

Police and Crime Committee – 24 September 2015
Transcript of Agenda Item 6 - Question and Answer Session with the Deputy Mayor
for Policing and Crime, Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of the
Metropolitan Police Service

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We are going to start today by talking about the thorny problem of police funding. Grey clouds seem to be gathering apace over this issue at the moment.

Perhaps I can start the questioning to the Commissioner, if I may. It is the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) I am going to be asking about first of all. With the spending review less than two months away, how are you fighting the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) corner, as you have said that you will be doing, in respect of potential funding reductions? You have previously said that you estimated that a further £800 million would be taken from the police grant. Do you believe that is still an accurate estimate?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): First of all, Chair, I just wondered if it might be helpful very briefly to set out how our funding is done broadly – and I know many Members are previous members of the [Metropolitan Police] Authority (MPA) – just to set out where we start from.

Broadly, about 62% or approaching two-thirds of our funding comes from grant. Precept locally and taxation is about 18%. We have an add-on because we have national work and we are the capital city – things happen here that do not happen in the rest of the country – which is called NICC [National, International Capital City grant]. I will not bore you with what it means, but the broad idea is that it is about 6% of our funding. We get 11% of the budget for counterterrorism (CT), which includes protective work. We get CT officers who go out and try to stop terrorism and then we have officers who are dedicated to protecting either people or places. Finally, we have separate streams of funding like, for example, Transport for London (TfL), which is a very big contract under which we get paid to, obviously, keep the buses safe. There are some other bits and pieces, but they are the big numbers.

Broadly, there are three elements of that under threat at the moment. One is around the grant. In the first sense, the CSR is setting out what will happen over the next four years.

Secondly, this year the Home Office also wants to address the issue of the funding formula and, regardless of what that grant is, how it will allocate it around the country. Our concern has been over these last few months that in fact we will suffer badly as a result of that as well because it still looks as though there is a potential for moving money from cities to more rural areas. Of course, we are the biggest city and so the risk is that we lose the most. We are worried that if you do that at the same time as you reduce the grant, the joint effect gets worse.

Then the third area is around this NICC payment. Other places, because they are suffering the same consequences, are starting to eye the NICC payment with glee. Apparently, Manchester believes that it is part of the capital; the City of London definitely does, and Cardiff, etc. People are saying, "We are under pressure around money. Why can we not have some of this money, which seems to regard things as a nationally significant, different, unique area?" Those three things together are worrying.

The £800 million that we are talking about is only about the grant. We have been asked to model, as the rest of the Home Office has, two broad options: a 25% reduction or a 40% reduction. The 25% is the £800 million

and I am going to explain very briefly that that is not all cash. I will be very open about that. Then the 40%, obviously, is quite a bit more.

Bear in mind that we have already taken out 15% of grant already. We say that adds up to about £540 million to £600 million, depending how you count it. We have already made those savings; yet we are the only force in the country that has kept our police officer numbers high. Everybody else has dropped their numbers with the existing cuts we have had. This is over and above that.

The 25%, which we say is about £800 million if it is only 25%, is made up of cash of around £400 million and then we have other things we have to pay whether we want to or not. We have inflation on pay, which is about another £100 million. We have inflation on non-pay, which is about £40 million. There is a pension issue, which I will not bore you with and I would probably get confused about, but the fundamentals are that we have to pay more through National Insurance as the employer for pensions, of around £50 million. We have to put some contingency in there of about a further £100 million for anything we cannot predict. You might say that £100 million is a lot and we have to discuss what we should put into contingency, but out of a £3 billion budget we need some in an emergency service. You can always argue about that quite a lot. There are further things we have to look at like reserves. Therefore, it is something in the order of £800 million.

If it is a 40% cut, then the cash change goes from £400 million to £613 million and correspondingly the overall amount goes nearer to £1 billion. That is what underpins that number that we have talked about.

Of course, the difficulty at the moment is that we do not know until December whether that is £800 million or £1 billion. We believe it should be far less. Over and above that, there is the potential for cuts as a result of the funding formula change and any reductions that might happen as a result of any changes in NICC. It is the compound effect that is worrying because we do have some plans and we may end up discussing it today. I say 'plans'; we have options as to how to make savings, but with that scale of saving none of them are attractive.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): No: I do not envy your position. It is going to be extremely difficult for whoever is in the mayoralty as well next May.

Then, together, both in the MPS and in the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), what representations are you making to the Government and do you think they are actually meeting with any success?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): First of all, I am sure the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime will talk about the political side, but from the policing side we are doing it together because, obviously, as you say, it is not a partisan thing. It is that we want to keep London safe.

We are working with the civil servants in the Home Office to understand what is possible. Of course, they have to articulate back to HM Treasury what we and they say is the impact of these various cuts if they are made. We are working with them to explain what will happen. Equally, they will challenge us about whether or not what we say is accurate. There is that process going on. We are challenging them about the funding formula. One, should it happen at all this year? Two, if it does happen, we should mitigate the effects and we should see what we think could be some very big swings in that money. Finally, whatever that outcome is, even if they introduce it, they should not do it in one year; they should mitigate it over a period of years.

Assembly Members who were on the MPA will remember that there was a change in the funding formula probably 15 or 20 years ago and we never actually got to the new settlement because over the years it was buffered.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yes, because of the damping effect.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Therefore, one part of our argument is that whatever you decide to do – and there are some difficult decisions for everybody to make here – it should take a longer term. Certainly, it should not happen in the short term. Of course, with the grant, we have tried to plan it out as though it is a glide, but it is entirely possible that they will take money out earlier rather than later. These are things that, for everybody concerned, are real concerns. We are arguing – no, I will not say we are arguing; we are debating frankly – with the Home Office about what is going to happen. In turn, they are debating – or arguing – with HM Treasury about what this will mean.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The objective for all of us is to secure the very best deal for London and the real concern about this particular settlement is the triple effect of a reduction in the police grant as well as a review of the funding formula. The change in pensions is very significant as well. Because of the overall modelling to £800 million, £200 million of that is the change in the National Insurance contribution. There are the three of those together.

The other issue will be the phasing of the cuts as well. The problem we have at today's Committee is that we do not know the final position on any of those elements. However, certainly the representations need to be made in the order that they come before us.

On the funding formula, there has been a formal letter from the Mayor to the Home Secretary¹. I have certainly lobbied HM Treasury and the Chief Secretary [to the Treasury, Greg Hands MP] that I did not feel it was sensible to change the funding formula at the same time as reducing the police grant. It is fair to say that all Government departments that are not protected are modelling 25% and 40% and so there is no difference between the Home Office and other departments in Whitehall. However, it is the combination of the three things together that is particularly concerning because the funding formula seems to have a set of indicators that will move resources away from cities to more rural areas. The Mayor met with Tony Lloyd [Police and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester] and me very recently and, clearly, cities are the engines of the economy and we need to make sure that our cities are not short-changed in any formula review.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. With regard to the NICC grant, I believe that makes up about 5.5% of total police funding, but we do know that that, from last year, has to be bid for annually now. Is that correct?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I know the paper talks about perhaps enhancing that, but given that it is a one-yearly bidding process, even if that happens, it does not allow for great planning, does it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am sure Craig [Mackey] will add, but you have hit one of the nails on the head, which is that if you are trying to plan a four-year budget and you are trying to employ people, you cannot employ people if you think that the money is variable. It is really quite hard.

¹ Mayor's response to Home Office consultation on police funding, dated 15 September 2015.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It also has specific things you can spend it against. One of the risks for the future is that your general grant that funds wider policing shrinks and the bits that become ring-fenced grow. Just to manage that collectively is far more challenging.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I can see there is going to be a lot of discussion. We have seen this letter from the Mayor, which is very tough, and personally I am very supportive of it. Presumably, you have written to the Home Office and made strong arguments? Have you made clear any reservations about the consultation itself?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes. To be fair, what has happened up until now is that, first of all, it is not only the MPS and the Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) around the country and the Deputy Mayors who are concerned about it in London; it is also around the country and those representations have been made.

To be fair to the Home Office, it has reopened the consultation and so there is now a process. I am not sure when it will conclude; I think within the next few weeks. It has accepted that it has not taken long enough around that process because it is complex. Clearly, equally, if we try to be fair to the Home Office, it is trying to get the budget arranged for next year and there is a short period of time for it to do that. However, we argued that because of the grant cut and the funding formula, it has to be done properly because we could collectively regret that decision if it is wrong.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Can I go back to the NICC? My impression was that you get top-ups from time to time if the Government asks you to do something extra like the Madeleine McCann [missing British girl] case. Is that right?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes, although that was a bit of a one-off. We might be able to find in the history of the MPS a few of those, but that was fairly unusual. As you know, we can make a bid for a special grant, but it is usually if the problem exceeds about 1% of the budget and 1% for us is still a very large amount of money. Generally, the Government expects you to work within what you have. You have reserves and you have to flex around. The Madeleine McCann case was quite unusual because the Prime Minister made a very clear commitment and that has been funded, but generally you have to do with what you have. I am trying to think of a good example where we have had a successful bid for a special grant. I cannot think of one within this last four years but we have in the past.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): For example, protection is one of the things, protection of ex-prime ministers and things like that, which is at the moment a rather quickly increasing potential number. Is that all ring-fenced or do you --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is ring-fenced but two things are happening, as you have indicated, as the threat level has risen. One of the consequences of the threat level being raised - if you remember from about a year ago now - is that the number of people on the list to be protected and how much they are protected has moved. To be fair, although some of that money around CT and around protection has reduced, it has been better protected than our general grant. While the grant was cut by 15% over the last three or four years, CT was cut by only 7%, about half of the reduction. In between, we have been making comments about, "If you keep adding to the list of people to be protected, we are not going to take officers from Croydon to do that". We are in constant debates about that.

The trouble is that some of these things change in-year. I will not go through some of the detail but, over the last four to eight weeks, there have been political and other issues happening and we have had to change that

list. We can be flexible around overtime a bit. We ask officers to work longer. However, the hours that people are working there are getting pretty difficult. It is financially rewarding for them, but it is probably not sensible to be at work for that long. We are in constant dialogue about trying to get that right.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I should just say that we have had sight of your letters to the Home Office on the consultation and, as a Committee, we have also sent one in similar terms.²

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): What we found particularly worrying was the fact that the Home Office was consulting on a police formula without giving any of the information or the figures behind it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There was no exemplification.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We thought it was quite disingenuous, actually, to have a consultation where you were not told what the impact of a new formula would be.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes. I suppose they would argue and we sometimes do because people say, "How do you get a formula for how many officers you get? What's the formula?" If you debate it and say to somebody, "If we include this factor, you take 50 officers away", they often say, "That is a stupid thing to do", whereas if you debate it objectively before you know the consequences, you get a fairer discussion. However, generally, you need to know the consequences of decisions.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Of course.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have argued that the funding formula bits we have seen have not been accurate, have not been helpful and have not been objectively fair.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That leads me very nicely into my next question. It is about consultation and having fair consultation and knowing outcomes before you make decisions. Given the scale of the funding cuts, you are going to have to make some very difficult decisions. One of those that have been highlighted is the options paper that you have going to your management board meeting at the end of this month, where one of the options is the removal of all Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) posts in London or a reduction in the number of PCSO posts. Obviously, as this Committee has championed the role of those officers and Safer Neighbourhood Teams before, it does raise concerns for us.

However, before I ask specific questions on that, can I just ask about the process you are going to take in making that decision? Is it something on which you are going to make a final decision on 29 September? Is there going to be a reference to the Mayor or the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime about this proposal and will there be a public consultation on this?

² Police and Crime Committee response was appended to Item 5 of the 24 September agenda. The weblink is: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s49902/Appendix%20%20consultation%20response%20-%20police%20funding.pdf>

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): First of all, it is a good opportunity to try to set the record straight. We are not considering that on 29 September. What is happening at the moment, and it is causing some difficulty because some of it has become public, is that because of the scale of what we have sketched out here - these are big cuts and we are going to have to find some way of meeting them - We are asking our people to come up with options to deal with it because it is no good getting to December and finding we have no plans.

Most of that is trying to be done privately because one of the issues we are talking about is these people's jobs and the impact on them is severe or could be severe and so we are trying to do it privately. If parts of that discussion - and that is all they are at this stage: presented options - get into the public domain, people will say, "Why are you doing this?" The reason we are doing the staff work is because of the scale of the task.

We want to get to December with some reasonable options. Therefore the only thing we are doing at the moment is looking into any of these options that look credible. Are there any that we just cannot stomach? Really, the only time we are going to start to make decisions and start to be able to consult on real options is around December. In November the Home Office will know what it will get and then it has to decide how it allocates its funds around between the police, the UK Border Agency (UKBA), the prisons and all of its funding streams. We will only really know by December. We are in the process of talking, but there is no decision-making on 29 September.

If we go to your second point, which is still fair, on when we have to make that decision and how we are consulting, of course we will talk to people. The problem we have is that often - if we stick with the PCSO example but there are many others we could talk about - they say, "Do you want this one?" People tend to say no. What they rarely offer is what they would prefer to save instead. We are going to talk later about rape investigations. Do they want to cut it from there, from neighbourhoods? Everybody is clear on what they do not want to cut, but the consultation rarely gives new ideas about where we should cut. We have some other ideas that we may talk about generally if you would like to.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yes, we will do in a minute and we have some further questions. Am I right in thinking that there is an options paper to your 29 September 2015 Board meeting that might have a range of options in it? What will you decide, then? Are you going to take the work further with regards to possible scenarios?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Craig [Mackey] can probably talk in detail, but what they are doing is presenting as far as they have got with their thinking and so they will need help. One of the difficulties we have as a management board team is that if I say to somebody, "Find me £800 million in savings and give me some options", I cannot then say, "Do not bother doing this; do not bother doing that". You have to give them some freedom. That is what we have done and they are coming back with some options, some of which look possible, some of which look awful and some of which we will never do. That is where we have to work. Of course, they then have to have the opportunity to present it back to us and for us to start to say, "Hang on, you have done that work there but you have not taken account of what we have said about boroughs and you have not taken account of what we have said about ranks". We are trying to draw that work back together so that we as a team, as well as their work, have some scrutiny. Then we are working alongside MOPAC to see what might be possible and what might be not possible.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It is going to be important that when you are making any cuts, you lay bare perhaps to the public and to stakeholders exactly what the full range is so that they can be looked at in the round and we do not just take one element only because it will have impacts.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): That is not what is being done. The way it is being portrayed in the press is that that is the only thing we are looking at and that is the first thing you have opened with, but it is not. Even with the options that are starting to be presented, of the £800 million gap, we still have a balancing feat to find of £150 million. All the options on the list are unattractive.

For example, I have said that at the RSA (Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce) speech I gave in March and so this is not news, but if all we did to take £800 million was to reduce cops, we would lose 16,000 police. That is what we are trying to mitigate. All of the other options to get savings look unattractive, but that is the unattractive thing that we all need to work against.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The issue about the PCSOs coming to the public is because we started getting emails from our local PCSOs and I know that over that weekend when it did come into the public domain, Borough Commanders were briefing their PCSOs.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): What happened as well - and Craig [Mackey] may tell you - is there has been another issue happening, which is that we are trying to move PCSOs from unfunded posts to funded posts because we get funding from TfL. If we do not fill them, we do not get the cash. We have been trying to get people into jobs that they are funded for and can see as genuine, permanent employment because, if there is a risk of losing posts, we want to make sure they are protected. There is a need to write to people. I suspect that process has caused people to be more frightened. I say 'more frightened' but they have obviously been concerned about what we are doing and why, quite rightly.

As you say, you have raised it and I am not objecting to it being raised. I am merely observing that at that meeting in September we are going to see a lot of things, one of which is PCSOs. It is not that we have gone out to say, "Let us get rid of PCSOs". We have not gone out to do anything other than manage the £800 million loss that we anticipate.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): In taking decisions forward further, will you be engaging with the unions on these proposals and allowing them to put in alternative cases?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Of course and we already have been doing that. The unions have been very responsible in this. They have kept the confidence that we have asked them to. Often some of the more public aspects have been because managers have been briefing staff, not because the unions have breached confidence. They have dealt with it responsibly and similarly also the Police Federation because, although the PCSOs clearly are very worried, people like the Police Federation are worried if the number of officers we lose starts to accelerate, as I am sure you would be and so am I.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): When you are considering the role of PCSOs, will you be undertaking an equalities impact assessment? About 34% of the PCSO roles are from black and minority ethnic (BAME) members.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We do that as a statutory necessity, but we have to be straight: these are big numbers.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): If you take the decision to cut posts, when will they come into play?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is probably premature. I am not going to answer that exactly right now. I am trying my best to answer questions as directly as I can, I hope you know. The only reason for hesitating is that we have to make these savings over four years. We know that we have normal turnover and, yes, with some people there will be natural wastage. We are still recruiting to some extent and there may be the possibility of people becoming police officers. Some of them want to. However, we do not know yet, first of all, the amount of the saving or, as I said earlier, the rate at which our grant will be reduced. If we have to take a lot out at the beginning, we have limited opportunities to get savings out. We still cannot – and I am not arguing for it – make officers redundant. Yes, there are limited opportunities here as to how we achieve this and all the levers are pointing in a downward direction.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The concern that we have is that PCSOs really have built confidence up in communities and we would be very concerned if they were lost. Stephen, you were interviewed and said that you would require a great deal of convincing for this. Could I just ask what role MOPAC will have in this?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): First and foremost, before we go on to the specifics of PCSOs, this Committee needs to be aware that the other thing we need to fight against is that, in the shrinking of money, there are more levers being pulled from Whitehall and that this money is properly devolved and unring-fenced. That needs to be emphasised as a very important point. When you have a smaller and shrinking budget, to be able to continually bid for bits of money makes financial planning very difficult and does not give you the flexibility to spend the money on the demands where they are greatest.

On the specifics of PCSOs, as the Committee knows, we went through a significant reorganisation of neighbourhood policing in 2013 and that was the move to having one PCSO and one police constable in every one of all the 630 wards. I have said that I would need a lot of convincing to remove a PCSO from every ward because my experience from going out across London is that they are very often the most knowledgeable person of that particular place. It is something that we would not want to do. The Mayor has said as well that that is not something we would want to do.

However, we need to see this in the context of a plan that balances the budget over four years. The critical thing to be aware of is that it will be the phasing of the cuts that drives the speed at which you need to make budget savings. If the phasing is frontloaded it can double the pain and, therefore, it becomes harder for the MPS to balance the books. In my view, we need to be lobbying very hard on the funding formula and, secondly, on the phasing so that we are not seeing the pain doubled in a way that means you then have to make people redundant, which is actually a huge cost.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I have a letter from the Mayor dated yesterday because I wrote to him raising my concerns about the loss of PCSOs and he has responded. If I can just quote one part of this letter, it says:

“When the MPS management board have taken a view on the elements they wish to propose, they will, as is proper, bring that forward to me and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, along with a plan to consult Londoners. At that point, though, I would take some very significant convincing before sanctioning the removal of PCSOs from the streets of London.”

The Mayor does say he envisages that the MPS will come forward with a plan to consult Londoners about any cuts --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Mayor has been very clear that we have not had a proposal yet and that is what the Commissioner has just said.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I just want to check that there will be a full consultation with Londoners. Yes, thank you.

Roger Evans AM: I was interested, Stephen, to hear that you were critical of ring-fencing from the Government, which is probably wise. I know that in the past we have had discussions, going really right back to the start of the MPA, about whether there are national elements of what the MPS does that should actually be divested from the MPS and dealt with elsewhere so that London becomes a much more local police force. The argument that has always been made to us by the MPS is that we get more money from the Government than it costs to run these things and, effectively, we would lose out if we did that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is not the briefing that I have had, Roger, to be honest with you.

Roger Evans AM: It was a while ago that that argument was made. Yes, Tony remembers.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes.

Roger Evans AM: He has been here as long as I have, yes. I think that was the case. However, it is interesting that you are saying it is not the case now because perhaps that means it is time to revisit that question on whether we do these pieces of work for the national interest if we are not being fully reimbursed for doing it and if that reimbursement is going to be further reduced. It should not be a burden on London taxpayers, should it?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly, as the Deputy Commissioner said, if we take the NICC grant, that is why the demands on us as a capital city are far greater than the level of grant that we receive from the Government. There are other grants. With the CT funding, there is a national element to that. Intuitively you would think, "It is a national function and so we can potentially just hive that off", but clearly the CT grant, largely, is for a unit of the police that is serving London and there is a co-ordinating function on top of that. Therefore, again, it is not as simple as it appears.

My parallel comes from other Whitehall departments because austerity started in 2010 for most unprotected departments. For policing, it started in 2011. For the MPS, it started in 2012. The way other Whitehall departments have dealt with reductions in budgets is by having less money but having more freedom to spend the money. That is merely the case I was making. If you follow other examples of how they have continued with austerity, it is by being much freer to spend the money where they need to.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Sir Bernard, my question was on your point about funding. You mentioned that everyone knows what they do not want to have cut and the areas where you can actually make reductions are few and far between.

I want to know. Have you considered the option of moving some of your responsibilities to other agencies like the National Crime Agency (NCA)? I am thinking specifically about CT.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have not because I do not think operationally it is wise. Number two: we would save no money. All you would do is transfer the responsibility with some cash. The danger would be that we would lose some of the funding that we have in the MPS, which would just transfer to the NCA. It would be worse rather than better.

My view is that, professionally, the CT network works very well. One of the biggest benefits we have is that our officers in the MPS – and when you look around in Greater Manchester – are part of the MPS to deal with CT. They are linked into the community we serve and that is the best way to deliver CT policing. We have officers on the ground who can provide intelligence. They are talking to people in the community. Part of what we do is to deal with people whom we worry about in terms of terrorism. They are not separate jobs. I would say it is part of the fabric of policing and we have had great benefits from doing it that way. I would argue that it is working and so why would you change it?

If you could argue that it would make a big saving for us, it would be a second argument. Even if it would not be as effective, it might be more efficient and might save money, but nobody says that it would cost less and there would certainly be transition costs, even if all you do is move the information technology (IT) or move out of buildings. The very worst time to do it is when it is working or when you are trying to save money. Why would you do it? For me, I do not think this would be wise.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM: On that point, you are saying that CT should be embedded in the local community. How small is a local community? You mentioned Cardiff. How small is a local community that requires that kind of resource?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am not quite sure what you mean, Tony. The first point is that, if you took London or Cardiff, which I do not know, you cannot just say, “It is that estate. It is that borough”. We have concerns in each of our boroughs about probably one, two, five or – in some places – more people whom we are concerned about in terms of their terrorist activity. We cannot just say, “If all we do is put the resources into those three boroughs, it will be fine”. It is right across. Even if they are grouped together in two boroughs, they might live somewhere else or they might work in another borough.

One of my arguments would be that you cannot predict exactly where they will live and you cannot predict where the problem is. You can predict where some of the targets might be. It is pretty hard to say where they will grow up and where they will develop. If they disappear, as we have seen, off to Syria and return, where are they going to live when they come back? You have to have a whole-city, in our case, or a whole-country network and the best way to do that is working with the police service.

Bear in mind that even now there are about 200,000 in the British police service providing a service to 60 million people. Getting that network right and embedded in the community, not a separate set of buildings, working with the Security Service; in my view, [changing that] would be wrong.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can some of this CT money be used to fund the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and particularly the PCSOs? They are the eyes and ears on the ground and they pick up those small changes in people’s behaviour that ring alarm bells up the line. If not, is that something you could be arguing for? That money could help preserve our Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): At the moment, some of the CT grant is threaded through the MPS; not all of it by any means, but a proportion of it. For example, if you looked at our firearms teams, we have a number of armed response vehicles (ARVs) out there. A proportion of them are paid for by the CT grant and that is on the basis that this city must be at risk --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Absolutely.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): -- of a terrorist attack. It is obvious. Therefore, if we only paid the money that we get through grant into ARVs, for the sake of argument, we could have two - that is not the number - but by having the CT grant in there we could double it. That is one way in which the CT grant is fed into general policing.

We have Prevent officers working in boroughs. They are working through the neighbourhoods to try to identify people at risk and put them into the Channel programme. We have various ways in which some of that money is diffused into policing.

The Government is constantly saying to us, "Are you sure you are using it for CT or are you just enhancing local policing?" We have always been in that debate. They have just carried out a review of it and proved that in fact - to Tony's point - we are actually putting more money into it than we are taking out of it. To be fair to them, they are always saying, "Are you sure you are still using it for the thing that we gave it to you for?"

Where we can get flexibility, we do try to get to it, but on the whole it is marginal. The majority of the CT grant is spent on the teams who go out and look for the terrorists. That proves it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The CT grant is an example of where the MPS receives money from the Home Office and effectively is performance-managed very strongly from the Home Office to the extent of, "Are the positions filled? How can we measure the productivity of preventative police officers? How is the Channel programme working? How are the funds being used that were commissioned to support the Prevent programme?" Therefore, the real issue for me in this budget round is if more of the money is not devolved so that we have a city-wide approach that makes sure that CT policing is seamless with neighbourhood policing and works from the streets of Kilburn to Kandahar, as it has previously been put. That is the key: to make sure that we get the money to flow and be properly managed by the MPS rather than being controlled by the Home Office. That is a big risk at this moment.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If I can, whilst it is a really good idea, there is not the headroom in the budget. Let us say you wanted to transfer the funding of one PCSO per ward. That would have to be a completely separate bid process into the Home Office to get growth to fund that. When you look at the other pressures that are already on there - and colleagues from the Security Services and elsewhere have spoken about that growing threat - the pressure is around having detectives or forensic investigators. The thought of trying to grow it to fund 600 or 700 other posts is a nice idea but there is not the money there to do it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Quite clearly, you need flexibility with the grants and budgets you get so that you can decide. If you choose from talking to your CT team that it is really important that PCSOs and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams are part of that intelligence-gathering, you should be able to use some of the funding for that if you so choose.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Just to be clear, Caroline, we cannot choose. We can propose --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I know, but I am saying that ideally you would have more flexibility so that you could then choose.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is correct. You would have more flexibility.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): You are going back to Stephen's point about a whole budget. Could I just say one other thing? Actually, for us, that is ideal. The reason why the Home Office is more worried about the rest of the country is that if you bear in mind where the CT units are, West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester, the Home Office would be concerned that if it allowed, particularly at the moment, the money to be blended into the force, there is a very good substitute factor and we may end up without a CT unit network. That came in, as you remember, post 9/11 because before then we did not have a CT unit network. We had the MPS and then Special Branch was scattered around the country. That network took a lot of developing and the concern that I know the Home Office would have is that that would just disappear and the money would just slide over to general policing. That is the worry.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): That is the worry. It is a balance. Clearly, community confidence in the police is the key out of all of this and having those resources in the front line is really important.

Are there other things you are looking at, Commissioner? You have questioned whether you should keep 32 borough command units (BCUs). You have questioned whether you should delete more ranks in the police. Are you looking at all of these again and do we expect proposals to come forward on these?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes, in short. It is difficult for us, again. If they are in one of those ranks that might be thought about, people are worried about. They are worried about the promotion prospects.

Just to give you an indication of the reason we are having to consider these things at all, with some of the work we have done around ranks, we might be able to save £100 million if we were to remove certain ranks. PCSOs we have talked about, but it is something in the order of £40 million. If we changed BCUs, there might be something like £50 million. We have a big piece of work, which the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has led, around getting our services either match-fit or, frankly, outsourced and we are in the process of that. There would be a further £300 million there.

What you can see is that even with these big numbers and these very big amounts of money - and we are trying to find £800 million - and even when we have done all of those things, we still need to find a balancing feature of £150 million. The problem is that marginal things in this context make no difference. We could reduce the number of cars we have by 5% but it would not make a lot of difference. We are getting into that area where all these things are very difficult. We still have not found what we anticipate will be the balancing feature of £150 million and so there is more to come in terms of our considerations. The balancing feature on the whole tends to be the number of police.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Clearly, there are some very big figures you are quoting there and things that you can do, change ranks and take out quite significant figures, but also you are going to have to do some very small things just to have those add up to help with this total. What else are you looking at?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Basically, there are the small things, Caroline, because you are right that it is not just the big things. However, in our view, in organisational terms, what you have to do is work out where these big chunks of money are coming from.

Then you get down to two things. One is optimism bias. If someone says, "I can offer you £40 million for this", you look at it and it is actually £29 million. Alternatively, sometimes you have to spend at the beginning to make the saving in the end. Therefore, there are nice big ideas and nice broad numbers and the scale of the

task forces you into it, but it is not the answer yet. That is why this work is being progressed over the next few weeks and months.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You start off any budgeting process not by working on the cuts that hit the front line or the middle office, but by starting with how you can lean out and make more efficiencies when it comes to, let us say, the estate or what you can do in terms of asset management and which assets you can release. You then look at the overhead and support services to policing. Then you move closer and closer to the front line and you get to the issues where, frankly, the public is going to be affected and the service they receive will be changed. You are focusing on the ones that will be of great concern to the public.

I was sceptical about the ability of the MPS to reshape the estate but it has happened in these last four years. We have seen a significant change in the MPS's estate. The running costs are dramatic. Over a four-year period, we are talking about savings of £160 million because you just multiply it by four. That is a significant achievement. Can we do that again? Actually, there is a plan to look at shrinking the estate without changing public access that dramatically shifts the estate again.

When you look at procurement and competitive tendering, just looking at back-office support services, over a ten-year period is about £100 million in savings. That is just the beginning of a process that rolls up to £300 million.

Then you get to the hard stuff, but even with the hard stuff it is possible not to see it as the most frightening option, which is, "We will stop doing this", or, "We will change that". There are options that I am sure the MPS is considering in between that may help us balance the books.

The last point is that the assumptions that you make to balance the books are very important because the assumptions you take around the inflation to buy things in the future is often a big factor in whether you balance or not. Making sensible assumptions but always starting with the savings from the back office to the middle office to the front line is the way that I know the MPS is doing this.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): To reassure you, over the summer we have run an accelerated service review (ASR). It is a fancy name for a priority-based budgeting programme. Every budget line has been scrutinised. Whether it is secretarial support and how we work or the management board committing to working open-plan, some of that has already started and is light years away from where we used to be. There is no dedicated specialist support as in personal assistants (PAs) and things. All of these lines are being looked at. You have to drive that. In total, with that ASR, there is only about £100 million left to come out of that. If you look at the progress we have made on overtime, Territorial Policing is doing some fantastic work and has taken 49% out of its overtime bill. These are huge strides that people are making and managing.

They are great, but when you still have that gap you run out of places to look. As the Deputy Mayor said, there is more money to come out of the back office but they are not all straightforward because some of those, as the Commissioner touched on, would involve you going back out to the commercial market and saying, "Go back out and look again at how we deliver this service". The one we have just done has affected 400 colleagues with jobs going to South Wales. Labour arbitrage has the huge cost in it of having jobs in London. However, during the next four years, all of those challenges are going to become real.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I do not envy you your task at all. It was fine when Stephen [Greenhalgh] was talking about getting rid of some of the estate and so on but, if you look at what

TfL has been doing with some of its estate, in some ways it is much smarter because it is looking at how it could get revenue streams going forward and has kept hold of freeholds and so on. There are ways you can do it that do not just ditch the family silver and get nothing back in return.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In fairness, we have debated that a couple of times at the Budget and Performance Committee. TfL works under different rules about income to us. It is not straightforward for the police to generate income and/or be a landlord because we look, quite rightly, at the challenge around New Scotland Yard. There was quite a detailed options appraisal around why disposal to bring capital in to fund transformation and to maintain frontline services was a better option than trying to build, effectively, a trading arm.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Finally, I just wanted to ask and maybe I can put this to Stephen. We were told that 18% comes from the precept by Sir Bernard at the beginning. Is one of the options you need to be looking at potentially increasing the precept to pay for police in London? If you make the case to Londoners, they may well be very happy to do that to keep the police we need on our streets.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Just before I answer that question, I will answer your question if I can just comment on your previous statement. Yes, of course there are options to increase the precept. That is a political decision for someone to make within --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Is that something you would support?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, I would not support the decision until I know the numbers. I certainly am not someone who is inclined to increase the precept. You know the rules: you can increase the precept by up to 2% before you have to have a referendum. However, again, we have to recognise that in London the gearing for the money the precept raises is far lower than for other forces. We raise around £600 million from the precept. Therefore, the increase is there to be made but it does not buy the sorts of numbers of police officers that are under threat without making significant savings elsewhere. It is going to be a political debate, no doubt.

On the land issue, it is fair to say that the booking and generating of the £1 billion that the MPS has raised from buildings has been a significant part of the ability of the MPS to change. It has not just been always a straight sale. The sales have been with overage to make sure that if there is any property upside it is captured. Secondly, where there has been a significant property development in play, we have looked at doing precisely what you have said where you keep the land or you do it in a way that you maintain an interest. Hendon is another deal that has been done as part of a wider development. There has not been a one-size-fits-all for the disposal of property, but it has certainly been something that has bought the space for the MPS to be able to have the money to invest in frontline policing. £1 billion is a significant sum of money.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, but with all this work going on, if you still cannot quite make the savings that you need to, would you put to the Mayor the potential to increase the precept to keep the numbers of police and PCSOs on our streets?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not going to deal with hypotheticals at this stage. We know where we are in the budget progress. We know that there is not any time before December when we will know where we stand and I am certainly not going to put anything to the Mayor until I know where we stand.

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

Andrew Dismore AM: I just wanted to ask you about the Home Office paper on volunteers, which seemed to be some sort of attempt to plug the gap. Volunteers are part of a wider paper with the suggestion that you would have police community support volunteers with powers to search a detainee, use reasonable force to take somebody to a police station, issue on-the-spot fines and seize illegal drugs or alcohol from young people. Do you think that is an option?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I think we already have them. They are called Special Constables. We can increase the number of specials and we want to. In fact, our Specials have dropped a little over the last couple of years. As we are recruiting more officers, many Specials are becoming regular officers and so we need to get back into that. In fact, the human resources (HR) department has a recruiting campaign planned. Essentially, these are people who are not paid and who have full police powers. That list of powers that Andrew has just gone through is the powers that they have. In fact, they have far more: they can arrest; they can do anything a police officer can do in England and Wales. Therefore, what we would do is to invest and make sure we have more Specials.

Of course, we have other volunteers, as you know, who do not have powers and who help us, sometimes keeping front counters open, sometimes on the closed-circuit television (CCTV) side, recognising people who have committed offences. We have two broad groups and we can certainly enhance those. I am not sure we need a third group as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is what the Home Office seems to be proposing. These are not Specials. They are not going to be warranted in the same way that Specials are. It sounds a bit like vigilantes, does it not?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I must admit that I can only say what I have just said, really, which is that we have in the Special Constable a well-tested, well-used and well-powered organisation. I would make the best use of them and increase their numbers if possible. I have not seen enough detail to understand how this third group would work.

Andrew Dismore AM: It is in the Home Office paper, is it not, and so I am not sure the level of detail is there, but it does not seem to me that they are talking about Specials; they are talking about a third group. You do not seem to be particularly enamoured of that idea.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I like the idea of a volunteer who has powers, but we have a group called the Specials.

Len Duvall AM: It is very important to get the distinction. I was hoping you were going to say further, Commissioner, that the Specials are warranted police officers, not volunteers as such, because you also have volunteers within the MPS doing some valuable work and contributing to that. That is the distinction.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes, Chair. Thank you. Commissioner, can I just take you back briefly to the PCSOs review? You acknowledged that three options were discussed at the 29 September meeting.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have not had that meeting yet.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: It is coming up. There are three options coming up.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I do not think I have discussed it. I have not even seen the paper and so I do not know what is in it.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Have you not discussed the paper? OK. Let me put it this way. Would you appreciate the concerns of many boroughs? I speak here representing three boroughs that would have those concerns. There would be grave concerns at the removal of PCSOs from ward level because those boroughs would see that their circumstances are so different from other boroughs. At the moment we have a one-size-fits-all approach to some aspects of the allocation of PCSOs, but in reality I believe you can see from the stats the changes that have happened in some boroughs since the allocation of PCSOs. To remove those PCSOs would turn the clock back in those boroughs.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): The only thing I can say at this stage is that it is not our or my proposal to remove PCSOs in any way. We have dropped, as you know, over the last few years anyway. We had nearly 5,000. We now have 1,700. It is not our proposal to do that. It is a consequence of the monetary change. We will consider when we know the money how best to deal with that.

What I cannot do, really, is just keep responding about PCSOs because we have to discuss Chief Inspectors, BCUs and the whole list of things, some of which we have probably not yet considered. It would be wrong to consider only one or two boroughs and say that they need a special model. We have to look at the operational need and we have to look at the money we have available and then see what is going to be the most efficient and effective means of doing that. At the moment, we have all been inundated with one part of one borough, which has been sending emails in saying that they should not lose things. I understand why they campaign, but I am afraid that at the moment it is not relevant because we have not yet seen the amount of money and we will do it objectively, not on a political basis.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: It is politics because I am a politician asking you. You are subject to the political will of the Mayor, who then responds to the views of the people of London. Therefore, I am saying to you that there are large areas of this city – and I represent three boroughs – where there are feelings about the relationship and the knowledge that they feel safer in their communities because PCSOs have been recruited from their communities and are like them and that the removal of that group of police staff would be a problem. That is what I am saying.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): That is certainly going to be one of the considerations, but there are no guarantees.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you for considering it.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Mr Greenhalgh, I want to come back to a couple of things you have said this morning that strike me as not quite right.

You mentioned, for example, this clear dividing line between assets and the front line. Actually, of course, once you do start selling off assets like police stations, it does put pressure on the front line because officers have to travel further to get to the job, they have to travel further for breaks and that sort of thing. You seem to understand the figures, but I am just wondering if you understand the human impact of what you are doing.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is a misrepresentation of what I was saying. Clearly, I believe that this is a public service that is doing its very best. I consider it the first public

service. The thing that affects the public is obviously front-counter access to those services. That is particularly important.

Making good use of buildings is about efficiency. There are police stations that are being so poorly utilised that it is probably not in the interests of an organisation that has to make huge savings to have buildings that are a third used. If you compare that with other office buildings that are 90% or 95% utilised, a 30% utilised building is not a good use of an asset.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I understand that but I am talking about officer welfare.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Releasing that and making space and, as the Commissioner was also saying, making more modern use of office space with a move to open plan is to be welcomed and saves money and is also about being more efficient.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Let me come back to something else you said. You said that you do not particularly want to discuss the idea of raising the precept, but do you consider it OK for a Mayor of London to throw a temper tantrum and blackmail the Chancellor into giving, for example, £93 million to the police?

Tony Arbour AM: What is this?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is a different way of raising money that is less acceptable than actually going out to Londoners and asking them if raising the precept is all right.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly, Jenny, I started the job in 2012 and the £90 million was secured to support the police due to the fact that they were leading in the largest policing operation in peacetime history and that was the Olympics. That was one of the reasons why --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You are missing the point, really, are you not?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not missing the point. That is a newspaper report, but recognise what it was for. It was dealing with something that was hugely important for this city and money well spent.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Let me ask the Commissioner a question. There seems to be a shortfall in the budget of about £1.6 million; again, small figures compared with the overall problem. There seems to be a dispute between TfL and the MPS and I wonder if that comes from the formation of the new Traffic Unit.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): You might have to help me a bit more, Jenny. I am not sure about this £1.6 million. What is the shortfall for?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is on transport.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): All right. We can have a look. I am not quite sure what it is. I do not think we have any dispute with TfL. I was saying earlier. Remember we were having that discussion about PCSOs and the concern because the numbers had dropped. We would end up with vacancies, for example, in TfL and yet Croydon, Brent or wherever were fully staffed. We were trying to work out whether we could get some of the PCSOs who worked in the boroughs to work for the funded posts, which might be better for them in the long term. It will be that if we have not filled a post

we will not get the money. I do not expect to be paid for a service we are not providing. I do not know whether that is it, but probably we can have a look if we get a bit more detail.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I will write to you and give it to you exactly. Thank you.

Len Duvall AM: I am slightly confused by some of the statements. This next round of cuts – and in fact probably the cuts that you have had leading up to this – is not business as usual, is it? At the end of the four-year period after the next phase, we will have a very different police service. In some ways, whether you had money in 2012 or not, it may have meant fewer cuts at that period of time but to buy time in.

There was something you said earlier about the cuts process and I am very pleased to hear that you are doing things slightly differently. I heard it from Stephen [Greenhalgh] but it was quite interesting in terms of the exercise you have gone through during the summer and it is quite important that you have done that.

In the budget process there are, of course, different levers to reach the budget settlement and different ways of working and some will bear greater savings in the short term and some will bear greater savings in the long term. I know, Commissioner, you do not want us to talk about PCSOs but it is on the agenda. With their process of recruitment and leaving the service, probably – I would not like to describe this because this is about people's jobs – as well as a service to the public in terms of a policing service, it is probably easier to let them go to achieve financial savings than others. What is the process of where you put a policing priority to say, "No, I do not want to take that saving at this moment in time because it does not make policing sense and because I need to protect that for whatever job or role that they are playing"? Where is that thinking and where is that built into this process?

I want to go back to some dates that you have said. We know that at the September meeting you are receiving proposals. We also have some other dates here in December. You have mentioned it and the Mayor mentions it in his response to you, Chair. Is it the December meeting where you are going to make some pretty major decisions about policing over the next four years? Are you going to be in a position to do that?

Where does the consultation fit into that? You talked about trade union consultation and there are mixed views about the informal side and the formal side. Equally, what is the public consultation? Is it going to be MOPAC coming out in January or is it the MPS that is going to come out to have – as with some of our exchanges in the past – an honest debate about what the police service looks like in the coming years?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Presumably we should talk about consultation. In terms of timings, it seems to me that we are talking about weeks, not years, in terms of making decisions.

Here we are, nearly at the end of September. In November, a matter of probably six to eight weeks away, the Home Office will know what it is getting and within a few weeks of that it will tell us. There is no certainty about the date it will tell us. We believe it will be before Christmas and that is what usually happens anyway and so we know that. We will plan our meeting structure and consultation around that initially. Could we make decisions straightaway? It would probably be foolish to make decisions within a matter of days. We will have to absorb what that means. We then have Christmas. We can work through Christmas and then we have to get a budget ready for April, which will be 12 weeks away. That is the broad timescale we are talking about.

We will do our best in that time to consult. To me, all the consultation that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime took and that we supported around the closure of police stations, in my view, seemed to be a pretty effective mechanism. People at least felt as though they were being consulted and were generally consulted

about what was going to happen. The plan changed a little after that consultation. It is more difficult, not impossible, when you are talking about the time we are talking about and the scale of the change. Whatever we can do in the time we have, we will do, of course, but the time is difficult and that is going to be a challenge for all of us. The money is difficult and the time to make the plans is equally difficult. As you have indicated, the lead time also is quite long and the longer we wait the harder it gets.

Len Duvall AM: Where does public consultation come into it? I know you personally hold dear policing by consent, but where is that honest conversation about the type of service that I and other members of the public can expect from the police service with diminishing resources? It is very different territory with the scale of the cuts. Most of your services are people and I have a different view about the front line than Stephen [Greenhalgh] has. You are part of the front line and many of your back-office staff are part of the front line in terms of supporting services and so we have already had an impact on the front line with these cuts. What we are facing now is slightly different. Where does the public fit into that? I am still not clear --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): In my view, that is --

Len Duvall AM: Sorry, Commissioner. I am still not clear whether it is MOPAC that is going to be leading an exercise or [the MPS] in terms of the New Year or are you not doing an exercise in engaging with the public on these issues?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There are processes that we should be aware of where the timing is a little unfortunate. My understanding - and I stand to be corrected - is that the Home Office will know its money in November, the actual amount that the MPS receives will be available in December and the Greater London Authority (GLA) budget consultation starts at the end of November. Effectively, you are modelling and discussing and opening up a budget that may need to be amended when you get the budget through from the Home Office in December, which is a little unfortunate. Therefore, we are not absolutely certain until December.

At the point at which we know the decisions and choices that have to be made at this stage, if they are significant changes, which some of them will be, we will need to find an appropriate way of engaging with the public, as we have done in the past when it came to changes to both the police estate and front counters and also the way that neighbourhood policing is carried out. That was entirely proper and it would be my proposal this time around, but that needs to be structured based on what we decide to do. At this stage, we cannot consult on options. I think you would agree with that.

Len Duvall AM: More significant, why can you not engage with the public about some of the dilemmas that you have?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The problem is --

Len Duvall AM: Do you know what I mean?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Len, in all seriousness, I will answer this question very directly. It comes back to the point that the Commissioner made, which is that if you stand by the changes in the budget with phasing being equal, then you do not have to have the dramatic effects that require you to take very difficult decisions for the next financial year. If the phasing, however, is radically different and towards the 40% end, then of course the options become a lot more unpalatable. Literally, it comes down to that. There is no point in gearing up to how we plan the consultation until we know the sorts of measures that have to be taken and the speed at which they need to be decided. That is really why it is --

Len Duvall AM: There will be consultation? Are we clear on that? I am unclear.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Where there is a fundamental change in the way we police London, there should be public consultation.

Len Duvall AM: OK. Let us talk about the fundamental change. We have the PCSO agenda as a fundamental change in the sense that PCSOs are important but it is more about your local policing measure and the way that you police that. Is that fundamental to discuss?

Can I also put on the agenda this question to the Commissioner? Commissioner, you earlier on alluded to a couple of other proposals that you would like to share with us today. One of those I would like to put on, which I am not sure about at the moment because I only know some details of it, is the changing way that we may be providing response in the future. Part of that in policing terms is that you would grow the response unit by asking it to do certain other tasks that it would not normally do under the response it is doing now, which is a change in the way of policing and it may well be a good outcome for the public in that sense.

Is that something that is fundamental in terms of what is being said and should there be not so much consultation but engagement with the public to keep the trust in confidence about policing in a time of reduced resources?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): The way you phrased it there is realistic – engaging – because proper consultation, which we have just accused the Home Office of not doing on the funding formula, takes time and it is not my fault that the time is short. We are going to have to deal with the consequences of what we have been given in the time we have available.

For example, we have concentrated up until now – quite properly – and we have talked about PCSOs and we have talked about big chunks of money, but one of the other things we have talked about you went into: response. How do we organise it? Do we organise it across boroughs? Instead of stopping at the Lambeth borough, do we say, “We are only in the next street. Let us get some more efficiency from that”? That was your second point that we are having to consider. Do we expect the officers to do more?

However, if we do all of that, do we continue with our present performance targets in the same way? I do not think that is realistic. What we will always do – while I am here – is we will attend emergencies as quickly as we need to. For example, the 15-minute target I am sure will remain. However, we have a further target of one hour. Do we stick with one hour or do we go to two? Provided someone’s life is not at risk and provided an offender is not at the scene, it will do two things, potentially. One, we may be able to do more with less resources. Two, frankly, we may do more while we are there rather than racing away and doing something else, which we are criticised for at times, “You get there quickly and you leave quickly. Do you do your job properly?”

They are the sorts of things that we are having to consider. The difficulty for us in the time we have is how well we do the work to present to the public and others, like this Assembly, about the consequences of some of these things. However, I will just go back: it is the least worst option, not the best.

Len Duvall AM: In terms of growing response, if you look at the pools of people where you could grow the response in the MPS, you almost have to look at the local policing measure to take those people and add to response. Therefore, we lose the capacity to be able to deal with issues within boroughs, flashpoints or particular centres of crime.

That, it seems to me, is a debate that we should fundamentally have and I, as an elected politician, should be able to understand what you are doing and the public should understand that maybe there is a new way of policing going on. We are not quite there yet and I do not quite see that. I can see where Stephen [Greenhalgh] is coming from when he is saying, "Wait and see on the phasing". Even with phasing, we are into a different type of policing model. Somehow, the sooner we have that conversation and the sooner people understand that policing model, the sooner we can get back into what we should be doing, focusing on cutting down crime still, which you are doing now and you are doing it - I have to say - under very difficult circumstances.

The bit that is missing for me - and it is not an accusation against people here - is generally about an honest debate about the service that we are going to receive and the fact that I do not understand the pressures that may well be affecting the police officers or PCSOs carrying out their duties. We are making the jobs of people who deliver policing, the people below you, much harder to do in retaining that trust and confidence because that is what will happen in this cuts process and will actually make the criminals' lives easier in some ways. I hope not in terms of a new settlement, but I am anxious about this process that we are in and anxious about what you have said to me about some of the missing elements that I would like to see in terms of your deliberations and processes, whether it changes slightly about what we discuss post-Christmas or not. Somehow, there has to be an engagement process.

I have never known, Chair, the Home Office ever to deliver to any of its deadlines in November. I live in hope and I hope it can because this is quite crucial for us to plan.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We always get the budget, generally, in December.

First of all, an offer. If there is any way that we can work together - and I am sure with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime - to sit down and share what we are doing, there are no secrets, in one sense? We are sketching out the scale of the task. You are quite right. The broader the church of people who say, "Actually, I can support that but I challenge you on that", the better the debate. It is not a political debate for us. It is just about what we can get right. We do not hold the Holy Grail. We have our proposals and we know what we think we can achieve professionally, but we do have to have a discussion about that. Any work that we can do during that period I am quite happy to do.

There are two or three things driving us towards quite a closed process. You are arguing for one with the public and with elected representatives. With the public one, we have been driven into a poor process by time. We have been driven into a closed one. I do not want to be accused of shroud-waving by anybody and I do not want to fall out with the people who I hope are going to give us some help here and who are going to help us through this. We want to negotiate and influence, not fall out.

Thirdly, this is talking about people's jobs. Every time we talk more openly about some of the horrible options, it worries people. I have a duty to the people I lead to present them with credible options that are maturely reflected on, not to worry them and then find that I have worried them unnecessarily.

They are the pressures that I feel. We are being driven to a quick, closed process. You are arguing for an open one. I agree with you. With the people of London and with the volume of them, realistically, it is very hard. However, with the elected representatives, certainly for me, anything we can do to have as open a debate as possible I am happy to do.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Could I ask two questions? One of your promises was to ensure that a police officer visited a victim of every crime. Given the scale of the cuts, is that going to be doable in the future or are you looking at some of those service proposals now as well?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have not reached that level of detail but, as I said in the answer to Len, if you are asking me, intuitively, I would prefer to lengthen the time before we arrive than to say, "We are not coming". That would be my view. I have said we will carry on going to burglaries. Whatever the future holds, we will. If it is serious, if somebody comes into your home, you should expect the police to take it seriously. The volume of burglaries is relatively low; I think it is on average seven per borough per day. Even if we stopped going to them, we would not save much time and we would let the public down badly. Taking a little longer to get to them, if the offender is not there, the public may understand if they understand the scale of the challenge. We have to make sensible decisions and some of the things I have heard around the country I do not support.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): My final question then is really about who takes the final decision. We have teased this grey area before between what is a political imperative for a directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner, who has said that he wants to maintain Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and the operational needs and you having control of the operation. What would happen if, for example, Stephen [Greenhalgh] and the Mayor say, "We want to retain PCSOs", but you say, "Operationally, I just cannot do that because of the funding cuts"? Does the buck rest with you or the Mayor or is it a shared responsibility?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We are going to have to tease you a little longer. My broad view is that it is something you keep debating. You are not arguing with us but debating with us, "Where does that debate happen with you?" All right, sometimes my staff think I have absolute power. I do not; I wish I had. You have to discuss things. These are big issues of public concern with big amounts of money. Of course we will discuss them. I have been in policing 30-odd years and have been a Chief Constable - a leader - of the police for 10. I do not once remember saying, "That is an operational decision. You cannot do it". You eventually get to a point where you can agree because there is no one pure vision. You can never get it absolutely right. I feel with politicians that they do not want to get involved in the day-to-day operational decisions, but these are big things and we have to keep discussing them.

What I do argue for strongly is that every time you take something off the table that you do not like, please, put something on the table that you do want to remove. Today has been representative of this. People know what they do not want, but they are not as clear about what they would prefer us to cut.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Deputy Mayor, do you want to comment on this? Of course, the Mayor has said before that --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly, the money flows from the Exchequer to the Home Office and then it flows to MOPAC. One of the roles is to set a budget that is the best budget for London with the resources that we have. I have taken the decision to have greater scrutiny of the individual spending decisions throughout the year.

It is, obviously, a collaborative approach. There are some decisions that the MPS will have to take that will be extremely difficult for the organisation to go through and that the leadership will find difficult to land. In fact, some of the proposals that will come forward, I am sure, will have been tried before. Equally, there are going to be other proposals that are very difficult politically to land with the people of London. However, we would

be abrogating our responsibility if we did not have a budget that was a sensible budget for the next year and a very clear idea of where further savings need to be made in future years. That is what we are working on.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We will be returning to this, no doubt, over the coming months, as will our Budget and Performance Committee.

We are going to move on now to look at some of the gangs work that the MPS and MOPAC are carrying out. Tony, you are going to be leading us on this.

Tony Arbour AM: This is to you, Stephen. MOPAC has spent quite a lot of money setting up Shield. It does not appear to have been a total success. That is probably an understatement. Are you confident that the stakeholder engagement that was carried out to develop Shield was robust and extensive?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Sorry. What was the question?

Tony Arbour AM: I am saying that since Shield does not appear to have been universally popular, I want to know whether or not you are confident that the consultation that was carried out before setting up Shield and the stakeholder engagement was sufficiently robust.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly, this is a pilot, Tony, and this was done with a significant amount of consultation and support from the local authorities that wanted to lead on the community engagement. In fact, I went to launch this in Lambeth and they were very enthusiastic, largely because some of the elements of the Shield programme they considered to be things that they were doing already.

It is fair to say that we are at very early stages to write this programme off. There is no doubt that there are some problems, but one of the three pilot boroughs has not even started yet and that is going to happen later this month in Westminster. There are, clearly, some concerns in Haringey and some issues in Lambeth. However, I would hope that where there are problems you work those through. I would say, given where we are, it would be wrong to write off the programme.

Tony Arbour AM: I am not sure I am asking you to write off the programme. I do not know whether you have looked at the report that you had from our session on Shield, but many of the contributions that were made suggested that the thing was not going to work and could not work. For example, we were told by the man from the St Giles Trust that in fact it would do more harm than good.

Do you not think that given that it is a pilot, in the light of those early and quite strong signals and two boroughs not being happy about it at all, you might perhaps be thinking of writing it off now and putting the money into something else?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No. First of all, we are investing around £11.3 million in supporting gang interventions and tackling knife crime and there is around £1.25 million that is being spent on a pan-London gang-exit scheme. This is an investment of £200,000 to do a pilot.

What I accept is that it has been a stuttering pilot and there are some issues that we need to work through. For instance, I understand from meeting with colleagues in Lambeth – and I met with Lib Peck [Leader of Lambeth Council] – that the call-in was held in the Town Hall, which was not a particularly successful location. I do not know why this happened because there was no need for it to happen in that place but it was not entirely the right place to hold a gang call-in. Clearly, there are lessons you can learn.

Tony, the principle of Shield is that it has worked in 50 cities across the world with a dramatic reduction in violence in those cities. In fact, in Edinburgh violence was halved. This is a pilot we think is worth persevering with to get right and to reduce the levels of violence in our community. We could certainly learn lessons and I hope that we are learning those lessons.

Tony Arbour AM: I have been around from the beginning. I have seen lots and lots of police initiatives.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is not a police initiative.

Tony Arbour AM: I will rephrase that: lots of initiatives on dealing with gangs and with communities. As far as this particular one is concerned, I have never seen a parallel like it in the sense that we are told – and you have told me the political leadership seemingly does not agree with this – that communities in Lambeth and Haringey say that this is going to cause more trouble than it is worth.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly there is some misunderstanding. One of the issues that has been raised is that this is a form of joint enterprise or extension of joint enterprise for communities. That is not the case. The insight from Professor David Kennedy [Director, National Network for Safe Communities, John Jay College of Criminal Justice] is as applicable here as it is anywhere. We are talking about 18 gangs that commit around 60% of the violence on the streets of London. Focusing on them in a way that engages the community to be supportive of the fact that they will not tolerate that level of violence is the right way to go. ‘Collective enforcement’ does not mean joint enterprise. That is one of the things we are struggling to get through to certain members of the community, but that is not all the community.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand. You are dealing with misinformation here. I fully accept that that happened. You have had such a poor start with this and such a lack of confidence, so far as one can tell, on this.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have had vocal opposition from members in the community. I would not say it is a poor start. Engagement certainly needs to be looked at and that is why we are going slower in some of the areas.

Tony Arbour AM: You may say that, Stephen, and I have often criticised the people who come to give evidence to the Police and Crime Committee. However, there was unanimity. They were not simply expressing a view of being a voice louder than others. They were people who had themselves been engaged within those communities.

Can I ask you what feedback you have had from non-official people like the leaders of the councils? Have you had feedback from these groups?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, I have. That is what I referred to. The feedback I had from the Leader of Lambeth when we had a London Crime Reduction Board was that the call-in venue – and I wanted to go down and see the call-in myself but was told I was not to politicise it – was not the right venue. You then had to go and find the nominals concerned, which was done within a period of about 48 hours. That was one of the major problems. The second one was some misunderstanding of the basis upon which you do the group violence intervention method. I have alluded to that as well.

Do you have any other points you want to raise?

Tony Arbour AM: Honestly, I cannot believe that this thing foundered just because a meeting was held in the wrong place.

I do not know if you have a view on this, Commissioner, as to whether or not you think that groups were sufficiently engaged before this thing got underway.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am afraid I do not know how the engagement went but I do support it. All the research shows – which Professor Kennedy has shared with boroughs around London – that this approach, which started in Boston, works.

Stephen [Greenhalgh] and I have a regular meeting with the leaders of the boroughs or whomever they send to represent them in which we are concentrating on gangs probably three times a year. Some of the leaders are very good and turn up and some send representatives. That was where some of these discussions started. The engagement at that level looked pretty good to me.

London can be quite a challenging place in which to land new ideas. As you know, quite often different boroughs say, “We are already doing something. It works here. Why can’t we carry on?” when all the evidence shows it does not always work as well as some other things.

I support it wholeheartedly. I am sure people need to talk a bit more about it. I do not support people rejecting it just because, “We don’t do it here”. I have always thought if you have got good evidence that something works, give it a go. Particularly if you can see that the gangs are not going away. There are still issues that we are dealing with and we do need to start some new things. I wholeheartedly support it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Tony, this may be helpful. I do not know if this is news to you. There have been relatively few meetings, in terms of five community meetings in Lambeth, four in Westminster and three in Haringey and also some one-to-one meetings. There has been some support from the Community Development Foundation.

We are very much at the start of a programme. It is clear that things need to be worked through. The opposition – as I understand it – was not just about where the call-in was held. As I said, it was a misunderstanding of the principles of the group violence intervention method. It was a combination of things. It does not help if you hold a gang call-in in a municipal building. My understanding of places like Enfield is that when they have held call-ins in the past they use a court building or they bring people in that can make a point. The buildings do matter.

Tony Arbour AM: I would have said that was a trivial point. The Committee would want to demonstrate to you that there is a healthy scepticism about this.

If I can raise a simple related thing as far as gangs are concerned. It is suggested – and I believe the police themselves have suggested – that the changes in the stop-and-search policy that there have been is, in fact, an encouragement to gangs, particularly gangs whose members are likely to be carrying knives. They believe if there is going to be less stop-and-search they are more likely to get away with it and therefore the gangs themselves feel rather more confident. Would you have a view on that? Can I ask Stephen first and then you, Commissioner?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There is no doubt that we are seeing a massive reduction in stop-and-search. For a long period of time the arrest rate had increased by such an

extent that more people were being arrested. Statistically there was no way you could say, "I am free now to walk around and I won't be stopped, searched and caught if I carry a knife". We have also had the tightening up of the legislation. The concern - which is the premise of your question - is that at a point in time, maybe four or five months ago, the absolute number of people arrested through this tactic actually decreased; the absolute rather than the percentage. That is concerning.

My view is that what we have to do as politicians is not call from the political armchair and say, "Let's increase stop-and-search, please, Commissioner", or, "Let's reduce it", but recognise that it is a valued policing tactic when it is intelligently implemented. It is interesting to note that some boroughs - and Lambeth is one where we have got the Shield pilot - where the Borough Commander has increased the amount of stop-and-search and violence figures in that borough are far better than other comparable boroughs. That is an example where having transparency and oversight works, and giving the police the ability to make the decision about how often they deploy a very important tactic.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand you to say that increasing stop-and-search therefore does reduce crime.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not saying that it does necessarily. What I am saying is that one of the problems of calling for a reduction and saying it must be reduced, given the start point is very high, is that more stop-and-search might be a bad thing but, after a period of time when it has dropped and you see a gradual rise again, sometimes it can be associated with a reduction in violence in that area. That is one of the associations we made when we scrutinised stop-and-search in Lambeth. If you implement stop-and-search very poorly then it is absolutely a disaster for community confidence and does not catch any of the criminals. It is about doing this thing properly and intelligently, not just calling for a blanket increase.

Tony Arbour AM: Commissioner, what do you think?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): First of all, as I have said here before, when I arrived in 2011 I found that stop-and-search and stop-and-account, because people who experience it talk about both; it is not just being searched it is being stopped and questioned on the street - was running at about 1.3 million to 1.4 million in each of the two previous years. There was a lot of it. That worried me because it sounded high. Also, as Stephen has already pointed out, the number of people we arrested or the percentage of people we were stopping - and therefore validated the stop - was very low at about 7%. Therefore, 93% of the people we were stopping were stopped apparently for a reason that we could not justify. That was one thing that was worrying.

We know that stop-and-search is contentious; it is around the world. Often minorities feel that tension more than anybody else. At the public meetings that I was having I was struck by the number of black families who were saying that their children were getting stopped a lot, who had never been in trouble and never would be. They understood the tactic. They supported it. They did not want us to stop it but they did want us to target properly. When we did it they wanted us to treat people with respect. We did reduce it.

During the just over three years we have done that, two things have happened. As Stephen [Greenhalgh] has indicated already we arrested more people and violence came down, stabbings came down. There was always going to be a point - if it has any value at all - where that would bottom out. There is some evidence that it has bottomed out. For the last three months we have said we are going to increase it in a targeted way according to the law. We cannot just say we will increase it. Individuals can only be stopped because you have a reasonable suspicion. We have trained our officers to - we hope - improve them in the way they deal with people. We have trained them to target according to the law. We are in a good position to target those

people who are carrying knives around in particular. It is not the only reason to stop-and-search somebody but when you have got children stabbing each other it is not good. We are increasing it in a reasonable way in those areas where we think it needs to happen.

You can criticise it both ways. You can say, "You are increasing it. Why did you ever reduce it?" You can do too much of it and there was some evidence that we were. We have reduced it and we are now sensibly and maturely increasing it.

Tony Arbour AM: Would you accept - and this is part of the premise of my question - that there is a belief that if there is less stop-and-account that is likely to embolden people, for example, to carry knives on the basis that they are much less likely to be stopped than they otherwise might have been? Therefore, it is likely to encourage crime rather than decrease it.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is a possibility; I would acknowledge that. Provided the people who are in the gangs, for example, particularly the repeat offenders who carry knives, know that there is a chance that they will be targeted and they are the people we are targeting, then that is the group we are interested in, not the people who never carry knives.

Tony Arbour AM: Of course.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We are interested in the people we believe are carrying knives, who have been convicted of it previously and we have intelligence to say they are at it now. That group would always know that we are still doing it. We have not stopped doing it. We have reduced it drastically. We are down to 300,000 to 400,000. It is not as though it stopped but it is not 1.4 million. It is targeted on the people who we say we are interested in. If it is that - as you indicated - some people think they are going to get away with it and they think we are not stop-and-searching, or it is so low that their chance of getting caught is low, we have to do something about that. That is what policing is about. There is no absolute science that says we should be stop-and-searching 4.3 per million. You have to react to what you have. We are reacting sensibly and now is the time to make sure that we intervene more.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that. We talk about communities but, of course, the principal community is ordinary people going around their everyday work and they do not want to feel that there is a risk that they might be involved in something even peripherally. If they believe that you are being lax, the *Daily Mail* reader would say that if there is less stop-and-search, irrespective of its target or whatever, you must be lax.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Forgive me, Tony, for not using that as my criteria.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that. However, there is a community that reads the *Daily Mail*. There is another community that believes the *Daily Mail*!

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): If the perception that you are going to get away with it rises, then that is not good. If you look at New York where they used to do nearly 1 million stop-and-searches a year, they have gone down to about 23,000 because statutorily the court said that an individual officer would be liable for their actions and so they stopped doing it. Secondly, a Commissioner was imposed on the police who said, "You can only use powers of stop-and-search when I agree that you can do it in that way". If the MPS and I lose the confidence of legislators and community representatives, then there is that danger. It seemed to me that we had to react to the information we are

getting, which was to reduce it, to do it sensibly and if we had gone too far, then we will do something about it. These are matters of judgement, not matters of criticism.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Tony, there is a reason why we, very clearly, as a performance framework, do not just want to see crime go down, although we do. Obviously we want to see crime and victim-based crime in particular go down and also to drive down the level of knife crime with injury, which has gone up, although overall knife crime has come down in recent months.

We also want to see confidence in communities. That confidence is driven in part because of engagement. We have talked about the importance of that and having policing that engages with communities and communities that engage with the police and, equally, that there is a just use of authority. We know that the single biggest effect on the public's confidence in the police positively is how well they do engagement and negatively if they misuse their powers. That is why we have to look at both. It is about getting that balance of having the right level of stop-and-search that keeps us safe and also ensuring it is intelligently carried out.

Tony Arbour AM: Of course. Thank you, Chair.

Roger Evans AM: My colleague made an interesting point, Commissioner, about the difference between measuring the effectiveness of stop-and-search on the basis of arrest rate and measuring the deterrent effectiveness, which is much more difficult to quantify. Are there other ways you can achieve that deterrence without using stop-and-search so that you can cut down the amount of knives being carried without damaging community confidence? I am thinking possibly of the good work that you do with knife arches at stations, for instance. Those cover a lot more people without creating the initial friction between your guys on the front line and the public.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): The best measure of deterrence is whether or not knife crime is going up and down. We have seen a rise, which is one of the big indicators we looked at. Deterring people from the casual carrying of knives stops a fight becoming a murder or horrible event. That is one of the indicators we looked at and, I would argue, the most objective one.

In terms of things like knife arches, you are right that they can supplement good stop-and-search. You have to resource them. Stop-and-search generally is an officer patrolling who will see someone whom they have intelligence about or they will meet and for some reason think they have a knife, stolen property or drugs. They are the three broad areas that you are always looking for. Also, if an officer who is attending an incident finds a burglar two streets away, one of the things that might justify his arrest would be finding the property that has been stolen from the burglary on him, obviously. They are the sorts of things that we always are using that power for.

If you set up a particular campaign, say around the night-time economy, you can do it but it drags your resources in. You are having to staff them. If you are going out at night, you do not want to stand in a big queue while we stop-and-search everybody who is walking down the street. Therefore, you have to staff it appropriately and you will put everyone through it. They can be a good adjunct. You look at the Tube and people coming in and out of there. We have dogs that can search for drugs passively. I have tried to find out whether we can get dogs to search for knives. They told me it is impossible. You can do it for guns but you cannot do it for knives, but we have tried. Targeted stop-and-search is a good thing. I agree with you that arches are a real adjunct to that but they do drag resources in.

The ones that Tony [Arbour AM] started talking about are the general and routine, either by officers patrolling or by the section 60 [power that] we use. If we have had a fight in a park or a repeated amount of violence,

we can put a section 60 in place around an area and then there can be random stop-and-searching in that area for a limited amount of time. We have reduced those drastically but, again, those we have started to increase. We reduced those by about 90% because they were getting like confetti and it became random stop-and-searches in too many places. Again, we have looked at that to see if we should more sensibly be having more of those.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Perhaps I can get us back on track. I do not often say that.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Just another one; you mentioned deterrent effects. Of course, since we last met, we have had the legislation change around sentencing. There is this change around a person carrying a knife for a second time. It is too early to see if that will have a deterrent effect. We have spoken collectively before here that the deterrent effect is, yes, being caught but also that when you are caught something happens to you. We will see whether that starts to have an effect.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We are going to talk about Notting Hill later. We had an officer stabbed at the Notting Hill Carnival. Although the offender was 17, he received a six-month sentence.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am sitting here in my political armchair, as you call it. My job is to hold you to account and so I would like some short, clear answers on your pilot, Shield.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I thought we just covered that off.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): One of the points that our Chair has made before is that there are different thresholds for Shield here in Britain than there were in the United States where it has been imported from. What concrete changes did you make to make it suitable for London?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have been advised by Professor Kennedy on how to implement this. I do not really see what you mean by 'concrete changes'.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): For example, the criteria used in the United States was on the number of killings that had happened, whereas here it is based on whether or not gangs are committing violence.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly what we have used would have been the Trident matrix and an understanding of which nominals and which gangs caused the most violence. That is known by the MPS. In the Gang Summit we had the previous year, that information was already held by the MPS, knowing who to target and which gangs were particularly violent. We would have used those statistics rather than invent a new set of statistics.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Professor Kennedy gave you advice on how to adapt the scheme for London. He knew enough about the London situation, presumably, and somebody briefed him.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, he was explaining the principles, that it is focused deterrence and how it works. Clearly, you do not reinvent the wheel if there are things that enable you to take the principles and apply them.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It does not seem to be working here, though. That is the problem.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Well, no.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Adaptation was necessary.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): What is not working here is not necessarily the process by which the police use collective enforcement on the streets of London. The issue we have here is engaging with communities in an effective way. They are supposed to be the backstop and it needs to be community-led. That is what is not working at this stage and needs to be improved.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You mentioned community help to make this work. You are using the Community Development Foundation on your Shield programme board. Yet if you do a website search on words like 'gangs', 'youth violence', 'Shield' and 'knife and gang crime', none of them come up on the Community Development Foundation website. What made you think it was suitable to be on your board?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): They are the people supporting the boroughs. Effectively, it is an agency that supports the boroughs to do the community engagement work. It is not doing the community engagement work itself.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): What is it doing?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is helping the programme of engagement with the community.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It does not seem to have any expertise in gangs, youth violence, Shield or knife and gang crime. One would have thought you would have picked a community body that would have had those within its *résumé* or actions.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I would have assumed that it would have been the partners who decided on an appropriate body to help with engagement. I can take that back and find out why specifically it was engaged.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That would be great. Thank you. I have been asking questions of the Mayor on collective enforcement. He said that there had been collective enforcement in Lambeth and that is the only one.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): To be clear, it is not the Community Development Foundation that leads on the engagement. It is just supporting the boroughs that lead on the engagement.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): If you are going to have a community body on your board, it would be recommended – I would argue – to have somebody who actually knows something about the issues that you are dealing with.

Let me go back to the Lambeth collective enforcement. I would like to know what the crime was that that was enacted for. Commissioner, are you the person to ask on this?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am not sure that I know what the criteria is exactly. Obviously, what we are concentrating on is the most serious gangs.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Does the Deputy [Mayor for Policing and Crime] know anything about this? It is the first of its kind, the collective enforcement in Lambeth. That is the answer I have had from the Mayor. Was there a collective enforcement in Lambeth?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I do not know what you mean by 'collective enforcement'.

The whole principle behind the work is twofold. It is that you get in the gang members and warn them about their activity and that if they continue they will be targeted. You warn the people who are around them that if they get involved they will also be targeted. If they want to seek help to remove themselves from the gangs, help is available, which is where the local authorities and partners can be alongside, "If you need help about literacy, come and talk to me." "If you need help about employment, come and talk to me".

Thirdly, you have this layer which is where the community says, "We don't want you to do it either. It's not the police telling us not to do it. It's not the local authority saying not to do it. We don't like it either". That is the core of it: trying to engage the community, trying to get the gang members to realise that everybody is not happy with their behaviour and then give them some very clear steers about their options.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I understand what 'collective enforcement' means as regard to Shield. My question is: what happened in Lambeth that the Mayor states was the first? What made it the first?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am sorry; I am not sure about that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Did you say what made it the first borough?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The reply I have had from the Mayor says, "To date there has been one instance of collective enforcement in Lambeth"³. I am just asking for clarification but obviously nobody knows. I will come back to that.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Of course, I am not seeing the rest of it but it sounds like we might be talking about different words for the same thing. It sounded like the same meeting differently described, did it not?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We have to trust the answers that the Mayor gives us. I am presuming this answer came from Mr Greenhalgh.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I do, but I have just not seen it. I am afraid I cannot help.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): All right, let me go on to a different issue. The Shield pilot is going to be evaluated. Quite often pilots do get rolled out before they have been evaluated finally. Do we have your assurance that Shield will not be rolled out any further until the evaluation has happened?

³ Mayor's Question Time question 2015/2712.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have always believed that you test what you want to expand and then you expand it. You do not rush and do anything until you have properly evaluated a pilot. That is why it is a pilot.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): OK, that is a no?

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

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That is really good. There seems to be some hint that there is a connection between Shield and the threat of eviction. Has that happened at all? Is that one of the options that boroughs might use?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I missed that question, Jenny. I was just trying to read something about what you just said. I am sorry.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): All right. Do you want to clarify whatever it was you were reading?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): No, because I am only halfway through it now. Sorry. If you could ask it again as I just did not hear it?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): This is about eviction and the fact that some boroughs have used the threat of eviction within the collective enforcement and within the measures within Shield. Is that right? Just to clarify it; that is all.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely, the boroughs will use their civil powers as well as the police powers in order to look at it. It is the Al Capone theory, is it not? If you have a gang that is particularly violent, you use whatever enforcement powers you can against it.

Len Duvall AM: Chair, can we just clarify? I am an individual that is causing trouble and violence and have come to the attention to the police. I live in a family home with my family. There is no indication at all that they have ever been involved in any criminal activity. Is it right then that they should be faced with eviction? That is what it is. That is what has been briefed in the boroughs.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, I did not say that. What I said was that when you do this with the local authorities and the police, then clearly collective enforcement is not just the criminal enforcement; there are also civil enforcement powers that can be used. It does not necessarily mean that people get evicted.

Len Duvall AM: It is an option?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Wait, I had another answer by the Mayor because I asked about this. He said:

*"Boroughs may occasionally wish to pursue actions for breach of tenancy as part of a sanction where the activity of a tenant warrants it."*⁴

He does not mention any criminal activity.

⁴ Mayor's Question Time question 2015/2711

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly that is a civil power. That is a civil power that – because of a breach of tenancy – you apply in certain cases. Equally, if someone stabs someone there is a criminal sanction as well. Collective enforcement is not just enforcement by the police. You can use a whole suite of things. That is the point I am making.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): If a council decides to evict somebody, then there has to be some criminal activity of some sort, gang connection or whatever? I am asking for clarity on this because Shield is your pilot. I want to know what the details are.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly the idea is to use collective enforcement against the small number of gang members that create the violence on our streets. If you have to resort to civil powers rather than police powers then that is one of the ways of doing that, yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): At what point might they be evicted? Will they be evicted after their court case and they have been convicted?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is a local matter for the local authority to be able to do that. It is not something that is controlled by MOPAC or by the police. That is why we are working with the boroughs, and equally why you need a community voice as well to get support and sanction for this as a way of dealing with violence on our streets.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Can you tell me if a gang member has been evicted so far?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not aware of any.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, and you would know?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am certainly not aware of any.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Can I ask you finally when the evaluation will be finalised on this?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): At least a year to be able to do a pilot of this sort. We only started in September. We will take a six-month look at this and hopefully we are a bit further along. As I say, it is very early days.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Len Duvall AM: I suspect most of us around this table would welcome any initiative that would reduce harm to our communities.

Tony [Arbour AM] was right in saying that there is a degree of scepticism over this path. I have never known a pilot as early as this to run with so many mixed messages from the practitioners who operate within the field. We have people who are supporting boroughs giving mixed messages. We have police officers giving mixed messages. There is something that is not quite right in terms of the approach in the pilots or what the community thinks is happening, hence what I think the Commissioner was alluding to earlier on.

I want to go back to some of the issues that Tony [Arbour AM] opened up about other tools for tackling violence. It could help but it has to be done properly and appropriately because – and I will say this point,

Stephen [Greenhalgh] - it is civil action being taken on the basis of police information. It is not taken in isolation. How do you think a local authority would find out whether one of its tenants is involved in issues? You cannot blur this issue. It is part of the Shield programme and so it has to be done properly and appropriately for it to be successful.

I want to return to the issue that I have raised on many occasions before with you: the issue of violence. Of course, Shield contributes to that but I am still very worried. With the MOPAC violence statistics, which helpfully MOPAC has highlighted, we have now seen in the last year every single category increase. We have seen the gun violence indicator increase by 23%. Issues of discharges are up; knife crime with injury is up; serious youth violence is up. I look to the Commissioner and the police: when do we see an anti-violence strategy *per se* with connections, whether it is Shield, whether it is stop-and-search or whether it is other tactics that you use to do this?

The trends are now going up in terms of crime and it might have something to do with capacity rather than police numbers, capacity to respond in terms of where some of those issues are. What is the thinking about that? Can you - and I suppose it is a plea from our earlier conversation - build that into some of your thinking around the budget strategy so that it does not fall off the agenda? I cannot quite see a coherent strategy: I see a number of tools and a number of things being used in terms of the toolbox but I do not see an overall strategy for driving this down.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have brought here before, but could bring again, the information we have about Operation Omega, which started probably four months ago.

I would argue that there are various strands to that strategy. Part of it is concentrating on the people whom we know commit violence, part of it is stop-and-search and part of it is working with local authorities around licensing, alcohol being a big precursor for violence. With domestic violence we are making sure that we are tackling that, sometimes in a different way to the other violence. We have done that analysis and we are carrying out that work.

You are quite right that over the previous few months we had seen an increase until [Operation] Omega. We are now starting to see a plateau and, we hope, a drop, but of course then we will have the dark nights and that has an effect as well. We are trying to watch out for seasonality. I would argue that we have tried to work with partners and with police action to produce a coherent strategy.

The only thing we have to be a little careful of - perhaps something we all have to keep an eye on - is that some of this rise is down to recording and some is down to a true increase in violence. There is no doubt about people being shot and there is no doubt about being stabbed and generally they get reported on the whole, but there has certainly been a recording effect over the last 18 months. Regardless of whether it is a recording effect or a real one, we do have a strategy which we have implemented that seems to be having an effect. I am quite happy to share some of the detail here if that would help.

Len Duvall AM: I would like to return to it because I am not convinced by some of those operations. They are well-intentioned but there are also mixed messages on the ground about whether they are directed at violence or whether they are directed at some other issues, again, mixed messages as they comes down the command structure about what the real objective is of these various operations, as we have seen.

My next question, if it is all right to follow up, arose from our inquiry on gangs, where we had a previous discussion. With the reorganisation of borough commands - as it is fair to say, although it may not be right -

we would expect to see a reorganisation of some of the activities under those boroughs. We have reduced capacity. With regard to the local gang units, where they are required and where they are operating, how would they work with the central unit, Trident, support issues? What is your thinking about that? Is one of your proposals up in September or December about this probably very important piece of work? You highlighted it yourself: we have a growing problem rather than a decreasing problem.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is one of the pieces of work we are having to do. Obviously we try to divide it up as much as we can but, as you have just indicated, lots of it affects each other. If we do decide to have less management at borough level or we do decide to share things, whether it be response -- there are three or four broad strands of what we do, as you know, in the boroughs: response, neighbourhoods, the criminal investigation department (CID) and, you could say, squads. One of the things is whether you can do more with less by sharing. As you know, the gangs do not respect the borough boundaries any more than most people do. They will wander into Westminster to go out for the night. We have to work across those borders. They do not acknowledge them, always.

They are looking as part of that planning at how the gang work would happen, at how we would deal with domestic violence differently and at all the things that we do, either routinely, if you like - the response side and the routine neighbourhood stuff - or in the specialist areas. That is one of the areas in which we might do better as a result of sharing but frankly we might have to do cheaper.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We are now going to move on to talk about the Notting Hill Carnival. Before I bring Andrew [Dismore AM] in, you talked about an officer being stabbed earlier and I understand other officers were injured. Can I just ask after their wellbeing? Are they recovering?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Yes, they are OK at the moment, thank you. They had hospital treatment. It was not very good and the prison sentence is disappointing, frankly. The point I was making is that he could have got more for carrying a knife and yet someone was stabbed. There were two people stabbed, actually: the officer who was stabbed intervened when somebody else was getting stabbed and was stabbed in the process. Two people were stabbed and it was a six-month sentence, which I am not sure sends much of a message, really. To be fair, he was 17 years old, but I am afraid he was old enough to do the damage he did.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK. Of course, Deputy Mayor, you have said that you have a Sentencing Unit. Is that something you are considering doing, challenging the sentence?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): To be fair, Stephen [Greenhalgh] was unaware of that and I was only briefed on it this morning. It has only been within the last few days that that has happened and Stephen was unaware of it.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It was only yesterday, I think.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): It was. I saw it yesterday in the *Standard*.

Andrew Dismore AM: I was going to ask you about the Carnival. You had 400 arrests this year, which is more than half again as much as last year, and that is despite the proactive operation the week before. We had quite a big series of raids to try to deal with some of the potential threats to the Carnival, as you saw it. What was different about this year's Carnival to explain that level of arrests and problems?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): If I might, I will give you an overall answer and then I will try to directly answer the question that Andrew raised with me.

First of all, in terms of the total number of crimes recorded, it went up slightly from last year. It had been 620 in 2014 and it went up to 683 this year. Not an insignificant rise, although we always have to remember that approaching 1 million people attend the Carnival. In terms of the serious crimes, we saw reductions in theft from person and serious violence. Theft from person was down by about a quarter and serious violence, again, down by about a third. Those were good things.

In terms of what the difference was, what was similar was that the weather was bad. Certainly on the busy day, on the Monday, the weather was awful. One of the things that we believed had happened the year before was some of the gang members had found each other. Previously they could not find each other because normally it is so densely packed.

We did make some changes to the plan. We, again, arrested people before the event. We executed 130 search warrants in the weeks leading up to the Carnival and made 143 arrests. We, this year, used for the first time disruption zones. That meant that officers could order people to leave the Carnival and not return for two days or as long as the Carnival was on, and also even dictate the route they left. It was not easy to spot them coming back given such a big crowd but officers did identify people who had been told to leave. That seemed to have some effect, perhaps, on the arrest rate. Also, we had had complaints from people who live in that area who were concerned that officers were, if not ignoring, not taking action when they saw what might be relatively minor offences such as urinating in someone's garden. We determined that we would take action. Those things together may have led to the increase in the arrest rate. As I say, we did still have some serious violence there as well.

My major concern is that, for us, it could be better organised. In fact, we have just finished the debrief on this year's Carnival and over the next two weeks we will be writing to the local borough to advise them that we expect more action to be taken in the future to get better organisation, not least because - for all the reasons we have spent over an hour talking - I am not sure we are going to have that many officers to police it next year. Certainly financially it is a real burden because it has cost over £6 million and every time something takes place on a bank holiday, we have a significant cost. For reasons of organisation and minimising risk and for the reason that we want to make it a good event, we expect to see better organisation by the organisers to reduce the number of police who get involved in stewarding, not in policing.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you for that. As far as local residents are concerned, a lot of things that happen just do not get reported to you and so it was probably far worse than that.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I acknowledge that. We can only give the recorded statistics that show what happens there.

Andrew Dismore AM: I represented the area on Westminster Council for 15 years and I have had a flat there for 25 years, and every year there is some minor vandalism or theft that nobody bothers with. Frankly, everybody goes away who possibly can go away for the weekend if they live in the area. That is how it is.

I was going to go on and ask you: you have mentioned the cost of the policing operation. You deployed 6,000 officers on Sunday and 7,000 on Monday. That is about a quarter of your total force, is it not? What was the impact on policing in the rest of London while you sucked in all these officers, on abstraction, presumably, to police the Carnival?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Generally, we managed to make it work. We had to keep to minimum staffing levels. We get officers to work overtime and that is the way we make it work. It is not dissimilar to some of the other big events with police. We have no separate box for maintaining public order: we have to take them from the boroughs. We try to minimise that impact and this year we have a new plan and we are reducing abstractions generally from the boroughs, but that weekend we have to make sure we have good numbers there.

Andrew Dismore AM: What was the impact on crime levels in the rest of London?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): To be fair, we did not see any change and our response times to incidents remained the same. We managed to maintain both. Frankly, it is the cost and the cost is paying overtime.

Andrew Dismore AM: You mentioned that you would like to see a difference in the --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Just to remind people - most people will know - of course we pay twice salary on the bank holiday. Everybody who works gets twice their salary. Generally, it is true of the MPS that around 50% of our police overtime is spent on bank holidays and that is only about eight days a year. This is a very significant cost. Any big event organised on a bank holiday brings with it a significant cost and, as you are suggesting, it stretches the line thinner. We did manage to maintain our response quite well for what at the end of the day is two out of 365 days, but it could be done better, cheaper and, I would argue, safer.

Andrew Dismore AM: How could it be done better?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I would argue it has to be more professional. As you know, it is a massive event with over one million people going. The organisers are the profession responsible for the health and safety of the people who go there. That has to be far better organised. They do their best but this often costs money. That money would have to be found. I do not think the substitute factor should be the police because we cannot take the responsibility of the organisers; we can only mitigate the risk that we see.

Andrew Dismore AM: What discussions have you had with the organisers about this for future events?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): This has been going on for years.

Andrew Dismore AM: I know it goes on for years.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): What I was trying to indicate was that we are writing formally to the local authority to request --

Andrew Dismore AM: Both Westminster and Kensington?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Kensington --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Let me just finish, if I could. We are writing formally to the local authority because it has licensing responsibilities to indicate our

lack of confidence at the moment in the quality of the organisation, which is leading to policing having to fill the gap. We cannot take responsibility for that event.

Andrew Dismore AM: Right.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): This is quite a different approach, in part driven by finance but frankly in part driven by my own experience having looked at that. Every Monday while I have been there, I have always gone to the Notting Hill Carnival on that day and it is not improving in terms of its organisation. Some fantastic people are having a great time, but the risks remain.

Andrew Dismore AM: You have raised this with both Westminster and Kensington, presumably?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The lead authority is the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) and Westminster is present as well. You would have written to RBKC.

Also, MOPAC is having regular meetings because, as well as the local authorities and the organisers, we have to recognise the commitment of the GLA towards stewarding. I watched the Carnival from the control room in Lambeth last year and this year I went to the Carnival. It is immense to watch the numbers of police who are effectively doing stewarding duties as opposed to policing, particularly during the day. The nature of Carnival is that some of the problems happen later on in the day and in the evening in particular. It is a very difficult one to be able to sort out.

Andrew Dismore AM: You are raising the need for tougher licensing from RBKC as the lead borough. What happens if it does not get into this tougher licensing? Of course, local authorities are also subject to financial pressures as well.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is its legal responsibility, for which it has to take accountability.

Andrew Dismore AM: What you are saying to it is, "You have to toughen up the licensing", or what?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is not my job to say, "Or what"; it is its job to decide what it is going to do about it.

Andrew Dismore AM: What do you think it should do about it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): That is its job. I have enough on policing London. We are highlighting our concerns and putting it very clearly to it to decide what it is intending to do about it. I will decide what to do about the policing of the event.

Andrew Dismore AM: It does not sound like very much of a partnership approach, does it, if you are saying it is up to them?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): That is not accurate. We have been talking for many years trying to get improvements and in my judgment is that it is producing limited effect. The risk to public safety remains and we cannot continue to provide policing at that level to provide the mitigation. I cannot take any responsibility for the safety of the people there because - and we have spent over an hour talking about our financial situation - this is one of the big things for the reasons I have said. You

have identified 7,000 officers, nearly a quarter of what we have. We cannot continue in a similar way. This is the time to draw a line.

Andrew Dismore AM: Stephen talked about stewarding; are you saying the GLA has a --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The GLA provides funding for the stewarding. My briefing was around 1,000 stewards. On the day, every day, it is far fewer from that, nearer 500. For an organisation that has an event hosting over one million people, it clearly requires the police to perform basic stewarding functions. That is one of the issues: how you get a more effective stewarding operation when clearly there is not the money there.

Andrew Dismore AM: No. Are you talking about having civilian stewards to --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Andrew, there are a series of things, are there not? One is --

Andrew Dismore AM: I am asking Stephen [Greenhalgh] now.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I know, but I am only trying to help. You started with me and I am just trying to help, if this would help, in this way. The licensing arrangements are about when it happens, where it happens and when it starts. These are big things that have a major impact. If it continues on a bank holiday, there is this financial consequence, for example, or where its route is. Obviously the Carnival has a great tradition but it also has great responsibilities and we are trying to draw that to a head to make sure that everybody involved, with all their powers, considers their joint responsibilities, as well as we ours. Sorry.

Andrew Dismore AM: Perhaps I might follow that up before I come back to Stephen [Greenhalgh]. Are you saying you want to see a different route? Are you saying you want to see a different weekend for it?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We have talked in the past about different routes and we have talked in the past about the potential for it not being on the bank holiday. Of course, people who want to hold festivals want the bank holiday; we as public servants say we do not have the money to do it. We have to look at all the options, as they have as a local authority given their financial constraints. We just need to consider it seriously.

Andrew Dismore AM: What route would you like to see?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I cannot start getting into that. To be fair to them, they might say, "You might have written to us first". I have given you a straight answer to a straight question. We are writing about our concerns. We will then discuss with them in a partnership way how that might change for this coming year.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is that a private letter to Kensington or is it going to be published?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is a private one. I do not generally publish letters I write.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am just asking because it is such an important --

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I am just telling you. I write a private letter --

Andrew Dismore AM: It is a simple question because it is such an important issue and it is such an important event in the London calendar. You have concerns about it. I was just asking you a simple question: whether you would be publishing your response.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): As I have just told you, I have just given you a simple answer, which is that generally I do not publish letters I write unless I intend to make a public effect, and I do not.

Andrew Dismore AM: Okay. Going back to you, Stephen, I was asking about stewarding and whether the GLA is looking at perhaps running more civilian stewards for the event.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The reality, Andrew, is that you have the policing as a public service organisation that has huge financial pressures, you have two local authorities that have gone through austerity since 2010 and you have the GLA, which has its pressures as well. I have not seen, and the Mayor has not certainly led me to the place where there is a huge pot of money to pay for more stewards. My understanding of the local organisation is that they are very willing but, again, they are short of funds as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: What would you like to see happen?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is a fantastically important part of the cultural calendar but we want it to be safe and we want it to be something that people can enjoy. Four hundred-odd arrests over two days is extremely high. The level of crime has gone up. It is good that the level of violent crime has gone down but we want a safe carnival and we want one that has a secure future. At the moment, an event that is under-stewarded and over-policed is something that needs to change. There are no obvious solutions. I would like to hear what you think.

Tony Arbour AM: It has always been like that.

Andrew Dismore AM: As Tony says, it probably has always been like that. I represented the area in 1982 and it was like that in those days.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It was always under-stewarded and over-policed?

Tony Arbour AM: No, it was always under-stewarded. I did not say it was over-policed. It has always been under-stewarded.

Andrew Dismore AM: Occasionally it has been over-policed but I do not see that as a major or a regular suggestion.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If you had more stewards, you would need fewer police.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We are going to move on now to rape case handling, which is an issue we have asked about before.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Thank you. My question is for the Commissioner. We heard in June that a review is being carried out of the workload of officers investigating rape. What was the outcome of that review and what progress has been made in shifting resources to investigate rape? When you have moved officers, where have they been moved from?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): We received a report from Dame Elish Angiolini DBE QC in June. If you remember, that was co-commissioned by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) and me. It was broadly about rape, particularly in London. It has produced a number of recommendations, which we are working our way through.

In terms of your particular point about how many officers we have investigating that area, she identified that we should put some more officers into it. She suggested about 240 or 250 officers; 244, actually. We have carried out a piece of work over the last few weeks. The first one was received by the Deputy Commissioner, who was leading the management board that day, and our view at the moment is that we have probably put about 200 officers in there. There is a further meeting to be held on 2 October --

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): -- on 2 October. Where will [the additional officers] come from?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Having said that we are going to do that, we have to work out where they will come from because we have no more. We would like to get them in place by the end of this calendar year. That will be tight, to be fair, because we have to identify them, but we are talking about a relatively short period of time. We have, at the moment, about 1,000 officers in there. We should have 1,099 and actually have 1,059 and so we are 40 short. We have to make up that gap and then give another 200, which is about 20%. It is quite a significant shift. Although we have 32,000 and so that does not sound too hard, these are generally detectives and we do not have as many detectives. We have vacancies on the detective side.

I was concerned, which is why I asked for the piece of work, and what this is clearly showing is that they are under tremendous pressure. These are serious crimes and they are not easy to investigate so we are going to have to give them some support. We are hoping there will be within the next few months officers moved and they will have that support.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Thank you. Looking more specifically at a particular issue, concerns have been raised that the rape of males has been included within the Violence against Women and Girls Strategy. What more can be done to assist male victims of rape, who usually make up around 20% of all the recorded rapes?

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): It is a good point. It is one of the things that [Dame] Elish [Angiolini] addresses in the review. One of my concerns is that women under-report but we suspect, although we cannot be sure, there is far more under-reporting by males. We are looking at how much more available we can make ourselves and other places to report for males who will report. People do not feel comfortable in talking about intimate things and this is rather difficult, particularly where there are existing relationships, say in a family. It is a constant challenge to get more reporting. We believe that most of the increase we are seeing is generally down to confidence and more reporting, not necessarily more crime, but I agree with you that, in terms of males, it is probably even more likely than for females at the moment.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Looking at this issue specifically, it is very hard not to consider the earlier discussions we have had around police funding because there are more and more requests for resources. Looking at that, the Commissioner told the Assembly that a few hundred more officers were likely to be needed and you talked about recruiting a few hundred, but there is also a need for more independent sexual violence advisers. Are you planning to recruit more of these as well? I know you have talked about finding the areas where cuts can be made but we are also hearing about needing to recruit more people. I am just trying to understand where the balance is going to --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Police officers are allocated by the Commissioner through his resources but the independent sexual violence advocates (ISVAs) you are asking about are a different pot of money. Often local authorities pay for them. What we have done, though, for independent domestic violence advocates (IDVAs) is to raise that threshold so that we get to what we call the Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA) minimum and apply a grant from the London Crime Prevention Fund. They also deal with some of the sexual violence issues. The question around ISVAs is more one for us, working alongside health [services] to commission that, and local authorities.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Are you conducting a review at the moment with health, Stephen, in this?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We are trying to join up a co-commissioning plan for health in this area, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have reached the last of our questions to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner. We have some further issues to deal with Stephen [Greenhalgh]. Commissioner, can I just ask that when you have details of what proposals you are considering with regards to reduced funding, you could let this Committee know as soon as possible? That would be very helpful to our deliberations as well.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): I was going to suggest that perhaps Craig [Mackey] could talk to the Chair or whomever you would suggest about how we could work together during the next few weeks.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That would be very helpful.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Time is going to be difficult and probably arranging that consultation, communication and engagement would be wise. Probably if we leave it to the normal meetings - and this is what we [Stephen Greenhalgh and I] have decided - we will not have enough time. If there is anything special that we can do to support that, we will.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That would be very helpful. Thank you.

Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis): Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you for your attendance today. It has been very informative.

Stephen, I am afraid you have to stay with us a little longer because we are going to ask you questions --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Madam Chair, it is an absolute pleasure.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): -- about Safer Neighbourhood Boards (SNBs). Jennette, you are going to start us off on this?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can I just set the scene here in terms of this series of questions, Stephen? It has been, now, more than a year since MOPAC introduced the SNBs in every borough. This was an initiative first announced in the Mayor's manifesto in 2012. This Committee has been following that development and the Committee raised concerns following meeting with MOPAC and receiving evidence from others. Three areas were highlighted: funding was one of them; structure and governance were the other two.

We have recently updated our evidence base about what is going on but, before I get to that, how satisfied are you that every borough now has a fully functioning SNB?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The information that I have - and you may wish to contradict it - is that we now have a fully functioning SNB in every borough. It is fair to say the inaugural meeting of the established Greenwich SNB will take place in November. That is my understanding.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: If I just look at one of the areas of concern that we have had - and, from evidence we have received, the area is still problematic - it is the £5,200 a year that each SNB can claim.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, for administrative support.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes, for administration and management of the board. Would it surprise you to learn that, from the responses, SNBs told us that this was not enough and indeed the lack of funding had prevented them from being able to get their act together to hold more than one meeting a year? That was what we picked up. A number of them thought that the amount was woefully inadequate. Some others who were getting support from boroughs said that they were OK at the moment but, as this funding was not going to carry on, they would have difficulty. Following on from that, a number of them said that the criteria for allocation and accessing the fund, given that the majority of the members were volunteers, was too problematic.

Are these things that have been raised with you through your officers following their reviews of SNBs?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): These are issues that have been raised on an ongoing basis by my officers and also my Advisor for Neighbourhoods. However, it is fair to say on the £5,200 that I do not think that is an unreasonable amount for administrative support for organisations that have a duty to organise a minimum of one public meeting a year.

In addition, that is not the only amount of money that we make available to SNBs because, as you know - and your question follows on - we allocate over two years £2 million for specific projects that help with community engagement, crime prevention and other crime reduction initiatives. That has been very successful. So far, £1.7 million of that two-year funding pot has been allocated.

I have heard that people find the form difficult, which is why I was interested to know how difficult the form was to fill out. As far as I can see, the exemplar for a substantial amount of money - £45,000 in this case - is a not a difficult form to fill in. It does not seem to be too problematic. Are there any specific issues people have raised about how difficult the form is to fill in?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We can get back to MOPAC about --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It looks pretty simple to me. It just says, "Is it neighbourhood watch? Crime prevention materials? Outreach work? Diversion?" Then it is a one-pager.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is the difficulty, is it not? You have run a business, you have a Cambridge degree --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Flattery will get you nowhere, Jennette.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: -- you are now the Mayor's Deputy and I believe you have ambitions to be the Mayor of London. Therefore, I would expect you to be able to fill in a blooming form! That is not the point, is it? It is the feedback from the volunteers. Volunteers are saying that the form could be improved.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly we need to make sure the form is as easy as possible --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Will you ask your officers to pick up those concerns?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, absolutely. If you have heard any specifics about the form can be improved, we are keen to hear that, but it is not very difficult.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Are you really happy that because of lack of funding - and this is what SNBs are saying - it is okay for an SNB then to only do the minimum: one meeting a year?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is the minimum; that is not --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: They say the funding is only allowing them to do that. We have an SNB that said it plans to hold only one meeting a year and it has not held it yet.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We would want them to do more than the minimum. Clearly that is disappointing. Many of the SNBs are doing far more than one meeting a year.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Your officers are looking at the clear variations that there are in terms of the functionality of the SNBs?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We keep an eye on that. Obviously the approach has been to set criteria and minimums and allow local areas to go about how they want to engage with their communities in a different way. London is a world in a city and just having a one-size-fits-all approach to engagement would be wrong. In my own borough, they have taken a view that you will not have just a borough summit but you will go through into local neighbourhoods and have meetings in libraries and so forth. They have taken a very localist approach. Everywhere is different.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am only dealing with funding. Other Members will come in. We have had and continue to have concerns about the level of activity that you are requiring of these boards. In terms of funding, can I just ask? If you do not have this information to hand, we can receive it later. Do you know how many boroughs did not use their full funding allocation for 2014/15?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): When you say 'their full funding allocation' --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That was the £5,200.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I do not know how many boroughs have not accessed their £5,200.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That would be useful information to have because that would then beg the question of why they have not --

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

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: -- and we go back to the difficulty in access.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I would have thought the only reason they may not have done is that you can only access the administrative pot when you are fully constituted and you have a bank account. There may be a delay in a number of them being in a position where they are constituted, started and set up - although they all have now, including Greenwich - and have a bank account. At that point, they can have the £5,200. It may be just a question of timing. There is no real bar to getting that.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: It might be their financial structure?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): They just need a bank account. You clearly cannot just hand over a wad of notes to a member of the public and say, "Here it is". An organisation needs a bank account.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Your officers will be evaluating that. Can you let us know how many SNBs have bank accounts?

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

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That would give us an indication because, if they do not have bank accounts, they would not be able to access the funds. That would be an indication of the underspend.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Then very often there were legacy organisations that would have had bank accounts and, therefore, I do not think it is an insurmountable barrier. I will look into it, Jennette.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We have asked this question previously. You talked about it being a lot of money. We have worked out that £5,200 is the equivalent of 50 hours a month at the London Living Wage. Did your officers do any comparisons? With what you are asking the SNBs to do, are other organisations doing similar work and more with that sort of support?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is a question of judgment. It is the right thing to be able to reduce the administrative overhead. It is a small amount of money. They can draw more money from other sources and so it is essentially a pump-prime pot to be able to organise a series of public meetings. Then they have a pot and they can make a real difference in their communities. The larger pot of £2 million is what they need to draw down on. What is very exciting is that we have over 160 SNB projects that really look like they are making a difference and building --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Somebody is going to go on to that. I was just trying to establish the funding issues that have been shared with us. It was not a matter --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): On the £5,200?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: It was not a matter of reducing that amount; it was the matter of asking if your officers have done any work to be sure that this amount of money was similar to other organisations who were doing this sort of work with volunteers.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): A lot of organisations in the voluntary sector do not get any state support at all. You know that as well, Jennette.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Your officers have not done that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I do not think there is any easy way to benchmark what is right, but effectively these are volunteers and we are asking them to set up, at a minimum, one public meeting a year. Many are setting up many more than that and they have access to - provided they fill in a fairly simple form - a significant amount of money to be able to do further work and engagement. That is reasonable.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: The question was what work your officers have done and it is clear they have not done any. The only thing that we have, then, is the response from the SNBs. When a good few of them are saying that the funding is not enough, is it reasonable to accept that and to ask your officers to work more with those SNBs that, for instance, have not opened bank accounts?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Certainly I will take away the issue that you raise, which is that for any organisation where we have made an offer of administrative support, they have accessed that money. My understanding is that they largely have but, where there is a barrier, we need to sort that out because it is there for them to have.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you.

Roger Evans AM: Stephen, back to the thorny issue of SNB meeting in public. I know because you have said this to us before that it is your desire that they should meet in public but not all of them are doing that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is a minimum of one public meeting a year but they can hold many more if they choose to.

Roger Evans AM: What about the ones that are not meeting in public?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The guidance is very clear that they have to have at least one meeting a year in public. If not, then they are not following the guidance and then we would have to look at whether we can continue to fund them. We are setting a minimum, not a maximum.

Roger Evans AM: You are saying if they do not follow the guidance, you will not continue to fund them?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have to recognise it is guidance. It is light-touch guidance but certainly we want them to be public-facing. We want them to be the voice of the

public and consistently holding meetings in private is not in line with the guidance. Where you have specific cases of an SNB not following the guidance and not even hitting the minimum, we need to be aware of that.

Roger Evans AM: I appreciate the guidance is light-touch but there are some things I do not think you can afford to be light-touch about and this is probably one of them.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Given that we want to have public engagement, the minimum is a fairly low bar. If a group whose mission is to increase the engagement of the public on public safety issues is not even having one meeting in public, it is a cause of considerable concern.

Roger Evans AM: All right. That sends a pretty clear message to the people who are not doing that. What about raising awareness of the work that SNBs do? What guidance are you providing for them to do that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have our own way of being able to help and promote in the MOPAC website, which helps to publicise the work that SNBs are doing. We are hopefully using the projects that they do themselves: the work that they are doing in Neighbourhood Watch in Barnet or some projects that Wandsworth and Croydon are doing to tackle youth violence and sexual violence. The projects in themselves, for their communities, are what should draw attention to what they do, not the meetings themselves, although they may be extremely exciting. They are the things that we need to publicise. We need essentially to do a suite of publicity of the very best projects and how they have benefited the communities that they serve.

Roger Evans AM: You are right that the more relevant the work they are doing is to their community, the more likely they are to get meaningful involvement.

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

Roger Evans AM: How do you ensure that they are representative of the communities they serve? We had this concern that the same people who were involved before would just transfer forward to the new structure and you would have a new structure but the same old people.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have taken the same approach as we have with holding public meetings. We would like them to hold them all in public but at least one, and then we would like to have one public event at least, one crime summit. Membership, again, is not prescriptive: it just says we need to have a voice of the victim, we need to have a voice of a young person, we need a voice of an elected member and we need a voice of the wider community. Provided we get a sense that we have people there who are representing some of the constituencies of a borough, then the guidance has been met. It has been very different across London. Sometimes we have seen wholesale sweeping changes and new groups of people have moved in; in others, it has been pretty much a similar group of people.

Roger Evans AM: Would it be appropriate for MOPAC to provide advice, maybe, if some of the SNBs are struggling or if the work they are doing is not as relevant to their community as it might be, to help them to open up and to find the right people to serve in that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It would be. Certainly we have been here when we have guidance to the SNBs. We give them a picture of the kinds of things they could do, we give them some ideas and also we would give them information about public safety and crime issues in their space. Clearly, we can give advice but we want them to be self-standing and sovereign rather than just 'do what we

say' agencies of MOPAC. They are there to do what they think is best for their community, but advice we can always offer and you guys can offer advice as well.

Roger Evans AM: I am sure we will. One of my ongoing concerns here is around online crime and I know some of the SNBs have suggested they would like more information about this because they regard it as a worrying issue too. What is MOPAC doing to support them in what is quite a complex and specialist area of crime?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is. You have done some great work on this, Roger. I would say it is the sort of crime where we need much better information. The information, as you know, first and foremost sits for London with the City of London Police. We have tried to unpack and get the information about fraud packages and how they are disseminated and get clearer information about how many fraudsters are convicted. Getting that information has been slow. Now that we have information through the Business Crime Strategy, we are updating our data packs to provide the fraud information that is relevant for particular boroughs. It is an issue - we hear this all the time - where we want to give more information so that they can do something with that.

Roger Evans AM: You would be able to alert them about new scams as they appear?

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

Roger Evans AM: Certainly, talking to my own safer neighbourhood people, that is the sort of thing they feel they would find useful.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We can certainly give them an idea of the general threats and scams. There is also a very useful book which not enough people have seen, *The Book of Scams*. Yes, we can also provide intelligence.

Roger Evans AM: I do not think I have seen that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is a very good one. It is a hundred scams. I am not sure if it is up-to-date but it is still interesting reading. Also, the scams are changing all the time. We are now refining our data pack to provide and cover online data.

Roger Evans AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I have been contacted by one SNB that says there is some lack of clarity about whether it can ask questions and hold local authority 'parks police' - they are not police officers but are termed 'parks police' - to account. Is there any guidance or you aware of some SNBs where local authorities do allow that level of scrutiny of their own community safety teams, wardens and other sorts, or is that not something that is in the guidance at the moment?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The ambition, I would say, is for a group of people concerned about public safety and it would make sense to be able to not just hold the police to account, although that is important, but also wider public safety agencies as well.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I suspect there would be quite a lot of resistance from some local authorities, but it might be something you want to consider when you are developing this.

Roger Evans AM: Parking wardens?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It all has an impact.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is all iterative, but the reality is also that community safety departments will reduce in scope. That is one of the big concerns.

One of the areas SNBs will need to focus on is to what extent CCTV is working in their boroughs. That is an issue that they need to be concerned on. The whole community safety role is something that is important and how that works hand-in-hand with neighbourhood policing is something worthy of scrutiny.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We have no further questions. Thank you for your time this morning.

This page is intentionally left blank