

Police and Crime Committee – 30 January 2014**Transcript of Item 4: Question and Answer Session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service**

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Now we move to our main session this morning, which is our monthly question and answer session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). Can I welcome Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Craig Mackey, the MPS Deputy Commissioner? Then we are joined today by Mark Rowley, Assistant Police Commissioner and Dave Martin, Commander from the MPS.

One of the first issues we want to raise is the question of water cannon, and, as I said yesterday, today we are looking at this in three meetings over this week. If I could just say for anyone watching or listening, we have just been given a talk through a written presentation on water cannon. Can I just check, Craig, that this is going to go on the MPS's website, is that correct?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service): We will put it up on the MPS website. You are more than welcome to put it up on the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) website. It is public.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yes, we will do that as well so that everyone can have a look at your presentation there. Thank you.

Perhaps we can start on the issue of water cannon. The Mayor requested the Home Secretary make funds available for the purchase of these three German water cannon and she has refused. Do you have any indication as to why the request for funding was refused from the Home Office?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have no specific information about any refusal of such a request, no.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I do not know, Craig, whether you have had any indication as to why they -

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Not in terms of funding, no.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): If the Home Secretary does not want to make funds available for what has been termed by the Mayor as an 'interim solution', because there is a debate and a process through the Home Office at the same time, if the Home Office does not think there is a need for urgency to provide an interim solution, why does MPS and the Mayor think there is a need for an interim solution rather than waiting for the full process that the Home Office is going through to conclude?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I do not think we should conflate the issues around funding of water cannon. We should understand that the case for the limited use of water cannon in very extreme cases of disorder has been made by the profession. That starts off with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) whose report indicated a very limited use. We have also had representations from the Commissioner and the leadership of MPS. We have Mark Rowley who will comment further on that. Consistently over the period that I have been Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, I have

made the case for a very limited use of water cannon to close the gap between traditional policing tactics and the use of more force, potentially baton rounds, which they are licensed to use, to close that public order gap.

Lastly, as well as that, widely trailed last week in the media, the representations by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). Therefore this is very much a professional view that there is a case, and hopefully never seen but certainly rarely used and rarely seen for water cannon, so it comes from the profession.

The Home Secretary and I have had a meeting where we discussed water cannon. The Home Secretary, like the Mayor, is minded not to block the use of something when there is a clear request from the profession. I do not think we want to confuse funding with an opposition from the Home Secretary in principle. The Mayor is very keen obviously to engage and consult with Londoners. Whilst he is minded to, we are very keen that everyone responds and makes their points.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I would make exactly the same point. I do not think we should confuse funding with the principle around it. Given the quantum and value of the funding, my expectation was probably that the decision was along the lines of: This is something that can be met locally. Certainly, and I think we have a letter from the Minister for Policing that indicates the support back in November. 6 November.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Will you share that letter with us after the meeting?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): We would have to check.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The key message was that there was support for police having the use of the tactics in principle, but he felt acquisition was a matter for Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) to consider. If it helps, the chronology of that was: David Shaw [Chief Constable, West Mercia Police], who leads on the national project, had written to Damien Green [Minister for Policing], and 6 November is the response to that saying that they are supportive of police having the tactics available to them, but felt that it was a matter for discussion with PCCs.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The Home Office has an ongoing national discussion with PCCs, so there is that national discussion, although it seems to be extremely quiet, I must say, on the national stage. It just seems that by the MPS trying to get this for the summer, in effect it is pushing that national discussion perhaps ahead of the time it would normally take place. Is that a fair comment or not?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think acquiring a conversation with PCCs nationally leads then into acquiring a national capability where you would probably end up with a conclusion that you would want devices based in more than one location, if that was where you were going to get to. There is not a certain proposal on that yet, but that is where that conversation would go to. You would probably guess, and you would be right, that there are not water cannons on a shelf, so the procurement and manufacture, an acquisition process for this project is two to three years' work. That project will not produce a national capability for the order of two or three years. In the meantime, we have been saying now for two years that we see a limited role for them. The question then comes: if we in London see a limited role for them in some high-risk situations where one would want to have every tool available to hand, is it worth coming up with an interim solution whilst all that work is done? That is what this proposal has been about, about giving us this opportunity in London if something awful happens to have the tactics available.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Is it fair to say that the national debate is happening too slowly for the MPS and you wanted to --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I do not think so. As Mark has outlined as well, the challenge will always be these are not the sorts of bits of equipment you can just go out and buy. To be specified, to be done, there are some huge lead-in times around this. When you have two reports from the disturbances in 2011 who say, "You actually need to consider this", waiting and waiting and waiting and doing nothing about it carries in itself its own risks. This is very much around how do we position ourselves for an interim solution.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I suppose my concern is that we are having the debate in London, but nationally there does not seem to be that debate, on what is a great change. I notice that you say this is going to be a national asset, so it is like booking the national debate and once it is there it is there, and the national debate follows afterwards.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): The work is still going on around the potential for a long-term national asset. As Mark said, that is a debate that will take place with PCCs and elected representatives wider than London. This is around a solution around the MPS.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I want to look at some of the risks associated with water cannon. The national work that was done looking at this, I think, only really looked at Northern Ireland, from what I understand. The ACPO project did not review water cannons that are used across the continent of Europe, for example. Has there been any real assessment of the suitability of using water cannon in London, by looking at a wider range of examples?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): One of the reasons for focussing on Northern Ireland is that they are using it in an urban environment, but most importantly there is a whole range of different tactical ways you could use a water cannon. You look at some of the videos, and some of them have been played on the media in the last few days, because of its public debate. Some of how it is used around the world you think, "There's no way we would ever use those tactics" in terms of our policing.

The reason for focussing on Northern Ireland is, firstly, those devices have been assessed through the British process for assessing safety. There is a scientific advisory committee on technology like this which had put some constraints and issues around water pressure and how it is used, etc. That fed into training and that is how it has been used in Northern Ireland as part of the UK tactical policy in terms of how they are used. It seemed to make sense to focus on one that was acquired, designed within a specification that we would work within and tactically used in the way that we would seek to use it in London, rather than looking at tactics and pressures and devices that we would not go near. That is why we focussed on Northern Ireland. They have used it 59 times in the last five years and have had no reported injuries.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): We will come on to injuries. London is a hugely populated, very dense, city. Have you looked at perhaps other examples in Germany where it has been used recently to see whether there are any other issues that are risks?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The team have looked at some things. I do not have that information to hand. One of the issues is about the size of the device. The devices that we are looking at are just a little larger than a fire engine. There are some water cannons on the continent which are just enormous beasts and they just would be completely inappropriate, and they are not what we need.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): So the focus has just been Northern Ireland really?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Police Commissioner of the MPS): Just to add to that, the operational requirement is that prior to deployment you have to make an assessment, because in terms of its use, is it safe to use it? Will it achieve what you want to do? Are there additional factors that are going to stop you using it? For example, if you have a low wall at the back then you would probably not use it, because you are not going to be able to disburse and then there is risk of further injury if people are knocked on there. Everything would be subject to an individual site assessment prior to any deployment.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can I pick up on the issue of liability for damages if you deploy water cannon and it causes damage to private or commercial property. Have you done any assessment of that?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): In all of our operations and deployment, we are civilly and criminally liable for our acts, so any tactic we use in public order situations with vehicles, baton rounds, horses, water cannons, applies in all cases: there would be no difference.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You would be liable for costs.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes potentially, if there was negligence. Yes.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Yes, if we are negligent. Yes.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): This is because it is a use of force tactic, so it is exactly the same as officers drawing a baton. As Mark says, it is the same as giving baton rounds. In that scenario the liabilities are the same. That is why the audit process around it would be exactly the same as that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): There could be a huge cost potentially if it is being used.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): If it has got to that stage in disorder, there is going to be a cost anyway.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Regarding an issue I picked up yesterday about personal injury: what real risk assessment was done around that issue? I think that is hugely important, particularly, as I say, there are visuals online and we have seen some horrific ones from the continent. Once you have the machine it only takes one operative to perhaps not use it correctly and you end up with such injuries. Have you looked at this further?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): We have, and that intrinsic consideration is part of this scientific assessment that starts off. The Science Advisory Committee on the Medical Implications of Less-Lethal Weapons (SACMILL) which looks at technology like water cannon, they assess it and they have come up with a whole set of proposals where they have said that working within these parameters in terms of pressure, these are what the risks are, and they identify what the mitigating actions are in terms of how it is used and training, etc.

It is that assessment which both then feed into if this consultation leads to a desire to purchase, then if that assessment which goes before the Home Secretary in terms of her decision to authorise it for purchase and use in the UK. It is also that assessment that then has influenced the national training and tactics. There is already approved professional practice in terms of our public order tactics. This is because it is a shared tactical menu with Northern Ireland, across England and Wales as well and Scotland, and because we want to be interoperable for obvious good reasons. Therefore that thinking has already fed into that training. It will only

be trained operatives, about how you use it, how you use it to achieve your aim with as little force as possible, which starts with warning and tentative warning, shots, so to speak, in terms of hitting the water on the ground in front and a graduated use. It talks about when it is used against people, how it is used, and what circumstances you do it, and then talks about looking at people who might be vulnerable and all those sorts of things you would expect. That is all catered for. I think pretty much all of that approved professional practice is on the College of Policing website and is available. I think we have copied it in some of our correspondence to you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can we just clarify that SACMILL is looking at it? They looked at it back in 2004?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Are you saying that they have since looked at it recently? Or currently? What is the timeline for that?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Police Commissioner of the MPS): They have done a provisional piece of work based on the devices that we have identified that we could provisionally acquire subject to all this. Then they will do a follow up piece of work if that becomes a firm decision.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Effectively it is the same group that did the work in 2003, so SACMILL have done an interim statement. It does actually mean, looking at the specific water cannon, that you are looking to purchase, because they do the tests on those, tests on pressure. They have produced an interim statement. They have asked for some additional work. Obviously if the decision is made to go ahead, then that work would have to be done and that would be one of the conditions that the Home Secretary would need to look at before making decisions on licensing.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Therefore all that work would have to be done as the case presented to the Home Secretary. In 2004 they did find huge concerns about the pressure from these water jets, and that it could have huge impact and potential for injury.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): The statement makes clear the pressures at which it should be used, and the manner in which it can be used, and then lists the type of injuries that can come from those. That is effectively what dictates the operating practice that needs to be put in place. Clearly, with any piece of equipment that uses force, if it is used inappropriately then, yes, it can cause injuries.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): If this does go ahead and you procure water cannon, what processes are you going to have in place to review their use and suitability following any deployment? Whilst I hear you saying, "It is rarely going to be seen and rarely going to be used", once you have that tool in your box you will use it at some point. Therefore, what are the processes you are putting in place around that?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Any incident which has got to the extreme level of disorder that would prompt us to even consider putting this on the streets, let alone using it, would get reviewed by ourselves, just as we reviewed what happened in 2011. We would do our own review. I would imagine MOPAC would want to scrutinise the events that had led to that and what had gone on, and I think you would want to scrutinise it. I also imagine that it is all very possible that there might be complaints that bring the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) into it. There might be civil litigation, all sorts of things. I think there would be an enormous amount of scrutiny, but we would determinately ourselves, as quickly as possible after an event like that, look at both what prompted the disorder, and what lessons have

come out of that that have caused it, and also the tactics we had used and their efficacy and anything we learned from it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Would you also consider evidence of medical implications from --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Absolutely, yes.

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

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Just on this issue of what it would do to people that you are firing at. The student protests, for example, were in November 2010. If you doused a few hundred students in the winter with the water cannon, you then have a duty of care to those people, because some of those people might have come from a long way away. They cannot run home and change their clothes, and they cannot easily find shelter. Have you thought through the impact of duty of care?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): There is definitely a duty of course using it in the summer, and using it in the winter creates different aspects, as you say, and protests in November. It could be very, very cold and that might be a consideration.

One of the important things to stress though is when disorder breaks and we have initial tensions, our default position, and it will remain the same, our starting point is about containment. We try and contain problems, calm them down, and manage them, because that is the most effective way when something is manageable. That is not when we are using a water cannon. We would never be using water cannon alongside containment. That would be completely wrong for a whole range of obvious reasons. If something has got so disorderly and so serious that it is not containable, for example, violent confrontation, missiles being thrown, petrol bombs, whatever else, and there is a real risk to life or of mass destruction, then we sometimes have to move to a tactic of trying to disperse an area, because often people are focussed on a particular building or a particular group of people, so we have to move to a tactic of dispersal. We very rarely do that but you will see in the riots and some other situations where we have done that. In those high threat situations, that is when we are using it. If people are going to get cold, we are using it to disperse them away from them being involved in the most serious violence, so it is probably proportionate. Of course if it was minus 20C and someone is going to die of hypothermia very quickly, then we would not use it in that situation. We would take account of it.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I do not feel satisfied that you have answered my question. The fact is you could be dousing hundreds of people, whether or not they are innocent or guilty. You then have several hundred people who are wet and cold on a very cold day. You have to think in terms of actually being able to provide blankets, hot drinks and that sort of thing. Even if you are arresting them, you actually have a duty of care. I think that is something you need to plan for.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): No, we have a duty of care. We recognise that. However, we would not be using it against hundreds of innocent people. The sort of disorder you are talking about --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Well guilty or innocent you still have two hundred wet, cold people.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It is all about who you use force against first of all. We are using force against people who are involved in serious crime. That is most important. The level of this disorder is your serious crime, and we are using this force against them. Whilst there are risks with people

getting cold, and we would take account of that based on temperature and whatever else, actually some of the other tactics available to us in those situations, like baton rounds, horse charges, etc, are actually more risky than getting cold. We have to take account of all those issues at the time and come up with the best tactic, if we have to clear an area from the most violent rioters.

Tony Arbour AM: The thing that I want to come back to is a point that you raised, Chair, about why this matter is initially a London rather than a national matter. I think this is really a question to hear from MOPAC. Do you not think that Londoners, in the light of the disorder there was particularly around Croydon in 2011, had a right to expect that the police, if they knew that there was something which might have prevented this, would get such a tool?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think that is entirely the right question, because I was asked whether the acquisition of water cannon was going to destroy the trust between the public and the police. That is the question that I have been put. I think we see from the riots and we see from extreme disorder that if that is not handled correctly, with the benefit of hindsight, if there were tools that could have been available to mitigate widespread damage to property, or to reduce violence, or to reduce the use of other tools, which are potentially more dangerous to people, the public simply will not understand that. I think there are limited cases where this is a legitimate tool for the police to consider. I think all the police have said, in talking about particular incidences is that it was a tactical option to consider it, not that they would have deployed in those cases. The MPS leads the country in public order policing. Just the sheer weight of public order events that [AC] Mark [Rowley] and his team deal with is second to none in the country. It is absolutely at the forefront of public order policing.

I think the other thing that is very important is this idea that if you have something in the toolkit, you reach to use it. They are licensed to use baton rounds, but it has never been used. In fact, I think there are only two police officers in the country that are authorised for the use of water cannon and baton rounds, and that is not in the MPS. This is not just about whether you provide the tactical options in the event of extreme public disorder, but closing that gap between potentially greater force. I think Londoners want the police to be able to protect property and to reduce the risk of extreme violence, and that escalating.

What I am interested in about the experience in Northern Ireland is you mentioned that water cannon had been used 59 times. However, my understanding is that over those five years, there have been hundreds and hundreds of deployments, and that has been the very threat of the use of water cannon that actually is a massive way of de-escalating potentially extremely violent situations. I think Londoners want to know that their police are able to resort to things in a proportionate way and understanding the duty of care that the police have as well. I think, yes, they do expect that.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The Northern Ireland experience is that they use it, and one in ten times they deploy it.

Tony Arbour AM: I want really to explore the role of MOPAC, because in effect MOPAC's principal decision relates to the purchase of these things. Is there a case, therefore, for saying that it might well be negligent of MOPAC not to acquire things which may limit the kind of disorder that we saw in Croydon?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think you have to think very long and hard as a politician, and anyone who has the interest of Londoners, and is trying to represent Londoners to second guess the professional opinion about whether something is needed within the public order toolkit. I think that is why the Mayor is minded to approve the purchase of water cannon, but wants to hear from Londoners, and recognises this is a change. I would not necessarily describe it as negligent, but you have to

think very hard as second-guessing people who actually understand what it takes to deal with potentially extremely violent situations.

Tony Arbour AM: Perhaps I could say something as an elected person here, which you are not. I take the view that those people that I represent are entitled to be protected from violent disorder and it would be negligent if ways in which I could be protected from that violent disorder were not available. I think the phrase is 'shot in the locker', something of last resort. If the something of last resort is not there, then I do take the view that it is negligent, and I would expect those that I represent to think that it was negligent. If, therefore, the decision has to be taken by MOPAC, which is I think what we are seeking to influence, then the case simply makes itself. We have been through this. We did not have this shot in our locker and we should acquire it.

What is the cost, let us say, of an hour of violent disorder, or the kind that is described, where this water cannon might be deployed, shall we say an hour in Croydon? The cost of that set against the total running costs of the water cannon here? I would see that as a simple physical price. I am not talking about anything ethical or anything of that kind, which Londoners would want to pay. Certainly I would be happy to advocate that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think the only way you can answer what Londoners think is by looking at the polling. Clearly people have a very strong opinion. The people around this table have a very strong opinion. They do not want to see the police have access to this. You do. Essentially this is not going to be militarised, as I understand it, so in that sense it is different from Northern Ireland. It is used essentially to deescalate situations to deal with extreme violence.

The polling is very interesting: the vast majority of Londoners would be in favour of the police having water cannon. That is not one poll. Numerous polls have said it. It would be interesting to see the recent figures following this debate. The interesting thing is that in the HMIC report, a quarter of Londoners thought that we had water cannon already, or the MPS had access to water cannon already.

Andrew Boff AM: Would you consider using coloured water or dye to help identify violent protestors?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): They have done this.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It has been done in the past. It is not something that we are actively looking at at the moment because we have other methods which we think are better. I think there is an issue about using the footage that we have got, because actually what it will tell you is where someone was. Again there are all the issues you get in terms of cross-contamination, so it has value. Again you then get into all the other medical implications of what the dye did, and what effects it had on people. Frankly, "I do not think we need it at the moment", is probably the best answer.

Tony Arbour AM: Do you take pride that London has not required water cannon up to this point? Or do you think it has in the past? I am not talking about the immediate past that we have already cited.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I take pride in the professionalism of the people who work for me in the public order world and the learning and improvement that has been done in the last couple of years. Some awful events at the end of 2010 where some elements off the side of some lawful protest did some pretty awful things, and also much worse, obviously, in 2011. Since then, we have improved our intelligence processes so we can nip things in the bud; and improved the style of our policing in terms of dealing with protest to be much more engaging, liaison teams that we have put in place, which makes a big

difference. I think we have made big improvements there. The reason intelligence is important is the risk with protest is that you get thousands of good people, and then you get 50 or 100 people set on creating violent disorder. Improving our intelligence is critical. It means we can get hold of those people at an early opportunity and stop them spoiling what should be positive event. We have done all of those things, and I am proud of that.

In the last couple of years we have had some difficult events but they have gone well. I think every year, Londoners have a right to expect we should be better than the last year at spotting risk, nipping it in the bud, and stopping things getting so awful that you are going to have violent disorder. Of course, we are not in complete control of that. We can never guarantee that something else will not spark some disorder that we take some time to get on top of, or feelings are so high around an issue that it is unavoidable. In those rare situations, we still think there is a possibility of them, and we would like to have all the tools possible in the toolbox to deal with them. Frankly, water cannon in terms of dealing with the most violent disorder, where we need to disperse groups or clear areas, is less violent and less threatening than some of the other tactics we might have to use.

Andrew Boff AM: You indicated your pride earlier about how well London polices public order, and presumably from relatively benign things like a football match, the Olympics up to the points of things like riots and potentially tense situations. Are there any academic institutions or centres of excellence for teaching this stuff?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): On one of the pieces of work that we have done, there is a Professor Scott from Sheffield or Lancaster - somewhere in that direction, I am struggling to remember - who has been working with us because he is one of the proponents around how to make protests successful, and the liaison work that we have been doing. We have been using his evaluation and some of his tactics to inform our thinking about a much more engaging and peaceful way of mounting protests, for example. Therefore we are open to academics.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): To reassure you, there are a couple of academic schools. University of Leicester have got a Centre for the Study of Public Order, and people study there. There is quite an area of academia that looks at that wide area from public order at its protest all the way through to extreme violent issues. In terms of training officers to deal with it, there is now an accredited process in policing. It is a national course. It is the only way you can be in a command position to do that. You cannot say, "I've got 30 years experience, therefore I must be good at this". You actually have to have gone through the accredited programme.

Andrew Boff AM: The use of water cannon would be at some point codified into that good practice?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Johns Biggs AM: I have three tiny things. The first is on the question of polling. I think there is a modern variant of the old thing about the last refuge of a scoundrel actually. You can ask whatever question you like with polling, and you will get the answer you want if you structure it in the right sort of way. I would be interested to know what questions were asked of people about water cannon. If you say, "There's a group of bad people, they are behaving badly and the only thing to solve this problem is to fire water cannon at them. Do you approve of the use of water cannon?" People will probably say, "Yes". If you say, "There's a kids playground and it will hurt them" should you deploy a water cannon and they would probably say, "No". Obviously they are stupid variants of the question but I think it does depend on the question you ask and it is quite complicated. Opinion polling has its uses but I think the political system we are in is not one in which we

make reasoned decisions based on evidence, and we do it thoughtfully. There are also things the public, I am sure, would support which, for better or worse, we tend not to do.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I do not know who prompted the YouGov surveys and whether there was any agenda behind it, which I suppose is your question, but the HMIC survey that was done to feed their report and their thinking for their report in November/December 2011, off the back of the riots, I know they were very keen to get independent expertise to make sure it had a lot of integrity to their survey. It went through a whole range of issues about what people thought about how the riots were dealt with. Could it have been done better? It went into all those sorts of issues, and it is available. I think we have a copy of it and certainly, you could have that. Then it goes into what tactics could have been used. It is quite an open and sensibly structured survey.

John Biggs AM: It would be useful outside the meeting to get an idea of the questions that were asked. Although, for the reason I have given, I am less bothered about that than perhaps some people might be.

The second question is we get a bit confused about what we are talking about here. The superficial headline is that we are deciding whether we approve of the Mayor authorising the deployment of water cannon. In reality, there is the petitioning process to the Home Secretary for her to license things. If she does licence these things, then from an operational point of view, you can go out and buy them, whether or not any Mayor, future, past, living, or as yet unborn, approves of it or otherwise.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is not quite true, John, because whilst the final decision about whether they can be used operationally by any police force on the mainland rests with the Home Secretary around licensing, the procurement process rests with MOPAC and the Mayor.

John Biggs AM: There is a logical line of argument based on precedent which suggests that that might not always be the case. Say you were not the reasonable thoughtful person that you are, Stephen, and there was some stropy geezer who just did not like blue uniforms and said, "The police will no longer buy blue uniforms", then clearly that would be overridden because it would be unreasonable and stupid. There are areas of precedent where police authorities in the past have challenged procurement policies, and the police have operationally won out. It has been challenged in the High Court.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): There is a stated case to that effect. I do not know if it is still current, it relates to some time ago, with, I think it was force in the north of England over the purchase of baton rounds. You could ultimately get to that. I do not think it is anyone's interest to get to the point there.

John Biggs AM: I think there is a political process now which is about the Mayor and other people petitioning the Home Secretary to license these things so you can then go out and buy them. I know there is a sort of fuzzy protocol between MOPAC and the MPS, as you tend not to do things they do not want you to do, but it looks like you might have to.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I think there are two things conflating here. There is the legal position around direction and control and operational independence. There is then the legal issue about our financial rules. Under our financial rules, it is absolutely right that we cannot do procurement over £500,000 without the approval of the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

John Biggs AM: Say, for example, you had to replace your helicopter, which would clearly cost more than £500,000, and the Mayor said, "I am sorry, that is too expensive, you are not going to have one". I suspect you could push --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): You could. In terms of the point, you could ultimately challenge that decision, as you can with any decision by a public authority.

John Biggs AM: My final question is a question which is going to be asked over many months and years, I suspect, which is about defining a protocol and being very clear about what that is. You have alluded to it repeatedly but there needs to be something written down and understood, so that as and when certain people take you to the court, they can understand why you have done it, and so you can have a decision made. It would be nice to see what that is and how you are negotiating it with the Mayor's office.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think there are two elements to that. The first one is there is already published the National Professional Practice by the College of Policing about the tactics, the decision making, the consideration that deals with the legal issues or tactical issues, and that is a tactical document about how we would use it. I do think a protocol or a standard operating procedure, or something of that nature which is about the MPS will use it in line with those national developed tactics and safe regimes, and all the rest of it but on top of that, "Here are the other issues that we are going to take account of in London".

For example, I mentioned when we were talking about this subject yesterday, even though the operation authority and decision to deploy in the UK is set at Assistant Chief Constable Commander level nationally, we decided in London that it should be Assistant Commissioner level, so two ranks higher. That is one simple variation we have made in terms of the clarity. It is our decision-making that we would discuss with the Mayor and others potentially before it was used. With some of those sorts of issues, we might want to clear up in a protocol so we have the operating tactics which are well-established in national practice, but a protocol that comes out of this consultation makes some sense.

John Biggs AM: That would obviously include record keeping, and I would take it as read that there would be cameras attached to the vehicle. and that the vehicle would have eight foot letters on it, "Water Cannon", so that people knew what it was and that it was coming.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Exactly, yes.

John Biggs AM: Thank you very much, Chair.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): You keep referring to the fact that it is going to be rarely used and rarely seen, but you are referring to public opinion as well. What would happen if public pressure was on you to use water cannon in a situation? Would that influence your decision? If you then did not use it because it was not suitable, how would you deal with the public outcry there would be?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): My prime accountability as a police officer is to the law. With respect to the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor, and with respect to this Committee, that is my prime accountability. That is how I am judged and that is the importance of policing. That is fundamental to the position of a Constable, and we could have a long conversation about that, which I know you are all well experienced in. That is my prime responsibility. On top of that, we all buy into, do we not, the importance of public trust and confidence in policing. The ability to discharge your duties is influenced by that as well. The opinion of the public is really important for how we police London, but at the end of the day I have to make a

decision that I can stand by and say legally, "This is the right thing to do because of the threat I saw in terms of protecting people". Public opinion in the heat of the moment might not be the best judge of what is the right thing to do.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It just strikes me that you are going to have an engagement issue whether you use it or not.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): In fairness, we are in that position now with many of the tactical options we use. You can go to public meetings or you can go to events afterwards and say, "If only you had done this". Ultimately, as Mark says, whoever is in that command position has to be satisfied. They have a rationale for why they had used or, as you say, not used something. I think we get into a slippery slope if we say we bow to public pressure on the use of tactics. It is not somewhere, I do not think, any of us would ever want to go.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Could AC Rowley repeat what he just said? I heard him to say, "Public opinion in the heat of the moment might not be the best indicator". Is that paraphrasing?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): That is right. I was trying to follow up the question from the Chair in the sense that, "Would you always do what the mass thought you should do?", and the answer has to be no. Of course public opinion is important. You want public confidence, but you have to do what is lawful and right at the time, and those things will often chime together because common sense is generally right, but that is not always the case.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is because public opinion coming at the heat of the moment does not have the reasoning or all the evidence, much like the post-riot responses. When people fall from their television (TV) screen, what they perceive to be the burning down of the city, the anger, if you could have measured it, would have gone off the scale.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I agree, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: If you had gone out and asked the average Londoner, and in fact you did, the average Londoner will say, "Where are the police? Why can't they do this?" which by that time they realised it was too late. At the same time that you were asking them about water cannons, if you had asked them whether the police should have used baton rounds, if you had asked them should the police have used CS gas, do you not think they would have said, "Yes, bring it on"?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think that is why the law is important.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: They would have said yes, would they not, in much the same way you are quoting their support following that survey, because that is part of your case? Part of your case is you have public support, because the public said after the riots, "You should have had water cannons! You should have used them!" Therefore now the Commissioner said, "Do you know what --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): No, no that is not true.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That is not the case. Also, Jennette, just factually, there has been more than one survey. There have been surveys on this issue before and after the riots, and there is an overwhelming majority that think the use of water cannon in very, very distinct situations,

actually, is a tool to minimise the use of more extreme force, and that is acceptable. Actually the YouGov poll before the riots showed around 70% of Londoners being in favour. That is before the riots happened.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I do not think that Londoners are adequately informed about the situation.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I would not disagree with that, if 23% think we have it already.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Many of us have been sitting around discussion tables with the police, and we still have to think really quite slowly and clearly about this whole issue of direction and control, and to know what it is we are talking about. I think where we get confused is where we get drawn into arguments about operational control, as politicians. I do not get involved in operations. I want the police to be able to go out there and do their jobs as the professionals that they are. I want them to be equipped and then I want them to give an account of what they did, why they did it, and then be held accountable. That is not the area I am interested in.

The area I am interested in, and the proper person we started this discussion with yesterday is the Mayor. When I say 'proper' that was the elected Mayor. The questions we started to ask him was about the purchasing and, if you like, the ownership of these water cannons. As the Deputy Mayor, Stephen, can you confirm who will own those water cannons that you are supportive of purchasing? Will they be purchased by the London pound and, therefore, you could say they are owned by MOPAC and Londoners?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): All property that is purchased by MOPAC is essentially owned by Property, the police buildings, the helicopters the cars. There is no change.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We have just clarified that over the last five or so years, so we are now --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Why did it take five years to clarify something that has not changed over five years?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is one of the good things about MOPAC, being in a position we are now clear that it is not for the police to go off and buy their cars and their horses and whatever, and their helicopters, as they used to. It was then the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA), and it is now MOPAC. If you are not going to get the money from the Home Office to purchase the water cannons, how can they then be a national asset as they are being talked about as?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The proposal here is for MOPAC to fund essentially three cannon that are going to cost in the region of £200,000. That is full cost, as I understand it. It is about £90,000 for the purchase of the three of them, and then delivery and transport comes to around £200,000. This will be an MPS asset, and therefore owned by MOPAC.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: They are going to be purchased by MOPAC, ie the Mayor of London?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Correct, yes, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We have figures that say that it is going to be between £200,000 and £300,000. Do you think that briefing is wrong?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The estimates that I have are that the purchase price is £90,000 and the full cost will be £200,000. In the unlikely event that there are some unforeseen costs, the top estimate is £300,000, but it is fair to say that the current estimate is £200,000.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Have you also been briefed, as we have, that these are 23-year-old machines --

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

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: -- and that there is only a chance anticipated that they have a working life of two to three years, meaning then that they would have to be replaced by new water cannons?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, I --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can somebody confirm the price for a new water cannon? Is it in the millions?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I think that was from a letter that, Mark Rowley, you sent.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The price obviously does depend on the specifications put into it. The price range for a new water cannon, in terms of the reports that will be available to you, is between £600,000 and £1 million depending on the type of water cannon you buy.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Anything from £600,000 to a £1 million each?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): For a new cannon, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Three is the minimum. We are talking London here with zone 6. People bring up Croydon which is zone 5 unless each zone has its own water cannon, or each zone has two, or I do not know how you would distribute them. It would seem very difficult to me if the water cannons are in North London, how long they are going to take to get over the zone 6, so you would need more than three, would you not, in the long run? You would maybe need half-a-dozen.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think we are talking about a small number of very rare incidents. I think having ten or 15 would seem completely --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Ten to 15 eventually?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): No, -- would seem completely nonsense. I think two or three is the right number, because it is having a small capability that is enough for what we want. Having dozens, which is the implication of your question, would be pointless.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: The issue is that in 2016 you envisage then that you will have been allowed a budget of some, what, £4 to £5 million to purchase new water cannons?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The two to three years indicated lifespan is partly associated with the parallel piece of work that is going on in terms of the national piece of work that Chief Constable David Shaw of West Mercia is leading on behalf of the MPS, working with the Home Office, in terms of a national capability. It depends on what they decide a national capability should be in terms of what the view of chief constables and police inquiry committees is in terms of where you get to in terms of how many devices in how many locations across the UK.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, I am bringing you back to London, because it will be part of the budget debate and it is part of Londoners paying in. I am just trying to get some clarity here so that in the consultation, Londoners are as clear as possible. In 2016 you will be looking to receive in the MPS budget an amount of about £5 to £6 million to purchase new water cannons. That is roughly --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): No, because if they are, say, two-thirds of a million each, then three of them will cost £2 million, for example. We have not made that decision, so it is not five or six. In a small number of years, there is a good possibility that they will be replaced. Whether it has to be done by the MPS, or whether it is part of a national programme, whether the Home Office, as part of the national programme, will provide some of the funding for that, all those things are yet to be worked out.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can I just ask the Deputy [Mayor for Policing], will you have all these figures ready when you have your public meeting so that we can be clear about the cost? I think the thing is around £3 million that you are looking to be spending in a couple of years' time. I think it is a little bit disingenuous to be talking about spending £200,000 - £300,000 now, because if you had put in the real figure then people would be more concerned. During your consultations, will you be talking about the real costs of new water cannons that Londoners will be asked to pay?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): First and foremost, most of the budget that the MPS spends is not from the precept that Londoners are paying into, but it comes from the Home Office directly. Around £600 million comes from the precept. We are spending £250,000 on technology in the next couple of years. The expenditure you are talking about --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That was not the question I asked you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If you are, in principle, opposed to the very idea of the police, even in response to the most extreme violent protest or mass destruction of property, if you are against it on purely budgetary reasons, then that is not the debate we need to have.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is not the question I asked you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Answer the question.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is not the question I asked you. I asked you, will you be fully informed, because I understand you will be doing some of these consultations. I believe it is appropriate for Londoners to be given the full facts about the cost of this purchasing of water cannon. It is separate to our own personal beliefs as to how our police operate. Will you be informed, so when we see you out and about you will have the full figures about the cost of the water cannons?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We can certainly provide, in response to your question, an estimate for the purchase of what a new water cannon would be, and that is a variation from around £600,000 to around £1 million. You know that there is no call at any stage for the foreseeable future of any more than around three, and you know that what we are actually talking about is initiating procurement for a cost that will be certainly no more than £300,000, likely to be nearer £200,000 for the purchase of these three second-hand water cannon. That is what we are having the consultation on. I think much more important is a discussion around the deployment for use and being absolutely clear.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am not talking about deployment. I have said that I am not talking about operational matters.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, you are talking about budget.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am saying that I am talking about matters that are within the responsibility and prevue of the elected Mayor of London. The elected Mayor of London is not involved in the deployment of the tools that the police use. He is informed but he does not make the decision. We have been here before and that is where we are.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am afraid that you are wrong in the sense that what we are --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Have you been briefed about the cost of training? Do you know the cost of training?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, I have been briefed on the cost of training.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: What would be the potential cost of training?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have had questions about what it would cost to house the water cannon. My understanding is there would be no net increase in the training budget for the use of water cannon. That is my understanding, in the public order budget, but the police can respond.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: On behalf of Londoners who you are going to meet, can you be sure that in your consultations that you have figures that demonstrate what the full cost is and that that cost will include the training? I understand that then they have to be stored and have to be maintained. I also understand that we have to have a small group of officers who will be water cannon specialists.

If the water cannon were required elsewhere would MPS officers be expected to go with the water cannon under mutual aid? Would you then have MPS officers operating this outside London?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Because that is all part of the working as a national --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Mutual aid, yes.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It is probably worth separating out as there are two --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Last question, I think to you, Deputy. I am a little bit down because I am disappointed that we have this in front of us at this time, because I just think there are so many more important things that we could be discussing with you. Were you there when there was a discussion about 2011? Do you recall anybody saying, "I wish I had a water cannon that we could take to Croydon"?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Look, I was around at --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am not talking to you, I am talking to --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You are talking to the Deputy. Just be clear because we both have 'deputy' in the title. It is not being rude in any way, but just to be absolutely clear, I am the Deputy Mayor, he is the Deputy Commissioner.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I was not here in 2011, as you know. I came at the start of -- I do not know what conversations did or did not take place.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Were you around the table, Mr Rowley?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): No I was not. No, I came in December 2011. I did do the review of what went on. I think there were a lot of heated views expressed by police officers and politicians in the heat of the moment in August during the disorder, which is why I think the reports that were published four or five months later by HMIC and six months later by us were cold reflections rather than in the heat of the moment. They were not just a response to public opinions, to pick up your earlier point. The HMIC took top-flight legal advice. The core thing for them is what could be used in such serious disorder that is lawful and has public support, as opposed to just being about public support.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Commander Martin, you have been a Gold Commander?

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I do not know in what circumstances, but do you ever recall thinking, "I wish I had a water cannon"?

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): I will answer both those questions. I was there during 2011 and was deeply frustrated about our inability to manage some of those terrible scenes that we saw, and there were long discussions about what tactics we should use. The issue for me is as a commander, and if we look back over the ones we have had over a couple of years, we have had a number of incidents which I would describe as very difficult, eg missiles being thrown. In any of those, have I felt that I needed to deploy water cannon? No I have not. My real concern as a commander is that there are occasions, when we look back, where the level of force was such, and the violence, that we were deploying a force which is effectively hitting people with batons, as they were hitting us with bricks and missiles. It really concerns me that I have no other option than to use that level of force, as opposed to something which both legally and morally I would want to use if I could. Maybe the circumstances would not allow me, but I would like to be able to use that less force if I could do it.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you.

Len Duvall AM: You had those options, you had baton rounds available, and you chose not to, it is judgement call.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Absolutely right.

Len Duvall AM: So you did have other options, right?

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Yes, exactly that. They were options that were available to us, and they were considered.

Len Duvall AM: Do you think that is an argument for where you say, if you had it that you might never deploy it, in that sense, but you have had these options before and you have chosen not to. I do find it somewhat, not laughable, but interesting that these are policing operational control issues, but you will take into account it is human behaviour about what other people will judge you on, in terms of those judgement calls. 'Failures' may be a harsh word, but let us call it that. The failures in the past, the three incidents identified by HMIC that, potentially, where water cannon could be used, would be about a judgement call, is it not? It would not necessarily mean that they would be used, because there are things that you have had in the past that you have chosen not to use.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): That is exactly right. It is times when it would have been legitimate and -

Len Duvall AM: No mainstream politician, in my mind, Conservative, Labour or whatever, would ever want you to use baton rounds on the UK mainland. There is something symbolic about this process that we are going into about how you police public order issues around that.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Let us look at the HMIC report on the back of G20, then the big disorder in 2010 at the student protests, and then the riot. There are quite a few pieces of work. One of the threads of the criticism of the HMIC was that they felt the MPS had not enough confidence to act and to use the level of force necessary in some of those extreme situations. Baton rounds are one of the things that they made a point that it has been available for a long time. They made the point, "You haven't trained many people in using it". Initially it almost was not a credible option because you were not ready enough to use it when actually with the level of violence going on then meant that it would have been a useful tactic, certainly if people are throwing petrol bombs and things. You have to use a lot more force than a water cannon, and that is what is so slightly perverse about this argument. A water cannon has no reported injuries in Northern Ireland.

Len Duvall AM: In a public order environment there is a number of things that can lead to people being hurt, is there not?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Len Duvall AM: Whether it is water cannon, whether it is going toe-to-toe with demonstrators, actually containment can itself lead to problems. I am a supporter of kettling, to be honest, but containment can lead to hurt and harm to the people inside the containment area. It is the nature of that public disorder, or the issues that may arise from that. There are around two issues that have come to mind. One leads into an arrangement if you were given permission to go ahead to purchase. Have we done the adequate training to put in place if water cannons were deployed, with your existing people currently that are trained up for public disorder for this summer? That is what we are talking about for: this summer. Are we really saying that we have got all the tactics ready for a new way of working to deploy it if the checklist of where it would be used?

Secondly, which really does interest me a lot more, is about the judgement call of the officers taking these decisions, because we can go back on all the other problems that we faced. We do not necessarily have to. It is about someone not making the right judgement call, whether it is water cannon, a Countryside Alliance issue, intelligence judgement call, or issues where you were going toe-to-toe with people in terms of a threat to Parliament. The Israeli Embassy, I am not quite clear about, but the student riots one was a judgement call that was allowed to get out of hand, which led to ineffective policing tactics. What is going to change in terms of the consultation about the confidence for those people that oversee you? What is going to change around

improving maybe some of those judgement calls to avoid the use of some of these deployments or other issues? What has changed?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): There are two or three questions there, so just picking up the last bit first. What else have we done? There were many lessons for us from 2011. Some of it was about what you can do to prevent. Some of it was intelligence. In terms of judgement calls, we changed our tactics and we changed some of our training, because a lot of our training historically had been done in these big set-piece confrontations, and of course what you saw in 2011 was much more sporadic, dispersed disorder, so public order commanders at different levels who are used to working in big teams were now in small teams dealing with sort of roving and changing threats. Therefore we changed some of our training to suit that to give better decision-making practice and better training to Commanders at a more junior level, so you can cope with those flexible scenarios. I have now done that thing where you forget what the first part of the question was.

Len Duvall AM: I do think about the training and ready for deployment in the summer, but allied to the --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Training ready for deployment has been an option in Northern Ireland since 2004, and because we work to one national practice across the UK, all the thinking in terms of tactics and deployment has been in place for many years. That is the first point. We do not have to create a new tactical menu.

Secondly, last summer things got to such a state in Northern Ireland that England, Wales and Scotland provided mutual aid during some of their marching seasons. We were part of that and we have - I do not know the exact number - 200 officers who were trained in water cannon tactics so that they could be deployed over there. We have already done that. Of course if we go through this, and this is arriving in a few months' time, then as soon as we get it, we will be doing some more training and exercises. You would expect us to, but we are not starting from scratch so it will be quite straightforward to get ready quite quickly after receiving them.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is the reason you keep talking about three because you normally deploy three at one time, is it not?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): That is the Northern Ireland practice.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): We normally deploy two. It is possible to deploy one as well.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is possible to deploy one if you are linked up to a water supply, is it not? Otherwise it is just ten minutes of water and then it is over.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): They can be linked up to water supplies. Certainly in Northern Ireland, that is not always the case. You are right, if it is turned on full then it has a fairly limited lifespan, about five minutes. It is not normally used in that way because again it is a bit like you would not drive your car at full throttle all the time.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I do not have a car, but I know what you mean.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): The tactics for Northern Ireland are in twos. As I say, there are good reasons for that. We would want look at tactics about one. One of their reasons is their ability to tow it away. The Northern Ireland ones are so heavy because they are ballistically protected, so part of their tactics is that if

they have a problem, if one breaks down, they can move it away. There are opportunities to look at deploying them singly. They do not have to be in pairs.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): The reason for us for going for three is because the norm is two. We are going to explore other options, so if one is being serviced at the moment that you need it most, it ends up looking a bit foolish.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Do you know what the top speed of these second-hand vehicles is that you are going to buy?

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): No idea.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am just wondering how fast you can move them to Enfield, Croydon, Hillingdon or Richmond if you have a problem.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): I do not know the specific details, but again, you are not talking about overly fast. Most of these would be limited anyway to a top speed of 50 mph, so it is not going to be quick. You can actually facilitate its movement through traffic with its own blue lights, and you would send a motorcycle team to support it to get there. In many cases, I think it is about either the worst circumstances we saw in 2011, in which case will they always be there on the first day? No, but one of the ones we have talked about is if you get the intelligence that you have got potential for disorder, ie you have got potential for stores of petrol bombs, we will do everything we can in intelligence to try to find them and stop them. However, if we could not, I would have to be going to the Acting Commissioner and saying, "Look, here is a real problem I have got. I have done all these things to try to prevent it, but I cannot rule that out".

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You see, the problem I have got is that you are actually describing more and more conditions that you would not use them in, and I am finding it more and more difficult to imagine conditions you would use it, because quite honestly, you are talking rarely seen, rarely used.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Yes. That is the point we are making. That is exactly the point, Jenny.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Then what is the point in having it?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think that is the whole challenge with civil contingency with policing. Whatever you are looking at, you are spending money, whether it is training, resources, or situations that are highly unlikely and you hope will never happen. The reason you spend money and time on them is if they do happen, they are so awful it is worth the investment. It is one of those situations.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You could not find £100,000 to save the Wildlife Crime Unit, which deals with global mega-million pound crime syndicates, and yet you can find all these millions for a vehicle you are hardly going to use.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): If a charity decides to withdraw funding for their part of it; we are continuing the activity, working in different ways.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We hosted the whole morning on wildlife crime. There is a huge commitment to wildlife crime.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): So can you accept that there are concerns that this is actually quite a change in policing potentially?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Baroness Jones, I do not accept that we are -- Lady Jones, I do not accept that closing a gap in the public order toolkit is heralding a new change in the style of public order policing. All of this morning, I think there has been quite a lot of assurance about the whole approach to policing public order, and dealing with extreme disorder goes through various phases. This is about closing the gap and potentially ensuring that you use less lethal options. I do not accept that this heralds a change. It merely closes the gap.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is that why your process for actually trying to explain what you are doing to the public is actually so limited? You are having an engagement, are you not? You are not having a consultation?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think any six-week consultation gives lots of opportunities --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is not a consultation though. There are Government guidelines for consultation --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Well, engagement then.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): -- and it is three months, and you are doing six weeks, so this is an engagement, is it not?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Engagement. This is an opportunity for a sensible dialogue, but it goes on the back of a considerable amount of discussion, reports, and a professional view that has initiated this discussion and engagement, and I welcome your comments. I know you have already raised many, many letters, comments, and questions.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yesterday the Mayor said that the consultation was on the basis that this is going forward.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): He is minded to, yes. He is definitely minded to. That is why we are starting with the Mayor's position which is that he is minded to initiate the purchase of water cannon, but he wants to engage and hear from Londoners. It is very clear.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): If public opinion actually goes against the idea of having water cannon, the Mayor might change his mind? He might, or might not?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not going to hypothesise on what the Mayor is or is not going to do, but he is very keen that we have a proper engagement.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is that an option?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think one of the things we need to do out of this engagement is to understand and be very clear about the protocol for deployment. We need to understand that what we are not talking about, to be absolutely clear about this, is a situation where a

politician has his finger on the water cannon button, because that seemed to be the line of questioning yesterday. That is not the case, but in order for it to work, Londoners have to be clear on the very rare situations when it would be deployed. That is what we want to be clear about, and also be aware of all the other issues around engagement. This is the opportunity to get that right.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You have completely ignored my question. You have really got to answer our questions here, because that is the whole point about having this meeting in public.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Well, try to make your question clear.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is it an option for the Mayor to decide against having water cannon?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Mayor and MOPAC have to initiate the procurement of water cannon, so in that sense you cannot initiate and buy something without the authorisation of MOPAC. I think it is very clear - and therefore the Mayor --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You seem already to have decided that you are going forward with it, so this engagement is to explain to London why you are doing it. However, if London comes back and says, "We do not want it", is there an option for deciding not to have them?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is about hearing the views of Londoners and understanding their concerns, but also reflecting those in any decisions. He wants to hear, but he is minded to initiate procurement because of the views of the professionals.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): How many public meetings are you having in this engagement?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You know that. We have outlined that. There is an engagement plan.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am asking you in public.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Do you want to go through what is written? You have been briefed on this in writing.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, I just want you to tell us now how many public meetings you are having during this engagement.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Obviously this runs for six weeks. There is a public engagement beginning on 17 January. We have the meeting today, which is obviously in public and you are questioning me today. There is a public meeting on 17 February, and then a briefing with other stakeholders on 18 February. We are already receiving public submissions from people and we encourage the public to step forward and voice their views.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): So there is one public meeting?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am involved with one public meeting, but there are countless briefings and opportunities for Londoners to represent their views.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): There is one public meeting. Do you think that is enough? For example, you are doing this tour, are you not? What about extending your roadshow and actually using that to talk to people?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The roadshow is a public meeting and we are having 16 public meetings, including one tonight, around the issues that concern the London Borough of Southwark, and obviously residents and people of Southwark can come to those public meetings to voice their concerns, and water cannon can be raised at any one of those meetings. Then the public meeting that is specifically on water cannon is only one of a number of engagements that will be carried out by MOPAC, but also by the MPS which is very keen to engage with Londoners. It is not the number of public meetings that you have, but in terms of whether it is effective as an engagement.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We obviously will do our best to get people to respond to your engagement.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I know you are already working very hard on that, I can see.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am. I am saying though that I want to hear people's views, whether or not they agree with mine, so I think it is very important that they do feed back to you.

Just going back to this point about the Mayor's responsibility, if there was an occasion when we had some abnormal circumstances and the MPS came to the Mayor saying that they would like to use water cannon, and the Mayor said "No", for whatever reason, and then the MPS went ahead and used it, and there were problems, would it still be the Mayor's responsibility?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We are very, very clear that there are two lines of accountability that I think Mark Rowley has made very clear: There is a legal responsibility and duty, operational independence from the police, and then there is a political accountability that the Mayor has with his mandate to serve London. This is where the Mayor would expect to be properly briefed in the event that this was becoming even a tactical option. However, operational decisions, the person who will decide that rests with Assistant Commissioner Mark Rowley, who has made that very clear on what we are proposing. In that sense, the Mayor will not have a right of veto at that stage --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, that is not what I asked.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- so that is what you are trying to paint, the Mayor will say "No".

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, not at all. That is not at all what I was saying.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Then say it another way.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I was trying to explain to you that actually once they authorise this, it is his responsibility if it is or is not used properly, whether or not he agreed, or whether or not he wanted to stop it. Never mind. Let me ask you a final question --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have made it clear that what we are doing now is having an engagement with Londoners. Part of that sets the framework in which this would be

used. The Mayor has made it very clear that he wants to ensure that this is something that is rarely used and rarely seen, and only to avoid more extreme use of force. In that sense, having a clear deployment protocol, we are probably minded to use our ethics panel to consider and define that so that there is a London approach to this. That is very, very important, as this is talking about London here, and we are also very clear about how we engage with people, but that is all part of this.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Do you think that your ethics panel should be involved now, from the beginning, understanding what the engagement is and so on, rather than just coming in afterwards?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, I do not. I think the ethics panel is something that we would use in the event that we decide to procure the water cannon. I think it is appropriate then to use that opportunity to ensure that we have the right oversight and framework, because the Mayor will not have direct control over the use of water cannon in an operational context. He is well aware of that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): He still has a responsibility though. That is the point I am making. People will blame him.

Tony Arbour AM: Precisely on the point that is being made here about public engagement - and this is one for you, Stephen - do you not think that the Mayor is someone who should lead decision-making and indeed make decisions? In other words, the sort of "GCSE" question, is the Mayor a delegate or a representative, that he should not simply follow the instructions of one, two, or three public meetings? You and I will know that over the past four months or so, in every borough there have been public meetings on whether or not fire stations should be closed, and the number of people who turned up in total will be fewer than could fill this chamber.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I think the point, Tony, is that Stephen is there already, so he could ask the questions.

Tony Arbour AM: No, but the next point I was going to raise in relation to that is, do you think it likely that any one of the new police panels which have been set up, that any one of the new borough committees which have been set up, are not going to discuss this matter? There is no veto from you, is there, to say, "Thou shalt not discuss this matter"?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely not. We have 16 public meetings over the course of the next few weeks, finishing by the end of March. They last an hour and a half, so well over an hour of public questions. Certainly not, I have absolutely no idea what will be raised and we try - and this will be the Assistant Commissioner for Territorial Policing and myself - to answer every single question. There is no veto on what people can raise. This is legitimate for people to raise.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Engagement only lasts until the end of February, not March.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You are right, end of February.

Tony Arbour AM: Can I come back to the very simple question that I raised? Should the Mayor be leading on this?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The political leadership has come from the Mayor. He has the mandate, and based on a considerable amount of professional advice, he is minded to

approve the use of water cannon and to initiate the procurement, and that is why we are going through this six-week engagement with Londoners.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I think we are going to have to move on, we are so short of time. We have two topics that you have been notified of that we want to raise. I want to ask you about the inquest into the shooting of Mark Duggan, and we had the jury's verdict in that inquest. One of their conclusions was that the MPS had not done enough to gather and react to intelligence, so what actions are you taking with regard to that conclusion, and will you be launching a review into what more could have been done?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Absolutely. In terms of looking at it, we have to await what the coroner has actually said. Like everyone, we have got the judgement. We do not have the detail of what that relates to, so there are some timelines now with the coroner in terms of when we will come back with some detail about that, so we can actually understand the areas we need to look at, and what that actually relates to into the use of the intelligence. We are absolutely clear, and the court was clear in terms of the MPS and Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) - as it was in those days - they did not do the best they could with the intelligence, and we need to understand what that is. Until we get the detail, it is very difficult to answer, but once we have got the detail, certainly we will have to review it and then see what actions we need to take as a result of that. If it may help, I do not have the exact timeline. Do you know the timeline?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think it is quite soon. The judge has set a process where, as you know, coroners can make recommendations and do reports, so he has asked for submissions which I think are due the end of this month. That is my recollection. Then he will consider his thinking, and then if there are any sort of criticisms or comments for the MPS, SOCA, or the IPCC, then he will consult them before he makes his final conclusions and publishes, so it is quite a few weeks away yet.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Could we be looking at Easter time before we get something substantial?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I know there has been comment recently about enforced stops and the MPS has recently said that it was wrong not to formally review the tactic following a private recommendation by the IPCC in 2005. Are you launching a formal review into enforced stops?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I have already had them reviewed. Just to be clear, what the IPCC actually said in 2005 was that the MPS should keep these tactics under constant review. It has been suggested that they said that there must be an immediate review, and it was not the case. That said, I have said publicly that I think we should have done more at the time in terms of reviewing it. There was a lot of work being done on firearms policing at the time, because within a couple of months the Jean Charles de Menezes incident had taken place as well, so those two were quite proximate in time, which we might now forget, but they were.

When the judge was considering his conclusion on that inquiry, it was clear from early drafts that we saw that there was more we should be doing in terms of reviews, and that was one of the things he was going to pick up, so I commissioned that piece of work. Rather than have it done within the MPS, I asked the national policing lead for firearms, Deputy Constable Simon Chesterman from West Mercia to do a review of our work and our tactics. He reported back to me and made some recommendations, which we have published, and he did that on the back of the draft report, as it was, for the judge at the time and him looking at what we did, because it is a contentious tactic publicly. What I have said publicly, and I will say here again: we are always up for doing something better and I cannot shirk away from confronting armed criminals. If a criminal is in a car

with a gun, then we need an option to stop them, arrest them, and seize the weapon. We work to national standards and we have the best tactics that we have come up with the UK. Simon Chesterman came up with some comments, but nothing dramatically different. I have got my firearms officers now looking internationally and seeing if there is anything anyone is doing overseas that might help inform our practice as well. We are always looking to improve it, and people commenting on a review is always helpful, but it would be nice if people had better ideas.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): You have looked at this review now, and then you are going to constantly review it as the need arises?

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Exactly.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That was very critical after the shooting of Mark Duggan, the breakdown of protocol between the MPS and IPCC, and it caused considerable distress to the family of Mr Duggan. I know that there was then some work going on to try to ensure that the police did not stop talking in respect of whether there is an IPCC investigation going on, but can I just ask you, has that work concluded? Do you now have a better understanding with the IPCC about what your respective roles are?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes, it has. There was new guidance that came out after that, and there is a much closer relationship in terms of the communication both between the press offices but also between principal individuals. I think you saw some of that after the verdict in terms of being very clear with the messages going out. We are clearer on those areas that we can legitimately comment on, even when there is an IPCC investigation in place, so we are very clear around now for both our senior investigating officers (SIOs), both in terms of pure investigation, but also in terms of professional standards around what we can say and what we can do. If worst comes to the worst, we pick up the phone and speak directly to the commissioner concerned to negotiate how we do that. We are really clear - and I hope people saw it during the events after the verdict - that actually communication and getting straightforward messages out is absolutely crucial, otherwise that space leads to confusion for everyone.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I thought it was significant. More communication following the verdict was very welcome, but representing Tottenham as I do, there is a piece around community engagement that was certainly I think lacking at the time, but perhaps understandable because of the aftermath of the disorder that shortly took place. The Commissioner met with community leaders in Tottenham shortly after, and there has been a series of meetings where he identified two actions: to strengthen relationships with the MPS, and to increase trust amongst our black and minority ethnic Londoners, not least to try to encourage them into the MPS. After the inquest, I think it was Mark Rowley, you announced that there was a senior officer to oversee the MPS's engagement locally.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I am just wondering what will be the remit of that officer who is conducting that remit?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes. We are going to announce later in February who that will be. I welcome your comments, Chair. I think post the inquest, we saw some of those things that we all know work: talking to people, listening to people, genuinely going in with an open agenda to say, "This is what we know, this is what we think will happen", and I think there are some lessons from that. What the Commissioner is very clear on is that level of community engagement and the lessons we have learnt there include: how do we get it across London, so this does not just become one area. You will know - and many of you who have been involved with the MPA will know - in the MPS, we have wrestled over the years with the question of whether you do everything centrally or locally? There are advantages and disadvantages with both

of those options, but we are absolutely clear that what we need is a senior member of the team who is absolutely the central lynch pin around what we do, co-ordinating the activity around community engagement. They are not the doer. They will not do everything, but it is that central post that allows us that ability and flexibility to do it. We are also clear that we want to pick all the learning from our senior leaders and the 32 Borough Commanders. Obviously each and every borough has done something on this. I think it is next Thursday we are with the Borough Commanders and Operational Command Unit Commanders around, where we will be asking "Come on then. What is the main learning around this and have we got that role right?" Then we are looking to announce the remit and specification of that role and how it co-ordinates that activity across the piece.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): What level will that role be?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It is an ACPO Commander and upwards. What we are trying to avoid - and it is only from the experience of talking to colleagues who have been around this loop before - is the notion that, "There you go. There is Craig", or, "There is Mark, they now do it all", because people will disengage. It is absolutely clear what works, and we saw it with not just this incident but a number of other incidents. It actually works incredibly well when you get it right at a very, very local level, but there are some things that we need to co-ordinate so that when we get the returns and we see them at, if you like, an MPS-wide level, we can be absolutely assured we are seeing what is really going on across London.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Obviously given that there is a parallel structure in MOPAC, you are director of - amongst other things - community engagement, and is that close work going on, Stephen, with your office?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely, and it starts off with providing a framework where we can see whether we are making progress, which is particularly important. We have said very publicly that the Mayor set a challenge. It is not just about cutting crime. We want to see that boost in public confidence, and one of the things that we have done is to ensure that we track the confidence measure for all of the 100-odd policing neighbourhoods that we have across London. The most recent bit of work that I commissioned was looking at comparing the bottom ten neighbourhoods in terms of police confidence with the top ten neighbourhoods in London, and finding out whether we can see anything in the socio-demographic makeup and other factors, irrespective of crime levels or confidence that might underpin that. All the information shows that effective communication is critical.

I started off my series of roadshows in Merton, where there is a very, very high level of public confidence in the MPS, very impressive levels in areas very diverse, from Mitcham, Morden and then Wimbledon. Mitcham, although lower than Morden, has very, very high levels of public confidence compared to similar neighbourhoods, so we have created a category of being able to measure neighbourhoods against similar neighbours, but I learnt that they had 500 Neighbourhood Watch schemes. Some parts of the borough were literally saturated with Neighbourhood Watch schemes. The Borough Commander and his team were looking at all these methods around how you engage properly with communities right across the borough, and I have to say that there is a variability in London, but looking at operationalising public confidence, and in particular the trust and confidence of black Londoners - because interestingly enough, that is very often the heart of this - how do we improve the trust and confidence to drive up the confidence levels in neighbourhoods which are relatively low, which include, I have to say, Tottenham and the neighbourhood in Haringey as one of the lowest.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): So are you trying to map some best practice and do that as a joint act across the two organisations?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely right, and that is one of the reasons why under the second stage transfer, where there is a transfer of Professor [Betsy] Stanko [Head of Strategy, Research and Analysis, MPS] and the team. However, I have to say an absolutely brilliant resource is the GLA Intelligence Unit, who have access to a whole raft of information beyond policing that can look at the socio-demographic make-up of London. We have been able to create this idea of a similar neighbourhood, and now we are operationalising and giving that information to territorial policing, so a neighbourhood Inspector not only has some targets around reducing those victim-based crimes, but also is looking at how public confidence tracks, because there are wide variations. There are areas of good practice, and there are areas that are problematic.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That would be useful to track in the future, I think, some of the work you are doing there.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Mr Mackey, could I take you back to the MPS's relationship with the IPCC?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Dame Anne Owers, the head of IPCC, has criticised the MPS, saying that officers sometimes do not co-operate fully with investigations. How do you respond to that?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): There is a lot in that question, and a lot in the assertion around it. I think we have got to be really, really clear - and we have those conversations with the IPCC - about that notion of not co-operating. The principal officers in this answered hundreds of questions - literally hundreds of questions, appeared before a court three times, because there were two other trials associated with this, so they have been subjected to a level of scrutiny around it. The frustration relates to whether they will step into an interview room and be interviewed on tape. In that way, there are huge challenges. If you said, "What is the relationship like with the IPCC?" the true answer to you is, "It depends where you are in the organisation", being really honest. At a strategic level, we work together, have a lot of contact, and a lot of dealing. It does not mean we always agree. Officers are concerned about what they feel is a process that seeks to portray them as wrongdoers from the start. Now, we can argue. All of us can argue professionally whether that is right or wrong. The reality is that perception exists, and some of the events we saw after the inquest did not help that in terms of them saying, "Oh, I am going to be part of that?" One of the challenges that we have wrestled with in the background is, how do we keep people volunteering? After all, carrying a firearm and protecting the people of London on their behalf is a voluntary job. We cannot make people do it. We think there is always a balance in getting that right. In an ideal world, would officers step into an interview and be interviewed every time in the way the IPCC wanted? Probably, yes. Do they have the confidence in that at the moment? No, they do not.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I can see your point, because the IPCC investigations sometimes take a long time. That puts a lot of emotional strain on officers and --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): In fairness, it goes far wider than that. I think at the moment, if you look at where colleagues in the IPCC are, we have got a high public expectation, along with a lower capacity and capability. Now, there is a national programme in place to address that, but you cannot just grow that sort of capability and capacity overnight. Professionally, I would say to you that that is probably a two, three-year transition to get to that stage. When you look at some of the history of why officers have got to this, you have also got to remember as well they are responding directly to legal advice they are getting.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, I understand that. I might doubt the legal advice, but what I am trying to get to is that there is obviously a need for a thorough investigation by the IPCC because that is their job.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The MPS has to co-operate as much as possible.

Dave Martin (Commander, MPS): Yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Have you actually now got a protocol that you are both broadly happy with?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We have got a protocol, and I think the issue has always been - I cannot second-guess Dame Anne's comments there - but I think it is at the individual officer level of engagement around it. As I said, we do not always see eye to eye, but we are absolutely clear: strategically, we want a fiercely independent IPCC - we absolutely do - that steers that ground, that they do, goes where the evidence and the facts takes them. That is in everybody's interests.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): There is a protocol. It was developed several years ago: the post-incident process, which the IPCC were in the room when that was discussed. It clearly needs to be changed and developed, and the IPCC are looking at fresh guidance and thinking at the moment. Since the [Mark] Duggan shooting, we have changed our own approach in the MPS to try to improve its transparency and the way it is done, and we are going to have further conversations with the IPCC.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Do you think we are at the stage when we need a formal review of the process to actually get some real clarity around it?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think that is what is happening.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Some of that is ongoing at the moment, so the work that the IPCC are doing at the moment in terms of that and consulting, that is part of the work. There is a range of submissions from interested parties and groups about, "Go on then. How do we deal with these thorny issues?"

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think the issue is, and we have got to be really clear: if there is evidence that an officer has done something awfully wrong and they are a criminal suspect, the powers to treat them as a criminal are just like anybody else. That is not what we are talking about in the vast majority of circumstances. If they are a witness, because there is no evidence they have done something wrong, but they've been involved as a firearms officer or something like this, then there are two things this post-incident process needs to do well. It needs to be very good at capturing evidence, so their statements and their evidence, in whatever form. Secondly, if they have done something traumatic in a job, they have volunteered to protect the people of London, and it needs to be good at their welfare as well. The post-incident protocol needs to capture both the welfare issues and the evidence capture issues. The existing protocol was an attempt at doing that, it needs to be reformed, and we are in debate with IPCC about how to do it.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It brings me on to the question of the wearing of body cameras, which of course might make a difference here because it would lend clarity on occasion. Can you tell us, how soon is that happening? Are there any hurdles to be overcome?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): It went through our investment board on Monday, and it is coming to the Joint Investment Board next month. I do not envisage that will be a problem in terms of holding it up. I think it is 50 for firearms in the first instance, is it?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): We are looking to acquire 500 for trials across the MPS in different functions. We are going to get 50 into firearms. Those are all out there in April, and we will be testing them operationally at that stage. The firearms one has some of its own complexities, because of course they are wearing so much kit, where do you put it? I have dealt with in the MPS and previous forces several police shootings. Two of them had video of the incident, one when I was Chief Constable of Surrey, and obviously the Woolwich incident here. Every shooting is a tragedy, but in terms of the aftermath and the follow-up, they become trivial, because you do not have what we have had with Duggan: two years of conspiracy theories on the internet and then an inquest which then, because of the conspiracy theories, people struggle to understand initially. Actually, you get facts very quickly, it gets sorted, the IPCC have got the best evidence possible, and it is resolved. Therefore I think it is a very compelling way of short-circuiting all these issues and just getting to the truth.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Time is the challenge, as you rightly say in your question. Two to three years later to still be playing over things, for families involved, for anyone involved - that is the real challenge.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I will just move quickly to Mr Greenhalgh. I was wondering if you felt that the IPCC needed more powers to - I was going to say "coerce", but I do not want to use that word - compel police officers to come and give evidence to answer their questions?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I think the most important thing to take out of this discussion is that the IPCC is over-tasked and under-resourced, and it needs the resources necessarily to do that fiercely independent job of providing oversight over these things and having a post-incident review. I think I would agree with Assistant Commissioner Rowley that the IPCC does need to have sufficient powers to be able to do the investigation, and collect all the evidence in a transparent way, but equally - I am cognisant also having met firearms officers and spent time talking to them - that they are volunteers, and officer welfare is also important. Therefore, this review is timely. I think it is very important that there is a review of the protocol and that there is enough power for the IPCC to perform its function.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I can agree with you about the resources of the IPCC. I have been told that their total resources amount to the same amount as the MPS's press department. That is quite shocking.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The Home Office have just top-sliced it and I think, Stephen, you just answered the question from me that I think it is about £16 million or so of MOPAC's budget will be going to the IPCC shortly.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): There is a move to understanding what will be presumably within the department of professional standards, which reports into the Deputy Commissioner and that will transport as part of that, but it is well overdue that you have a properly resourced IPCC.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I have heard that anecdote. It is actually smaller than our professional standards department, so the IPCC is having to service the whole of England and Wales with a smaller resource than our professional standards department, and I think that is one of the challenges.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): One of the things that the IPCC has also said is that problems that can arise from officers conferring when they are writing up their notes after an incident. This is something the former MPA were very concerned about and - certainly in their report they did into Stockwell - recommended that officers should not be allowed to confer when they write up their notes. I remember at the time the MPS would not respond positively to that recommendation from the MPA. Have you revised things so that officers do not confer?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): No, we follow the national post-incident procedures. As Mark said, that is one of the points that is actually under consideration at the moment, and if you look, there are some really quite interesting submissions on this from people who say, "You should separate everyone" even down to separate them into different police stations, all the way through that spectrum, so that is actually one of the live debates at the moment.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): So you are awaiting that?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): We have got to go with it. It would seem strange for us to step outside of national guidelines almost on a, "Well, we will have that one, but we will not have that one".

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It is contentious. The important thing about the process is that firstly officers are given a warning, a very clear instruction that their notes and their statements have to be their own recollection. There is nothing else other than that. Secondly, we have strengthened the process since [the Mark] Duggan [shooting] so that there is an independent senior officer in the room, not engaged with that operation or that firearms team, who supervises that process whilst they are writing up their notes. There is some evidence about welfare that post-trauma, separating people who have been through a traumatic experience, is actually bad for their welfare, so that is where you get into some of these complexities about the issues. Therefore I think it needs supervision and scrutiny to make sure that everyone can have confidence that the notes are proper, accurate, and just reflect my account and Craig's reflect his account, and we have not inappropriately talked to each other. However, you have then got to balance it with the welfare, about if you start to treat people almost as criminal suspects, I am not sure that is a good thing either.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): It would be welcome to see if we can move in that direction. Thank you.

Andrew Boff AM: If it be proved that officers, as a result of conferring, have manufactured a false story about an incident --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): A criminal offence.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): That is a criminal offence.

Andrew Boff AM: So you would not expect an officer in any circumstances still to be in the service of the MPS?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): If we could prove officers had constructed evidence falsely, we would be looking to charge them, and if the Crown Prosecution Service supported that, they would get referred to the courts of justice and go to prison. That is what should happen.

Andrew Boff AM: Can you picture a situation where that being proved, no action would have been taken against an officer?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Without knowing the specifics, it would --

Andrew Boff AM: I do not want to go into specifics here, obviously.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): As the person who oversees all the professional standards, and I know there are colleagues from the Metropolitan Police Federation probably in the back, and they probably think we are very hard at the moment. Without knowing the specifics, that is a really difficult one to answer.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): There are points about recollection and people making mistakes, but if there is evidence that people have deliberately and mischievously constructed things, then that is a very serious issue.

Andrew Boff AM: It is a story that was manufactured and then proved wrong by closed circuit television (CCTV) evidence, so I will acquaint you outside this meeting.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I am more than happy, Chair, if you are comfortable, I will pick up the specifics with you outside.

Andrew Boff AM: Thank you.

Len Duvall AM: Back to community engagement, rightly or wrong, it is a bit bizarre this morning. We have a Home Secretary willing to give you a 'water gun', but in terms of tools in the box, prepared to undermine stop and search. Rightly or wrongly, stop and search is now part of a debate arising from the Duggan affair and what happened there. Stephen, what is your position on this issue of stop and search and the future of it within the MPS's operation? Are you going to wait for senior officers to say that they do not want it before you take a position? What is the position of the Mayorality around stop and search in London and the community engagement aspects of it arising from the Duggan affair?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The position of MOPAC regarding stop and search is that it is a legitimate policing tactic, but if it is implemented in the wrong way, it has a profoundly damaging effect on trust and confidence in the police. We will all have personal experiences or friends that have experienced that. That is why I think the focus of MOPAC, the single-minded focus alongside cutting crime, of boosting public confidence, of the four, the two major drivers that will see that boost are effective community engagement, which we have discussed, but also just authority and the fair treatment of Londoners. Therefore we welcome, we note, and we review the figures around the use of stop and search, and look at those very carefully. We engage, and as you know, we have a series of stop and search monitoring groups that carry out oversight as well. I also note that there are boroughs that have differential levels in the use of stop and search, and that potentially if it is not used enough in the right way, rather than it is used too much, actually that results in greater violence in neighbourhoods. Therefore what we want to seek is the balance, the effective use of the tactic, and just authority on the part of the police. That is why we have to have the right oversight and monitoring arrangements.

Len Duvall AM: So in short, you are not going to weaken it then as a tactic for policing in London as it is a very important tactic? You are not going to weaken it? You just want it done properly and appropriately. Is that shorthand?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We are not calling for a curtailment of stop and search powers.

Len Duvall AM: Do you not have a view? You are not doing that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We are not calling for it. We want to see it properly --

Len Duvall AM: Are you sure about that?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We are not calling for it.

Len Duvall AM: OK.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): MOPAC is not calling for a curtailment of stop and search.

Len Duvall AM: No, I am asking you, you and the Mayor. Have you got a view on it or not? Are you just going to sit on the side and wait until something happens?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have a view on it. We are very clear. I have given you the view.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Can I just say, Craig, I think on behalf of the Committee, we are very pleased that you stopped officers resigning rather than avoiding disciplinary --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Very much so.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Well done.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Andrew, we are going to move on to the Modern Slavery Bill.

Andrew Boff AM: The Mayor's London Strategy on Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) highlights the need to get tough with the perpetrators of violence against women and girls. To what extent do you see that the proposals in the Modern Slavery Bill will assist in that end?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly, the Modern Slavery Bill is highlighting an incredibly pernicious little-understood -- although I have to say that your report that looked at human trafficking was incredibly helpful. Yes, we recognise violence against women and girls and the focus on violence against women, particularly the trafficking in the sex trade. It is important to think about responses in that sense, but this Bill raises other forms equally pernicious where we need to have a good understanding and awareness of these issues right from the neighbourhood level through to the MPS specialist team and ultimately to the National Crime Agency. I think it is useful to raise this and highlight this issue as a Bill and that is why we support the Bill.

Andrew Boff AM: Is it not a problem that in terms of the strategy that the Mayor has about human trafficking that is contained within the Mayor's VAWG strategy, that it ignores the fact that possibly 40 per cent of trafficking victims are actually men and boys? That we are talking about Vietnamese boys working on cannabis farms, British boys being groomed for sex trafficking, homeless men being starved, beaten and labour trafficked. Yet there is no strategy addressed to that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Human trafficking is mentioned in the Police and Crime Plan (PCP) and that is ultimately the document that we are working to, so it registers that this is an issue. VAWG clearly deals with issues that affect violence against women and girls. That is not to say that we are not concerned, and I think the figures I have are not 40 per cent but around 20 per cent of victims tend to be men and boys. We need to ensure that the policing resources capture all of those issues as well. That is why we welcome the Bill, but I do not think it serves us well, and I think it is incredibly bureaucratic to create a strategy for every form of crime, and sometimes you get the lead from the centre, particularly something around this kind of Bill. Other times it is right for us to have our own strategy, but certainly we look at human trafficking in the round within the PCP and what we can always do is make sure that the resources follow the PCP.

Andrew Boff AM: Have we now accepted that actually labour trafficking probably affects more people than sex trafficking?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is where I do not get the clarity of data around prevalence. I cannot respond to that directly because of that, but certainly we are aware that labour trafficking is an important part of the pernicious cycle, the gang masters, and how they use people. I remember the videos when you launched your report, and they are quite striking. Where MOPAC will take a lead is ensuring that we do cover labour trafficking as well as trafficking for sex and other things. They carried out about 150 investigations, I think, was my understanding, and a lot of those will be around labour trafficking, forced labour, and sex trafficking, so I think the problem is well understood within the MPS. Our remit is to ensure that we work in ensuring that there is awareness of these issues right down to the local areas, and that the councils and other local public services are aware of it; a campaign recently amongst taxi ranks to raise the issue around human trafficking. I think there is a real important issue around awareness-building around this as well.

Andrew Boff AM: That is a very good point, because it leads directly on to my next question. How will MOPAC work with the various partners to ensure that the new legislation is used to the fullest? I have certainly received some evidence that a lack of communication between various agencies at a local level has often got in the way either of identifying specific cases or even of identifying that there is a trafficking problem in general in some jurisdictions within London?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I do not think that this is an easy one to answer. I do not want to give you a glib answer, but if we have got an issue which is poorly understood outside perhaps the professionals within the human trafficking unit within the MPS, the key is to have simple-to-use things that we can identify the problem earlier. I think MOPAC's role is essentially to ensure that the agencies and the public can spot this, and then have a clear reporting line that does not just happen straight to the specialists, but that the local police officer is aware for the warning signs as well.

Andrew Boff AM: Would you admit therefore that that requires better multi-agency working than we have actually got at the moment?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have discussed this before, that it would make sense, given that you need to join up different agencies, and that this is a problem that requires a multi-agency approach, such as we take to safeguarding, to potentially pilot this in a part of London and ideally find funds to be able to do that, because it is not just about the policing response. It is ensuring that we get a joined-up response across all agencies that are relevant.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can you give us an assurance that in terms of the service that you have got - going back to this relationship with organisations that have been out there working in this area - that at borough level and in the unit that you are meshed with the organisations that look particularly at domestic enslavement and, to be frank, domestic enslavement in particular communities?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think we are the only force in the country - I am not aware of another one - that has got a dedicated trafficking unit, and I think that has a massive, massive advantage because the relationships they have with all sorts of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), both at a local and national level, is second to none. The Detective Inspector who runs that unit has received plaudits across Europe, including personally from the Pope at one stage a couple of years ago, because of his reputation in terms of what they achieve. Just to give you some numbers, the unit managed 263 victims of trafficking-type offences last year, which involved exploitation for labour, sexual purposes, domestic servitude, prostitution, rape and some other factors. A wide range, 263 victims, managed and 114 people arrested. The challenge with many of those victims of course is they have been under somebody's thrall and influence for such a period that the welfare care they need to get their confidence back to be able to speak and give evidence effectively, that welfare piece of work, care, and counselling, alongside the evidence gathering, those two things need to be managed very, very carefully together. Some of these cases, if people have been in servitude for years and years - and we are dealing with a case at the moment where someone, it is for their whole natural life - then that is a process that takes an awfully long time and an awful lot of care, so you want specialist officers working with NGOs with specialist training. That is something that we are really proud of, and I do not think many people can replicate that.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you for that, that is just so important. I just get a sense that in some parts of London and in some communities, we really have not been able to get into this particular area, especially of domestic enslavement, and so thank you for your work on that.

What resources and training implications might the proposed Modern Slavery Bill present to the MPS? Would you need more officers enforcing trafficking, the prevention order?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think there is the tweaking of some powers around trafficking and things. It is the sort of thing that happens regularly with the legislation and the experts. We can deal with that; that is quite straightforward. There might be some training implications across the whole MPS, picking up some of the earlier points, in terms of improving routine patrol officers' ability to spot situations, not to be experts in dealing with them, but just to identify it. That is always something we need to look at.

In terms of prevention orders, I think there will be some specific training issues, but we do use prevention orders an awful lot. If you think about gang injunctions, serious crime prevention orders, the idea of us getting sort of civil-type orders that are intended to restrict criminals' ability to sort of do their criminality in communities, we do lots of those and the list of possibilities is changing quite regularly, and this will add on to that list. Therefore we have a lot of experience which we can build on and then there will be a few extra nuances on this, depending how it is finally drafted, but it should not be too problematic.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am not clear about how the Modern Slavery Commissioner would work with the MPS, and what level that relationship will be with. Any ideas?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): It has been announced. I think that is a bit early for me to say at this stage. Have you picked anything up, Craig?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): No. Other than yourself, I think that is one of the areas as the Bill goes through we will clearly look at, but given the national lead that we have got on this piece of work, I would expect there to be a close working relationship either at Mark's level or at one of the Commander levels.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Have you made submissions or asked questions about this particular relationship?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): My team have been involved in conversations around the Bill so far with the Home Office, yes, and we do not have any problem with the Commissioner. I think it is an issue that is --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, it is not the problem with the post, it is the relationship and the role. You are clear about that, are you?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I am not, no.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: So you are doing some work to see --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): Yes, we will look at the role and we will want to work within whatever their powers are, and what their responsibilities are.

Andrew Boff AM: Half the problem is training those officers about identifying victims of trafficking, but should an officer identify a victim of trafficking, are you confident that ordinary police officers know what to do next?

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I am. I think the challenge is identifying the more subtle signs so that we get cases where you get awful stories where a woman has been trafficked across the world, raped, beaten, put into prostitution, and then a week, a month, or a year later she manages to escape and ends up calling 999 or a police officer finds them and blurts out this story. Those officers recognise this is something awfully wrong, know that we have got specialists in the organisation, and we can follow through on that.

Andrew Boff AM: They know that?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Yes.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): They know that bit. I am confident that they know we have got specialists, and that does happen. I think the challenge is someone who is a victim but maybe is in the presence of the offender. For example, I am aware of cases where trafficked individuals or enslaved individuals are taken into hospital because they need treatment for something, and the trafficker/enslaver is there as a translator, and actually it only gets spotted if you know what signs to look for. So I think with those subtleties, there is a much more difficult job there.

Andrew Boff AM: We are not going to have situations where Vietnamese boys are put through the whole criminal justice process and being accused of a crime when actually they are the --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): The victim, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: I still hear of these cases happening.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I think the challenge, of course, is spotting the difference between someone who has decided to travel illegally into the country and is working in the sort of criminal business deliberately versus someone who got trafficked here, got beaten up, and enslaved. That is a very difficult thing to spot the difference between, and particular if the individual does not say that themselves.

Andrew Boff AM: A 14-year-old is not going to have the sophistication to organise from Hanoi a flat to go to, commission the plants to grow, order all the equipment in on their own. There has to be somebody who is doing that and --

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): There does, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: -- so I find it untenable that a 14 or 15-year-old boy is going to be the criminal in this, in the cannabis farm. I just do not believe it and I do not see why the police should believe that.

Mark Rowley (Assistant Commissioner of the MPS): I would have to look at individual cases.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): One of the things that has been mentioned, and I would obviously need this confirmed, is the legal duty of all the agencies, not just the police, to notify people who are potentially victims of human trafficking. In that sense, when we talk about the burden falling on agencies, I think the biggest single change and shift with this draft Bill is the onus on certainly local authorities, that they have a duty to report this to the police. I think the point you make about victims as opposed to perpetrators, I am sure the police would agree we are after the people that organise the trafficking. We are not after the people who are the victims of organised trafficking, and that is certainly something that is absolutely at the heart of this. The response then needs to be about joining that all together, and I think this Bill is moving us in the right direction.

Andrew Boff AM: Thank you.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: DC Mackey, we have talked on a number of occasions about my concerns about this affordability gap with young police recruits in terms of now those who can afford it and those who cannot. When we last spoke, you were telling me about --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): The bursary schemes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: -- the bursary schemes. Can you put that on the record?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Of course. You have got the letter I sent?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, I have not, but --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, of the MPS): Oh, sorry.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: -- I have been in so many meetings and I have not seen my post for days.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): So that the wider audience are aware, we have been discussing the issue around how we can support people on low incomes to fund the Certificate in Knowledge of Policing which is a prerequisite for entry. There is a letter for you - hopefully it is sitting on your desk - that explains that as of March a bursary scheme will be available that allows successful people coming through parts of our process the potential to use an interest-free loan to fund it. The full details of that will be on the MPS website when it is launched so everyone can work through and see if it works for them. The other thing to be aware of since we last spoke is that there are a number of the colleges and providers who are also offering similar types of scheme and funding.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Good. So that is across London?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Across London.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is very good. We have moved on, and again, there is a number of cases that I have picked up in my constituency covering Hackney, Islington, and Waltham Forest, and I am sure that there are cases elsewhere.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): I think there are, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: One was quite sad, because one brother was able to get in and the other one could not because the family could not afford it. I did offer them a meeting with you, as you graciously offered, but the second son has decided he is going off to be something else.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Well, maybe we will get him later in life and he can come and join us with those experiences.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is our questioning today, so thank you.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner of the MPS): Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It is nice to end on some good news, so thank you.