Appendix 1

Police and Crime Committee

27 February 2014

Transcript of item 4: Question and Answer Session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We now move to our main question and answer session today with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), Stephen Greenhalgh, and both the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), so thank you all for attending.

Before we start our formal questions today, you will be aware that the minutes we have just agreed were the three meetings from our examination of the case for water cannon. We have released a report which sets out the fact that this Committee has not been convinced by the arguments put forward. We have actually had some very good and robust sessions on that.

Can I ask both Stephen and Bernard about the timeline now for the process? Your consultation closes tomorrow, Stephen. When do you expect the Mayor to formally make a decision about whether he is going to request the Home Secretary to licence water cannon?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Also, as you know and covered in your report, there is the most extensive survey of Londoners on water cannon. I believe we are going to have the results of that sometime next week. I would have thought, together with that survey and then an opportunity to digest the consultation responses, the Mayor will be forming a view and will then decide whether to initiate procurement at some time in the next couple of weeks.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): A couple of weeks, so in the middle of March he is likely to make a decision?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Sometime in March.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Just for our information, could you perhaps send us a copy of the survey that you are using? It would be very helpful.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Sure.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Are we aware of when the Home Secretary might be minded to make a decision on this? Does anyone have any inkling at all?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Certainly, Chair, we do not have that completely. Obviously, it depends on their decision-

making process, really. In our view, at least a decision either way would be helpful fairly quickly, within months, but I suspect also political issues will have to play a part. Obviously, we are now moving towards the May elections as well.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It could be that we would not have a decision until after the elections?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot give you any further guidance on it. We just know that it will have to go through a process, but I am not sure that a date has been given by which that decision would be made. Certainly I have not heard of one.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK. That is helpful.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I know the Committee argues that this is a rushed decision. We would argue that this process has been going on for quite a long time now, since 2012.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Stephen, can I just clarify that the Mayor will not make funds available to purchase these three water cannon until you have a formal decision from the Home Secretary?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Mayor will have to initiate procurement without having a decision from the Home Secretary, but also he will not conclude procurement unless this has been licensed by the Home Secretary. The decision for licensing rests with the Home Secretary.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: How can he do that? Rubbish.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Will taxpayers' money be spent before we have a decision from the Home Secretary?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The initiation of procurement does not mean you are paying anybody. It means you are starting the process.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is why we want clarity.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: If it is not procuring (overspeaking) completion.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Presumably, if you are entering a contract --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, you are not entering a contract. You are initiating public procurement. There is a timeline for public procurement.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can you guarantee that you will not commit public funds to this until --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You only commit the funds to people when you have actually agreed a contract. You initiate procurement. You do not conclude procurement. The conclusion of procurement is when you transfer funds to someone for water cannon.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can you confirm to us that you will not spend taxpayers' money on this until there has been a formal --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You may have to spend minimal amounts of money. I am happy to inform the Committee of what you spend, but you will not be spending the money on the water cannon until you conclude procurement.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Will that conclusion come after the Home Secretary has made a decision?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, it will not. It will obviously come after the Home Secretary has agreed to licence, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I understand that there may be officer time used in establishing the procurement process --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is not going to be out of pocket with the costs, but it is going to be the time and effort to do that. Obviously the money does not transfer until you conclude procurement.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The £200,000 to £300,000 purchase of the water cannon will not be made until after the Home Secretary has licensed it formally?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Correct.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Any further questions? No. Victoria, you wanted to raise an issue?

Victoria Borwick AM: Yes, before we move on to the other main questions. At the moment we have all been keeping up with the news, as is the wont of politicians, and we are inevitably a bit shocked by the recent announcement about what has been going on with the Northern Ireland cases.

Could you give us an idea if any of these amnesty letters have been written to anyone in the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) area; just so that we in our scrutiny role can feel reassured about what is actually going on and the involvement of the MPS in this?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The only thing I can say at this stage is that, obviously, the particular case is the only case that we are fully aware of. There has been criticism of the process in Northern Ireland, but not in the MPS.

We made an arrest in good faith based on a reasonable suspicion, so the court accepted that. Therefore, in that case we have not had any criticism, I think quite rightly.

There is now clearly a process to go through in Northern Ireland, announced by the Attorney General yesterday in Parliament, to consider the wider ramifications of what has been described as about 184 letters that were sent out in Northern Ireland; I think by the Northern Ireland office, some years ago. At the moment, in terms of the process, what will happen is that (1) Northern Ireland has to decide, I suspect within the next 48 hours, how it intends to address that dilemma and (2) the Attorney General has to consider in this country how that will be addressed.

Victoria Borwick AM: Inevitably, although I accept that you have not been sitting there signing letters yourself, this comes under the MPS. Therefore it is up to us to ensure the correct scrutiny or procedures are gone through, in order to make sure we do not have people running around the streets of London who could be causing a threat. Therefore, I would ask you and I would be very happy if you come back to us in writing with any further information. I appreciate this has all come up in the last 24 hours, but it would be sensible if you could keep us abreast of any changes.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am not just trying to shirk. It is very early after that decision and, essentially, this is a Northern Ireland issue, not one for the rest of the mainland United Kingdom (UK).

Victoria Borwick AM: It would be reassuring if we all felt that was the case.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): On that, you have highlighted the fact that the MPS was chasing leads and following evidence in an outstanding case. Will you now be going through a process and seeing whether there are any further cases that you may be pursuing that are affected by these letters? Are you in contact with your Northern Ireland counterparts to establish that?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. Obviously, what we know is that we wanted the man who now has been released by the Court from the threat of prosecution; and the test is whether or not we want somebody for a terrorist offence from the past. That is the critical test, so one of the things that is being reviewed is whether any of the people we want are affected by any of these letters.

Victoria Borwick AM: They may, therefore, be in London?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If they were, we would have got them by now, if we knew that, I hope. Anyway, that process is being gone through. How much we can share publicly, I hope you will understand, we will be a little bit careful about. At the end of the day, we do not want to arrest someone else who has this letter and then we waste a lot of their time and everyone else's by putting them through a judicial process that is not going to be concluded.

Victoria Borwick AM: No, but I do think it is reassuring to Londoners to know that that process is being gone through and, that it is being scrutinised by the Members here in order to make sure we try to keep London safe.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The final comment to make on it from me is that it is quite a complex process, but it is not yet clear whether anybody intends to - and I have no reason to suspect - get involved in an appeal process. It is not straightforward at all and people are trying to work out what happened, what the ramifications are and what the next stages could be.

Victoria Borwick AM: Thank you. I hope you will keep us informed.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Caroline?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, I want to pick up on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC) value-for-money profiles from 2013 and ask some questions to the MPS; and I think colleagues will pick up some to Stephen [Greenhalgh].

One of the things that came up when we looked at this last time was that the number of staff working in local policing functions at the MPS seems to be decreasing; from 19,700 in 2012/13 to 18,900 in 2013/14. Why is this? Perhaps you can explain that.

Also, a lower proportion of your budget is spent on local policing. You spend 8% of your budget on neighbourhood policing, which is around half the amount of similar other force groups. I am just wondering why you are spending such a small amount on local policing.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): This is quite a difficult thing to discuss at times because by trading numbers in this forum it could get a little bit confusing. However, there are a couple of broad points I want to make and Craig may well add a bit of detail.

The first thing is that at the time affected by these measurements, it makes fair points about what are reductions in numbers; and at the same time the MPS has seen reductions in numbers to, as you have challenged us about before. We should have around 32,000 officers and today we are running at about 30,200, so the overall actual number of officers has dropped. It is not what we want, but until we can get the savings out of the budget, we cannot employ people that we cannot afford to pay. The overall numbers have dropped to 30,200 and it got down to about 30,100. Therefore, the proportions in all our units have dropped, whether it is in homicide or neighbourhood policing teams. Really, a large amount of this change over this period is accounted for by that.

The second thing to say is that in terms of proportions, genuinely, having been sitting where HMIC sits --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Quite. You are in a unique position.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I have always been very challenging of the MPS in saying, "You cannot claim to be unique all the time unless you can substantiate that claim". At least to some extent, we can substantiate the claim around the percentages here. The MPS has around 4,000 officers that every other force in the country will never have. For example, we have a very large counterterrorist unit. The whole of the Specialist Operations (SO) department, which includes things like the Royal and Diplomatic Protection Groups, things which other forces just do not have --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I thought those were taken out. The national responsibilities are generally excluded from the profiles.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They can be, but we would argue they are not entirely excluded here. There is a reason why the averages which are shown here are not truly representative. That would be our first point.

The final point to make is that we have said here and we are in the process of actually achieving, putting more officers into neighbourhoods and more officers into our response teams, which accounts for the visibility. We have the neighbourhood teams, as you know. Then we have the response teams, those officers who are seen, visible. We are in the process of putting in about 2,600 more officers, which are not accounted for in these figures and will not be there entirely for about another 18 months, as we recruit another 5,000 over the next few years. We have already increased the actual number in neighbourhood teams from around 1,800 in 2011 to 4,000 today.

I have given my best explanation of what is a quite complex set of figures and, as soon as you start crosscutting in the way I just have verbally, it is really hard to get our heads around. We can genuinely prove we are putting more officers in. The percentages are not always representative, but we are committed to neighbourhood policing. The way we have funded that is not by more money, but by redeploying officers out of back offices. As of this Monday, we have redeployed about 500 officers from sitting in offices to neighbourhoods and response.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can you just explain to me, Craig? I am still not clear. I understand you are talking numbers and you are down in recruitment. I understand it is going to be another 18 months before you are at the level you want to be. It still does not answer, for me, why you have half the number of neighbourhood policing that other similar forces have.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Half the spend, yes. I absolutely get that. I live by these things. There are 80-odd pages of it. Interestingly, if you look at the net revenue expenditure, we spend the same on neighbourhood policing as the most similar groups. In terms of our net revenue expenditure, we spend the same as our most similar groups.

It is important that the table you are referring to, table 47, as well, is not just police officers. All the roles that are in that top branch of neighbourhood policing, incident, local investigation and other local policing functions do include a lot of police staff roles as well. There are two

snapshots there. There is a snapshot in June 2013. I cannot remember when the workforce snapshot was taken in 2012. There will have been some movement in amongst that as well.

I agree with you. The interesting one is when you look at the total spend against the most similar groups (MSG) around it. What we have been able to do by looking and talking to some of the other forces is, given our size and scale, one of the things that we do that will look like the forces in the MSG but probably will not look like the other forces, so 20-odd forces that are about 1,500 officers or more will double-hat. What do I mean by that? Officers will be identified as local beat officers but they will also drive what you would regard as a response car; and they will take incident calls when they are in their area and out in their patch. Sometimes we are not actually comparing apples with apples, but in terms of the MSG, absolutely.

As the Commissioner says, we go through this cycle. We grew all the way up through the Olympics to September, stopped recruiting, went down like that all the way through - I think it was 30,200 on Friday of last week - and are going back up with the recruits who are in Hendon at the moment, so you will see that curve come back through. The investment is absolutely, as we said, in terms of officers going into neighbourhood policing. We are aiming for 4,500 officers in neighbourhood posts. We are currently at 4,337. The big growth in that overall number is still to come in the response uplift. We put some more into response. As officers are coming out of training school and going into territorial policing (TP), where it needs topping up at the moment on our terms is neighbourhood policing.

The other one where I think we suffer slightly on these is around those roles that are not visible in local policing. A lot of things like Territorial Support Groups (TSG) and a lot of the support, even if I take my old working environment, would probably be in your local policing figures; because it would be their version of borough-based or something like that. It is not, in our model. Some of that is how we cut it, but it is a good test in terms of doing it. I am more than happy to show you that curve going through in terms of officers going in and then the officers going back up that are going into neighbourhoods.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): It would be interesting to try to understand more what this comparison is with other forces. I am still, if I am really honest, not 100% clear. I hear what you are saying about the police going in, but unless you are saying other forces are counting other things in it --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): You can count other things in it. In fairness, the back end, if you like - the specialist investigation and some of those things that on that chart then come further on down the line - is much smaller as a percentage of their force. If I take my old working environment two and a half-odd years ago, the volume and capacity of serious crime capability was very, very little compared to the percentages here.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): The issue is that our briefing says HMIC strips a lot of these things out to try to make it equal --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They do with the nationals, but it is depending where you put the line. As the Commissioner touched on, something happened on Monday this week that will show a move of 500 officers. What we did as part of the work we are doing around the change - and we have spoken in the budgets, seminars and elsewhere - is centralising some functions, taking posts out,people out and putting police officers back on the front line.

On Monday, we went live with intelligence, not delivered in borough but delivered in a series of hubs. For the duties office, probably when many of you were Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) members, you would have been used to walking into the borough station and there was a duties office at the end of the corridor, a communicator. They have all gone. They went on Monday. That is done now in a centralised hub. A third fewer people come out and there is a multi-million pound saving on the back of it, so it is a very different way of delivering that service to a borough and to a service delivery unit.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Let me move on, then, to some other questions. We want to understand about your business support roles because it seems that the MPS has 4.9% of police officers in business support roles, a higher proportion than any other force. I am wondering why that would be the case.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): First of all, a large proportion of those are in training. Although they are described as 'business support', I would argue that actually having police officers training other police officers can be of benefit. It is how the HMIC describes them because they are not on the front line arresting people, so I understand that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You have a bigger training function?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. Some of it we can explain and some parts would be a fair criticism, if you like. Firstly, for example, we have about 2,000 firearms officers. The reason we have so many as a proportion of what should be 32,000 is that we have more guarding functions, for example. We guard all the high-profile buildings, we guard some individuals and we have the Royal and Diplomatic Protection Groups, so we need a pool of about 2,000. For each firearms officer, it takes quite a lot to train them and then to refresh. Other forces do train firearms officers, but not in those numbers or by that proportion. That is one of the reasons we are distinctive.

Secondly, we are actually one of the few forces in the country recruiting. Other forces have seen that they have had a 14% reduction in their grant, as have we, but in fact we have managed to get the savings out; and we are going to recruit 5,000 over the next three years, so our training function at the moment is bigger than other places' would be.

There are a couple of reasons why sometimes the comparisons are not always fair. We do think that in fact it is nearer to a 2.4% figure rather than the one that is mentioned in here. I am completely conscious that trading these sorts of numbers over a committee table makes it

difficult, but we would be prepared to try to explain why we do not think this is a completely accurate picture.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I understand what you are saying there. That sounds more logical than perhaps the other earlier explanations to some of my questions.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Sorry, there is just one final thing, which is relevant if we go back - and I do not want to raise water cannon - to 2011 and what happened then in terms of riots. We reached a couple of conclusions. One was we did not have enough officers on the night, so we changed the shifts to make sure we now have more officers on, for example, in the evening.

The second was that they needed to be better trained in riots or public disorder; so we have hugely increased the number of officers who have trained in those fields over the last two years, which we think is a good thing. We had to have somebody to train them, so we get the training numbers at a fairly high level and those have generally been police officers.

Therefore, there are a couple of reasons why we think it is not a fair comparison and we can justify it. However, I am not going to sit here and say that all the numbers can be turned completely, but it is still possible to argue that we ought to remove some officers.

The only final one we would mention is that in all the change processes we had, we had the MPS change group and also the information technology (IT) side, we have definitely intended and have put in police officers to help in those two areas; because I do not think administrators can exactly say what police forces should look like in terms of MPS change. In terms of the IT changes that we are going to invest £200 million in over the next three years, all the research shows that if you have a police team and an IT team working together you get good product. My argument has been for the MPS - and not only the MPS - that the police have abandoned to the IT department the task of designing IT for the future; and that that is wrong. It has to be together. We have put a few more officers - I think it was about 50 - in there, for example, even this week.

That is business support. It is a good investment for the future, but others would argue it is a waste and they should be on the front line. Sometimes you do have to invest somewhere. There may still be fair criticism about our totals.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have touched on this before when we have looked in more detail at the budget and one of the things we are trying to do with the work around the budget and re-profiling. It would be really interesting to look at this number in November 2014 and November 2015 because it should get lower. If you remember, part of the work we are doing is getting police officer roles. If I use 'back', 'middle' and 'front', it is moving them to the front, so the work has all been around doing that.

The Commissioner quoted 2.4%. That is against the Home Office guidelines, which are slightly more detailed, so there are about 60 activities they put in business support. As of

September 2013, if it helps, there were 745 officers that you would classify in that out of an establishment on that day – i.e. actual people in the organisation - of 30,631.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): How many did you say were working on IT? Was it 15 or 50?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): From memory, so it may be wrong, it was 50.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you for that clarification. One of the other things we picked up is the lower sanction detection rate in the MPS, which is lower than any other force. The rate across its most similar group was 18% but for the MPS it was about 14%. I am just wondering if you have any comments on that.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is a fair criticism and I have accepted here before that we need to have better detection rates. I can come up now with a few reasons why they are not the same, but they should be better. We have improved them over the last couple of years. I think we improved about a couple of percentage points, but it is still low.

There are some reasons that this Committee would accept in London why it is different. You have a high transient population. One of the things that help detections is that people notice things that are unusual in a community, so you get community surveillance who will say, "He is a burglar. That is unusual behaviour", and we get calls in a way that in London patterns of behaviour are harder to spot.

Secondly, we know that 28% of the people we arrest at the moment are foreign nationals. That is not to say that foreigners commit crime. That is broadly the proportion in London with our numbers of citizens. What it does mean is that when you are investing a crime, three things you must have are access to the criminal intelligence about that person, their history of offending in terms of their convictions and, thirdly, ideally, access to their fingerprints, the forensics, deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) and - more and more now - digital images. That is harder if they are from a different country. It is not impossible, but it can be quite a slow process. It is not quick and efficient. For some forces, it could be 2% of their total arrests. For us, it is nearly a third. We are doing our best. We have 200 officers now and we are getting more into helping to deal better with foreign national offenders, because the thing we are trying to do is not condemn foreigners. We are trying to give the same quality of justice to non-British citizens as we do to British ones. At the moment, it is a bit tricky. I am not going to use it as a complete excuse because I do not think that would be fair, but there are big things that in London we have to recognise are different and, in some of our boroughs are very different.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): It is an area you are working to improve?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. I take it on the chin. We need to be better at this.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Excellent. The other thing I wanted to pick up is this issue of earned income. The MPS expects to receive more earned income per head than any other force. Where are you getting this additional income from and why do you expect to earn so much more than other forces?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We think this is a good thing. There is a very clear explanation for a significant amount of it.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are two major contracts that the MPS has that, in fairness given the size and scale, I expect most of our colleagues would envy and probably cannot get. There is the Transport for London (TfL) work and you will know we receive in the region of £80 million to £90 million for the TfL work that we do around safer transport. There is the work for Heathrow and London City Airports, which again delivers £30 million.

If you take that as a totality, it is a considerable sum of money that comes in before you do all the other things that we can do: reclaim, work around traffic, criminal justice, disclosure, sporting events income. Those come in and that is what makes the total look so large for the MPS.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): What about some others? We have heard recent reports about Virgin Media offering you a share of compensation it recovered from fraudsters in a private prosecution.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do remember that case and I remember the judgment around it in terms of that. That is a tiny sum of money and does not feature in the list I have here. These are the things: safety camera partnerships, Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) disclosure fees, intellectual property rights and sponsorship, traffic, criminal justice and the work we have done about investing in the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA) to take more money off criminals. That is what feeds your income line.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Lovely. Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I have a range of people now wanting to speak before I bring Tony [Arbour] in. I have Jenny first, then John [Biggs] and then Jennette [Arnold OBE].

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We have mentioned Virgin. Do you have contracts with other companies or you have arrangements with other private companies where you look for fraud or whatever?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am not aware of them, Jenny, but you might --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We have heard about them in the past and Virgin is just one example where you have gone in as police officers to look for fraud --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): In the MPA it came up.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Yes.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am not aware of any now, but I will check for you.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Really? I would be glad because --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That was one of the questions I asked. Do we have any other examples and, if so, are we sure that after that judgement in particular? I would say, for the reasons you are raising, it is a risky area. I would want reassurance and I have not heard that, but I will check again for you.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You have had the one with Virgin?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That was some time ago, I think you will find.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): All right, so you think at the moment you do not have any ongoing arrangements? As you have just said, Mr Mackey, it is a tiny amount of money and it looks to the outside world as though, if you are a big company, you can buy more justice than if you are not.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, I absolutely appreciate that. I am not aware of any others at the moment, but I will have a look for you and come back to you in writing on that one.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Thanks very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): John?

John Biggs AM: Yes. I am very grateful for this conversation and I see us as being at a fairly early stage. There is a nod of agreement from Craig Mackey.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely.

John Biggs AM: I am interested in the role of HMIC and in the role of what I still think of as MOPC but what is otherwise known as the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) in holding you to account. How do you see those two things being balanced? In order to understand value for money and productivity, it is worth us comparing you with peer groups, with all the caveats about being different. Obviously, you have accountability to the Mayor through MOPAC and that will have a different set of criteria. Is that an issue at all?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot see that. It would seem to me they perform different functions. It has changed over the years, as you know, having been members of police authorities. It is so often forgotten, but Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) used to produce reports for the police authority about the police force. The sad reality around the country was that not all police authorities took what I regard as a duty seriously, so the report went to the police force and they were never really held to account about it by the police authority. That changed when police authorities disappeared.

It remains true that the HMIC has a professional and - what should be- an objective view of how well a police force is being run. It has moved away from the old system, which was giving a certificate every year of being efficient and effective, but broadly they are going to make objective comparisons to see whether or not, they can see whether something is being run well or badly. From time to time they have thematics. It seems to me that that is a beneficial piece of information, as you found and also I am sure as the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime would find, in terms of informing sometimes a political judgement but certainly an accountability and governance function. That can be a complementary thing.

Also, this HMI would, I am sure - as we did - if a committee or a Deputy Mayor said, "I am really concerned about something", or, "I would like to understand something more", task the inspections around that request. It is a complementary thing, not a destructive thing.

John Biggs AM: Absolutely. If I could be impudent, I think that is the right answer. It was interesting that the HMI is there to inspect you but not him - so not MOPAC, not the police authority - yet I suppose, indirectly, the performance of the police authority, or the Mayor's role, the MOPAC role, is scrutinised by HMI; because you could, for example, have a Mayor who said, "Let us not catch burglars anymore, let us focus on pickpockets", or something. Then the metrics would go up the spout as a result of that. Therefore there is an indirect scrutiny in terms of holding the politicians to account and the police authority to account and I suspect that is an area of developing policy. Would you agree? We are still in the early days of course of having this new arrangement for accountability.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I hesitate to comment on what another body is doing. It seems to me that there are a couple of complementary things. You have the Audit Commission and you also have your own auditors to assess whether or not public money is being spent appropriately, efficiently and with propriety? It is a slightly different role for the HMI and I think it would be odd for a police HMI to start trying to hold to account a politically-elected (overspeaking)

John Biggs AM: No, absolutely not, absolutely not.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I think that would be quite hard. They can provide information however I am not sure they need to inquire into that politically-elected element. That is probably for someone else.

John Biggs AM: Yes, I suppose one could be in a position where, as a result of the decisions of the politicians, your priorities were skewed. I suppose I am trying to understand this better

and it is a new area to my mind. Your priorities could be directed in a particular way by the political leadership and that could have an impact on the performance of the authority; and then you, as the senior officer, would have to work out how to best respond to and deal with that.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I can see the potential tension; however I am not sure it will develop too much. At the end of the day we are responsible under the law, therefore we can only investigate things that are criminal acts. We can prioritise because we have to because there is too much volume of work and you tend to prioritise where there is the largest volumes and you do not prioritise when you have very serious things, which are thankfully relatively rare. All right, you could see a potential tension developing, however in my experience, in the time I have been chief officer, I have not seen that develop very markedly. There are times I can remember in the past, I suppose 1984 around the miners' strike, the tension between the police authority and the police force then about what they should do and how they should do it therefore on those very big occasions, probably once in a generation, tensions can develop.

However, on the whole, I think we both have the same ambition, which is to keep people safe and reduce crime and try our best to prioritise resources. The debate that you have about prioritising resources, in my experience, would be one where everybody agrees - well actually you cannot put all your officers into neighbourhoods because you still have to investigate about 100 murders a year. We have rape investigations, they have to be funded. As cybercrime comes along somebody has to investigate these things even if we have no more money. Therefore I think we are forever having a debate ourselves about how best to do these things and I think the debate you have with people to whom you are accountable usually improves the quality of that. You rarely come to different conclusions. Nobody ever says, "Do not investigate murders". Nobody ever says, "Generally do not put everybody into neighbourhoods". Somewhere along that spectrum you usually balance. However you have arguments along the way and I have never found it contradictory.

John Biggs AM: OK, thank you very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Jennette.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Chair, thank you. Chair, I would just like to go back to the Commissioner, or Deputy, about sanction detection rate; and I think it is what I always say, looking at it the other way we are talking about 80% of all crime remaining unsolved. There is a time to that, is there not? Is it the timeframe that might be the problem? Therefore, if we are looking at it in this fixed timeframe then that does not give us the sense that some of those crimes will fall outside of that timeframe and will eventually be resolved? We do not get a sense of that. I am just left thinking 86% unsolved, unresolved, feeling totally at a loss. Therefore I do not know how to reconcile that, I have never known how to reconcile that with my belief that police officers do a good job. That is one part of it.

Is the 14% including actions taken around restorative justice and the issuing of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC), is that within the total?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): For what total?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: You must use other measures to assess the productivity of officers doing investigations because if you were just using this then it would not look very good, would it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are quite a few questions there, therefore I will do my best to try and deal with each. In terms of timeframe, there can be an impact on detection figures. I am just trying to think of the best example. The more serious a case, the longer it takes to come to court, and therefore the longer it takes to count as a detection. You have had in some years a detection rate for murder which could have been 200% because all the murder trials happened in the succeeding year; and it is a nonsense, but that is how it happens. For the more serious crimes you can get that knock-on effect year by year. On the whole it balances out, however occasionally you can get a year where that has a major effect.

When you talk about detections, although we talk about simply this overall figure, which I am acknowledging should be far better; there are also some complexities in the middle of it that need to be understood as well. Our detection rate for murder is over 90%. If you murder someone you are very unlikely to get away with it, and --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, because that bears up with my confidence and my experience over the years with my boroughs. At one time we never ever used to get news of a criminal being taken to court and the time given by the judge, now we get that in a more routine way, therefore that would symbolise to me that something is going on that is good in the system.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, it is, however I am not sure it totally distorts the figures, I can only say that for some it might, and I think we all have to be aware of that. We look at it professionally and think that might be explainable, however I think it takes a while to explain to the public some of the complexities. Therefore murder would be an example where we have a very high detection rate; however it gets masked in a very low one. I think that is a very important issue that we need to draw to people's attention. Terrorist cases, I think we have detection rates of nearly 100% for as long as there have been terrorists, therefore (overspeaking)

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: However the everyday burglaries?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am not going away from that, I am just pointing out that of course concentrating on the 14%, you miss the 94%, and I think it is fair to talk about both.

I think the second thing is that we changed the way we measure some detections this year, therefore in terms of sexual offences, instead of talking about percentage detection rates we have talked about an absolute number of how many detections there were. If you are not

careful, we are trying to encourage people to report more rape, more sexual offences, which we already know is 85% under-reported, however if we get trapped in worrying about the overall number of rapes and counting the number of detections, the percentage can send misleading signals to our own staff. Therefore we started counting absolute numbers just for sexual offences. I think there is an argument for doing it for everything, however that is one change that we have made.

The point that you make about the different types of detections, we have always called them primary and secondary, the one about which no one argues is a conviction in court, very straightforward, a court accepted that person committed that crime. We then have another form of primary detection where someone goes to court, is charged with one offence, and accepts that they committed other offences, taken into consideration. At court they accept it; that is a primary detection. Finally, things like police cautions, therefore if someone cautions someone and the person has to accept the caution, they cannot be cautioned unless they accept the caution, therefore it is a detection; they accept they did it, it is marked down, and a police caution has a consequence. It is a very effective form of preventing recidivism. Those are the things that I would always regard as primary detections, things that really are copper-bottomed.

There are other forms of detections where people then debate it, for example restorative justice. Some find it persuasive, others do not, it is not something in the MPS we have done a huge amount of, however some forces have, and that is a growing amount of detections in some forces. We are not (overspeaking)

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Would that be within your 14%?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, however very, very low numbers, and if I am honest, because I am not particularly persuaded yet it is the most effective way of providing justice.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: OK.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): You are seeing it occasionally in the MPS in certain places and it has always been there at some level, however some forces are finding those numbers are increasing. My concern is it may become such an alternative that people do not end up in court; therefore I need a little persuading myself, however I am told that in fact victims find it helpful. In our numbers, not large numbers, some forces, you will see larger numbers growing over time.

The only final point to make on things like secondary detections is that there are a group of detections, for example when someone goes to prison it is entirely possible to go and see them in prison and explain to them that, should they come out of prison and not have admitted all their offences for which they could have been convicted, then they can have them written off; because the alternative is what is called a gate arrest, they are arrested at the gate of prison as they leave. That can be quite helpful for the victim in explaining, "Actually they were in prison, they may not go back to court, but they have accepted they have committed that offence", and

the offender has removed the risk of further arrest. That is a group of secondary detections. I myself am less professionally persuaded about those because there are all sorts of motivations going on where prisoners are having those conversations with police officers, therefore I rely on the primaries.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: All right, OK, and then it was other ways of assessing performance, because again going back to the public's perception, if you are talking about 86% unsolved, you must have other measures about assessing productivity?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are, and, as you know, our officers, if we just stuck with the officers in uniform who are the ones that most people think about, they have to deal with missing-from-homes, they have to deal with sudden deaths, they have to deal with road traffic collisions and anti-social behaviour, which is not recorded as a crime. It is a completely different system for which there is no real sanction detection rate. Therefore they do many things in those areas, which we are aware of, and one of the other things we measure is whether or not the customer is left satisfied with the interaction with the police.

Therefore I think there are other ways of measuring it. Detection rates are important for me, however it is not the only measure; and on the whole we know that for many offences the victim will not have the satisfaction of the offender going through court and therefore we still have to look after them. What is the quality of their statement-taking? Do they make any arrests? Are they attending incidents on time? There are a lot of things that we do to measure competence and productivity of officers; some are not necessarily very good at going out and arresting people, however they are good at getting from other people intelligence about who did it, and in a team you have to have all of that. Therefore we try and measure many things.

The thing we have to be careful of, if I set a target, "It is the number or arrests you make, the number of detections you get", they can go out and arrest anybody if you are not careful. Therefore I think I have to be careful, we have to be careful, about setting inappropriate targets. In all this discussion I would go back to my first answer, which was I think we need to do far better in this area.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Great, thank you, and just a quick one to the Deputy. When you were answering Caroline's questions you talked about a restructuring and it just struck me that with your restructuring, now area commanders have a huge span of responsibilities. That is just what I am assuming.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Now I am not clear really what that is, therefore I would appreciate some sort of command structure, because I only see area commanders at Gold meetings for fatalities and crisis; however it just seems to me now they have a much more day-to-day function and management role and I do not think, Chair, we have picked that up. Therefore I think an organisational structure, because like, for instance, how many area commanders do you have now?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): 32.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: 52?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): 32.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I was going to say, 52 sounds large.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Are you talking borough commanders?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, area commanders, clusters, or what is the word (overspeaking) are you sure it is not fifty-two, you might have come out with a Freudian slip?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, if you look at the benchmarking it is not 52.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I will go with the Deputy, he is the man who knows.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Can I just pick up on a bit of explanation around one question you raised; do the numbers include ASBOs? They include ASBOs. Do they include restorative justice and all of those sorts of approaches? As the Commissioner said, in the MPS it is tiny, there are only three boroughs who have trialled it, therefore it is very, very small numbers.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is because the Commissioner does not like it.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is also because they did not previously count. It comes back to one of your colleague's favourite questions (overspeaking)

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: He does not like it.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): -- the dreaded counting rules change as of 1 April, therefore this whole area of what is called community resolution will be included in detections after 1 April. It therefore means that when we get these profiles next year your question is really important, because we are really going to need to understand when we are doing comparators against peers how much of this is detections as you would understand and members of the public would understand; versus this community resolution approach. Therefore it will be a really important point with next year's figures.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Good, thank you. We will get the structure?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will send you the structure.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Just before I move to Tony, I think you said, Craig, that response teams are not included in the neighbourhood policing figures in the HMIC?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, they are, it is called 'local policing', they are in there.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): They do form part of local policing?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I think it is four groups, what we would call neighbourhood policing, response policing, local investigation, and I think they call it 'local policing other'; which is sort of in the nicest way a sort of a catch-all for roles.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Tony.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes. Firstly arising out of the question that you were asked about earned income, you said that one of the principal sources was going to be from the POCA. I wonder if you could possibly tell me how much you expect to get from that?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Last year, I can tell you, give you a figure, it was £7.4 million. This year, it is a bit difficult to be absolutely sure, however we think it will be more. If you look over the years since POCA has been in, you cannot guarantee any figure over a year, because it depends on the cases and how much; but generally it has ascended and I think it is a really important thing, therefore we are concentrating on it.

Tony Arbour AM: I am glad to hear that because it is a fact, is it not, that it is a very tiny sum in relation to the amount of - how shall I put it - assets that convicted criminals have, which you should be able to get hold of.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are two things: (1) you have to be clear that the reason we seize the assets is not to feather the pockets of the MPS (overspeaking)

Tony Arbour AM: Well indeed not.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is done to make sure that organised criminals are put in front of a court or have their assets seized, it is not to put it in our pockets; that is point 1. I think point 2, in terms of percentages, what you have to remember is there are three ways of gaining assets, criminal assets. One is to seize cash and the two others are two different types of orders where basically you restrain their assets. When we seize cash we keep 50%, if we restrain assets we keep 15%, and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and the courts retain another 30% between them shared equally. I

think that we should get a bigger percentage, however that is what the system says. Therefore you are quite right. I am sure there is a very large amount of organised crime money out there, we are making more inroads into it, however that number is not the whole of the assets we seize, it is just a proportion that we keep.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that. However, the £7.5 million, even if you receive the whole of that, quick maths suggests there is only £30 million being seized in the MPS area, which must be a very tiny fraction. Obviously you cannot quantify it, however you must have a suspicion of how much these characters have got away with. If you agree with me that it is only a tiny fraction, surely, if you were applying business principles, and I think this must be one for the deputy, this really ought to be an area where MOPAC should be saying to police, or perhaps this might even be an area where you get outside specialists in, to come in and help seize these assets. As clearly, the amount of money that is available, which you are unable to get currently, must be far greater from any of the other sources of income that you have been talking about.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The Deputy Mayor may want to answer, however I think there are two things. First we do have outside specialists who help and we have actually - during my time here we talked earlier about what is visible and where we have moved resources - moved officers into neighbourhoods and we have moved officers into criminal asset recovery. Not because I want the money, although it is nice, but because the criminals should not be getting that money. Therefore I think you will see a very significant increase in that money, however it is not only police skills, although one does not work without the other. What you need is a forensic accountant to discover where the money is, you need a detective to often get hold of it because these people do not give that money up easily, so there has to be working together on these things. It is certainly something we have been committed to and when in Merseyside we had the second largest amount of assets recovery outside London, we were not the second largest force; and it is something I am determined to increase because, as you said, there is more there to be got. It is not straightforward however we are investing more in it.

Tony Arbour AM: To put it in perspective, my group have been looking at this as an area for generating income. Wales, I do not know how many constabularies there are in Wales, but --

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

Tony Arbour AM: -- the total population of Wales is smaller than the population that you serve here; and robbing sheep is probably less profitable than robbing banks or whatever it is, the crimes they commit in Wales. I understand however that they have seized £48 million in Wales. If they can do it, you surely ought to be able to do it.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am going to challenge you Tony about one thing I am going to keep coming back to, we do not do it to generate income.

Tony Arbour AM: No, no.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): However that is what you said. I am not going to agree with that, therefore that is why I challenge you. I think in terms of the Wales example, I do not know enough about it, however what you have to watch is that in individual cases you can generate a huge amount of money and still have only arrested one person. I suspect in Wales they have had one big case, we saw it in Thames Valley a few years ago, they had a really big case and you get a surge of money. What you have to look for is the trend over time - and I do not know in this case, it may be that they are very good at it - however in the past, the big forces who have done well at it have been the MPS, Northern Ireland and Merseyside.

Tony Arbour AM: Please, I am not saying you should simply be doing it to accrue income, however at the same time as punishing criminals by seizing their assets, if a by-product of that is that the MPS gets a percentage, that must be good news and that is why I say to Stephen, is that not something that MOPAC should be looking at very hard?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is something we are looking at and that is why we are consulting on the Business Crime Strategy and ensuring that we have the right response. I think the Commissioner is absolutely right that the objective should be to deter criminality as much as anything and the seizure of assets is part of that. Early on in my time as Deputy Mayor, we were looking at potentially some kind of social investment model to supplant additional resources for forensic accountancy and all these other things that can potentially support the police in that; and that was difficult to get off the ground quite frankly. However any tangible ideas you have in ways in which we (overspeaking)

Tony Arbour AM: Bounty hunters.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Sorry?

Tony Arbour AM: Bounty hunters.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Bounty hunters, OK.

Tony Arbour AM: That would be a way of doing it.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is a little contradictory of the Committee, though, because we were challenged earlier about I think doing exactly the same with Virgin.

Tony Arbour AM: All right, if I can go to my question. It was just that since POCA was listed as a way of generating money, we do not appear - I understand your explanation - to have been terribly successful at it. I think today is the first time I have ever come across an actual figure being given, although I think there have been Freedom of Information Requests to the MPSasking for figures on this and it has been denied.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Obviously I trust your judgment, but I would be really surprised because it forms part of the

budget and therefore it has to be in the budget; it must have been in the budget because it forms part of our income stream, and it is a significant amount of the (overspeaking)

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Perhaps you could furnish details after the meeting.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We can do that, however I would be surprised if the old police authority and --

Tony Arbour AM: I just looked it up on Google actually and that could be right. Anyway, so far as the formal questions are concerned, relating please to the Inspectorate's report, HMIC said that,

> *"The Metropolitan Police Service, which has comparatively high numbers of police officers and low levels of officer visibility, might indicate low productivity."*

Do you think that is true?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is fusing quite a few things together there and I think, as we have seen already, it is not that straightforward an area to understand. In the past there has been criticism of the MPS about having quite a big budget, you as police authority have overseen that as well; and then there has been a need to actually police quite a difficult area. I think that there is no doubt that it is a challenging area, it is invested in and it is quite an expensive option, because police officers here are more expensive than in the northern part of the country. As you know we pay more, that is the only way people can live in this city and we can attract talent. Therefore I think there is no doubt there are some fundamental issues that we together are working on to make sure the MPS is more efficient.

Tony Arbour AM: The business of police visibility, it is something that often attracts criticism. Most of us I think who have travelled past a traffic accident will have seen loads and loads of people in uniform, many of whom will be Police Community Support Officers (PCSO); or for example at suburban railway stations checking to see whether people are travelling without a ticket, really very large numbers indeed. The very tiny suburban station I travel from, when these things happen, I see the entire neighbourhood team is there, all of them, and yet you will know - and I know that Stephen knows - the Conservative group have again been looking into this, we have been looking at small business crime and shopkeepers say that the police never come; and yet if they are close to the railway station they can see all these characters. There is a kind of dissonance between lots of police doing apparently minor things and when something that is very significant to a small shopkeeper, when they are robbed or something like that, they cannot get hold of police. How do you equate that way of using your staff, which you have just told us are very valuable?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I think you juxtaposed two things, which anecdotally are powerful, however I am not sure statistically are significant. However, in terms of the railway example, I do not know enough about it and I would be surprised - although I will inquire - why MPS officers are checking on tickets, if that is

the case I am surprised, however I will check. If it is the Safer Transport Team that may well be the reason, however if it is the Neighbourhood team I would be surprised. Because the Safer Transport Team are funded by TfL and are concentrated on two things, one is about congestion and traffic behaviour to make sure people are kept safe on the road and number two is obviously there are issues about people basically defrauding. TfL remain a business and, you have just been making the point about businesses, they need to make sure they have an income stream. Therefore I think it is a reasonable thing to make sure that ticketing is fine.

The second point, I would not disagree with you, which is that if people are the victims of business crime, or any crime, they expect that we go. We can show that, since I have been here, we made a promise, if the victim wanted us to go we will go, and we have now visited, last year, more than 200,000 more people than we visited in the previous year, therefore we have tried to do that. I would be really surprised if someone says they have been the victim of a robbery, robbery being theft with violence or threat of violence, and we did not go. If anybody can give me an example of that I will look into it straight away. I can accept that with shoplifting, which people sometimes mis-describe as robbery, it is still a crime, it may be that sometimes we do not get there as quickly as the business would like; and if that is the case I am still interested, however I think they do need to be distinguished. However I do not think it is necessarily fair to put the two things together and say that we are more interested in rail fares than we are in business.

Tony Arbour AM: Well, of course, however we represent the man in the street and the man in the street sees lots of people in blue doing something trivial; and indeed in the report that we have done on small business crime, very often that is the conclusion that we have come to. Shopkeepers do not bother to report crime, I am sure that they would report robbery rather than shoplifting, because they believe the police will not come; and that police will be very dilatory and that the small shopkeepers believe they have to provide policing for themselves.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I understand that belief, however we do still arrest many thousands of shoplifters every year, therefore I think we can show - particularly in places like Oxford Street - it is a very significant part of their working day. I think there is always a challenge about prioritising if it is busy, I understand that, therefore we do try and take it seriously, however that was a relatively small sample I think --

Tony Arbour AM: It was a very tiny sample.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): -- from what I saw; and I think some of the people expressed a view about 30-odd people I respect their view, however we have to police London.

The only final thing I would mention is that there are times when police officers group together and people say, "What the hell are they doing that for when they could have been doing something else more important?" We saw that when we had six cyclists die in a few weeks, we put quite a lot of officers into patrolling at the junctions and people saw them and some people said, "Why are you doing that?" Well actually in the end I think we issued 15,000 tickets and it

did appear to modify people's behaviour. We have been accused before of not taking cyclists' or motorists' bad behaviour seriously.

We have operations, where we have now seized 85,000 uninsured vehicles, , the only way we have done that is by first of all asking officers patrolling to carry out their duty, and also having big QBO days where we have set up operations on the street. We put an automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera out and then we have stopped vehicles that are uninsured; and we know that 70% of the people who are uninsured are criminals. That is a big operation where people say, "What are you doing that for when you could have come and dealt with this shop crime?" We do deploy officers in uniform in groups and hope that at some level it reassures people we are doing something; because sometimes some of the work that they do goes unnoticed because it is done quietly in ones and twos. Therefore this is a more symbolic way, I accept, however it can have - as we see with uninsured vehicles at 85,000 - a very significant impact on both crime and road safety.

Tony Arbour AM: The very simple question is, which arises from what HMI said, how do you calculate the productivity of a police officer?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is not easy, I have to admit that, there is no easy measure. In fact some of our officers' challenges, because if we set arrest targets then, "Does that mean I only arrest this person because you set me a target or did they commit a crime?" We try to get broad measures, number one is do they attend incidents reasonably quickly; do their colleagues find them helpful; do they detect crime; do they put intelligence in; are they attending work on time; are they working when they are there. One of the measures for response officers is, are they attending incidents? If their colleagues are busy and they are not available on the radio, the inspector should be asking, "What are you doing? Why are you always unavailable? Why are you always the last there? Why, when it comes to putting a file in, are you the one who is not going to put the file in? Because you arrived, however you did nothing. You left your colleagues with the problem of resolving this issue." We try to have a broad measure and the trouble is, if we pick one figure, we are always criticised for having a narrow view of policing, therefore we try to have as broad a measure as possible. However I have to say it is not straightforward.

Tony Arbour AM: All right, OK, thank you, Chairman.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Stephen, can I ask, are you happy with your oversight of productivity and are you happy with the structures that are in place to assess productivity in the MPS?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think this is a useful discussion, not least because one of the jobs that MOPAC has is setting the budget, and in fact the value-for-money profiles for 2012 I think were - given that there was not a plan that I could find and I do not think that the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner could find to save the money - useful as a start point to have a three-year view about where you could legitimately look to make sensible efficiencies. We have not discussed that, however the obvious areas where making sensible savings in the running costs of the police estate, or the property that we

own that is used by the police, is a big part of our plan to generate income and also reduce running costs.

The second area, which we also have not discussed, is the expenditure by the MPS on technology. Thirdly, also, the structure of the organisation and the balance between officers that are in back-office and middle-office roles and the frontline. What you have in the 2013 profiles is a useful annual look at the rate of change over time. We know that the overall plan is to get thousands more officers - and the Commissioner has mentioned it, 2,600 extra officers into neighbourhoods - and we know that, because of recruitment and lag, that we are not there yet. This however is an opportunity to take a check on where you are relative to your plan. Therefore I think it is absolutely very useful to have this input from HMIC. Indeed it is also useful to have their report on our approach to setting the budget, which has not been talked about; however they were very complimentary about the plan and pay tribute to the value-for-money profiles in providing that sense of direction.

I am happy with the structures that we have in place. It is very clear. Despite the questions that we have had, it is very clear that it is MOPAC and the Mayor's Office that has oversight of the MPS and indeed it is this Committee that has oversight over MOPAC. The Mayor will set some strategic priorities for the police and the criminal justice system as part of being elected Mayor of London and it is our job to ensure that as many of those are implemented. It is also our job to set a sensible budget, however I think in this case we have a shared view about how we make those savings; and then that breeds the confidence to recruit, which is happening at the moment, and I believe we will be at or around 31,000 by the end of this financial year.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, thank you.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Just one general point, I think it is worth making, because I have taken all the detailed questions and they are very fair questions. If you bear in mind what we are involved in, the MPS has had probably 20 years of growth and we have now embarked on 3 years of cost saving. During that time we have still seen crime come down and at the end of the next two years we are going to end up with as many police officers as the MPS has ever had; and more constables than it has ever had. The only way we can do that is by becoming more efficient, and I take it that some of the points are very fair ones. The three big areas however that we have not talked about, and I think are fair to bring to the debate, are that we are going to have a third less estate, we are going to have a lot less managers, and sadly, but true, we are going to have about 3,000 less police staff. They are very significant shifts of money, which are going to make a real difference in allowing us to recruit the 5,000 that is going to allow us to get better and back to the numbers that we all want to be at.

However, we are engaged in shifting some very big lumps of people, and also money, from one part of the organisation to the other. Really acknowledging the fundamental point the HMI makes which is that this organisation could spend less money, be at least as effective and probably more effective. Therefore I think it is not unfair to make those points and the final one is in terms of savings around procurement. There is more to do there in terms of where we spend the money in the back office and contracting things and how we provide that support,

which is something we have worked on with the Deputy Mayor. That is not an easy thing to land with the 3,000 support staff that have lost their jobs, the managers who will not be there, the officers who aspire to a job that will not be there either. Therefore we are involved in a significant amount of change and I think the HMI reports on us partway through that change. One of the reasons we have embarked on it is because we do not have the money; we will lose £600 million. We are also acknowledging there is a need for that change.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is two very helpful answers and actually we have, as you know, looked at lots of these issues before and no doubt we will keep returning to them. However, Jenny, you wanted to talk about taser.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. I would like to ask Mr Greenhalgh about some hard facts as opposed to anecdotes and musings that some of our colleagues seem to think are interesting.

Male Speaker: I thought you were going to be nice this morning.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I did not promise to be nice.

Mr Greenhalgh, I am sure you know that taser use by the MPS in the first year of its rollout increased 88% on the previous year and then in the next year, 2013, in the first three months it was almost as much as it had been before the rollout. Therefore it is on its way to actually being four-times, a 400% increase. What is your oversight of taser use at the moment?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you for raising the issue of taser, we have discussed this before at this Committee; however it is fair to say that our oversight has changed from the way that it would have been done in the MPA. I commissioned a look at the governance of taser and I am expecting a draft report shortly that we will be able to share with you that makes some recommendations. You are right that, prior to becoming Deputy Mayor, there was a rollout of taser to boroughs and some of that happened I think just before the Olympics with a few pilot boroughs and then gradually all boroughs have had a deployment of officers who are trained in taser. Our oversight extends to receiving figures of the number of incidents that have been attended, the number of times taser has been drawn, because each officer has to fill in a form, and then the number of discharges. You are right in the sense that there has been greater usage of taser, however there are far more officers that are trained in the use of a device that I believe actually - from what I have seen - minimises potentially the use of force and is very effective in some very violent incidents.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is your report looking at how many violent incidents there were before and comparing them subsequent to the taser rollout and so on?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is (overspeaking)

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Are you actually finding out if the violence has decreased at the same time?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is a review of the use and the control of taser, so it is looking at the governance and infrastructure around taser.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Are you not actually looking to see if they are having a positive effect, ie fewer officers hurt, fewer prisoners hurt?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, it is (overspeaking)

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is all very well to say taser use has increased because the police need that particular tactic; however it is not OK if it is not actually having a beneficial effect somewhere else.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We want to establish the broad trends against a background of, what are the complaint levels, number of incidents that are being attended to by officers, the number of times that taser is discharged. As you know, Jenny, in the vast majority of incidents where someone responds with a taser, the taser is not discharged. It is enough to be able to challenge the person and say, "Stop what you are doing", and that has an impact in and of itself in around 85% of cases. Yes, we are reviewing at the moment the governance arrangements following the taser rollout to the boroughs. We are not looking at each individual incident in the way that you have described.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I have concerns that situations that would once have been resolved by negotiation are now being resolved by the use of threats and intimidation. That is a concern. Are you concerned about that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am concerned against a backdrop where there seems to be an increasing number of violent incidents that the police have to deal with; and I am concerned at the consequences when the police were not able to use taser to minimise the risk to themselves and to the public. I wholeheartedly support the rollout to the police, recognising you need to have effective governance.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We look forward to that report. Mr Hogan-Howe, sorry, Sir Bernard, could you tell me if it is true that there is an increase in violent incidents that taser are being used for?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot give you that figure because I did not have notice of the question, however we will get that information for you. There are probably three building blocks to this: first of all we have increased the number of officers who have tasers, therefore it is likely we will see more use. If you remember, the reason we did that is twofold: (1) because there was a horrific attack on some officers in Harrow where the taser support took 45 minutes to get there and it was late and when we investigated we found that on average, particularly in the outer boroughs, when taser was needed it was getting there after about 45 minutes, too late to be of any use. Therefore the sad reality was you were getting involved in physical violence when in fact a taser might have prevented that.

Although the amount of usage has gone up in the way that you have described by about six and a half times, the amount it is actually being fired - because bearing in mind usage means it is withdrawn from the holster and it is pointed at a dot, therefore you put somebody on warning you are at risk of it being fired - has only doubled. Therefore it has gone from about 113 over two years ago to about 247 I think it was for all of 2013. That is about one a day.

I do not think there is evidence that it is getting abused, in effect I do not think we have had serious injuries as a result of those taser deployments. However, what does appear is that where it has been deployed, it has actually worked by its deterrent effect rather than generally having to move on to actually using it to taser people; which for everybody involved is not a pleasant experience. I do not think there is clear evidence it is being abused, however its use is something - as the Deputy Mayor said - that I would want to know is being monitored. Therefore if one borough was seeing a high usage, one officer was using it a lot, then I would expect us to monitor that, and we do.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): OK, therefore at the moment you are happy that it is being used appropriately?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, however to be fair I am monitoring it as well. We are monitoring it internally because we want to make sure that in fact the usage, as I have described, across boroughs is not getting disproportionate or that individuals are abusing it, because even if (overspeaking)

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Or individual officers.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Even if the figures say its use is proportionate, but we have two people who are abusing it, I would want to know.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Could you get back to us specifically on what the Deputy Mayor just said about the fact that violent incidents are increasing, because that is not something that I have heard. I would very much like to see that.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I think there are two different levels, and I cannot speak for the Deputy Mayor, however one is how many violent crimes there are; and number two is where an officer attends an incident and the offender is still there, are they getting more violent. I think that is going to be a little more difficult to show because we do not always record incidents in that way, however we can give you all the information we have.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): OK, that would be good, thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Jennette and then Roger.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes, Chair, my question is to either the Commissioner or the Deputy. Our report on the MPS highlighted the importance of publishing data for scrutiny,

given the high-profile nature and the concern of many Londoners. I can say that personally from my constituency, and I know other Members represent constituencies where, there is still a lot of concerns about taser use. Therefore, when you go on to the MPS website you get sort of a narrative about taser. You have not however published any statistics on its usage and I am just asking you to consider doing that; because I think that was part of the discussions that we had when you wanted to introduce it and you talked about openness and about informing Londoners. I have just gone on, just to check again, because you might have done it in the last week, when if I put up the search and put up the statistics on taser use there is nothing there; it is just narrative about the rollout by a number of my borough commanders. Can you go away and consider that and inform Londoners about the usage on your website?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): First of all you are right, it is not there. Secondly, I was surprised because I thought it was. The reason appears to be to do with some IT problem and - that is not the entire answer - because the forms that are getting filled in to show that an officer has used it and why and the justification; apparently there is a backlog in getting those on to the computer. Therefore, as a result of various things, your question has been helpful. The first answer I received is it would take six months, however I am not happy with that, therefore when we have a date we will let you know, however I am told that there have been some difficulties. However, I was surprised. I thought it was on there.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Because when I visited Hackney and went out with a night patrol, the sergeant, whoever was in charge, showed me the day's use of taser, which was recorded on computer. If at the end of the day they are doing that, I would have thought that you would be able to collate that and actually just be given a MPS overall picture, which I think would be very useful.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I agree.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: You are going to investigate that, thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Roger.

Roger Evans AM: Yes, thank you, Chair. I am quite supportive of your use of taser because I think you have made the case as to when you are going to use it and what benefit there might be for the police and for the public; which is not necessarily the case with some of the other equipment that we are talking about. Use of taser, you are defining, am I right, as drawing it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The table I have here is not complete, it will be by the time we get on to the computer, however first of all where officers with tasers deployed, secondly is did they get it out of the holster, did they point it at someone, did the dot get shined at them, finally did they actually use it, and, if they did use it, ie fire it, it can be used in different ways. They can fire the prongs over 15 feet, probably about that far, and then it can be applied by attaching it to someone's skin, I think there was a third mechanism, which I cannot remember.

Male Speaker: Drive stun.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Drive stun, which I do not quite understand, however (overspeaking)

Roger Evans AM: That is what they do in America and we were advised against it here.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, when it is fired that is a separate record, we record it in different categories. Therefore we are accurate about whether we physically hurt someone or did not.

Roger Evans AM: Yes, and you record the reasons as well, I seem to remember seeing the form.

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

Roger Evans AM: In training, do you advise officers or suggest to them that, instead of drawing the taser, they might just make someone aware of the fact that they have it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The first thing is to ideally, not get involved in that at all, if you can try and persuade somebody to do what you want without any physical violence or any contact. That is better and 90%-odd of arrests are compliant. People often think we are fighting with people all the time, however it is not true. Most people understand the nature of the game they are involved in and many of them have been in it before; and unless you have extraordinary resources they are going to be there available the day after, therefore even if it does not happen then it will happen. 90%-odd of the people are compliant. Most people, even if they are resisting and/or violent, eventually will comply. It is only a very small percentage, bear in mind we arrest nearly 300,000 people a year, and yet we deploy this, even at 2,000 times, still a very small percentage, and we only actually fire it 247 times. Therefore I think that is clear evidence that we are not using it universally.

Roger Evans AM: Do you anticipate the number of occasions when you fire it or even draw it will go down over time as people become aware that all officers are carrying this now?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Just to be clear, Roger, not all officers are carrying it. It is only two vehicles per borough.

Roger Evans AM: All right, that all officers are able to carry it.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We only have eight officers per shift I think, who are trained, therefore only two can be taken out. I have had criticism because we have had four tasers to allow for shift changeovers, therefore they have said, "If there are four of us trained why can we not all take it out?" We have said, no, we have said two cars and we are going to keep to that promise. It may be that it goes down in time because people are aware. However I think at the moment I am not sure, because I

would have thought rational people, knowing that they are going to be hit by a few thousand volts, are going to say, "I will not do that". Some of the problems we have are because sometimes we are dealing with somebody who is sadly psychiatrically ill; however you are not aware of this. They may be affected by alcohol or drugs and they are not making rational choices. Therefore I think it is hard to be clear whether that number would go up or down in time because the only population that might change their view are the ones who have been tasered and that, as we know, is a relatively small group of people.

Roger Evans AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I think, Roger, you are going to carry on with predictive crime mapping.

Roger Evans AM: Yes, predictive crime mapping, something else I am very enthusiastic about. You have been running a trial. Can you tell us about it and how it has turned out?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It seems to be working quite well. It started out as a trial, however we decided to roll it out to the 32 boroughs; there are only 5 that we have not yet, however they are coming soon.

Roger Evans AM: Where are they?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They are Ealing, Waltham Forest, Southwark, Kingston and Lewisham, and they should be getting that soon. For those Members of the Committee who do not know, this is a piece of software that originated in America, the idea is to predict where crime is going to happen rather than where it did, based on where it did. It seems to be most helpful in burglary. However we are also trying to apply it to other crime types as well. I think it is difficult to be precise about what effect that is having by percentage. However, we are still seeing reductions in burglary, robbery, and some of the tactics that we use, particularly around residential burglary, have been enabled by this. You do warn people around the area where the burglaries have been that, "You are likely to be a victim in the future, you ought to take reasonable precautions". It actually maps out which houses you would advise of that, because it is no good telling 2,000 houses when you need to talk to 10. Therefore that does seem to be working. It is probably too early to say, right across the MPS, how effective it has been; however we expect it to be as effective as other countries have found in the past.

Roger Evans AM: Is it telling you anything that you did not know already?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I think so. I think sometimes you know that there have been a spate of burglaries down this estate and how they got in and you can sort of anticipate that. However it does seem as though what it does is also, not only talk about burglaries, but what other crimes are happening in that area and then warn you in a different way than probably intuitively you might have grasped. It makes a statistical inference from data, whereas we probably make an intuitive one, and it probably

takes our intuition a while to spot a pattern whereas the software will spot it quicker. Therefore in that sense I think it allows us to spot patterns quicker and therefore intervene earlier.

Roger Evans AM: Yes, you said it is particularly useful with burglary and certainly I can predict, if I get burgled once, I am likely to get burgled again fairly soon, as soon as they realise I have replaced everything because they know their way around my house and they know how to get in.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. When I started in the police we used to go around advising people that, having been burgled once, you are very unlikely to be burgled again, and the research showed actually that is completely wrong for the reasons you have just given.

Roger Evans AM: Are there other types of crimes that you feel you can make assumptions about? I imagine they are high-volume crimes because low-volume crimes would not have a large enough sample.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The two things are robbery, which is not high volume, but certainly robbery is one, because robbers tend to move around a bit more, and number two is around vehicle crime. Vehicle crime is a very high percentage of our crime. It can be about one in three, in some areas, of the amount of crime; a vehicle being attacked, stolen or having stuff stolen from it. Therefore those are the ones where it is helpful.

Roger Evans AM: Yes. I think some witnesses have suggested that officers might become over-reliant on this type of programme. I have to say I do not get that myself. I cannot see how that would work myself, however how do you make sure that is not going to happen?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I think the bigger risk is sustaining the interest and the police response over time, not whether or not that is making a useful prediction. I think it is making sure that officers respond to it, and they will do as they find that it works. However the difficulty is, if you have response officers racing off to an anti-social behaviour, or an assault, the danger is that the pulse policing that you expect around this does not happen in the way you expect. The neighbourhood teams have got a good chance of it, however I think over time that is the biggest risk that officers get distracted doing something else, therefore it needs good supervisors to keep to the task. I think that is the biggest challenge we will face over the years. However it is early days and I think it is a good investment.

Roger Evans AM: Yes, I am pleased to hear that. It is not quite the same thing, although how far are we off being able to track an individual crime for someone so that --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): An individual?

Roger Evans AM: An individual crime, not an individual criminal, a crime, so that when you report a crime to the police you can go online and there will be something on the MPS' website saying what stage the investigation has reached and reassuring you that the police are actually still involved in solving the crime. Often people think that it has been put to the bottom of an in-tray whereas in fact you may be conducting a piece of work long-term on it.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot give you a date, however within the next two years, because you remember one of the things we are doing is selling the estate; so we are selling a third, and the capital we are getting from that has two broad benefits, one is to improve the two-thirds of the estate we keep and the other is to improve the IT. Therefore we need to have a big investment in the IT to get it off the ground in some significant ways. The infrastructure is not spectacular, the contracts we have are not spectacular, so we are in the middle of unpicking that spaghetti. Therefore I think you will find over the next two years, that sort of thing will be more available, however I cannot guarantee a date yet, however it will happen.

Roger Evans AM: Because one of your key targets is around public confidence and do you not think that would be one way of considerably increasing confidence?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I agree, it is just that I also know that our IT infrastructure is in a position where I cannot deliver it today. I think it crashes if we have more than three minutes of video on it, therefore I am afraid the state of it, given the investment over the years, is remarkable.

Roger Evans AM: I think even City Hall does better than that.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): If Amazon can track a parcel, therefore --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): More and more examples of people who are better than us will not help me be any less embarrassed about the state of ours I am afraid. I agree.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Have you finished, Roger?

Roger Evans AM: Yes, that is a fair point.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can I just ask one question, you started off with your pilot looking at burglary, you have then expanded it to MOPAC's seven targets?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In my explanation, and it is in my brief and I did not mention it, that is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to give the best examples we have to date of the ones where it is most effective, however it is being expanded to the seven.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): What about if there are particular local priorities that local authorities have decided with residents, will they be allowed to be factored in if it is useful?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It can be. The only thing, going back to the answer I gave Roger, I think there are going to be two challenges to it for the future. This is what I think forces have found in the past, keeping that sustained over time and not making too many promises, just making a short number of promises and keeping them. Therefore, if it is burglary, or three or four things, I think if we try and use it for everything you get officers trying to allegedly patrol in certain areas and it will just be random patrolling after a while. There are not so many of them that we can tackle all priorities. Yes, of course, if there is a local priority we will tackle it, however I think we do have to watch trying to give too many priorities.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, thank you. Any further questions on this? No. Can I then move on to changes to the probation service, and we have looked at this a few times in the past, and perhaps I can start with Stephen. We have identified some risks in the past and one of those is one that you shared with us, and we agreed on; which was whether the new community rehabilitation company would actually have a duty to liaise and to sit on local partnership boards. Has that been resolved? Are there any other risks that have been identified as far as MOPAC is concerned in the latest discussions you have had?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have expressed those concerns and indicated to the bidders - and we now know who the three bidders are - that we want them to build on local arrangements. In fact we have asked, and we have agreed with the Justice Secretary, that the community rehabilitation company would sit under the auspices of the London Crime Reduction Board. We have also made it very clear that bidders should be thinking about how they can play a part within a number of boroughs that are embarking to a greater or lesser extent on some form of integrated offender management. Because of course we do not want the contractor here to operate in a silo. That would be the wrong way to go and we recognise that as a risk.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Are you confident that when the procurement actually takes place that the Government will put those conditions in?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): At this stage we are making a very strong case for this very real concern that the contract almost operates in isolation and does not take into account ways of integrating services around offenders; and we want that written into the contract. We have made some progress, I would not say we are there yet, therefore it remains an area of risk.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. I do not know whether Sir Bernard or Mr Mackey --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will pick it up if it helps, Chair. I would agree with the Deputy Mayor, it does remain an area of risk. I think the pace, scale and complexity of this change is always going to have a high degree of risk to it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The timescales are very short now, are they not?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That sort of pace. As the Deputy Mayor said, we have made some progress collectively. To give you some reassurance, there is a multiagency Gold Group that is jointly chaired by Commander Alison Newcomb [Borough Commander, Westminster, Metropolitan Police Service] and Nick Walkley [Chief Executive MPS], and that is literally meeting, looking at how we manage that relationship, and a lot of the things you say about the role of the CRC, some of the issues around payment by results, those are all the detail we are all now pushing on. This is a standing agenda item on the London Crime Reduction Board delivery group and it reports in to the full board chaired by the Mayor; and it is a standing agenda item, given the significance of getting this right, because it will fundamentally change the landscape and we have to make sure that all those things join up.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Just to add, I think we are neutral on whatever the solution is. Many force areas I think are probably going to be able to make this work. I think the biggest challenge in London is our size, which will end up with two things: (1) there will have to be more than one provider, which means that they have to be co-ordinated and try and get consistency with one organisation, one court, etc., and (2) that some of the areas are not congruent with all of the other areas involved, whether it be CPS, ourselves, etc. Therefore I think they are the things that we are particularly interested in and there will be a transition period, which we are all working hard to manage. However the complexity and scale of it I think are the biggest challenges for it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK. I have seen the maps for the National Probation Service and the community rehabilitation companies and how London has been divided. The boundaries do not even match in those two.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Except for Hammersmith and Fulham of course, however you are right. That is a real issue and it does not match even with the CRC and the National Probation Service. Therefore the way that London has been divided is a concern and that means binding into some contract a need to work together with other partners, which is absolutely critical.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Is that something you are still making representations on to the Home Office or is it the Ministry of Justice (MoJ)?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We continue to make representations and continue to lobby that we should be a partner in the active contract management of this. We have been acknowledged though by the Secretary of State that the Mayor's Office is an important strategic partnership and it needs to fit within the activities and work of the London Crime Reduction Boards. Therefore that is at least some progress on this.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I understand that all staff in the probation service have now been told which part of the new arrangements they will be in; and that from April there will be a shadow system operating and then the contract to be let in the autumn.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is right.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can I ask, from the MPS' point of view, are you yourselves geared up to actually co-ordinate and to fit in with the new arrangements in that timescale?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is part of the reason we have the Gold Group in place, because of the pace at which this is moving. If you went to every one of our boroughs and said, "Are you aware of the scale of change going on?" I think you would find the information is patchy. However in fairness the information coming out of the national programme at times is patchy. There is, however, an absolute willingness by everyone involved - colleagues from the MoJ, colleagues from the existing probation service and those going to take up the new roles, therefore the new leaders, they have identified some of the new people - and we are all around the table working through the detail of this. It is not for want of willingness or energy or effort in terms of trying to solve it, it is quite complex.

You raised the issue, and as you see from the maps, even simple things like attendance at meetings, who co-ordinates what group, how do you pass risk between the two groups, is complex. Therefore we are getting into some of those concerns and we are going to run a number of scenarios with people ahead of go-live so that we are actually all clear on that; rather than sort of later in the autumn go, "Well I thought you were managing that one". "No we were not, that is a different risk and you have got it."

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is very helpful, and if you could give us some information on what work you are undertaking. However it is about risk and in your analysis have you identified that there may be a greater risk to public safety in the transition between the two arrangements?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There should not be, however it really does require careful management, the transparency, the bidders' day was very successful, with people coming in and understanding the size and scale of London. As the Deputy Mayor said, how we knit this together and make sure it is a complete blanket and not one with holes in is the challenge for us. However there is no reason, fundamentally and sort of philosophically, why the risk profile should look different.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is not without risk and you are right to raise it, I think it is absolutely appropriate. However I have to say that the whole approach to the market engagement was one where we have been able, both with London Councils and certainly in MOPAC and other partners, to set out some of the expectations of what we believe is critical for London to work. We were the first area to start market engagement and the whole bidding process. We helped design it, it was very intensive, we were able to set out and certainly get a requirement that we need to see how they plan to respond to really the diversity and complexity across the capital as part of their bid requirements. I think that gives some cause for confidence.

I think the Deputy Commissioner is absolutely right, in that the risk is making sure that people know who is responsible for what. Therefore it is the transfer of cases that might move from medium and low risk to high risk and all those other issues. There is no doubt there are some issues along the line, however certainly the bidding process has enabled us to highlight that London does not need a one-size-fits-all approach when it comes to providing this service.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That was actually going to be my next question about the MPS' resources going into integrated offender management because - I might be behind the curve on this - one of my boroughs is very concerned that the MPS is trying to fix a one-size-fits-all in each borough across London, where we may end up with a model that is not exactly flexible to local needs and local authority priorities. Is that something that you have been looking at?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes it is. We have been doing quite a piece of work on integrated offender management; and in terms of MPS resources, I am comfortable in terms of where we are around MPS resources. What you are probably picking up, in fairness, is there is a nervousness across the 32 boroughs about how large you describe the cohort of people you have to manage and whether that creates new responsibilities for London boroughs at a point at which they see their budgets going that way. Therefore there is a real tension there in terms of those. Those are very open debates, we are talking about it, it is being steered through the Crime Reduction Board; and we are talking about, if we want to be serious about managing a cohort of offenders, this is what it looks like for your borough. I do get the nervousness and it is a nervousness that plays out a number of times between those agencies and organisations that, if you like, are pan-London at that level; and those who cut on a borough level. Therefore it is not a case of us saying, "This is what you have to have, get on with it", that is a very live debate as we go forward.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The principal thing is that obviously the changes in the probation service, essentially, the police are not here to fill any gaps that may develop. We will work together, however I think we are all agreed it is not our role to fill those gaps. We will work together, even if you have transitional issues. However at the end of the day that system has to work and if there are savings accruing in the probation service, what we cannot do is shunt money from the police budget over there. I do not think anybody is proposing that, however I can see why boroughs will start to get worried if they see a system that, as we have described it already, will have some tensions at the beginning. Therefore I think we will get through the transition but there is no intention for us to fill any gap.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, and on that, Craig, the funding was an issue that has been raised with me, however also about identifying the cohorts. I think there was some suggestion that gangs may not be in it, however I understand that now they will be?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Gangs will, yes, absolutely.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Also I think there were concerns about whether the MPS'IT system would be up and running in time to do this. Is IT an issue for you with this?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In fairness I have not had the brief on the IT system and identifying the cohort. There is a slightly separate debate going on about who has access to a particular IT system to see some of the stuff around anti-social behaviour in gangs. If you are happy, outside of here, I am more than happy to try and answer that if it is specifically about IT on integrated offender management, although I do not know that one.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is fine. Stephen, can I ask you, perhaps finally from me, we have heard from the Commissioner that he does not want to be filling the gaps for any issues that may arise, however I take it the MoJ will be letting the contract, is that right?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is right, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Who then has the responsibility for monitoring it and checking performance?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): At the moment it is driven by the MoJ. However we have made strong representations that we believe that MOPAC and also the boroughs should have the ability to help ensure that there is active contract management; and that it is not all managed from the centre. This is part of that ongoing discussion about how we work alongside the MoJ.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK. Does anyone have any questions? It would be helpful Stephen if you still have concerns to let us know, then we could perhaps write a letter in support as well from this Committee. Then we go to Tony, you are going to ask questions about the victim services.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, that is right. We are quite interested in the apparent failure of the contract where you asked the --

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Before you start, Tony, we have finished questions with theMPS, therefore, Commissioner -- unless, Jenny, you had a --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I just have one more topical question and that is that there has just been a ruling about the Azelle Rodney case, and it has been thrown out. I just wondered, the MPS supported this case and the judge has said it was unarguable. Therefore perhaps there are questions about your own legal team and what they are prepared to challenge in court.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not think that is fair. It is fairly quickly after the judgment, therefore we have to reflect on it, and if I just went through some of the points. Basically, E7, the officer involved in the Azelle Rodney case, was the one who brought the judicial review (JR) and we did not support it directly;

however we were associated with that claim. In particular, one ground of the claim, which was ground 2, was about whether or not there had been too much analysis of a split-second decision in a high-risk situation. Therefore fundamentally a firearms officer has a really difficult job and in the blink of an eye they have to decide whether they are going to shoot or not; and we did honestly feel that this needs to be contested in a judicial review. In fact the court was quite supportive of that particular point, although overall they did not find in the officer's favour of saying that the inquiry was flawed, because what they said was,

> *"The minute dissection of fractions of a second with the benefit of hindsight will discourage an appropriate response in real time to threats, thereby resulting in a potentially increased danger to those involved in these exceedingly difficult operations."*

They concluded,

> *"As for the Commissioner's concerns, we hope that this judgment will provide some guidance as to a proper approach and will help to ensure that the investigation of any future incident is addressed having regard to the overall circumstances without undue weight being placed upon minute dissections of time."*

Now we need to think about this a little, however I think that is a fair comment from a senior judge, I think it was Lord Justice Leveson; and I think we take some comfort from the fact that we think there was a minute dissection, a forensic analysis of a very small period of time, and he obviously supports that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): My question I suppose is, the Mayor's Office authorised payment of £168,000 to see this case go through court. I am just wondering if you could have challenged that particular part of the ruling in some different way, because that has cost the taxpayer an awful lot of money for a case that has been thrown out.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): To be fair, it was on my recommendation and support that we did this. I thought it would have been quite wrong to have not supported the officer in this case. We do not see too many shootings of individuals. This was one from, if you remember, I think it was 2006, and we had known already that our firearms officers are concerned that when they fire, for years afterwards they are under scrutiny and they are still being asked to account - in the Azelle Rodney case, nearly eight years later - for a very small period of time and are then called to account for what they did or did not do. Therefore I think it is vitally important that, if there was an opportunity to examine it at law, that was supported and that is all we did. The cost of the law process we might all agree is very expensive, however we had no other forum in which to examine that, and in fact at the end we could not bring the judicial review ourselves as a force, it had to be the officer; and the only thing we could do is at some level support it by being associated with that application. I professionally just think it is unarguable, we have 2,000 officers, as I have said earlier, who are trained, we ask them to volunteer, they get paid no more for carrying these guns, we ask them to put themselves in danger, they make split-second decisions and then some years later someone comes along to ask, "Why did you do that?" I entirely understand

that, however we have to believe it is a fair and objective process; and it is a fair thing to do, to ask in law whether that was a fair process.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I have heard Mr Rowley [Assistant Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service] say, "Why do people not just accept the results of inquiries?"; and sometimes perhaps they should just be accepted rather than push on, spending so much more taxpayer money, and extending the pain for everybody.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe (Police Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are many sides to this argument and the officer's case has to be considered. We know exactly what happened in this case so many years ago. It was a difficult intervention on the streets of London, and the alternatives of letting it carry on were significant. The risk would have materialised in another place with the person who had the gun, they materialised on the streets, and it was a very unfortunate outcome. However the officers did their best and we now have to await the outcome. We have to be a little bit careful. I can only share this JR, because as you are probably aware the officer who has judicially reviewed this decision is now awaiting the outcome of CPS consideration on whether he should be charged as a criminal.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you, and can I thank you both for your attendance today. Thank you.

We are going to move on with some questions just to MOPAC. Tony.

Tony Arbour AM: You will recall, Stephen, that you commissioned Baroness Newlove [Victims Commissioner] to look at victim services. We understand that she is now unable to do that and that you are retendering for this and the tender price has come in substantially more than Baroness Newlove was going to charge us. Two questions really: what exactly was Baroness Newlove's personal role in this, in effect was she a kind of intermediary who was going to commission it from somebody else, or was she going to do the work herself? Secondly, how do you account for the fact that the price has gone up so substantially?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Let us take those questions in turn. Baroness Newlove is not an intermediary. We wanted her to carry out and undertake this review of victim services in London, which we think is a very important part of our preparation for our role as a commissioner of victim services from October this year; and that was undertaken as part of a sole tender action, because obviously she is the Victims Commissioner and we felt that there is no one else who is the Victims Commissioner.

It became clear that, while she is going to be undertaking this review she needed some support. She would continue to lead the review. However, under all the circumstances, she would need some support from a third party to help in the delivery of that work. That is why we went through a process by which we identified a third-party supplier that is working for Baroness Newlove in effect. The price is I think under £50,000. That is the information that I have. I am not aware that the amount of money has gone up, however there was a competitive

bid process for that work and that work will then happen under the direction of Baroness Newlove.

Tony Arbour AM: We are told that the price went up from £35,000 to £49,495, which is a substantial increase.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Obviously you can always set budgets, however a competitive process was gone through, you determine what you want from the third-party supplier, and you then select the supplier on the basis of the quality and the value for money that they provide for the work.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, however of course first time out we did not establish a price.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We needed a third-party supplier to deliver the work and they are providing that work for under £50,000. Given the fact that many millions of pounds are going to be commissioned by MOPAC, I think it is important to have a good review conducted by Baroness Newlove, therefore I think it is money well spent.

Tony Arbour AM: I do not think anyone here disputes that it is going to be a good thing to have this work done, however it did seem rather odd to us, and indeed it does seem rather odd to us that in effect there was not a proper tender process when Baroness Newlove was recruited. Could it be that you believed that because she was the Victims Commissioner she was absolutely the ideal person to do it and therefore it was not necessary to commission the work?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Nothing has changed. We recognise that the leadership of the review, from the first moment, was always going to be carried out by Baroness Newlove; However the focus and the need about who commissions the support to deliver that work, when it became clear that MOPAC needed to undertake that, it was effectively on her behalf. I do not think that changes anything materially frankly.

Female Speaker: Spending money like water.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Caroline.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can you just assure me that this review of victim services will still look at domestic violence services across London and do you have a timescale yet around the development of the long-promised pan-London domestic violence service?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It will absolutely include domestic violence and one area where I think we really do need - and I met with the head of the CPS for London, the new one that has taken over from Alison Saunders, Baljit Ubhey [OBE], only last week. I think we all recognise that this wide-ranging review of the response of, not just the police, but also the wider criminal justice system, to domestic violence is absolutely critical. It is one of the areas in fact where we believe that the case for London having more money for victim services is clear. Around domestic violence, hate crime is another area, and

then also violence around gang crime where you particularly need additional support for a capital city. One of the silver linings to the victims funding cloud is that the Justice Secretary has announced a pot of around £12 million. I was on a call with the Mayor and the Justice Secretary and it is recognised that there is an opportunity to rebalance I think the level of funding, recognising the complexity of crime in the capital city.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): What is the timescale around developing your long-promised pan-London domestic violence service?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): An important part of this is to map services. If you remember, we refreshed the Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy and that forms part of that. What I have asked to do, and this is what we are doing at the moment, is mapping current service availability around demand in the capital. I think there is a hypothesis that potentially we have some major service gaps where there is demand, and while we have more provision in other parts of London, therefore a clear demand for better service in the east of London, and potentially gaps in services there, so I am asking for that map to be carried out over the next few months.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): What are we saying, by the autumn we should have this service up and running?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely, if not before.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): If not before, lovely, that is great, thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I have one question as well and that is on Safer Neighbourhood Boards. Can I just check, Stephen, are we still on track that they will be up and running by April across London?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am told that we are still on track for the April go-live date, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Last time we checked I think there were four you said that may have had difficulties. Are we any nearer with those four or are they still being negotiated?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There are one or two boroughs that still present difficulties, however I do believe we will still get there by April.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, that is helpful, thank you. Unless any other Member has a question? No. OK, thank you for your attendance, Deputy Mayor.