

(Agenda item 8)

98.1 The Authority received a report outlining key issues that had been considered at recent Authority Committee meetings. The report covered the following meetings:

- Finance and Resources Committee – 24 March 2011
- Standards Committee – 29 March 2011
- Finance and Resources Committee – 14 April 2011
- Communities, Equality and People Committee – 5 May 2011

Resolved – That the report be received.

99. Any other urgent business

(Agenda item 12)

99.1 There were no items of urgent business.
The meeting closed at 12:36 p.m.

Appendix 1

Addendum to the Commissioner's report

Report by the Commissioner

This report follows up on the actions and commitments made verbally by the Commissioner at the Full Authority meeting on 26 May 2011.

The Commissioner committed to provide an update to Members on the following issues:

- Whether a register of Membership to Masonic Lodges was appropriate.
- Written response to questions from Members
- Operation to tackle robbery offences and burglary
- Human trafficking
- Geotime mapping software
- Emergency Equipment
- Fortnum and Mason arrests and charges

Whether a register of Membership to Masonic Lodges was appropriate

1. Members asked for further information following the discussion at the Full Authority Meeting in March 2011. Information will be provided to the MPA by 28th June 2011.

Written response to questions from Members

2. Members asked for written responses regarding the below questions

- ANPR camera locations
- Freedom of Information
- Victim Support in Enfield
- MPS arrests of children
- Crime growth in areas around nightclub/night time economy areas
- Police cuts
- DNA Data base

The responses are to be sent to the MPA by 28 June 2011.

Operation to tackle robbery offences and burglary

3. The Commissioner agreed to provide Members with a briefing on Operation Target. This has been provided to the MPA.

Human Trafficking

4. Members asked how many of the dedicated human trafficking team are involved in working specifically on the trafficking of children and the MPS input into Government's Human Trafficking Strategy. Information will be provided to the MPA by 21 June.

Geotime Mapping Software

5. Members asked for Information regarding the evaluation of this software. Information on the evaluation process will be provided to the MPA by 21 June.

Emergency Equipment

6. The Commissioner agreed to provide Members with information from TP regarding officers having sufficient access to emergence equipment. Information will be provided to the MPA by 28 June 2011.

Fortnum and Mason arrests and charges

7. Members requested details of charges 'dropped' against people arrested for aggravated trespass at Fortnum and Mason. Information will be provided to the MPA by 21 June.

Report author: Zara Ryder, Strategic Relationships, MPS

Background papers None