

AGENDA

Meeting	Police and Crime Committee
Date	Thursday 12 January 2017
Time	10.00 am
Place	Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts where you can also view past meetings.

Members of the Committee

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman)
Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair)
Kemi Badenoch AM
Sian Berry AM
Andrew Dismore AM

Len Duvall AM
Florence Eshalomi AM
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Keith Prince AM
Peter Whittle AM

A meeting of the Committee has been called by the Chairman of the Committee to deal with the business listed below.

Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat
Wednesday 4 January 2017

Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: Joanna Brown or Teresa Young; Telephone: 020 7983 6559; Email: joanna.brown@london.gov.uk/teresa.young@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458

For media enquiries please contact Mary Dolan, External Relations Officer on 020 7983 4603. Email: mary.dolan@london.gov.uk. If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf.

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা assembly.translations@london.gov.uk এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے assembly.translations@london.gov.uk



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda
Police and Crime Committee
Thursday 12 January 2017**

1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chairman.

2 Declarations of Interests (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Joanna Brown, joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Note the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

3 Minutes (Pages 5 - 122)

The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meetings of the Police and Crime Committee held on 1 December 2016 and 15 December 2016, to be signed by the Chairman as correct records.

The appendices to the minutes set out on pages 11 to 60 and pages 65 to 119 are attached for Members and officers only but are available from the following area of the GLA's website: www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee

4 Summary List of Actions (Pages 123 - 140)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Joanna Brown, Joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to note the completed and ongoing actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report.

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Pages 141 - 142)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Joanna Brown, Joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to note the recent action taken by the Chairman, Steve O'Connell AM, under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree the arrangements for the Committee's scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan.

6 Response to Violence Against Women and Girls (Pages 143 - 148)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Joanna Brown, Joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to note the response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to its report, *Violence Against Women and Girls*, as attached at Appendix 1 to this report.

7 The Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan (Pages 149 - 152)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Becky Short, becky.short@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4760.

The Committee is recommended to note the report, as background to putting questions to invited guests on the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan and to note the discussion.

8 Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Pages 153 - 156)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Becky Short, becky.short@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4760

The Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Agree its updated work programme, as set out in the report; and**
- (b) Agree that a site visit to a Metropolitan Police Service custody suite will be held on Wednesday, 1 February 2017.**

9 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Thursday, 26 January 2017 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall.

10 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 12 January 2017

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests¹;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

¹ The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

Member	Interest
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley
Kemi Badenoch AM	
Shaun Bailey AM	
Sian Berry AM	Member, LB Camden
Andrew Boff AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Leonie Cooper AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Wandsworth
Tom Copley AM	
Unmesh Desai AM	Member, LB Newham
Tony Devenish AM	Member, City of Westminster
Andrew Dismore AM	Member, LFEPA
Len Duvall AM	
Florence Eshalomi AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Lambeth
Nicky Gavron AM	
David Kurten AM	Member, LFEPA
Joanne McCartney AM	Deputy Mayor
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Keith Prince AM	Member, LB Redbridge
Caroline Russell AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Islington
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Fiona Twycross AM	Chair, LFEPA; Chair of the London Local Resilience Forum
Peter Whittle AM	

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. The appointments to LFEPA reflected above take effect as from 17 June 2016.]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
 - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
 - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

UNLESS

- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.

- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985	
List of Background Papers: None	
Contact Officer:	Joanna Brown and Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers
Telephone:	020 7983 6559
E-mail:	joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and teresa.young@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES

Meeting: Police and Crime Committee
Date: Thursday 1 December 2016
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee>

Present:

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman)
Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair)
Tony Arbour AM
Andrew Dismore AM
Len Duvall AM
Florence Eshalomi AM
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Keith Prince AM
Peter Whittle AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements (Item 1)

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from: Kemi Badenoch AM for whom Tony Arbour AM attended as a substitute; and Sian Berry AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

2.2 The following declarations of non-pecuniary interests were made by Members, for reasons of transparency, in relation to the discussion on policing and security in and around the London Stadium at Agenda Item 6:

- Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair) as a Trustee of the West Ham United Foundation;
- Len Duvall AM as a West Ham United season ticket holder; and
- Keith Prince AM as a member of West Ham United Football Club.

2.3 **Resolved:**

(a) That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

(b) That the declarations of non-pecuniary interests relating to West Ham United by Keith Prince AM, Unmesh Desai AM and Len Duvall AM be noted.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 **Resolved:**

That the minutes of the Police and Crime Committee meetings held on 3 November 2016 and 7 November 2016 be signed by the Chairman as correct records.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 **Resolved:**

That the completed and ongoing actions arising from the previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report, be noted.

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

5.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the recent action taken by the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee, Steve O'Connell AM, under delegated authority, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree the report on Violence Against Women and Girls arising from the Committee's discussion at its meeting on 8 September 2016, be noted.**
- (b) That the letter to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and report on Violence Against Women and Girls, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.**
- (c) That the recent action taken by the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee, Steve O'Connell AM, under delegated authority, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree that this meeting will be used for a discussion with invited guests to examine policing and security in and around the London Stadium, be noted.**
- (d) That the recent action taken by the Deputy Chair of the Police and Crime Committee, Unmesh Desai AM, namely to agree that the Chairman send a letter to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime setting out the conclusions from the Committee's review of preventing extremism in London at its meeting on 6 October 2016, be noted.**
- (e) That the letter to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime setting out the conclusions from the Committee's review of preventing extremism in London, attached at Appendix 2 to the report, be noted.**

6 Policing and Security in and around the London Stadium (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, as background to putting questions to invited guests on policing and security in and around the London Stadium.

6.2 The Chairman welcomed the following guests:

- Commander BJ Harrington, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS);
- Linda Lennon CBE, Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185;
- Alan Skewis, Director, E20 Stadium LLP;

**Greater London Authority
Police and Crime Committee
Thursday 1 December 2016**

- Sheila Roberts, Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham;
- David Goldstone CBE, Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC);
- Mark Camley, Executive Director of Park Operations and Venues;
- Peter Miller, Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd; and
- Baroness Karren Brady CBE, Vice-Chairman, West Ham United Football Club.

6.3 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 1**.

6.4 During the course of the discussion Commander BJ Harrington, MPS, agreed to:

- Provide a copy of the special policing service agreements for charging that have been put in place (on a match-by-match basis) to date;
- Inform the Committee whether there would be a statement of intent and information-sharing agreement, as set out in the College of Policing guidance, *Authorised Professional Practice: guiding the Service*, with West Ham United Football Club in the future; and
- Ensure the Committee received a response to its questions about the wider policing issues of the Park and surrounding area on non-match days, to which he was not able to provide a response at the meeting.

6.5 During the course of the discussion, Alan Skewis, Director, E20 Stadium LLP, and David Goldstone CBE, Chief Executive, LLDC, agreed to provide the contract between E20 Stadium LLP and London Stadium 185, subject to any information that would not be deemed to be releasable under statutory exemptions pertaining to the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

6.6 During the course of the discussion it was agreed that the Chair would write to Linda Lennon CBE, Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185, with questions regarding the licensing hours of the stadium on football match days and on the permanence of the stewarding arrangements.

6.7 At the end of the discussion, the Chairman thanked the guests for their attendance and helpful contributions.

6.8 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the report and discussion be noted.**
- (b) That the Chairman writes to guests requesting the follow-up information as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.7 above.**

- (c) **That authority be delegated to the Chairman, Steve O’Connell AM, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM to agree any required output from the Committee’s scrutiny of policing and security in and around the London Stadium.**

7 Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

7.2 **Resolved:**

That the work programme, as set out in the report, be noted.

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The date of the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 15 December 2016 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent (Item 9)

9.1 The Chairman stated that, in accordance with Section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, he had agreed to hold a discussion on a report by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary on *National Child Protection Inspections:– The Metropolitan Police Service 1 February to 27 May 2016*, as a matter of urgency, the special circumstances being that the report had been published after the main agenda on 24 November 2016 and this would be the first opportunity for the Committee to hear how the MPS intended to take forward the recommendations in the report.

9.2 At 12.17pm, with the consent of the meeting, and in accordance with Standing Order 2.2C, the Chairman announced a short adjournment of the meeting.

9.3 The Committee was reconvened at 12.25pm.

10 Child Protection Investigations in the Metropolitan Police Service (Item 10)

- 10.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to a discussion with the MPS on HMIC's report on *National Child Protection Inspections: The Metropolitan Police Service 1 February – 27 May 2016*.
- 10.2 The Chairman welcomed Commander Nick Downing, MPS, to the meeting.
- 10.3 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 2**.
- 10.4 During the course of the discussion, Commander Downing, MPS, undertook to provide:
- The average caseload of staff working in the area of child protection and the supervisory ratio; and
 - The current figures for staff working on child protection.
- 10.5 At the end of the discussion, on behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked Commander Downing for attending the meeting and for his helpful contributions.
- 10.6 **Resolved:**
- (a) That the report and discussion with Commander Downing, MPS, be noted.**
- (b) That the Chairman writes to Commander Downing, MPS, requesting the information as outlined in paragraph 10.4 above.**

11 Close of Meeting

- 11.1 The meeting ended at 12.55pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Joanna Brown or Teresa Young; Telephone: 020 7983 6559;
Email: joanna.brown@london.gov.uk/teresa.young@london.gov.uk;
Minicom: 020 7983 4458

Police and Crime Committee - 1 December 2016**Transcript of Item 6 - Policing and Security in and around the London Stadium**

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Welcome, guests, to our discussion on policing and security in and around the London Stadium. We have a number of guests here today, more than we would normally have, and that is partly because of the importance of the issue but partly because of the number of parties and interests around that area and it is important that we have the right number of people.

I will start the morning. I am a football person. I was around in the 1970s and 1980s and I understand the history of football violence over the last 20 or 30 years. We had gone away from that. There were some instances around the stadium this year that Londoners have taken an interest in and we have a responsibility around scrutinising safety in London. It is an appropriate subject for us today to take a keen interest in, not just in London Stadium itself but in the wider area. We have colleagues from Westfield and elsewhere today to talk to us.

I will start, with the first question reflecting particularly on this season's violence within and around the stadium. It is probably best to Linda [Lennon CBE] initially and then I will bring in BJ [Harrington, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)]. How many of West Ham United's [Football Club] football matches at the stadium to date have resulted in significant levels of disorder or violence?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Good morning, Chairman. Just to explain, I am the Chief Executive of London Stadium 185 (LS185). We are the operators of the stadium, which means that we are responsible for providing the services in the stadium: catering, stewarding, security, for example.

In terms of what we have seen in the stadium - and you asked a question about significant levels - this has to be borne in mind, very much as you were saying, in the context of what is happening in football across the country. We had one match, which was the Chelsea [FC] match, when there were six arrests. That was the one match which probably elicited some headlines. However, if you put it into perspective, there have been only 18 arrests so far, only nine of which were West Ham fans. If you look at that pattern and you compare it with the Boleyn Ground¹ () last year, it is on a par and we have over 20,000 or 25,000 extra people now in this Stadium.

I do not know if Commander Harrington wants to add to that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I will come back on that. It is great that you introduced yourself. Because we have a number of guests, when you do come in for the first time, it would be helpful to Members to remind us of the context of your organisation and where it sits.

You said the number of arrests this season is comparable to Upton Park and the Boleyn Ground last season in numbers, but - and, again, I will bring in BJ [Harrington] - I would like some clarification, probably from the police, on that. Violence within football grounds, in my sense of it, is largely a thing of the past and that has been a great success for London particularly and other parts of the country. We will have questions later about costs and things that Andrew [Dismore AM] and others are going to come on to.

¹ Former home of West Ham United Football Club

Your comments are that violence within London Stadium has been comparable to last season. Would you say that?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): I am not saying that that is -- "violence" is a really strong word, is it not?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That was what it sounded like, yes.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Chairman, I just wonder if I could come in for a moment. I am David Goldstone CBE. I am the Chief Executive of the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC). We are the development corporation for the whole area in which the stadium sits and we have the wider regeneration responsibility. As you said, we do have a number of parties here because we have different responsibilities in relation to the stadium.

If I could just make two or three points, by way of context for the whole discussion, first of all - and this may be obvious but it is important to say - we all feel absolutely committed to the safety and security of people visiting the stadium, visiting the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (the Park) and the wider area on match days as on all other days. That is an absolutely paramount priority.

It has been a really small number of people who have misbehaved and have caused some headlines, but we have had over 500,000 visitors to the stadium this season and we have had over 500,000 to the stadium last summer for a series of other events. As Linda [Lennon CBE] said, there were 18 arrests in the 11 games so far with 500,000 people attending. It is a small number. It is too many. We all want to reach the point where there are no such incidents, but it is at a low level. The police will be able to compare more broadly to other matches and other venues, but it is a small number.

We are not denying that there have been some issues - there have - but we are in the context of a stadium that is a new venue for football, it is within the Park, which is a new venue for hosting a stadium, and there has been a bit of getting used to those new arrangements, new teams, new teams of stewards, new policing and West Ham [United FC] moving to a new ground. We do feel like the misbehaviour is the fault of the people who have been misbehaving. We do not think the stadium has caused it or the police have caused it. The Club has not caused it. It is the misbehaviour of some individuals.

We are all here because we are all working really closely together to try to absolutely minimise and eradicate those issues as far as possible. We are putting in arrangements as we have learned from those early games and we can talk about those in more detail, but there is a range of areas that have already helped to improve the position and make sure that match day incidents are minimised. There has been really close working between the police, Linda's [Lennon CBE] team at LS185, the club and all of the parties here.

We do feel like we have made really good progress. There have been only a relatively small number of incidents anyway, but we already have a number of improvements in place that will help make that position even better.

Also, just lastly, the stadium is a really big part of the wider legacy and the regeneration of the area we are bringing. It does bring great numbers of people, activity and economic benefits to the local community. There is that side that we would not want to lose, either.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): We understand that the stadium is used for a range of events and what we are trying to understand is the aspect of West Ham [United FC] using it and how that works, whereas there are many other events within the stadium when there probably is not a problem.

We can get on to some of the design around it later. Some of the disputes were around seating and you can probably come in later, but you were placing people who were used to standing in places where they were not allowed to stand and then there was friction. As a football person, I understand that.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Sure. I can respond on that. We can deal with that issue later.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): I want to hear from the police anyway.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Of course.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): BJ [Harrington], could you comment a little specifically on the violence within the ground? Is that unusual? Is that unusual compared to other London FCs? Tell us a bit about the context of what you have seen this season.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you, Chairman. If I can, I will introduce myself. I am BJ Harrington. I am the chief officer with strategic lead for policing football in London.

We have had 11 matches that have all been policed at the London Stadium this year and only four of those have resulted in any form of disorder. It is really important to deal with the facts, for me. Only at one of those have we seen violent disorder reported and that was at the Chelsea [FC] game. I think everybody saw the very clear and unacceptable behaviour, the deployment of policing, the work of the stewards and a number of arrests as a result. There have been 18 arrests within the stadium, nine of which have been West Ham [United FC] fans or have declared themselves as West Ham fans.

I would for the Committee’s benefit just say that the most serious offence was violent disorder that had been recorded at the Chelsea [FC] game. The most serious other recorded offences have been actual bodily harm.

Whilst unacceptable, this disorder has been localised. If I were to put that in comparison with other forms of disorder that we deal with in London, I would suggest that it is important and it is significant but “significant disorder” is something that I would not describe it as, with the exception of the Chelsea [FC] game. I would stress that there have been seven matches when there have been no issues and no disorder.

In answer to your question about how this relates to other stadiums and the wider policing of football, there were only two other incidents that compare with the Chelsea [FC] game that I could report from this season. One was at Tottenham [Hotspur FC] v West Ham [United FC] on 19 November 2016 when there were 23 arrests and also at Brentford [FC] v Reading [FC] on 27 September 2016. These were the only other significant issues in London when I would say that it was serious disorder. In terms of your question, on par with some other clubs, this is unusual in terms of that.

In comparison with last year, it is difficult to compare different seasons but, if we looked at the four matches [AFC] Bournemouth, Watford [FC], Southampton [FC] and Sunderland [Association FC], which West Ham [United FC] played at the Boleyn Ground last year and had played at the London Stadium this year - there were four arrests at those matches this year and no arrests at those matches last year. That is a direct

comparison. [The match against] Chelsea [FC] is very different because of the Cup dynamic and the home derby position. Is this unusual? Yes, it is.

I would come back to the point that there is lots of learning in terms of new partnerships, new individuals and new challenges in a stadium that has 25,000 extra fans. We are not - and neither are the people attending - familiar with the norms of routes and so things from a policing perspective - flashpoints, areas where we would expect problems - we just do not understand because the people attending themselves are developing those. Of course, we have had to work together to get to a point where we understand and deal with those challenges.

I would conclude by saying that if you look at the results from the Stoke [City FC] game, where that partnership had matured and the things we have learned together we had put in place - whether it was the policing, the stewarding, the stadium or the club - you will see that at what was a category C or high-risk fixture in terms of potential disorder, there were no issues and there was no disorder.

A final point, Chairman, I would make is that the real issue here is about a small but significant minority of people who associate themselves with football, in this case West Ham [United FC] and - I must stress - other visiting supporters, who are intent upon crime and disorder. That is at the core of this issue and that is why we arrest and are working so tightly with our partners to prevent these people and exclude them from ruining football.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I am going to bring in, in a minute, Karren [Baroness Karren Brady CBE], if you would like to come in, Baroness, to comment from a West Ham FC point of view, but I wanted to mention that in a minute the Deputy Chair is going to come in and talk about outside the ground. We know that whilst many FCs have managed well within the football grounds over the years, that has often pushed the violence outside and the Deputy Chair is going to talk about that, but I have two points before [Baroness] Karren Brady CBE can come in.

One thing is about how there are not problems within the football grounds at the moment because the segregation has improved so much over the years. I shall be visiting West Ham [United FC] later this season when my club goes there. One of the problems perhaps is around the design of the ground whereby the segregation between fans is not perhaps what it should be. Perhaps you would like to comment on that.

Secondly, my last point - and, again, I will bring Karren in - is that the Chelsea [FC] game was a high-profile game and, from a policing and safety aspect, there will be other potentially high-profile games, which will be high-risk. You may have Cup games against one or two teams that you particularly do not get on with. I would like your thoughts about managing the high-risk games. There is the segregation piece and also the high-risk games and your thoughts around that and then West Ham could come in, please. Do you want to comment on that?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Chairman, segregation is in my area later.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I just wanted to ask a direct question. As a football person, I understand that [segregation]. If you could just briefly touch upon segregation, we will explore it a bit later.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): The first point I would make is that the key issue here is this core minority of fans who are intent upon disorder and will work around the police and will try to evade any kind of control in order to engage in disorder.

At the stadium itself, the segregation has developed through the season. If you look at the Stoke [City FC] game, I am entirely satisfied and think it is highly effective. We saw that at that game, when there were no issues. A segregation line has been developed and built. It is a case of learning with the design of the stadium and also the way that the police, the stewards and the club have worked together to ensure that that segregation is effective.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Are you highlighting and targeting particular games? Are you anticipating during the season there will be high-level games that you would have to put special arrangements in? We will get on to that a little bit later around costs and things.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I would say that the proof was in the Stoke [City FC] game. That was a high-profile game and a high-risk game in terms of the policing perspective. The segregation that was put in place by the stadium working with West Ham [United FC] and in terms of the police support was highly effective. That is the model that we have now accepted as a partnership. When the risk of disorder at the stadium is high, we will put those measures in place. I think my colleagues here would agree that that is the plan we have.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): This is one of the areas I was referring to where there has been improvement already implemented from early learning. It is joint working and a joint approach that was adopted by the club with Linda's [Lennon CBE] team at LS185 and the police. The segregation is now different to how it was at the start of the season.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are going to cover that more fully, David. Karren, sorry. Would you like to comment, just for the scene-setting, on your take or the club's take on what the problems were and how you are addressing them?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): We all accept there were teething problems, as there always are when you move to a new stadium. Let us not forget that it is one of the biggest stadiums in the country.

To put some perspective around it, as already Linda [Lennon CBE] and BJ Harrington have done, of the 18 arrests, nine were West Ham [United FC] supporters and that is for the 11 matches so far this season. Just to give the Committee some context, there was a game at Aston Villa [FC] a couple of weeks ago and at that one game there were 14 arrests and at [Queens Park] Rangers [FC] there were 18 arrests. We are coming up now to about the halfway point of the season and there were 18 arrests at West Ham [United FC]. Just to, again, give the panel some perspective, Arsenal [FC] had 16 arrests for the whole season last year and Manchester United [FC] had 57 arrests.

We accept that any kind of disorder is disruptive to us and to our supporters' enjoyment of the game, which is why we are working so closely with both the police and the operators to eradicate it. However, we want to put some perspective into it. We have learned from some of the issues that we have. We have implemented strong and decisive action and we are adamant as the police and the operators are that we want to eradicate the problems.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That was helpful. Thank you very much.

Andrew Dismore AM: I wanted to ask BJ Harrington about the College of Policing document in a minute but before I do that, just on arrests, when I saw those films of violence on the television inside the ground and so

forth, there were rather more than half a dozen people involved in it. It was just that you did not get it captured. Is that right?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): There have been 18 arrests inside the stadium. To date, following the inquiries, there have been 27 arrests in total. That is both in the ground and away from it. There is an ongoing inquiry, Operation Stoke, which is looking at all the closed-circuit television (CCTV) footage, working with the club and LS185, to identify people whose behaviour is unacceptable so that the Club and the stadium can ban them. We can use that intelligence and information to apply for a ban when it is on an intelligence basis under section 14(b) of the Football Spectators Act where we do not have to have a crime committed. We are looking at identifying another 18 people from various incidents to make the arrests and to seek both criminal convictions and also alongside that, if [we obtain] the convictions, to get bans against them.

Andrew Dismore AM: The number of arrests so far is not an indication of the extent of the problem?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): The number of arrests inside the stadium is factual and I have been clear about that. There have been 27 arrests in total related to the whole West Ham [United FC] policing operation and that has a broad footprint, as you know. There will be more arrests as we identify further people because, as you saw from the footage, there were more people than have been arrested involved. We need to identify them and we need to get the evidence against them. As I said, to go back to my point about it being a small minority of people who are ruining football, the right thing is to make sure we convict them when they commit criminal offences and get them banned from football.

Andrew Dismore AM: I wanted to ask you about the College of Policing *Authorised Professional Practice*. Does that apply to these arrangements?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): In what respect, sorry?

Andrew Dismore AM: I am going to ask you some questions about it. The College of Policing has produced a document called *Authorised Professional Practice: Public Order and Policing Football*. Does that apply here?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): It would do, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: All right. You are the police Commander football policing lead. I think that is what you said.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): That is correct.

Andrew Dismore AM: There are various duties set out for you in the College of Policing document, one of which is to ensure that the right paperwork is in place. I was going to ask you whether the four documents that the College of Policing recommends are in place here. First of all, is there a statement of intent that has been put in place with a FC which reflects the division of responsibilities including when to take primacy; for example, during major incidents? Is one of those in place?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): We do not have a statement of intent in place with the club or a special policing service arrangement in place with the club.

Andrew Dismore AM: You do not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Not at this stage, no.

Andrew Dismore AM: The next thing I was going to ask you was whether you have the charging agreement in place with the club.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): No, there is no special policing service agreement under section 25 of the Police Act in place at this stage. However, for the Stoke [City FC] game and going forward --

Andrew Dismore AM: I will be coming on to the detail of charging later on and so --

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): In answer to the question, to give a full answer to that question, we have an agreement now with LS185 - the operator - that we will have match-by-match agreements around section 25 special policing services. There was one in place for the Stoke [City FC] game and there is one in place for the game on Saturday [3 December 2016] against Arsenal FC].

Andrew Dismore AM: I will be coming to that in more detail later on this morning. That is two documents that do not exist at the moment. Do you have --

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Sorry, Chairman, can I just say? There is no special policing service ongoing in place. For the game against Stoke [City FC], there was a special policing service agreement in place. There is a special policing service agreement in place for this Saturday's [3 December 2016] game. On a match-by-match basis between LS185 and the MPS, when it is required on the advice of the match commander and special policing services are requested, we will make those agreements on a match-by-match basis so that they are in place when required.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do you have an information-sharing agreement with West Ham [United FC]?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Not that I am aware of, no.

Andrew Dismore AM: No? All right. A public order command structure, presumably, you do have?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. For every match, there is a public order command structure put in place - Gold, Silver and Bronze - and a suitably placed operation that is proportionate to the threat that is posed.

Andrew Dismore AM: Good. What is in your control you have, but two of the key documents - and they are called "key documents" by the College of Policing - the statement of intent and the information-sharing agreement you do not have. The charge agreement, the third one, is on a case-by-case basis.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): The special policing service agreements are being made on a case-by-case basis.

Andrew Dismore AM: It is, to my mind, a matter of concern that we have a College of Policing document here setting out good practice and it has not happened. It is an open question, I suppose.

In relation to the charging agreement for the special policing service, can we see a copy of the one that you have so far?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I do not have that here with me at the moment but --

Andrew Dismore AM: No, I would not expect you to have it.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): -- you can. Of course you can, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: It would be helpful. I am concerned that those key documents do not exist. It sets out here in detail what they should cover and it is rather surprising that it has not been done so far.

Also in the College of Policing document it refers to the definitions of "risk" and "non-risk" supporters and says that "there must be a specific reference to the actual risk posed by individuals or groups" in the descriptions. Has that been done?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. At every game, there is an assessment based upon a national matrix, which covers a number of factors that I can list and which looks at what the grades of those games are.

Chairman, if I can come back with that point, for every match this season there has been an assessment of the threat that the game has posed. There has been work with the stadium operator to agree a proportionate policing operation with a command structure. When we have been able to charge under the guidelines - and I am sure you will come on to those - we have charged for those services, for the things we are allowed to charge for. Whenever police have been called to discharge their responsibilities - prevent and detect crime, protect life and property or keep the Queen's peace - there has been an operation in place to do that.

Andrew Dismore AM: Good. We will come on to charging later on. There will be quite a few questions about that, I am afraid.

Looking at the two games so far, the Stoke [City FC] game and the Chelsea [FC] game, were those assessments of the risks posed by individuals and groups done for both of those games?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): When we make an assessment, there are a number of factors that are brought into question in relation to that: the history of the clubs, the stadium, the number of people attending. A number of factors come together in a grading system as to whether it would be a C - a high risk of disorder - or indeed police-free, which is the aspiration for all of these games when it is appropriate.

Andrew Dismore AM: See, what the guidance says is this. It is not guidance, actually. It is rather stronger than that. It is professional practice. It says:

"It is essential that the risk in relation to individuals and groups is quantifiable and dynamically assessed. The description of a group or individual as 'risk' is not sufficient on its own; there must be a specific reference to the actual risk posed by individuals or groups."

Has that been done for those two games?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): For every single game, yes, it has, Chairman. For every single game, there is an assessment of the match itself in its entirety on a number of factors to give it a grade from A through to C being the highest risk.

When there are specific individuals who are identified, we will take specific action. For example, if we knew someone was under a banning order and we knew they were attending, we would be actively briefing to look for that person. When we had any intelligence that there were specific issues, we would seek to identify that. We deploy dedicated officers, whom we call "spotters", who are familiar with working with different groups of supporters to identify people whom we know are either concerned with or have an affiliation to the disorder that we talk about. We monitor them, we engage with them, we deter them from taking part and, when they commit offences, we intervene to prevent that.

I would say in answer to that question: proper and thorough risk assessments, proper and thorough grading both about the game in its entirety and also about individuals when those individuals are identified as posing a threat to crime and disorder.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I have quite a few questions. Chairman, I must firstly emphasise something that you touched upon in your introduction. This investigation is not just about disorder in and around the stadium; it is actually about policing and security issues concerning the Park as a whole. We have an iconic venue in the stadium itself and we have restaurants, but we also have a growing number of housing developments and a growing community. I really want to take the focus away from the stadium, if I can.

My first set of questions is to you, Commander. What is the policing strategy for the Park generally as a whole and how does it differ on match and non-match days and for other events?

You also talked in your answer to the Chairman's question about a partnership maturing. How do you do that with others like restaurants, for instance? Could you give examples of what you described as this partnership maturing? Also, where is the nearest operational police station?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I will deal with those questions in two parts, really. My responsibility is around policing football and there is a clear strategy in place for policing football across London. I have that here. I wrote that strategy and it applies to the whole football policing operation.

In terms of the policing of the wider Park on non-match days, it is a matter that is dealt with by the local Borough Commander in terms of Newham Borough and I know that there is a dedicated police team in place. I do not have and have not seen the strategy for policing that and so I do not have that to answer that question now.

In all honesty, I do not know where the nearest operational police station is. When my officers are deployed in terms of football policing, they are deployed to the ground and the environs and are controlled from central London.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I do not want to be critical, but when you were invited to this meeting, presumably you were told about what the scope of the investigation is and what we are looking at.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I was given some information about the scope of this and about --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): It is difficult for me to take this further if all you can say is that you are responsible only - which I accept - for policing on match days, but my question is really related to the policing of the Park and in particular the residents. There is a growing community --

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Can I --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I am going to bring you in later, David, if you do not mind.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I was only going to say that the security of the Park more generally we can maybe help with, not just the policing but the security arrangements that prevail across the Park. I am happy if you want to pursue the line of questioning with Commander Harrington, but in terms of how we manage the security and safety in the Park generally, we can help you with what --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Ms Roberts [London Borough of Newham] looks after the licensing functions, David, and I am going to come to you later as well. I am more interesting in the policing aspects of the Park as a whole and particularly the residents, the people who live there, and also how you work with other agencies. You have talked about the partnership maturing. I am a bit frustrated if all you can talk about is the maturity showing itself on match days and not on other occasions.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): As I described in relation to this, I will have to come back and answer. If there are further questions about the wider policing of the Park on non-match days, then I am afraid I cannot help the Committee.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, but presumably when you have such a massive development - yesterday, I was down at Barking Riverside, another growing township - you do look at these things in totality, do you not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. In terms of match days --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): You should also have an awareness of the wider aspects of your football-related operations?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, and that is absolutely part of what we do on match days: make sure we link in with local [police] officers, make sure we are taking account of the disruption and the issues --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, I know, but you keep on talking about match days. I do not think I can take this any further, Chairman, if he feels he cannot answer --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We have an empty chair there, which is for the Borough Commander.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): That is not the Borough Commander. The Borough Commander is [Chief Superintendent] Tony Nash.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is the Chief Inspector, would you say?

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): David Moorhead, yes, whom I do know.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Is David here? Could he help at all with the conversation?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): He could. He could help in relation to that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): David Goldstone wants to comment but, giving [Chief Inspector] David [Moorhead] time to come down, you might like to have some questions on --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I do have a question for you, David [Moorhead], now coming up, but I suppose I really cannot take this any further with you, Commander. It is a bit disappointing but --

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Deputy Chair I am happy to deal with those questions outside of the meeting and answer those questions as required.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): It is good to have these issues explored in public. That is the whole purpose of this scrutiny exercise.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I understand that.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): If I could come to you, David, what do you see as the challenges in keeping the Park safe and secure and how do these challenges change on match days?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am pleased to say that generally on the Park, in the two-and-a-half years since the Park fully reopened, we have had a really successful relationship in terms of its function with large numbers of people and with very low numbers of crime, disorder and issues of safety. We do operate a Park safety and security regime. We have a control room on the Park and that is part of how we liaise with all the relevant agencies, including the borough and of course the police, who work with us in that way.

In terms of crime and disorder, we have had the numbers month by month vary at around 10 or 11 recorded incidents of crime per month. Again, we would want to keep that as low as possible but they are very low. In any comparative exercise, the Park - and when I say "the Park", I am including the wider communities such as Westfield and the new housing developments that are coming - has proved itself a safe and very popular environment. We are getting now towards 6 million visitors a year through the Park and that is increasing with the football attendance, the other developments that are coming and the new employers that are coming in; yet we are running a regime where people are enjoying the Park, enjoying the experience and not causing trouble.

The second half of your question was particularly about match days when there are particular arrangements in place, which are relevant to all of the attendees here. The control room and the Park arrangements we have for the Park generally on those days - and there is integration and co-ordination between the Park and the arrangements that are put in place through Linda's [Lennon CBE] team and through the police - are part of what is reviewed in the Safety Advisory Group that Sheila [Roberts] takes responsibility for.

The co-ordination of events - and again, of course, major events in the stadium and in the Park - is not new this year. Those arrangements were used last year when we had the five Rugby World Cup matches. We have had Diamond League athletics on a number of occasions over the last recent years. Those arrangements are pretty well tested and proven on major event days in the stadium, whether they are football or other events. Of course, now we have hosted our first concerts as well and have had even bigger capacity crowds. We have made major events in the stadium. We have had concerts at the Copper Box on the same night as matches or

concerts in the stadium. Those crowd-management issues and those safety arrangements have been proven to work very successfully.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Let me come back to you, David. I will turn to you, Peter. Westfield has a large footfall of people, especially on match days. What safety and security issues do you experience when football and other events are taking place in the stadium and how are these issues mitigated?

Peter Miller (Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd): I am Peter Miller. I am Chief Operating Officer (COO) for Westfield. I run Westfield's business here in the United Kingdom (UK) and Europe.

One of the key things that is a priority for us is the health, safety and security of our customers, the public, retailers and also all the other occupants of our estate, including visitors to the hotels, office occupiers, etc. It is of primary importance that we have safety and security for the success of our investment in Stratford, which is substantial, and all our stakeholders. We have invested over £2 billion in developing our estate there, including the retail, office, and hotels, etc. It is very important to us that safety and security is upheld.

You mentioned a huge footfall. We have 47 million people visiting our shopping centre annually. That means about 1 million a week, just to put that in perspective, and about 200,000 on a busy Saturday when the football matches are being played. The shopping centre itself has a capacity of about 35,000 people and most days, if you have been down to the shopping centre, you will see that it is crammed full. It is a very busy shopping centre and very successful. Being a catalyst for regeneration in the area, it is fundamentally important that the 10,000 jobs that are created by the centre are held and sustained for the future. A lot of the people who are employed there were long-term unemployed before we developed the estate.

Putting all of that in context, the challenges for us are really the fact of the hard egress at the end of the match when a lot of the football spectators have to exit from the stadium and get to the railway hubs. In doing so, they have to cross over our land with the Town Centre Link Bridge and getting into the Northern Ticket Hall is also going across our land. That requires an interface with our customers and with the general public. Our primary objective, working with other stakeholders here, is to make sure that, as I said, our customers and the general public, as well as the football fans, are well looked after, they are safe and secure and we do not have issues.

We are actually at the pinch-point of the egress. I do not know if you have been down there but there is a very complex egress. We have had to work very intensively with all the stakeholders to make sure that that safety and security is upheld. It has been a constant review process with all the stakeholders here to make sure that we can mitigate the risks associated with it. Football fans, as you hear, are not like Olympic spectators. There are some non-compliant elements in there and we have to make sure that there is security as well as crowd management.

The bridge itself is a complex crowd-management area because we have to allow for the fans to go down Montfichet Road, up the stairs and over the bridge and we also have to allow our customers to get into the shopping centre and visit the [Queen Elizabeth] Olympic Park because not everyone is watching football. Also, we have to make sure that the customers and visitors to the [Queen Elizabeth] Olympic Park can get out over the Town Centre Link Bridge. It is very complex management of that and that is always under constant review because it is a very big concern to us to make sure that there are no issues on the bridge.

Also, when exiting into the Northern Ticket Hall, again, customers have to get out of the Northern Ticket Hall and they have to get into the shopping centre and - vice versa - they have to get out of the shopping centre into the Northern Ticket Hall and get home safely. When there is a hard egress and at times when there is a

peak ingress period, we have to make sure that those interfaces are well managed and that the security and safety of everybody concerned is properly administered and executed.

Those are some of the complexities we deal with. Football has its other challenges but generally, combined with our other stakeholders, we run 40 to 50 crowd-managed events a year in and out of the stadium and other venues that are in the [Queen Elizabeth] Olympic Park. There is a huge amount of collaboration that goes on with all the stakeholders to make sure that those events are expertly managed, executed, well-planned and well organised.

Westfield has a long track record of managing huge events. We have a team that is probably the most consistent through the period since the [Queen Elizabeth] Olympic Park was launched. In fact, we opened in September 2011 and since then a lot of our team is still intact and so they have had a lot of experience managing big crowds right through the Olympic Games and through all of the big events that David [Goldstone CBE] and his team have attracted to the Park. We believe we have a huge amount of experience and knowledge base in working as one of these stakeholders in this team over here. I call it a "team" because it has to be a team. If we are going to be successful and get a stabilised, long-term, sustainable solution to this, then we have to operate as a team and we have to be absolutely joined. The communication has to be second-to-none.

Those are some of our challenges. For us, it is really important that we have a commercially robust solution here that is sensible in the long term for everybody and that there are the right resources allocated to this. Everybody is sitting around this table - and some of the key stakeholders not represented here - have invested a huge amount both commercially and individually in making sure that Stratford City is an enormous regeneration success. That is what we have been steering towards. It is a success and we need the future success to be underpinned by making sure that the crowd management, the whole Stadium and all the reputation of Stratford City as a location is underpinned. We are certainly invested as a company in working intensively to find the right long-term solutions to this and that is our mantra.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I am going to bring Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] in but we have some unanswered questions that the Deputy Chair has posed about the broader policing aspects that we will probably need some answers to, but we can touch upon those.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I wanted to ask Peter, have your retailers noticed a drop in footfall when there have been match days. Particularly given some of the incidents that have occurred, I would have thought many shoppers might decide to avoid going to Westfield on days when there are football matches on.

Peter Miller (Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd): To date, it is very hard to measure whether there has been a drop in footfall because we have added footfall that comes in because of the football. A lot of football fans come into the shopping centre before the match. After the match generally there is a hard egress and people want to get home, but we offer the opportunity for people to come back into the shopping centre once the hard egress has taken place. Therefore, it is very hard to measure whether there has been an impact. In fact, the footfall at Stratford has been growing dramatically since the opening and, as I said, we are now at 47 million and that is growing positively.

We are all very concerned - particularly in Westfield - that we have a long-term, sustainable solution here that does not detract because we have a massive investment. As I said, over £2 billion is invested just in our facility by our joint-venture partners - the Canadian Pension Plan and APG, which is a Dutch pension fund - and Westfield itself. We also have the hotel owners, the casino owners, all the retailers and the cinemas. We have plans now for residential development on our site and office buildings. Then we have the nearby stakeholders

who have invested a lot like Lendlease, [Taylor] Wimpey and East Village partners as well. It is growing and it is a real success story.

From the retailers themselves, we have had comments. It would be wrong for me not to admit that we have had comments from some retailers to say that on match days their turnover is down. It is interesting. The restaurants, the pubs and the leisure facilities are up because of the nature of football, but some of the retailers have commented that they are seeing a comparable drop in turnover during matches. It is hard to assign that to the matches themselves. There are a whole lot of factors that can influence that --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: There could be, but you probably need to be careful. That is why it is important us having this discussion today because you could end up with people saying that it is a no-go area on certain days. When cycling is on it might be fine, but people may feel, when football on, "Actually, I do not want to be in that area at that time because I do not think I am going to be safe. That is why our discussion today is really timely to make sure that we do not see that loss of people using the facilities.

Peter Miller (Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd): That is why we are all working together so intensively. It is not just about the retail; it is about everything else that is there.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Of course, the wider things.

Peter Miller (Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd): There is a lot being invested in residential and people are wanting to live in Stratford and are wanting to make it a community and a great place to be, to live, to work and to play. We want to make sure it is a success. A lot of people have invested a lot of time and money in this and it is important that we have a long-term, sustainable solution.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Could I just add one point to that? I agree with everything Peter has said and Westfield has been a great success and is a big part of the wider regeneration benefits of the area. We all want to help sustain and support that success.

With the arrangements we have on match days - and Peter explained some of the challenges - we have in place now perfectly satisfactory and working routes that do not go through the shopping centre but go around using the roads and around the Park into the stations. We have a number of stations around the Park as well, but for Stratford Regional itself we have two different routes without going through the shopping centre. It works fine.

As we were all saying, we are always looking for how we can improve that further. We have Chris Allison [CBE, former MPS Assistant Commissioner and appointed by E20 Stadium LLP to help ensure crowd safety] working with us now in terms of other opportunities in how we all work, including looking at egress and the ways out from the stadium through to the transport system and if there are further improvements. It is working now.

We are not taking spectators through the shopping centre. Spectators, if they do not want to go into the shopping centre, go straight into the station through the other routes and therefore, as Peter said, they touch Westfield land on the bridge or on their way into the station but it is not into the shopping centre itself. Shoppers should not feel that pressure.

Peter Miller (Chief Operating Officer, Westfield Europe Ltd): Certainly not, no.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): One of the points to make from West Ham's point of view is that we are going to be there for the next 98½ years and Westfield is our

neighbour. We are working together. Peter wants to protect the commercial interests of Westfield - and that is totally legitimate - and our supporters need access. A lot of these issues have been dealt with in the Section 106 [Agreement] and the planning permissions and all of the other things that Westfield has to abide by, but we want to work with them so that our supporters who want to make their way to the station can make it as quickly and as effectively as possible and those who do want to go and enjoy the facilities at Westfield, of which there are many, are able to do that. It seems to be working OK.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Caroline's point was a good one because, clearly, the outcome that we all want is for people to visit and to shop and to live safely and not to see those images that we were seeing a few weeks ago and think, "I do not want to go there on that day when West Ham are playing". That is, clearly, what we want to be able to proof against and that is the work that we want to help you with today.

We have a few questions about the Safety Advisory Group.

Peter Whittle AM: Yes, they are technical things, really, relating to security and safety. Can I start by asking you, Sheila [Roberts]? You are here from the London Borough of Newham, but can you just tell us what your role is?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): Yes. Effectively, I have two roles. I am Strategic Enforcement Manager and part of my remit is to deal with the licensing and certification of the stadium. I also chair the Safety Advisory Group. One is a regulatory role and one is an advisory role.

Peter Whittle AM: Can you shed some light on the actual planning process for us for ensuring security and safety on match days?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): It starts quite early prior to the general safety certificate being issued. That safety certificate does require certain safety arrangements are in place and the whole ethos of that safety certificate is to ensure public safety.

There are many operational arrangements that need to be in place through the operations manual. The certificate requires stewarding plans; it requires medical plans; it requires fire plans. There is a whole list and I am quite happy to go through if you want me to go into more detail but, basically, it puts in the arrangements to make sure that safety is adhered to and that when spectators enter they do so in a safe manner. A lot of it is around safe evacuation and there is a time limit put on that of eight minutes. There is detail about the egress routes, the ingress routes, the number of gates and the number of turnstiles.

Pivotal to that is the Safety Management Team and I am very satisfied with the safety management arrangements that are in place. The Safety Management Team are very experienced and very knowledgeable. They make arrangements to put the plans in place and then, after every game, there is a review. If there are learnings to be made, the Safety Management Team put those into place very quickly. It is overseen by the Safety Advisory Group but, as a regulator, it is important that the safety certificate is complied with and that is the whole point of that.

One of the requirements is that there must be a fulltime safety officer in place at all times during the game.

Peter Whittle AM: One?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): There is a deputy, actually, but in terms of the safety certificate there has to be a safety officer there at all times. If there is not a safety officer there, the spectators are not allowed to enter into the stadium. It is quite an absolute requirement.

In terms of monitoring, there is internal monitoring that happens through the delivery of those safety arrangements. There are preopening checks before every single game anyway and so the doors do not open unless everything is in place, which includes messaging, includes the fire safety plan, includes the stewards and includes the postings. The safety officer has ultimate responsibility but, as the regulator, so far we have attended every event that has taken place, football or not football. The Sportsground Safety Authority also has a role in this because it issues the licence that allows the spectators in and it has also monitored every single game that has taken place so far and every event, in fact.

Peter Whittle AM: Could you explain to me? Sorry, I just simply do not know. With the safety certificate, how long does that last?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): It lasts until something changes. The current one was issued in August [2016] and the capacity for pitch games is 57,000.

However, if there is an application to change that or vary it, the safety certificate would be reviewed and then would have to be reissued. That is in terms of capacity and any of the arrangements that change in a major way. It is a dynamic document.

If there are small arrangements, it is fine and they can take place within the existing conditions on that safety certificate. For example, as has been mentioned before, there is a risk assessment that takes place before every game that takes into account intelligence and other information. That happens before every game and the provision for that is within the safety certificate and so anything that has been put into place as a result of learning is catered for.

However, if it is something major, if there are new seats put in, if there is any structural work, if a greater capacity is desired, there is an application made and then it is incumbent on the Safety Management Team to tell us what safety arrangements are going to be different.

There are two issues that are important in terms of capacity. They are called the “p-factor” and the “s-factor”.

Peter Whittle AM: The “p” factor and the “s” factor?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): “P” stands for “physical” and so that is the physical arrangements. They are the means of escape, how long it takes people to get out, how many seats there are, whether they are in the right place, sightlines and lots of detail. That will determine the figure for capacity. Then there is also something called the “s-factor”, which is about the safety management arrangements and that includes people, really: stewards, the Safety Management Team. Those two [factors] together should equal one. The p-factor should be one part, which relates to the number of spectators that they are applying to be there, and the s-factor is one part which basically means that everything is satisfactory before people enter into the stadium.

If there are concerns, through the Safety Advisory Group - it is quite a large Safety Advisory Group and, as you will appreciate, there are a lot of partners involved in this - everybody has a voice in that. If they have

concerns, they address those concerns through the Chair of the Safety Advisory Group - which is me - to the operator and it is the operator's responsibility to come up with solutions, which, as I said, they do in a proactive way anyway. If there are any further concerns, they are dealt with in that group.

Peter Whittle AM: You have explained that very fully, but you chair the group that is overall responsible for the safety of the stadium?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): Just semantically, the Safety Advisory Group is an advisory group, as it says. It is really to advise the local authority on how to administer the safety certificate and to advise the operator on how to comply with the safety certificate. In terms of overall responsibility, we are the regulator and we regulate as a certifying authority through the safety certificate. They are slightly different. In effect it is the same but, in terms of responsibility, I have to be clear that the Safety Advisory Group is an advisory group.

Peter Whittle AM: Thank you.

Alan, with the safety certificate, what is the detail about expectations for safety? What is the detail in the certificate?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): I am Alan Skewis. I am the Director of E20 Stadium LLP, which is a joint venture set up between the LLDC and the London Borough of Newham to own the stadium over the 98½ years that Karren [Brady CBE] has mentioned already. We employ LS185, of which Linda [Lennon CBE] is the Chief Executive, to run the stadium on our behalf. That was just by way of background.

Linda makes the application to Sheila [Roberts] for the safety certificate and manages all of that. Our role is to get the reassurance that that is being done properly and Sheila provides the assurance that the certificate was given and is in place.

Peter Whittle AM: Basically, what are the expectations, as it were? Can you just be a little bit more detailed?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): Yes. I will answer and then hand over to Linda [Lennon CBE]. We expect that LS185 has a certificate in place for an s-factor and p-factor that is safe, works for the whole Stadium and at a capacity that is agreed and in place. We use the Safety Advisory Group, the second part of that - and we have an active role in that - to make sure that there are adaptations within that group that mean we are improving and that any issues have been raised and learnings from games have been addressed.

Peter Whittle AM: I see.

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): Linda, did you just want to explain?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Overall, there are something like 31 different conditions that we have to comply with.

Peter Whittle AM: Yes, that is what I really want to know about.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Sheila [Roberts] has mentioned some of them. A really good example: we talked about pre-event checks. Forty-eight hours before and 24 hours before, my team is ensuring that the public address system is working so that if we have to evacuate

people, they can be evacuated safely. My team is also working with our stewarding providers to make sure that, depending on the risk assessment and the intelligence, we have the right number of stewards and the right type of stewards and we know how we are going to deploy them.

We also do a much wider planning piece as well with the club, with Westfield and with Transport for London (TfL) because each match is different. We share intelligence. We look at the plans. Do we need to change anything? For me, it is an iterative process. We are constantly learning. We are not sitting there and thinking, "That match was good. Tick the box". We are actually looking at it and thinking, "What can we do better?"

I think that some of you are looking to come and visit us. That would be a really good idea because then we can take you into the control room. We can show you the multi-partnerships that are there, what the individual roles are and how we work together to deliver that.

Peter Whittle AM: You mentioned that you monitor after each match and all the rest of it. Could I just therefore ask you, again, what the Safety Group concluded specifically about the recent disorder at the West Ham matches?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): It has been said. It was a very small minority of ticketholders who seem to be bent on causing disorder. It is not a general reflection of what happens there. It is unfortunate that it has had a lot of publicity, which, in my view as Chair of the Safety Advisory Group, is unfair. In terms of public safety, there have been learnings and developments and, as I said, it is a dynamic situation and it is assessed after each one. In terms of the actual disorder itself, it is a very small number of people who have done that --

Peter Whittle AM: How many?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): It has been mentioned already. There have been 18 arrests and then 27 from further investigation.

What is important is to separate the visitor experience from the actual safety issues. There have been publicised issues about persistent standing and sometimes that can reflect on safety but is also about the visitor experience. That has been dealt with quite firmly through the Safety Advisory Group because it is difficult. As has been said, there are families, there are young people and there are elderly people who might not be able to stand and it does affect their experience. That does not necessarily mean that it impacts on public safety. The role of the Safety Advisory Group is really to talk about public safety.

Although it is regrettable and it should not happen, there are plans in place every time it does happen to deal with it. The operator has put in different segregation arrangements. There have been response teams that augment the role of the safety stewards. There is an arrangement with the police now every time it does develop and it does grow. Therefore, my answer would really be that people have come with that intent.

Peter Whittle AM: Could you just indulge me one more question? It is totally off the subject, actually, but I am just interested now that you are here.

Would you be, therefore, looking at and taking a great deal of care over possible attacks on, for example, the ground? I am thinking of the terrorist attacks that have happened in football grounds.

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): It has been addressed after the Stade de France issue. There was a different searching regime instigated, again, suggested by LS185.

At the moment, it is 100% bag checks and people are physically checked as well. They use the wands and they pat down the away fans. It is always something that people are concerned about. It is part of the stewards' briefings as well. There is an awful lot of CCTV in there. The Stadium is well aware of hostile reconnaissance visits that might take place. There has been some training offered by the MPS in that regard. It is something that there is an awareness of and everything reasonable is being done to try to stop that, yes.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The police have a primary role in this respect and I do not know if we can bring Commander Harrington back in.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. Nationally through national counterterrorism we have done some guidance and counterterrorism design advisors have spoken to every club, including West Ham [United FC], to bring that knowledge and experience and to improve the security, hence the increased bag checks. All officers are briefed in terms of the current terrorist threat level and are aware of those issues in the briefing. It is an integrated plan between the two. We have clear emergency plans, which are integrated with the stadium, to respond to any incident, whether it be terrorism or otherwise. We will continue to monitor the threat to sporting stadiums and put a plan in place should that threat increase.

Peter Whittle AM: I know it was a bit off the subject, but the fact is that with Stratford City and the football matches there as well, it is just pay dirt for a terrorist wanting to make an attack. It is just a huge target.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Just to come in, this is interesting and we wanted to talk about this anyway, which is the point of it, because we did not want to concentrate on just the arrests and disorder. We wanted, particularly led by the Deputy Chair, to spread the debate to the Westfield because of the large amount of numbers.

The understanding on that point - and Len [Duvall AM] is going to come in - is that the Safety Advisory Group has responsibilities around that as well and will be looking at the large numbers coming in on the day. You do not look at that?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): Indirectly, not directly. Clearly, that is a police issue. The safety advisory role is really to make sure that if there is an incident, everybody gets out safely in terms of that emergency --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Out of the ground as opposed to the broader piece?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): Out of the ground to a place of safety or a place of relative safety, yes. The whole island is subject to the safety certificate. As I mentioned before, everybody must be out within eight minutes and all the doors would open. There would be PA systems, they would default to the open position and everybody could get out very quickly. In terms of stadium design, that is a positive thing about the London Stadium. Everybody can get out very quickly, certainly within eight minutes.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): If the questions are about the broader area, which I think you were asking about, the Stratford area and the stadium and the interface and how, if there was such a threat, it would be managed and co-ordinated, would it be OK if I brought Mark Camley in? He co-ordinates all of this for us with the partners across the area. We do have co-ordinated plans, we rehearse, we activate them. That is something that Mark leads on, which is why I wanted him to be here.

Mark Camley (Executive Director of Park Operations and Venues, London Legacy Development Corporation): Thank you. I am Mark Camley. I am the Executive Director of Park Operations and Venues across the Park and the wider LLDC estate. We take an overarching role on business-as-usual operational safety and we work closely with all the partners during match day events. We have a control room where the partners join us for what is happening in terms of egress and ingress on the Park and controlling that.

Particularly in relation to counterterrorism, we have hostile vehicle mitigation measures across the Park, which includes the parkland and each of the venues, including the stadium, to make sure that we can protect against a Nice-type of attack. We have extensive CCTV and partnership agreements in place with the police. We work closely with them on any intelligence that they might have.

We also, as David [Goldstone CBE] indicated, exercise regularly on desktops, which look at non-event days and event days, and we would do them on event days. That is with all the partners. We have done them at Gold level and Silver level. We have ensured that, in terms of command-and-control and communications, there is clarity about, if there was an incident, who would take primacy and how that would be managed through. That includes each of the blue-light services, it includes TfL and it includes Westfield in those plans as well. The local authority is also involved, as is LS185 when we have an event day.

Peter Whittle AM: Thank you very much.

Len Duvall AM: I was not going to come in, but it does beg the question. Listening to you all as we come in about - I get it - a mature partnership with people working together for sustainable solutions to the issues, really, I do not get any feeling of some of the preplanning and some of the discussions.

On the counterterrorism issues, how did we get into a situation where Airwave was not, [working]? Given that this is an iconic stadium and a target for terrorism, somehow it fell through the cracks. That is how it appears from the information we have been given. Who should we hold to account for this? Are you all jointly responsible for not getting adequate emergency communication into the stadium at the very beginning before we did these things? What went wrong with that bit?

I am just following up on Peter's [Whittle AM] issue. It does seem to me one of the failures at the moment. As a user observing some of these issues, it was not rocket science to have avoided some of the headlines that we have had. A bit more thought in the process with different elements could have avoided some of these problems.

On the back of the terrorism question, how have we got into a situation where we do not have proper emergency policing [communications] inside the ground in a stadium that has had, from the public's point of view, a considerable amount of investment go into it? Where was this on the list of priorities for the people looking after the safety of the users of the ground when dealing with those issues? Who is at fault?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): If I begin in terms of the broad question, the stadium had Airwave for the 2012 [Olympic and Paralympic] Games. It has not been overlooked. However, the stadium, as you know, has been substantially transformed in the period since 2012. It has effectively been redeveloped from the temporary or demountable stadium that was built to host the Games now into the permanent multiuse venue we know now where we can both host West Ham's long-term arrangement as our anchor tenant and bring in concerts and other events. It is a completely different structure.

Airwave was installed and we have operational arrangements now in place so that the police can deploy using tactical arrangements so that they are covered for the communications they need. Commander Harrington, I am sure, will come in on this. We have agreements in place that it will be fully operational from February [2017]. There is no major omission that has occurred. Until the transformation was complete, it was not really possible to precisely configure the way the system was going to work, but there is a technical detail to that that the police would be better commenting on. The police have been able to deploy when they have needed to deploy into the stadium. They have done and they did before even before the tactical arrangement we have in place now was in place.

Therefore, there is not some major omission that you need to worry about that goes into the counterterrorism risks, but probably Commander Harrington should pick up on that.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): First and foremost, there is no reason with the absence of a full in-building solution that the police cannot deploy inside the stadium. Indeed, when we have been called for crime and disorder, we have done and that has been seen. If there was a terrorist incident, we would deploy into the stadium.

Going forward from this point, there is a tactical solution that allows, as you have heard, the deployment of officers in a special policing service arrangement for preventative policing. From February [2017], going forward, Linda [Lennon CBE] and I are overseeing the implementation of that with Airwave and that will be a full in-building solution in operation.

It has not affected the way we have policed the stadium and it has not affected the ability of the police to respond. There are lots of places where there is no Airwave coverage we deploy to in terms of terrorist incidents.

Len Duvall AM: Chairman, it does get into the question of why that was not rebutted if you are giving me reassurance - which you are trying to do but I remain unreassured - that there was a temporary solution in place for all these matches or just when the trouble started to occur. That is the bit. I do not believe everything I read in the press, but I do recall police officers giving one of the reasons. A MPS police officer quotes one of the reasons they found it difficult was because they never had a system to communicate with each other.

Which is the true story, then? You had a temporary system that allowed you to do your policing operations from the very beginning of matches taking place in the stadium all along. In February we are going to have the fully fit-for-purpose service in terms of this important element. I do not understand why that is the case still. You have not reassured me at all.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Airwave guarantees coverage for officers outside buildings. That is part of the contract that it does for us as the police service nationally and as the MPS. There is coverage inside the stadium and we can deploy into the stadium to deal with issues. The issue is that it is not guaranteed by Airwave.

If we are going to put officers into the stadium under a special policing service agreement, which is asked for by the stadium and which is a discretionary service that a Chief Constable can offer, then we have to ensure under health and safety legislation that we guarantee the coverage. That is why we have insisted on and asked for and indeed been provided with, in the interim, a tactical solution that allows us to do that and, in the long term, this full in-building solution that will be --

Len Duvall AM: When did you insist on that, then? What was the timeline?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): In terms of the changes to the stadium, the final requirement for what was required to do this in-building solution was available from Airwave only on 3 August [2016]. LS185 has funded that and we have then pushed the installation of that within the quickest possible timelines. Be assured that we are holding Airwave to account to make sure that that is delivered as quickly as is feasible. I do not have the technical knowledge to describe it but it is a significant investment.

I come back to the point that there has never been the inability for police to deploy inside the stadium whether in terms of a terrorist incident or, indeed, in terms of disorder and we have done.

I would caveat all of this by saying that the aim for policing is not to have officers inside the stadium because it is a private event and there is very good stewarding to do that. These officers come from boroughs and are taken from other parts of policing London to do this. We will deploy them only when we are requested to and when the operational need is there.

Len Duvall AM: Or when you have specific intelligence that it might kick off, presumably? You could insist on that in your intelligence and your grading system earlier on? As in the Chelsea game, when I understand you had specific intelligence from both Chelsea and West Ham that there were issues, you could have insisted on deployment of officers inside the stadium much earlier. Is that true?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): There was specific intelligence for the Chelsea [FC] game. We will always seek to prevent that. The operational plan in that case was to identify those people who might cause problems outside the ground, which we did. We brought some of those people to the ground. We used legislation to disperse a group of those and we sent them away from the ground, ticketholders whom we feared would commit crime and antisocial behaviour. We used that legislation to send them away. We did everything to reduce that disorder and then worked with the Club inside.

Len Duvall AM: In your wider Prevent role, then, do you think you should maybe on occasions be of a bit more assistance to the people you are dealing with about some of the threats you might both be faced with and say, "Normally, we would have a discussion about this and it is your event, but we are going to insist that we want X, Y and Z to happen on this occasion"? Do you feel in that Prevent role that maybe the police should be a bit more insistent with the people you are dealing with?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): We are insistent when we need to be. We have a good partnership that allows us to reduce those.

I must stress that this is a small minority of people out of the 56,000 people who are attending London Stadium. We have clear plans for dealing with those and identifying those. We are satisfied that the stadium and LS185 have clear arrangements overseen by the Safety Advisory Group, as you have heard. I am quite certain that if I had the need and I was not confident in those, I could come to the partnership or address the Safety Advisory Group to make those changes and they would listen to those.

In terms of the Chelsea [FC] game, it was a high-profile, high-risk game. We identified it as such. We had an extensive policing operation. I think you have seen the number of officers deployed. There was an extensive stewarding and security operation, which - let us be honest - was effective. There was a small minority with unacceptable and inappropriate behaviour, which the club are dealing with in terms of bans with the stadium and we are investigating and seeking bans in the courts and to prosecute people.

I am very confident that if I asked, I would be listened to. I am very confident that the plans we have had so far have been effective. There are different challenges at every game as things develop and - I will come back to the Stoke game - all of that collaborated learning and all of that knowledge has shown that now we are in a place where we identify threats, as in the Stoke game. Our tactics together - the police, the stadium and the club - are effective in preventing crime and disorder and doing all the things we want, which is to make it a safe place and a place that people can experience and feel that they can come to safely.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are going to have some questions a little bit later specifically about policing and stewarding, but the point that we are reflecting upon is that this stadium particularly seems to have a need for police, whereas other stadiums in London at the moment during football matches have virtually nil police requirements, in the main. We are getting on to that in a minute.

We still have questions from Florence [Eshalomi AM] about the banning of fans. One last question will be around the safety certificate and that process. Because, uniquely, this stadium has a number of partners, many of which are here, unlike other football stadiums that always have to apply for a safety certificate - and the applicant in that case would be potentially the owner of the stadium, which in most cases would be the FC - and would have the prime responsibility around that, here it is more confused and conflated.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): The owners of the stadium delegate that responsibility to me through my safety officer.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): The question begs - and it is what I call the Notting Hill question - if, God forbid, something bad happened, who has the prime responsibility in the stadium and a legal responsibility for safety?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): My safety officer is responsible for that on the match day events. He is the one who controls all the operations and who would make the decisions if, for example, there needed to be an evacuation. It would be really good if you would come to see the control room because --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are coming along. No, that is the operational piece. There may not be a simple answer. David, you are going to leap in on this, no doubt, and we get loads of reassurance here and so let me just say that.

Just from a legal point, if something particularly bad happened within the ground, in the stadium, who would be at the end of a legal process?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): E20 Stadium owns the stadium. In our contract with LS185, LS185 is responsible for that and getting the safety --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You are the owner, so --

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): It owns the stadium, but we have a contract with LS185. It has the responsibility for the safety and control in the stadium.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is what I wanted to understand.

Florence Eshalomi AM: We touched on fans and the number of arrests earlier on. Of the 18, I am correct in understanding that nine of them were West Ham [United FC] supporters. To both Linda [Lennon CBE] and BJ [Harrington] and definitely you, Karren [Brady CBE], in terms of those fans, how many of them have been banned from attending matches for this season and how many have received lifetime bans?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I will just deal with the legal issues around that. At this stage, none of the people arrested this year have so far been given bans. There are two sorts of bans: there are bans on intelligence and bans on conviction. Until we get convictions, we cannot ask the court for those bans. We will do. There are two bans underway from arrests from West Ham [United FC] this year and I do not know the exact progress of those. As we convict people of criminal offences, we will - and the court is obliged to - consider banning orders under section 14(a) [Football Spectators Act 1989]. Where we get intelligence that we think meets the threshold under 14(b), we will go for the civil injunction type of bans. We are quite good in relation to that.

We have 302 bans - I am just looking for my exact numbers in relation to that - across all people who call themselves football supporters in London. West Ham [United FC] has 38 currently; Millwall [FC], 51; Chelsea [FC], 59; and Tottenham [Hotspurs FC], 29, to give some comparison. As I say, we will seek bans on everyone who is convicted and we will seek bans where they meet the threshold for the civil injunction type ban based upon intelligence. That is a process that takes a number of weeks around that. Separate to that, of course, there is the club, and I am sure Karren will --

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Karren, do you want to pick up?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): Yes. Anyone who is identified as causing any form of trouble is identified through their ticket purchasing and banned. We work in conjunction with LS185 because we can ban them from football, and LS185 has to ban them from the stadium. It is a joint process.

It is not always straightforward identifying people because if they are in an area causing trouble you have to follow them back through the CCTV to their seat to identify them in their seat, which gives you the name and address and the details of who they are. It is because the stadium has such excellent CCTV that 71 people have been identified and banned.

Florence Eshalomi AM: How are those bans being enforced and how successful would you say they have been?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): They are banned from the stadium and from West Ham [United FC] matches. Their details are issued. They are issued with the ban. Some have appealed. Some have successfully appealed when it has been a case of mistaken identity. They are circulated to other FCs. That is the process of the ban.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Effectively, their season tickets and the membership cards are revoked and so they would not be able to work then at the turnstile.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): In terms of those legal bans, the court's ban, we have a dedicated football liaison officer, Andy Shelton, who works dedicated to West Ham [United FC]. We have dedicated teams of intelligence officers. They know the people who are on these bans from the various clubs. The officer is deployed a brief as to who they are. We attach specific conditions, not only to deal with,

“You cannot go to the match”, but also to say, “Not within two miles of a Premiership match, not within a borough where a Premiership match is taking place”, and we actively monitor and look for those people and, when we see them, we make arrests. Of course, that extends to travel abroad for international games, where we have ports monitoring operations to make sure they do not.

So far, as far as I am aware, there have been no breaches of the legal bans for those that have been issued to people who are affiliating themselves with West Ham [United FC]. Therefore, it is highly effective and they do not come to the games and we can control them away from the games as well.

Florence Eshalomi AM: That is reassuring. This is not an issue that is isolated to West Ham, but do you think there is more that the club could do in terms of targeting those regular, persistent offenders who are seeking to undermine the club’s name?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): Those that can be identified have been identified and have been banned. That is within our power to do, and we work very closely with both the police and LS185 to physically go and identify them and have a big team of people whose job it is to watch the CCTV.

We are also constantly communicating with our supporters about what is important in terms of stadium behaviour, but I have to really point out that the majority of West Ham supporters are passionate and well-behaved. We are talking about a really small minority which we have worked very hard to identify and ban, and that has been very successful.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Thank you.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): We have a few questions now around the stewarding segregation and logistics.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Yes, I want to pick up on the logistics. I have to say I am finding it incredibly confusing this morning understanding how it all runs. I thought the LLDC was in charge of everything out there, and it turns out you have two other organisations I did not know existed until I had my briefing.

To Alan [Skewis], Linda [Lennon CBE] and BJ [Harrington], what is it that is so different about the London Stadium - I still think of it as the Olympic Stadium - compared to other stadiums? Why is it posing perhaps a greater risk to safety and security?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I will start and I can answer from a policing perspective. It is a new stadium. It is newly used for football. Again, you have this minority of people exploiting that in terms of exploring it and in terms of the vulnerabilities of any new place. The complexity of the wider footprint is unique. The multiple entry points and the different Tube stations, the different transport networks from the two rail stations, Pudding Mill Lane, the Docklands Light Railway, all of those are things that spectators are learning. If you go to the Boleyn Ground, people knew which way to go, they knew where they parked their car, they knew which pubs or restaurants they went to and they knew which way they walked up. They are learning those things and so those are changing. Of course, for us, that means that those people intent on disorder are creatures of habit, and we would know where the flash points and where the issues were so that we could police those quite easily. We are learning those because they are learning those, and that is, as I say, about that learning together around that.

The issue of migration around the stadium is an issue because those people are intent and they can move around the stadium, and I think the Club and LS185 will talk about how they are dealing with that. I will leave them to deal with what they are doing and the useful work they are doing to control that. Things like the actual Olympic Park itself, it is a wide open expanse. With most stadiums in London, there are natural segregations by streets, by furniture, by roads, by cars. Here, you have multiple points of entry and, in policing terms, they are very difficult to segregate. That is why you will see larger numbers of police deployments this year, particularly at Chelsea, not to deal with the disorder, but almost to allow us to segregate and prevent the disorder because there are not these natural barriers.

Another element around it is unique in that it is a novelty to come to the London Stadium, and that is attracting people who perhaps would not have come to the Boleyn Ground and people who are intent on disorder, and that is a real factor. We have to contend with that, with all these other issues. In policing terms, those are the things that make it a new challenge. I would say that we are learning those challenges. We are learning more each time and allowing to adapt our policing tactics to challenge those and identify those, which are different risky groups of supporters are starting to use. What that allows us to do then is to use other legislation, licensing legislation, to put controls around those pubs, which is what we do normally. Until those norms of behaviour have been set out by the fans attending, and once they establish what they are going to do, then we can understand who we police and react to those threats and prevent the issues.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Caroline, just in relation to the broader responsibility you referred to that we have, as Commander Harrington said, most of those challenges relate to it being new. The context of this is we are 11 matches into a 99-year relationship. Those challenges do exist, but things have already got better, and they not only can be addressed but are being addressed and have made improvements already. That is the context we would want to see it in.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: In terms of logistics and layout, what is so different? Commander Harrington has said it is partly that it is new, it has multiple entry points, and it is transport, but what other things? As you manage the stadium yourself - you are the Chief Executive - what is it that you think is so different compared to others?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Commander Harrington mentioned about the free movement. It is easier for people to get around the stadium. One of the things we have started to introduce now is much more hard checking of tickets, making sure people are going to the right seats and challenging them if they are not. We have also done a big review and it has been very much a joint partnership effort with the Club, with the police, with the local authority, looking at the segregation. The segregation plans were designed, they were passed and everybody felt that they were fit for purpose, but obviously there was one breach at the Watford game. We reviewed all those plans. The actual segregation areas have been extended. We have created a sterile area and those away supporters who are higher up the stadium cannot then throw things down on other supporters below them. We have also created a dedicated segregation route outside of the stadium from when the away supporters leave the stadium and come out to the exit. We now have a dedicated segregation report there.

Again, all of that has been refined and tested. The really good challenge for us, Caroline, was at the Stoke [City FC] game, because there was quite a lot of intelligence around there, and it passed off without incident. There were no issues around segregation then at all.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I will get into the segregation in more detail in a minute. Maybe, Alan, you might be able to help here. Is part of the issue that the stadium was originally designed for athletics, but the design bit is causing problems? We have heard it reported that there are some issues that it is an all-seated

stadium, but some West Ham fans stand in the game, and that causes tension, and also that away fans have been asked to file in through a narrow entrance with only eight turnstiles, and there are delays and frayed tempers and people concerned about crush. Is it that how the stadium was designed is causing some of these issues?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): The stadium is a multipurpose stadium. It is designed to host athletics, football, concerts and a whole series of events, but a lot of the work that has gone on since 2012 to transform it --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: It was not really designed for football. That is the point, is it not? It was designed for athletics events.

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): It is designed as a multipurpose stadium, but a lot of the work that has gone on since 2012 when it was designed for the Games themselves has been to transform it so that it is able to hold football matches in a safe, suitable manner. As people have alluded to on the panel, we have definitely gone through some areas of learning about how you manage football crowds at different games. I would go back to the game against Domžale [FC] or the Juventus [FC] game at the start. The free flow around the stadium worked absolutely perfectly, really well. It really added to that event for the supporters. We are dealing with the 56,900-and-whatever supporters who were there to enjoy it in that type of stadium.

However, the measures which Linda [Lennon CBE] has alluded to - putting extra segregation in, managing away supporters in and out of the stadium - are things we have learned and have put in place to ensure the safety of the stadium. I believe the stadium works as a multipurpose stadium. It works as a football stadium. The measures we have put in place have added to that and have reflected the learnings we have had over the last three or four months. I am absolutely confident that it is a suitable stadium that is safe and can host fantastic games at West Ham with 57,000 - and our aspiration is even to go higher than that in time - in terms of the capacity of the venue.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): There is one point I should add as well. The stadium itself has been designated Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) Category Four status, which is the highest possible status a football stadium can be granted. This means that, for example, it can host a Champions League final. In terms of its suitability for football, it absolutely is suitable.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Therefore, it is just getting these logistics right and, as you say, it is very different if you are going to a pop concert where people will happily wander around, but if you have different fans you might want to segregate. Let us move into the segregation bit. You have talked about more hard checking as you go around. Do you think that the problems with segregation - and you have changed what you do now - have been part of the problem for fans clashing at the earlier matches?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): Yes. After the initial games in the Premier League, when there were 3,000 away supporters in the ground, very quickly, collectively between West Ham [United FC] and us, we increased the segregation line to the upper and lower tiers to increase the distance between supporters and put additional stewards into those areas. We were literally standing in the areas and West Ham's safety officer and advisers were providing that advice and changed that. That has transformed the segregation of away and home supporters in those areas in terms of the risks to any games. It is definitely a very good example of a quick response to an issue that was identified in those early games and definitely helped to manage the risks when we came to the highest-risk game we have had, the Chelsea [FC] game, in later times.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Can I understand in terms of the seating? We have been told previously there had been little formal segregation between rival fans and basically it was achieved by stewards physically standing between the crowds and by leaving some areas of seating empty. What more are you doing on that now?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): There was a physical difference, which is fenced, which then has stewards between them, which is standard within other games at Emirates Stadium. That is the way it works.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I do not go to football and so this is an education.

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): The addition, which was quickly put in, was to take seven to ten rows of seats in addition to that fence and cover them so that there were no supporters in those areas. That creates a sterile area between supporters which, first of all, means it is more difficult for them to get close to each other and, secondly, means there is a significant distance there between them. That was further extended more recently just to provide that safety-first approach, and the club moved some supporters from further up --

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): Just to help you, all FCs have segregation of one form or the other. It is either physical in terms of a physical barrier, which we have; seating, which is kept empty, which we have; or people, and that could be stewards or police or a mixture of both. That is the same for every FC in the country.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You have increased it since your early games to make sure, but you feel you have increased segregation. You have increased it.

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): Absolutely. What you will see in the stadium on Saturday, if you watch it on television, is different and it is an expanded solution to what you would have seen in the first Premier League games.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Just talk me through - this might be David or Peter [Miller] - outside of the stadium how you are segregating fans to the transport links, to the restaurants and bars of Westfield and how you are managing that.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): For the segregation immediately coming out of the stadium, the responsibility does sit with LS185. It is not confusing; LS185 has, as Linda said, the full operational and safety responsibility for fans inside the stadium and on their egress through to the station services.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Linda, it is all down to you.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): There is a separate turnstile that away supporters go in and exit out of. There are now physical barriers when they come out of the stadium that take them out and down to the edge of the footprint of the stadium. I also have a dedicated team of experienced egress stewards, people who are very experienced in moving large numbers of crowds safely across the Park, and that is what they do. There are various what I would call stop points so that if crowds are starting to build up in a certain way, they can stop the crowds - we call it pulsing - so that they can control the flow of the crowds going through the Park and along Montfichet Road until we get to the transport hub.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): At every football game, inevitably, the crowds come out and at some point - you do not segregate them forever - people merge and you say you do not go to football but there is always a point at which that operation comes to an end and people merge. We do go further probably here in the sense that we have arrangements through the Park, but they become members of the public who are going about their daily business at a point beyond the stadium. The police I think would confirm that is normal; I do not think what we are doing is significantly different. It is a different landscape, but the nature of the operation is how it works with other clubs around London and the country.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): What is also quite critical is that at half-time my safety officer chairs a briefing where the police match day Commander will be present and other police colleagues and they just review what has happened in the match so far. Are they happy with the egress plans that we have already documented? Do there need to be any changes? Do the police need to have anybody deployed or not? That is done on a match-by-match basis and works really well as well.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): That is an important point. We will adjust our deployments post the match to support that segregation immediately outside the turnstiles, and also to any known risk, again, back to this risk assessment element at half-time. If we think there is going to be a particular problem, either on intelligence or the way we think people have come to the game, we will adjust the police deployments to put them in a place where they can best: (1) prevent; and (2) respond to any incidents that develop as people exit.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I am pleased about the sterile areas because that is the norm in football grounds, where you would have a bank of seating - 10, 15, 20 rows - covered over. Clearly, you did not have that for the Chelsea game because you just had a line of stewards.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): We did. It was the camera angles.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes. Somehow, a lot of these people have managed to get within -- I will not say the word that they were shouting at each other.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): It does appear that way and that is the way the camera angle of the photograph was taken, but they never actually came together anywhere in the ground. There was never any breach, whether that was in the bowl, on the concourses or anywhere else.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It appeared that there was just a line of stewards.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): No, that is not correct.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): That is not correct. The sterile area, as it has been described, was in place for that game.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): There should have been a sterile area of about 20 rows of seats, frankly, but, anyway, Andrew [Dismore AM], you wanted to come in.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): You will probably remember the photograph of the Chelsea [FC] supporter who reached the netting and stood on the netting.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): That is where you would have seen it.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Was that about as near as they got to each other?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): Yes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is fair enough.

Andrew Dismore AM: I suppose this is nothing new to sports fans because they had it in Constantinople in Byzantine times, which was the greens and blues.

While we are on Byzantium, I want to try to untangle a bit the relationship and the Byzantine arrangements between your three different organisations. One thing I would like to try to establish, first of all from Alan, is whether you pay Linda [Lennon CBE] to do the job for you or whether Linda pays you for the privilege of doing it.

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): The way our contract is set up is that we pay a number of costs to Linda for her to run the stadium on our behalf and take all the responsibility taken. Linda is over the time of the contract - that is a long-term contract - going to provide me with more money back from that to make it into a net profit for E20.

Andrew Dismore AM: When you send a bill - and I will come on to this in a bit more detail - to Linda and Linda pays the bill, do you pass the bill on to Alan?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): It is part of our fixed costs budget and so we have an allowance for that and would pay that out of the fixed cost budget.

Andrew Dismore AM: It would be helpful if we could see the contract between E20 Stadium LLP and LS185. Can we see that?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I cannot remember exactly when, but I believe we released it under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) previously.

Andrew Dismore AM: If not, can we see it? Yes? Is that a yes?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): As ever, we will need to look at it in the normal way under the FOI requirements about if there are any elements that cannot be released but broadly, of course, if we need to release an agreement and you are asked --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We do not want to have to FOI.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): No, I am not saying you need to register an FOI with us, but in the same way that there are elements about safety that do not get released and commercially that we would --

Andrew Dismore AM: Are you going to let us see it or not?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am saying it can be released subject only to any points that would normally, if it was an FOI, not be releasable under statutory exemptions. Subject to that, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: All right. How long is that going to take?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): We can do that immediately, from today. We will get back, do the check today if required and then give it to the Committee.

Andrew Dismore AM: OK, immediately.

Can I go on to questions about the stewarding? Stewarding is supposedly governed by the statement of intent set out in the *Authorised Professional Practice: guiding the Service* from the College of Policing document, and we have already established there is not such a document. The duties of stewards are set out in the College of Policing document, which cross-refers to the statement of intent. I want to probe this a little bit, obviously without having the benchmark of that document. I am rather surprised it does not exist, because the College of Policing says the document should be reviewed, updated and signed by the club and the force on an annual basis. Perhaps you could let us know in due course whether that is ever going to appear.

If we can go on to the issue of stewarding, what has the Safety Advisory Group - this is probably a question for Sheila - said about the stewarding arrangement's effectiveness so far?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): Can I just go back on the first point that you made that there may not be a signed-off statement of intent but there is certainly a stewarding plan? That is one of the requirements of the safety certificate and the stewarding plan details the roles of those stewards. There is a detailed stewarding plan before each game that details the postings of those stewards and the different roles. There are fire stewards and there are safety stewards and so there is detail of that, although it might not be in the place you expect it to be.

Andrew Dismore AM: Does that stewarding plan comply with all the requirements of the College of Policing document?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): I am not aware of all the detail of the College of Policing document, but in terms of the safety certificate, it does comply with the requirements of the safety certificate. As I said, it is a dynamic arrangement and it may change for each game.

Andrew Dismore AM: It might be worthwhile you cross-checking with the College of Policing document to make sure it does. It is easy enough to find; it is on the internet.

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): I can do that, yes. There are two requirements, then, and it is complied with in terms of the general safety certificate and so it does comply with that.

In terms of the stewarding, the numbers have been increased as learnings have taken place. There was an issue with familiarisation of the stadium because it is new and the arrangements within there do not reflect from the Boleyn Ground to those stewards that came along, and there are stewards who are new to that site. In terms of the stewards, there are more than there used to be. There has never been an issue with the safety-

critical control points in terms of the stewarding. The general stewards are gaining in confidence and they are learning. In the briefings that take place, there are different tiers of briefings that take place before every single game, so the supervisors are briefed and then each individual steward is briefed by their supervisors, and there are level managers above that, so there is a lot of detail and tactical detail that is delivered to the stewards on a match-by-match basis. They are getting better. The stewards themselves are really involved in taking spectators to their seats, in safety arrangements in case there is an evacuation. There are also response teams, which are more to do with dealing with disorder. They are all Security Industry Authority (SIA) authorised, and they are really separate from the stewards. They are working together increasingly better. They have given more confidence to the stewards as well. It is certainly an improving situation. The stewards are more familiar with which area is which in the stadium, and which exit is which. The new arrangements for segregation they are aware of. Generally speaking, it is an improving situation.

Andrew Dismore AM: You touched on my next question, which is whether any of the stewards that you presently have had moved from the Boleyn Ground, and I think you said some of them had.

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): My understanding is that each person was offered the opportunity to do so.

Andrew Dismore AM: The next question is: how many moved over?

Sheila Roberts (Strategic Enforcement Manager, London Borough of Newham): I do not know the number.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Everybody who worked at the Boleyn Ground who was employed as a steward there was offered a role.

Andrew Dismore AM: “Offered a role” I understand, but some may have moved and some may not. Question number one is: how many moved? If you do not know, you can tell us.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): About half.

Andrew Dismore AM: About half. How many is that?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): About 300.

Andrew Dismore AM: About 300. How many stewards altogether do you deploy?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): It is 1,100.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Yes, 1,100 for the recent game. Yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: It is 1,100 for every game of those stewards who were at the Boleyn Ground, fine, and then you have presumably the other 800. Are they new to football?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Some are and some are not, as you would expect if you go to a team that size. On the plus side it has provided some new opportunities for local people to get new jobs and that is fantastic. That is certainly one of the things that we are looking to aspire for, particularly from a legacy point of view. We have other stewards and, as you can imagine, for anyone that

needs to manage 1,100 people, you will have real different spheres within it. We have other stewards there who have worked regularly at other football matches.

I honestly do not know about the policing document you mentioned, but we look at the *Green Guide to Safety at Sports Grounds* that says what is required for our stewards. For example, if we take a new steward on and they need training, we would look to buddy them up with an experienced steward, whether that be an ex-Boleyn steward or, say, somebody who has been at Wembley.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is my next question. What training do stewards receive?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): All of our safety stewards either have to have a National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) 2 in Spectator Safety or they have to be working towards that, and in order to work towards that there is a staged process for that. As you would expect, they need to have a detailed induction so that they are familiar with the stadium, so that they know things like what the warning codes are, where the exit doors are, what they do in an emergency. They also get a briefing document and they are buddied up with an experienced steward. The guidance is that that should happen for four games. Obviously, if somebody is not so good, you would look at continuing that longer. Then they have to put together a portfolio of evidence which is assessed by a qualified assessor. We also supplement that, so at every single football match there is a cascade briefing system, which starts at the top with my senior managers and all the senior stewards and level managers, and includes the COO from West Ham as well, and then they take those messages down and cascade. A lot of it will stay the same, but if there are any particular things that we have to do, if we are changing the search regimes, then that is what they will do.

As Sheila [Roberts] was saying, we have six different types of stewards, ranging up to the level manager. They will all have different types of qualifications, from NVQ 2 to NVQ 3 or 4. Some of them will have the SIA certificates as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: For example, do your stewards all know the ground regulations?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): As part of their induction, they will be familiarised with what the guidance is, what is expected of them in their role and the various responsibilities that they have.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do you think there is any more that West Ham [United FC] could do to support the stewarding?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): West Ham [United FC] was very helpful to us at the beginning of the season in that it arranged for my head of safety and security to go over to about six of the games to meet all of the stewards who were there. There were a lot of myths going around that they were not going to be paid as much and this sort of thing. We were able to put a stop to that. Their COO now attends all of our senior stewards briefings and that is really good for showing that we are working together in a joined-up partnership approach and encouraging that. Where any of us see good examples of stewarding, we make sure that that is passed on and goes up the chain to their managers so that they get a "thank you" and a "well done".

Andrew Dismore AM: What is your turnover of stewards?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): It is very difficult to answer that because these are not 1,100 dedicated stewards to our event. One week they will be working with me; the next week they might be at Tottenham; the week after they might be at Wembley.

Andrew Dismore AM: Are they on zero-hour contracts?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): All of our stewards are provided through a stewarding provider. People have the options to work when they want to work.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do they get paid the London Living Wage?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): No, they do not, not at all categories. They do not at the basic steward level. It is one of the things that we recognise about looking at being competitive and, as you will appreciate, the stewards are employed at other venues across London. It is not just at the London Stadium. Certainly, our senior stewards are paid that, our level managers, hospitality stewards, and we give them a meal as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: Does it embarrass you, Karren, that your stewards are not paid the London Living Wage when you are paying footballers £60,000 a week?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): We pay all of our staff the London Living Wage. We were the first club to do so and have been doing so since 2015.

Andrew Dismore AM: Touché.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): We cannot engage with other partners and force them to do that. Yes, we would like it to be done, but it is not part of our authority to insist it is done.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do you think morally it is your responsibility?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): It is a hypothetical question because it is not my responsibility. Anyone who worked for us at the Boleyn Ground or who works for us anywhere has been earning the equivalent of the London Living Wage since 2015.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am pleased to hear that your direct employees are, but one of the problems we have found throughout London is this particular problem where people pass the buck and say, "It is nothing to do with me. It is a contractor".

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): It is not a case of passing the buck.

Andrew Dismore AM: It seems that way to me.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): I can only pay the people I employ. I cannot pay the people I do not employ.

Andrew Dismore AM: It seems that way to me. Anyway, let us move on to some questions for [Commander] BJ [Harrington] on policing. Do you think if you had more police inside the stadium it would help prevent further disorder?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): The point I would say is that it is a small minority of people who are causing that problem inside the stadium, and I am absolutely confident that the arrangements inside are preventing - we saw that at the Stoke [City FC] game - disorder inside the grounds. The arrangements and the risk assessment we make before that have contributed to that.

Every cop we put inside the stadium comes from a neighbourhood somewhere and comes from part of a London borough. It is our strategy that it is private premises - quite rightly - and it is not shying away from that responsibility. LS185 is absolutely taking that. We will try to minimise the number of officers in the stadium all the time. It is not our role to police private premises. We would not put cops next to a dancefloor if we thought there was going to be a fight in a disco. However, where we are required to go inside, we will and we have done. Where we are requested and where we are able to, we will put officers inside if that is the appropriate risk assessment and, again, as we have done for the Stoke game and will be doing for the match on Saturday, we will require payment in the areas we can for those special policing services.

Andrew Dismore AM: I understand that the estimated police officer costs excluding overtime for West Ham fixtures so far at the London Stadium this year - since 4 August up until 5 November 2016 - are £426,170. Correct?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. I would say it is a little bit higher than that, in fact, in terms of the total policing costs for those West Ham [United FC] fixtures this year.

Andrew Dismore AM: You have billed West Ham for about 10% -- not West Ham [United FC] because they do not have to pay. You have to pay. They get it thrown in, yes? £43,350.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): That is correct. It is really important, Chairman and Andrew, if I explain what we can charge for.

Andrew Dismore AM: I will come on to that. Just following the numbers first and then we will come on to what you can and cannot charge for. You have billed Linda for £43,350, which you are paid by Alan Skewis to absorb as part of your fee. Yes?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): Yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, ultimately it goes back to the public purse, but it is about 10% of the total costs of policing at West Ham [United FC] so far this year.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): As part of that special policing service, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Correct. Good. Then the total cost for policing West Ham [United FC] last year was £525,426 and the year before that was £429,284. That is at the old ground.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): That is correct.

Andrew Dismore AM: All right. What West Ham [United FC] paid the MPS last year was £45,874 and the year before that was £98,801?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): That is correct, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Correct, yes. If we scale that up across London, the net cost to the MPS after the contributions from FCs - or, in this case, Linda [Lennon CBE] - is over £5 million, is it not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): I would say the net cost of policing football across London as a whole, because it extends beyond the grounds to those clubs that travel through because of the transport network, is closer to £8 million across London of which, including Wembley National Stadium, we probably recover through special policing services about £700,000. It is really important that we are clear about what it is we can charge for because it is clearly defined in law.

Andrew Dismore AM: It is all right. I will come to that. Let us just stick with the figures you have just given me because the previous answer I had was that the net figure was £5 million, but you are now telling me it is even more. If it was £5 million and the higher figure you have given us now, that equates to getting on for 100 police officers' equivalent wages across the whole of London, does it not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): It is certainly the equivalent wages of a number of officers. Clearly, I have not worked the exact figures out.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. That is three or four extra officers for boroughs who did not have to bear that cost.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): It is the salary costs. Whether that would equate --

Andrew Dismore AM: If we look at the Chelsea [FC] game, the number of officers you deployed there was getting on for 500, was it not, for the Chelsea [FC] and West Ham [United FC] game?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, it was 520 officers.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, and that is equivalent to the entire police force of an outer London borough, is it not, pretty well?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): A day's work, yes, for probably some boroughs. Yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, it is quite a drain on police resources, is it not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely, and that is one of the key points we make. Crime and disorder around football - it is really in terms of that - like any crime and disorder is a key role for police to address. There is a proper responsibility for us to do that.

Andrew Dismore AM: You will probably guess where the question is going. You are only allowed to charge basically within the curtilage of the football premises, are you not?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): It is a bit more complex than that. We can only charge in certain circumstances. We can charge for policing under section 25 of the Police Act 1996 for special policing services. They have to be requested by an agency. They are discretionary and so a Chief Constable does not have to provide them. Where we can charge has been defined in two High Court cases. The first one was Leeds United v West Yorkshire Police in 2013 and that defined that it was on land that is owned, leased or controlled by the stadium operator of the club in that case. That was further defined this

year in Ipswich Town [FC Company] v Southwark Constabulary, which further defined owned, leased or controlled and only differentiated that we could charge only for what is called preventative policing, when we are there in case something happens, as opposed to operational reactive policing, when that is our duty: a bad thing happens, we get called and we respond to it. We cannot charge for that.

In terms of the West Ham [United FC] position, where we are asked by the stadium to provide special policing services for the Stoke [City FC] game, we can then charge for those officers who are deployed on the land owned, leased or controlled. That is what LS185 has done with the £43,000. What I would say is, the policing of football, the Olympic Park and much of that area is not land owned, leased or controlled. Therefore, we cannot charge. The policing of somewhere like [the match against] Stoke [City FC] starts, if you were to include the British Transport Police (BTP), from the moment they get on the transport network. We deal with them in central London and so we deploy officers and it would be remiss if we did not. We deal with them as they come across to whichever train station. I have already explained that for a match like Chelsea [FC] or Stoke [City FC], with us getting used to the geography and the norms of that, we have had to deploy more officers because we cannot be as forensic and intelligence-driven about where the issues would be. Yes, we have had to deploy more officers. They are a drain and one that we would not want to take from boroughs because that is where they come from. We will charge wherever we can.

I have to say that where we have been asked by LS185 to do it we have done and there has been no reluctance on their part to pay. Where the money comes from --

Andrew Dismore AM: It is not your concern. As long as you get the bill --

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): It is about me making sure that we charge appropriately. The point I will come back to - and you made that point well - is that the policing of football globally is not just about West Ham [United FC]. If you include all of the special things and all of the crossing of London that goes on, it is a massive drain on policing, not only in cost but in terms of the people who are taken from Bromley, Hillingdon or Camden.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is the point. If you did not have to spend that £7 million on policing, we could spend that on more officers.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): We could, but I would also say there are important things. Where there is this small minority of people who are intent upon crime and disorder around football, there is an absolute obligation on us to deal with those. We do. You have heard about the banning orders. Where we are asked to, and around that safety contribution, we will take part and do so and, whenever we are called, we will go to deal with crime and disorder.

Andrew Dismore AM: The Mayor, in answer to a previous question I put to him, has said that he supports full cost recovery of policing operations for football. Do you agree with that?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): With the multi-billion-pound business that is football, there should be a greater contribution made. There are some things which are very clear that the police should do. Bad people committing crime: that is what the police are expected to deal with and we absolutely step into that. Where we are having to put these huge deployments this Saturday coming, around probably 400 to 500 officers deployed policing football across London, whether that is at one of the home games in London, whether that is people transiting through the central London station around that, that is a massive drain on policing. Yes, we would ask that the ability to ask to charge is extended, because it is currently quite narrow and I have been clear about where that is.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do we need to change the law?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): We need to be clearer about making a greater contribution.

Andrew Dismore AM: Karren, you do not have to pay anything for policing your games.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): That is not true. I pay all the costs.

Andrew Dismore AM: That £43,000 that we have mentioned earlier on you will be paying?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): I pay £2.5 million a year, which covers all those costs.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is all thrown into your overall contract and so, no matter how many police officers are deployed or not, you do not pay any more?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): No. I have already covered it in the £2.5 million that I pay. That covers the cost of policing, security, maintenance, electricity, utilities and so on.

Andrew Dismore AM: When BJ [Harrington] talks about these figures that it is costing the MPS and costing Londoners to police your business, do you think you should be paying more?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): As you heard Commander Harrington say, there were two cases that were brought about to change the law in relation to what football pays for policing and both of those were not successful.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is what the law says. I am not disputing what the law says. I am asking: do you think there is a moral obligation on West Ham [United FC], when so many London police officers are deployed to police your games and support your profits, to cough up a bit more?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): There are a couple of things I would say to that. First of all, it is not just West Ham [United FC].

Andrew Dismore AM: No, of course. I accept that.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): We abide by the law and FCs abide by the law, and they pay what is due to be paid. The other thing I would say is that FCs contribute billions of pounds to the UK economy through their taxes and the way they run their businesses and the National Insurance they pay and so on. Some would argue that that is all taken care of in the contributions that they make. This is not an industry that just sucks out of the system. It puts an awful lot back in.

Andrew Dismore AM: You can afford to pay £20.5 million in a transfer fee and all but £18 million in a wage bill. Police officers come a bit cheaper than that. Do you not think there is a moral obligation to pay something towards this?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): All of our assets are people, whether that be on or off the pitch, and our sole purpose of our business is to attract the best talent and put

on the best entertainment to fulfil all the hopes and dreams of every West Ham [United FC] supporter in the country. That is the purpose of our business. Yes, it may look extraordinary that we pay £18 million in wages, but that is our sole purpose of what we are and what we do.

Andrew Dismore AM: Fine. If you want to pay £18 million to your footballers, fine. My concern is the cost to Londoners in losing their police officers from the boroughs. The borough police force, as Commander Harrington has said, is potentially putting Londoners in outer London at a little bit more risk of crime, although it is spread more widely, on the removal of officers to police your grounds. It is putting a burden on the rest of London, your commercial operation, and it is a commercial operation, otherwise you would not be doing it. I accept there is no legal obligation on you to pay any more. What I am asking is whether you think there is a moral obligation.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): I would say to you that we do what is requested of us. We pay the bills that are put in front of us. We certainly pay those bills through our rent. All FCs, all 20 of us or more throughout the professional leagues, the 92 of us, pay what is asked of us. It is not a question of whether the FCs should pay more. It is a legal argument, and that is something that will no doubt carry on into the future.

Andrew Dismore AM: I accept you are complying with the law. What I am saying is that there is a moral obligation --

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): I know; you have asked me three times.

Andrew Dismore AM: -- and I suspect most Londoners would probably feel the same way about it.

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): It is what it is.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Many of us will agree it is a fair point strategically that London football should think about contributing more. It is not just a West Ham [United FC] issue, and I thank you for holding your ground on that.

We are moving to the last part of the morning. We have a couple more questions.

Keith Prince AM: I do not want to take very long on this. Most of it has probably been covered.

This is firstly to Alan. In September, you appointed Chris Allison [CBE] to do a review for you. West Ham has also published a five-point plan for improving security. How do those two tie together? Just so we can wrap it up, of the conclusions that were come to, how were they prioritised and what is going forward?

Alan Skewis (Director, E20 Stadium LLP): For clarity, Chris Allison [CBE]² has been employed by E20 Stadium and his role is to give us some oversight, to give us some assurances and to facilitate and help the improvements we have spent a lot of time talking about this morning. Chris is pretty uniquely qualified to do that and that is why we wanted to use him. His role in the 2012 security operations, the Rugby World Cup, his knowledge and previous employment within the police force has helped. Chris is advising us and he has absolutely worked with everybody around the table today to help. West Ham's [United FC] five-point plan came out of discussions which Chris has been involved in, with LS185, with the Club, and absolutely integrated

² Chris Allison CBE, is a former Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police Service.

into those plans. Chris has focused much of his intention, on the first month to six weeks of his time, on the stadium and the stadium island that we have talked a lot about today. Chris is now turning a bit more of his attention into that wider Park, the integration around Westfield and TfL because that is the bit we see now we need to make similar adaptations to try to improve the way that people can move, the amount of time and how it works across the stakeholders. Chris - this Saturday included - is doing some really intense work with Westfield and with LS185 around those areas. We found Chris's involvement very valuable. We think it has added a lot of value without attempting to step on any toes or get into LS185's business.

Keith Prince AM: Linda?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): There are 18 recommendations. I support them all. Some have been completed already. Others have review points. The West Ham [United FC] plan fits perfectly within those because they cover areas like segregation, as you would expect. There have been ticks in both the West Ham plan and in Chris Allison's. I personally welcome independent feedback because it gives you the opportunity to look at things from different perspectives. My team and I really welcome it.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Just to be clear, the nature of Chris' work is to work with - engaged by E20 Stadium LLP - all the parties involved just to find incremental things we can improve day-to-day and how we can work this better. As Alan [Skewis] said, he is looking particularly at egress but real-time improvement and so it is not a review with a report. It is a working engagement to help find improvement and identify ways we can move it forward, particularly on the egress through the Park, Westfield, the station and the interfaces we have talked about.

Keith Prince AM: Karren, could I ask you a question in relation to the five-point plan? I believe that in that five-point plan the stewards are given handheld video cameras. One of my questions would be, will the stewards be instructed to be vigilant, particularly, for instance, of racist or anti-Semitic chanting in relevant football matches?

Baroness Karren Brady CBE (Vice-Chairman, West Ham United FC): Some of the stewards in the ground have the cameras that are on their jackets in the same way that some of the police officers have and that is to identify and record things that may be interesting to the police to have a record. We were specifically talking about an area where there had been allegations of throwing of items and we were looking for perpetrators who were doing that so that we could ban them from the ground. That is those officers that we were talking about.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Then, to the assembled masses, is there anything that you think the Mayor could do to help in relation to some of the issues that we have discussed today? Is there any more that the Mayor could do?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Maybe I should pick that up. You will know from announcements recently that the Mayor has announced a review in relation to the stadium more generally. That will look at the costs that have been incurred, but also looking at operational arrangements going forward and how we reach the position we all want to achieve of the stadium continuing to be a popular venue for the wide range of events it is hosting and how we reach the position we have always committed to, that it will become financially self-sustaining over time. I hope that review will be very helpful and that is something the Mayor has instigated for that purpose.

Keith Prince AM: Is there nothing else that anyone would like to see the Mayor do?

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): This is not about West Ham [United FC] . This is about this wider cost and the point that Andrew [Dismore AM] makes around policing football across London.

Keith Prince AM: I agree.

Commander BJ Harrington (Metropolitan Police Service): Anything the Mayor can do to ensure that there is real clarity, not paying for what is the police's core role but to ensure that a greater contribution to that, what is a significant cost to the policing of football across London, not just at individual stadiums but in terms of the wider consequences, whether that is central London, on the transport network or elsewhere. That is not about West Ham [United FC] and certainly the police would welcome the Mayor's intervention in relation to that.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Again, coming back to policing and security of the Park as a whole, my question is to you, David. Alan [Skewis] talked about the Allison report and structured liaison between TfL and other agencies. Are there arrangements for this liaison to take place on a regular basis on non-match days?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The arrangement with Chris Allison [CBE] is specific to events in the stadium.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, and I am more interested in what goes on throughout the week.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, so in terms of what goes on with the Park generally - and I have been marking again - but we have not brought in an independent assistance of the sort that Chris is providing because the arrangements on the Park have worked very well and I do not think we have had significant problems other than the ones we are here discussing around match day events. Broadly, the safety and security arrangements in the Park have been very successful. The safety incident and the security issues we have had have been inevitable, with 6 million a year coming through. There are incidents, but we have a very efficient operation that manages them.

Mark Camley (Executive Director of Park Operations and Venues, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have very low levels of crime and most of the crime that we have is low-level crime, graffiti and things like that that we have in the Park. We do have in place an information-sharing agreement with the MPS which has been in place since 2013 for the Park. We have a Park security partnership in place and we are embedded within the Community Safety Zone within Newham. We meet regularly with all the partners including TfL and East Village. Lendlease is not here today, but it is the landowner. We have shared information on a dynamic basis. If there are incidents happening in the Park, the control room in the Park will be informing East Village and/or Westfield or --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): With a structured mechanism for regularly [reviewing safety and security]?

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, absolutely, and we exercise and rehearse it.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): When I referred earlier to Barking Riverside, we have all these new townships and what we have on the Olympic Park is a whole new township. We do not take policing and security aspects into consideration.

David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It might be the sort of example where, if they wanted to come and talk to us, we could share how we have this set up. It is an evolution of what was in place in the Games, but it has been working for a number of years and we would be very happy to share our experience if that would be helpful.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Chairman, very finally, I just want to flag up two issues on which we can write to, I believe, Linda [Lennon CBE]. I do have questions on the licensing hours of the stadium. Particularly for the Chelsea [FC] game, I understand there is anecdotal evidence not just that the bars were open earlier but that beer was being offered at a cheaper price. I was hoping --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Do not answer it now. We will write.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Secondly, I also want to ask about the permanence of the stewarding arrangements because you talked about your stewards moving all over London. One of the things with the old ground was that the stewards knew the people they were dealing with. They had been there for years. Perhaps we could do that in correspondence.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): That is fine.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Since there is this prospect of a Chelsea [FC] game, is that true?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): No. In fact, we --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): To avoid congestion, did the bars open earlier?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): No.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): That is what I read in *The Evening Standard*.

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): No. When the stadium first opened, we were very keen to try to encourage people to get to the stadium early. Therefore, we did open up the stadium gates two hours early, whereas in most clubs it is two hours before kick-off rather than one-and-a-half hours. There were some happy offers to get people in early.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Happy hour?

Linda Lennon CBE (Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185): We have since refined that. We no longer do that because we have looked at the crowd flows coming through and, certainly, for the Chelsea [FC] game we looked at a risk assessment basis on that, which we agreed with the Club and the police. There have been quite a few things in the press which have perhaps been over-exaggerated.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We understand. As ever, thank you very much, guests, for contributing this morning. We have had a lot of reassurance, but we are going to be writing. Hopefully, the Committee can agree for the need to write to you. We have some questions about the board of safety and security of the Park and some other questions about licensing that have been duly noted. Clearly, there are some concerns about

cost to policing of football that we will continue to look at. Are colleagues happy to delegate authority to me to do that? We will also be visiting. We are trying to get that date buttoned down before Christmas.

This page is intentionally left blank

Police and Crime Committee - 1 December 2016

Transcript of Agenda Item 10 - Child Protection Investigations in the Metropolitan Police Service

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We shall now reconvene on any other business the Chairman considers urgent, which is in essence item 10, reflecting on and early comments or thoughts around child protection investigations in the MPS. I welcome very much Commander Nick Downing, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). It is really good he could come along at short notice, only a week after publication.

The context is that in a couple of weeks' time in our question-and-answer session (Q&A) [on 15 December 2016] we understand that Assistant Commissioner (AC) Martin Hewitt, MPS, will be attending and we can ask further questions around that. We also understand that Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) will be revisiting, shall we say, the MPS three to four months into the New Year to see what you have achieved and what you have done. It will be appropriate that this Committee, again at that stage, to do some more work around that.

We will continue on this but today we want to have an early conversation with you to understand your action plan that you were asked to put into place early on and what you have already instigated at a relatively high level so that we can understand that and take those questions on for two weeks' time. Initially, it is probably worth setting a bit of a scene around it. Tell us what you have already put in place and talk to us a little bit about the plan that you are drafting to improve on what was a poor report.

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity to come here today. It is never good to start off with an apology but Assistant Commissioner Martin Hewitt sends his apologies. He has been appointed as the Safeguarding Children lead for London and that addresses one of the number one concerns of the HMIC.

In relation to that, I just want to reiterate that there have been a number of chief officers working in the area of child protection. I am one of them. My colleague, [Commander] Stuart Cundy, from Specialist Crime, is one of the other ones as well. We all will work to AC Martin Hewitt.

A couple of points I just wanted to make. First of all, we welcome the report. The findings, although hard to read, give us the impetus to go forward and improve the lives of children across London. I also want to draw out a comment made in the report about our staff. The HMIC recognised that our staff work with genuine commitment, dedication and empathy to protect and help children and young people. This is an extremely challenging area with changing environments and threats, and this work is frequently distressing for our staff as well. There is a health and wellbeing element to what we have to introduce to our plan. It is important that we recognise the work that our staff do across London every day.

We recognise that significant change is required in both behaviours and our knowledge. We need to equip our staff with the right resources, awareness and training to do a good job and to keep children at the heart of everything we do. We look at the new challenges in protecting children online, through social media and with gangs. It is not just in the home, it is also on the street as well.

The final point I wish to make before going into some of the things we have done is that our partnerships across London, which are really strong, are absolutely integral to how we protect children. We need to get stronger and we need to work as one and we would welcome future inspections to be joint inspections.

On the immediate response, I have already mentioned that AC Martin Hewitt has been appointed as the single chief officer lead. As soon as we had the verbal debrief for the HMIC report, Deputy Assistant Commissioner Graham McNulty called together a goal group with all the strategic leads from the various departments to address the early findings and to come up with some solutions. We introduced an audit and continuous improvement team to review every single one of the cases that HMIC had said required improvement or was inadequate. From that review, we can say at this time that no child has come to harm and no additional people have been charged or cautioned. That is something we want to build for the future. We recognise that in the report it says that our self-assessment was not very good. Having our own continuous improvement team to gather the learning and mitigate any risk is really important.

Not only that, we want external scrutiny. We have already set up an external scrutiny panel, which has on it the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) and Child Protective Services. Some cases we are saying we think are complete and dealt with to a satisfactory standard we want reviewed and then we will gather the learning from those as well. We are broadening the external scrutiny with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and developing a child safeguarding advisory board that is engaging with academics, the NSPCC, Barnardo's and the Howard League for Penal Reform. Then there is scrutiny to make sure our plans going forward are viable, robust and understood by colleagues, the public and interested parties.

We have looked as well at and are developing the action plan. It is in draft form at the moment. It is going to cover some key areas. First of all, leadership, management and governance; initial contact with a child; our investigation; our decision-making; and our management of those who pose a risk to children. We are going to theme it in those five areas.

We are going far wider than just HMIC recommendations. We are looking at our serious case reviews, our domestic homicide reviews and previous reports and recommendations that have been made. We are looking at national learning, working with the College of Policing and looking at HMIC inspections of other forces. We are not alone. We were number 13 on the list and the reports are very similar, albeit it has been recognised that our report was more severe. We are working with the Home Office and Greater Manchester Police as well because their response was recognised as good practice. We are going to bring that into our plan.

Then there are the emerging challenges and horizon-scanning. What is the future threat? I do not think we can underestimate what that online threat is. Yesterday, AC Hewitt was talking about sextortion. Online grooming, bullying and harassment cause problems for child protection.

I have already mentioned the development of our self-inspection continuous improvement and we want to embed that in our new headquarters function. We are already developing a new model of policing for London - we have two pathfinder sites - in January and part of that model will be a protecting vulnerable people strand. We will be bringing our specialist functions from child abuse and sexual offences to our local investigation around community safety units and hate crime. Then we will have officers dealing with child abuse, child protection issues and child exploitation in one place, locally.

We need to broaden that out as well to our neighbourhoods, looking at our increase in dedicated ward officers and our investment in schools. This does not start at senior school. For me, we need to invest in primary schools as well and early intervention to make children's lives better in London. Shall I pause?

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): This is good. This is really helpful. This Committee’s Safeguarding Working Group, chaired by Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] in 2014, issued a report and we will be asking some questions based on some very strong recommendations out of that report. We have some questions to ask MOPAC and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime around that in a couple of weeks’ time.

You touched upon, towards the end of your presentation, the new design of policing in London, the new borough design and the new local design with dedicated ward officers. Again, this is something this Committee will be looking at closely and how that will possibly impact on it.

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): I am sure.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): It is clearly a complex area. You said that the MPS would welcome future investigations into the whole partnership piece, which sounds like it makes some sense. I will pause there.

Len Duvall AM: I asked for this to go on the agenda because in your opening statement you said it was not a good report. This is a damning report and does not reflect well on the MPS at many levels. There is no doubt about that. We should not underestimate this issue in this report for all sorts of reasons.

There probably are a number of reasons why we need to understand what goes on. When we come back to it, we will want to talk about how we got ourselves into this particular issue, not just thinking about how we get out. I am all for reviewing the partnership work but the MPS needs to focus on its work and this issue and not try to widen it out. That is the next stage, the future around that, because something has desperately gone wrong here for this to happen at this level. It is damning and horrendous.

For me, when we come back, I would like some answers around some bits of the future. Some of my colleagues will say, if I can pre-empt it, that there are some changes in the reforms going on in the MPS. We want to know, in terms of the response and the changes in response, where there are going to be carrying caseloads and what the implications are for this work under that system in the future. How quickly can you get us to a position where we can have confidence that if a police officer is confronted with these issues, they are going to be dealing with it appropriately and properly?

The borough mergers may cut across some of your work around joint working. There are some core procedures boroughs operate but around the fringes there is wiggle room and local issues. What we want to understand is how the MPS is going to deal with those issues. You might have two or three borough mergers with one police service servicing those three boroughs. They might be used to dealing with Borough A and in Boroughs B and C they might have a different practice. We want to be assured about this. It is no good people saying, “We have some pilots to do it”. We want to know that people have been thinking about this. They should have been thinking about it.

There is a bit in the final HMIC report about the national issues in trying to say, “MPS, this will be all right if only you stop dealing with volume crime”. That is not understanding what the London volume crime piece is. We would like to hear from the Assistant Commissioner about how he is going to deal with HMIC because the volume crime that we are most concerned about around this table is violent crime, which we think the MPS has underestimated particularly over the last four years. While we value that certain crime is going down in some areas, violent crime is going up. We understand the domestic piece. We are talking about violent crime going on between our young people, that volume crime. Before you start screening that out, concentrate on some of those issues.

Overall, Chairman, we are looking for the MPS to describe, under pressures of falling police numbers over the coming years, how you are going to deal with this and what those issues are. Your first response is welcomed. I wish we were not in this situation. I bet you wish you were not in this situation. It is a start but there are some other deeper questions that we want to understand about how we have got into these issues.

We know there were some conversations about the MOPAC 7 [crimes]. I would like honest reflection from the MPS on the loss of experience and knowledge. We have a relatively young workforce. What is the system? What is the plan about getting underneath the skin of these issues and a new way of working, which is being driven by the reduced resources you have at your disposal to deal with some of these issues? I hope, Chairman, when we come back to it, it is an informed, frank, no-holds-barred exchange. We want to get further from initial responses and to get into some wider issues around the future of the MPS policing and this particular issue.

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): I agree with the statements you make. We need to look in-depth. If I can just clarify something, at no point am I suggesting we pass over responsibility for this report to our partners, in no way. We are looking internally. We are reflecting internally. This is our report, it is about us and we will take the steps to address what we should be doing as the MPS. It is integral to protecting children and protecting the most vulnerable in society that we have to work in partnership but this is our report, it is on us and absolutely it was an unsavoury read, I agree.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you for that answer.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Just to echo Len's thoughts around prioritising, this is a period of change. The MPS's budget is shrinking. The number of officers may shrink. You need to attend to this, as Len said, horrendous report and think about resourcing around that, remembering that London has an issue, as we have just talked about, with serious youth violence and knife crime and also, to many of us in our localities, those crimes that local teams are dealing with, burglary and anti-social behaviour. These are still important to people. It is a question of how far this pendulum goes. We would be interested to hear the detail around that, which Len has picked up on.

Andrew Dismore AM: I wanted to come in on the borough merger point because one of my boroughs is one of the pilots. Camden is merging with Islington. We met the superintendent the other night at the Safer Neighbourhoods Board. She is going to be in charge of the vulnerable people strand or whatever it is called. It is not entirely clear to me how that is going to work and I am not sure she was entirely sure how it was going to work, either. It is supposed to be coming in in January [2017] and so we do not have long to go.

Can you give us an indication of how you think it is going to work at borough level, bi-borough level or tri-borough level?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): We are bringing together our child abuse teams and our sexual offences team under one detective superintendent lead for safeguarding. That will bring on [our work] on protecting vulnerable people and that brings our community safety units together as well.

If you look at the duplication of effort that has happened before, a number of sexual offences are in a domestic setting but we would deal with them as individual cases and not bring them together. That is just inefficient and it is not good for the victim. Bringing the teams together for one response and having the experts together as well will be better for the victim in the long run. There will be one front door for referrals, as well. We have Multiagency Safeguarding Hubs across London in every borough. We have the tri-borough in Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster, but one front door and one point for

referrals so that nothing gets lost. Then it can be assessed there, triaged there and the right assets put towards it, whether that is from the police or partnership.

Having that single governance structure across there will bring consistency, which can only be better for the victims of crime, in my opinion. We need to look and really study what the pathfinder sites do. We need to listen to the victim as well. Is this service better? That is what matters here. We need to make sure the children are not forgotten. Our initial response when a child before you needs help is good because he or she is there in front of you.

What we want to do is make safeguarding business as usual. It should be the norm that every time we go to a house we are thinking more widely than, "This is a burglary and we are looking at the victim of a burglary". We want to look at what else is happening. There has been a violent crime. Who else is affected? Are there children affected? It is widening our scope. Quite a lot of that is education and awareness, empowering our staff to do that and giving them the time to do that as well. That answers a bit of the question around the response.

It is my responsibility, it is my police community support officers' (PCSOs) responsibility and it is the responsibility of all my colleagues across London to be safeguarders. It should not be only a specialist team-only responsibility. That is why we want to make it at the heart of neighbourhoods as well around our dedicated ward officers knowing who the most vulnerable are within their community. That is important to us and that should be what we are doing every single day. The model is bringing experts together to provide a better service for the victims. I want to see what that evaluation says and make sure it is the right way for us to work in the future. It makes absolute sense but let us pilot it in the pathfinder sites and make sure we listen to the victims as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: Getting back to Len's point, I do not know if there is a different process at the moment in Islington [Borough Command Unit (BCU)] compared to Camden but you have two boroughs coming together that may have a different approach to these things. How do you overcome that?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): We have the policing approach, which should be consistent. That is where the leadership is going to be really important, the superintendent and the BCU Commander, to ensure that the same processes are within both boroughs. We have to be cognisant of the partners as well. Different partnerships and different local authorities have different processes. We have to be reflective of that and work together with our partners to get that consistent approach. I have not visited specifically the MASH at Islington or Camden but that is what we need to do to make sure that we are working as uniformly as we possibly can and that the child or the vulnerable person is at the heart of everything we do.

Andrew Dismore AM: Are you just doing this in the two pilot mergers at the moment or are you doing it everywhere?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): The protecting vulnerable people strand at the moment is just in the two pathfinder sites. We evaluate that and there is going to be ongoing consultation. It is a step process and you are here to hold us to account on that evaluation as well.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): As you say, this will be affecting the work of the new dedicated ward officers and the PCSOs and there may be significant skills uplift.

Tony Arbour AM: A couple of questions on the practicalities of doing what you are suggesting, given that HMIC firstly says that there is a shortage of officers who are trained to fill the vacancies that already exist. You

are talking about the open door and more training. Where do you think you are going to find these people who are going to do it?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): We constantly review where our resources are and what activity they are doing. That happens monthly at our Deputy Assistant Commissioners postings meetings where we prioritise where the assets are. We have 32,000 police officers in London. That is the most we have ever had. It is realigning those officers to the priorities that are at the forefront.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that but clearly there are specific skills that are required. If those people already existed among your 32,000 you would not have the vacancies that already exist, would you?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): There is an ongoing challenge across policing across the country around detectives, but the training is far wider than doing a specialist course. Already, since when we heard the early piece of this report, we have trained, over a day, 10,000 officers in child sexual exploitation, missing and Every Child Matters, and that is going to be a rolling programme. It is empowering and giving different levels of training to frontline staff, whereas the specialists working in the area will have enhanced training. They should have that already. That is the piece we need to work on and have a consistent training plan that is not just over three or six months but is over a year, three years or five years to ensure that we have the right skills placed in the right areas. I believe there is a duty for us to raise awareness across all of our staff around these critical issues of safeguarding.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that, but the urgency is not over three or five years, if there is a training period as we were talking about; the urgency is now. I am very conscious of the very bad press that the MPS has had by seeking to recruit officers who are trained to use firearms. We are depleting neighbouring police forces. There is a risk that this is going happen with this as well, is there not? The problem exists here and now and, because of this very severe criticism you have, you are going to want to make it better as soon as you can. What I am saying to you is this. The easy way of doing it is to recruit people who already have this training and already have this competence, is it not?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): At the moment that is not part of the plan that we are developing. We are looking internally. We want to make this absolutely core business from our first responders all the way to our specialists. We consistently and continuously review our resources to place those officers. I understand the point you are making about specialist training and we need to look at making sure that those we place in these specialist roles get the right training. At the moment there is no plan to try to take officers from around the country who are specialists in this area.

Tony Arbour AM: I appreciate it is not your problem, but when we deal with this formally, when deal with the matter in a fortnight's time, it is important to flag up. It is all very well to talk about the 32,000; you are not going to have 32,000 as time passes. Time is going to get harder and harder and already there have been loads of initiatives over the past few months to divert people from doing their existing jobs. In effect, you are cannibalising what you already have and the proposal that you have just made is that you look internally - I think that is what you said - and you want to resource this internally, which is going to cannibalise things even more. That will mean that the remaining officers are going to be infinitely more thinly spread. That is right, is it not?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): No, we are realigning our resource to a new way of working.

Tony Arbour AM: Does "realigning" mean slimming down?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Tony Arbour AM: It does not?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): I disagree.

Tony Arbour AM: If I was an officer who had been dealing with the MOPAC 7 [crimes] -- because you will recall some criticism has been made in relation to this HMIC report. It said, "It has all come about because we are looking at the MOPAC 7". OK? The suggestion is that people should be removed from dealing with the MOPAC 7 crimes, which are not going to go away; they are still going to be there. There is still going to be theft; there is still going to be all that kind of thing. If you are going to staff this up from your internal resources, you will be taking people away from the work they are currently doing, will you not?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): We need to look at what our policing priorities are. We need to work with MOPAC on the Police and Crime Plan and to understand what the policing priorities are for London. We are suggesting a model where we are realigning our current assets into BCUs with the BCU model.

Yes, there is a recognition that we have to do things differently. We need to invest in prevention and reducing the demand that is there and trust our officers to go out and provide the best level of service to the people of London that we want them to. This should be business as usual in the fact that there is potentially a child at risk and how we then problem-solve.

Tony Arbour AM: I understand that and you are dealing with the matter very manfully. In a fortnight's time we are going to want to do that. As I have indicated, "realigning" is perhaps going to be the fashionable way in which the MPS says, "This is how we are coping". I will not pursue the matter further here, but clearly there is a problem because if you are saying that everything has to come from existing resources, then Peter is going to be robbed to play Paul, is he not? You do not have to comment.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let that sit. I think you get the gist of one particular concern of the group.

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): I understand the concern and of course I will feed that concern back.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is something that we will revisit in a bit more detail.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I do not know if off the top of your head you are able to give us any idea of the caseload that staff in this area are currently having to deal with and what the supervisory ratio is. If you are not able to give that today, it would be helpful to have it next week to help us prepare for our hearing in a couple of weeks.

In terms of the staffing, you have your establishment, if I recall, and a large number of women work in this area. A large number have children and go on maternity leave and so we had always encouraged you to over-staff in order that you would be at your establishment the whole time. Are you able to give us the real figures at the moment in terms of staffing?

Commander Nick Downing (Metropolitan Police Service): I do not have the real numbers in staffing. There were 17,000 child abuse and sexual abuse investigations in the last 12 months. It is a high volume. That does not then look into domestic abuse as well and you add that in the family setting. Numbers alone probably do not give the complexity of some of the challenges. I do not have the makeup of staffing available now but I can make that available for you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Greater detail on that will help us for our hearing in a couple of weeks. Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Other questions, colleagues? This was really useful because we have had the early heads-up. We have talked about the five areas and the action plan. We have had the opportunity to give you some of our early concerns that we will revisit certainly in more detail in a couple of weeks with AC Hewitt [Professionalism Command, MPS]. That probably is it for the moment.

MINUTES

Meeting: Police and Crime Committee
Date: Thursday 15 December 2016
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee>

Present:

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman)
Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair)
Tony Arbour AM
Sian Berry AM
Andrew Dismore AM
Len Duvall AM
Keith Prince AM
Peter Whittle AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements (Item 1)

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Kemi Badenoch AM for whom Tony Arbour AM attended as a substitute, and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 **Resolved:**

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the Police and Crime Committee meeting held on 17 November 2016 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 Resolved:

That the outstanding and completed actions arising from the previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report, be noted.

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

5.2 Resolved:

That the recent action taken by the Chairman, Steve O'Connell AM, under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members be noted, namely to agree the arrangements for the Committee's site visit to the London Stadium on 9 December 2016.

6 Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to the questions and answer session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

6.2 The Chairman welcomed the following guests to the meeting:

- Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime;
- Craig Mackey QPM, Deputy Commissioner, MPS; and
- Assistant Commissioner Martin Hewitt QPM, MPS.

6.3 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 1**.

6.4 During the course of the discussion Assistant Commissioner Martin Hewitt undertook to provide data on young people involved in hit-and-run road incidents, both as perpetrators and victims.

6.5 At the end of the discussion the Chairman thanked the guests for their attendance and helpful contributions.

6.6 **Resolved:**

(a) That the monthly report from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, attached at Appendix 1 of the report, be noted.

(b) That the report and answers given by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the MPS to the questions asked by Members be noted.

(c) That the Chairman write to the guests with the follow up actions outline in paragraph 6.4 above.

7 Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Item 7)

7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

7.2 **Resolved:**

(a) That the work programme, as set out in the report, be agreed.

(b) That authority be delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the arrangements for the Committee's scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan.

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The date of the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 12 January 2017 at 10am in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent (Item 9)

9.1 There was no other business the Chairman considered urgent.

10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting ended at 12.55pm.

Chairman

Date

Contact Officer: Joanna Brown or Teresa Young; Telephone: 020 7983 6559;
Email: joanna.brown@london.gov.uk/teresa.young@london.gov.uk;
Minicom: 020 7983 4458

Police and Crime Committee – 15 December 2016**Transcript of Item 6 – Question and Answer Session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Metropolitan Police Service**

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): Now, going into the main part of the morning, which is our question-and-answer session, welcome very much to Craig Mackey QPM, Martin Hewitt QPM and Deputy Mayor Sophie Linden.

This morning’s questions have three particular parts to them, which, before we launch into that particularly, I would like to just ask Craig to reflect and give us a statement upon. Our first item today is about the extraordinarily bad report on child protection, which we will all spend some time on in questions. That is the first part of today, but the Committee is reflecting upon the fact that very recently the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has come under some criticism around the Stephen Port [British convicted murderer] investigation and, equally, part of the recent report was around the abuse of authority for sexual gain and corrupt activity. These are three concurrent reports that have been critical of the MPS in relatively short timescales. This is of concern and I would like, possibly, Craig, for you to make some comments about that.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you, Chairman. If I can, I will separate them. I know we are going to spend quite a bit of time on this, mostly the child protection report, but let us touch on the Stephen Port one.

The horrific murders of four young men and the rapes and serious sexual assaults committed by Stephen Port have, rightly, led to a number of questions being asked about the original police response. That is why we have admitted missed opportunities for arrest and Commander Stuart Cundy [Specialist Crime & Operations (SC&O) Command, MPS] has apologised to the families. We have referred ourselves to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), which will investigate and see what actually lies behind that. Is it individual failings? Is it organisational? Is it systemic in terms of the approach to these sorts of crimes?

We have also done a number of things in the meantime. We have looked at the guidance we have given to officers about dealing with chemsex and gamma hydroxybutyrate (GHB) sexual offences. We have rolled out a new toolkit and advice in relation to that and specialist training for frontline officers who have to respond to those sorts of incidents in terms of the things to look for. We have also started a piece of work where, with the consent of people, we are doing a forensic study looking at the prevalence of GHB in sexual assaults, particularly in the male community. We are trying to understand the extent of the challenge there.

Also, as a retrospective, we have gone back for both London and the Home Counties to look at deaths where either GHB was found or we believe it was a contributing factor to see if there are any other lessons to learn from that. Is there a pattern to this? Is there a pattern to its use?

We are also doing a lot of work with Galop and other lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT+) organisations about how we understand and provide the best support and how we provide the best support to people who find themselves victims of these sorts of crimes to overcome some of the barriers to reporting.

There is a lot of work going on. In terms of the actual learnings from [Stephen] Port, because there is an IPCC investigation into those, clearly, we have to await the outcome of that. In the work we do with the IPCC going

through these investigations, it is quite normal that we talk to them throughout and say, "Are there things or are there organisational learnings we can pick up now and address?" That is where the work is around the tragic case and the horrific murders of four young men.

On the Police Effectiveness, Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) legitimacy report and the work that was published this week, it is important first of all to see the overall context. What has got lost in the noise, as you are probably aware, is that the MPS was graded as "good" in the overall report. There was some stuff that did not get a lot of coverage but the media picked up in some places. London had the best visibility rates in England. South Wales was best in England and the United Kingdom (UK); we were second. There are some real things to celebrate in there in terms of the things we are getting right.

This issue about police officers in particular and also police staff roles or any role where someone has a position of power and is abusing that position is very real. We are absolutely clear: it is completely unacceptable. We work with our specialists in the Directorate of Professional Standards Prevention and Reduction Team giving advice to people when they join about where those barriers are, what is right, what is wrong and where those boundaries are that you cannot cross at all.

Just picking up on a couple of the points that Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) raised, I have worked with the lead Her Majesty's Inspector (HMI), Mike Cunningham. He and I have been working in this area for over five years and I was doing work in this space before I came to London. It is an issue that we have been aware of and have been working with.

They are right to raise the issue that there is something about how we define it. I would say: do not get too hung up on the definition; it is wrong however you define it. To give you why it is complex, we use a slightly different definition of corruption to the HMIC. The National Crime Agency uses four different definitions of corruption. I do get that there is probably a better way to collect that data nationally but, whatever it is, it is serious professional misconduct and it should be treated as that and that is what we do. Fortunately, it is relatively rare but it is shocking when it occurs and the impact on individuals, particularly individual members of the public who have had their trust abused, is appalling.

The HMIC also picks up a number of things there. It talks about something that we have discussed or something that I have discussed with you as a Committee before. It talks about the move to have legally qualified chairs of police misconduct panels and whether the outcomes at police misconduct panels are appropriate for the offences for which people appear. You will remember that when we moved to this, probably two years ago now, we raised then one of the concerns we had. We thought legally qualified chairs would be more reluctant to sack police officers. They are. You will remember the position we had in the MPS prior to this when we had a dedicated Commander who did that because we thought that being clear about our own standards as an organisation was absolutely crucial. There is work going on with legally qualified chairs of panels to make sure that, as I call it, where is the bar for what is acceptable and what are the values around that?

The other point that the HMIC picked up is whether we could do more work to actively seek out corruption. Yes, we do that. As you are aware, we still have, certainly by size and capability, one of the largest anticorruption commands in policing. We have made no secret of the fact that we have maintained that with its full capability to do everything as a standalone command. They suggest to us some areas like talking to refuges and like talking to domestic abuse referral centres. Is that another way of getting intelligence on people in positions of power who might be prevalent to abusing their position? We will look at that and see what more we can do about that. For the anticorruption command, this is fairly bread-and-butter business.

These sorts of allegations when they are received and working around these is one of the ways we work around it. That is the work that is going on in relation to that at the moment.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Thank you, Craig. You will understand the concern of the Committee is that we have had two or three reports that have been very critical of the MPS's procedures and the Committee will continue to take an interest in that.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If I may, Chairman, we have to be really careful with that last one, the PEEL inspection. That was not the MPS. The MPS was part of it, but there are forces in there that did not get a "good" grade and who did not "pass", in HMIC speak. No one supports that, but I would not want to just take one piece out of a national report and say, "Therefore, everyone is bad", because that would do a disservice to the work that the HMIC has done to produce quite a detailed report. Also, with that PEEL analysis, they spent two-and-a-half weeks with us. It feels like they are living with us for a period of time. It is important that we get the full perspective of that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Your point is well made because it is a more holistic report and the MPS did come out in more favourable terms. You have made that point.

That leads us into our work around the actual HMIC inspection on child protection investigation. At our earlier meeting, Commander Nick Downing [MPS] came along on 1 December [2016], which we were grateful for, to give high-level feedback on what the action plan would look like and the work around that. That was really helpful on that day.

We would like to ask some more detailed questions and I am glad that you are here today, Martin. You will introduce yourself in a minute, but you are the [MPS] lead. There was a weakness of the previous approach because there was no identifiable lead. We will be interested to hear your responses around that.

My first question around that particularly is to you, Martin, and again you can introduce your role in that. How confident, as the lead, are you that the HMIC recommendations are achievable?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If I may introduce myself, I am Martin Hewitt. My day job, if you like, is with Territorial Policing (TP). As you will all be aware from the report, one of the issues that the report very clearly raised was no person at the most senior level in the organisation having the overview in relation to child protection. That is a position that I took up in the very early stages after the immediate debrief we had with the HMIC on its findings.

It is really important to make the point that what they were saying and the fact was not that there was an absence of senior leadership completely in terms of how we deal with child protection. What they were reflecting was the fact that child protection activity takes place in different parts of our organisation and our organisation is unique in the size, scale and volume of what we do and so, by definition, control is broken up. We had very senior people within the SC&O Command who oversaw the command that deals particularly with child abuse and sexual offending and we had leadership within TP.

The point that the report legitimately makes is that at board level in the organisation we did not have one person who was bringing that all together and bridging some of the gaps that we have in terms of our organisational structure. That is the role that I now have.

As I know [Commander] Nick Downing said when he was here a couple of weeks ago, we had the "hot" debrief, as they described it, from the HMIC immediately after it finished its inspection and it became very

apparent that there were going to be some very difficult messages and that it had found some issues. We began a process at that stage of dealing with what we saw as the emerging findings and trying to identify what we would do and how we would do it.

We have put our work together in a number of areas and there is a very extensive action plan now that runs to 10 pages of a spreadsheet and picks up all the issues, not only in specific terms the recommendations that the HMIC made but also all that sits underneath those recommendations and gets us to effective delivery. The areas are around initial contact, investigation, our decision-making about cases, how we deal with those who manage a risk or pose a risk to children, the issue of police detention and then, lastly, the issues of leadership, management and governance.

We have a range of governance processes that we have put in place. In the immediate aftermath of that "hot" debrief, we created a Gold Group to pick up all of the issues that sit around that. That Gold Group sits and continues and is chaired by my deputy, Graham McNulty, who is the Deputy Assistant Commissioner within TP. That Gold Group brings together a range of people from across our organisation and also has Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) representation on the Gold Group.

We then have a delivery group below that, which is multi-agency and which is looking at how we actually deliver through the extensive action plan that we have put together. We created a scrutiny group as well, which is made up of people who are not part of the MPS - academics, professionals in this field, people from the third sector - who are able to challenge us in terms of the way we are developing what we are doing. We now also have an oversight [group] that the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] chairs to make sure that we are moving forward on the action plan.

I am confident that we will be able to deliver against the recommendations that the HMIC makes there. What I am really focused on as well, though, is not to just produce, if you like, a transactional response to those recommendations because many of them focus on policy and procedure. There, for me, is something about how we transform collectively within the organisation to focus on the protection of children.

It is really important as well that a lot of the discussion subsequent to the report has focused very much on child sexual exploitation (CSE) and that particular arena, but this is about protecting children in the round and in all the stages that a child may have an interaction with the police. We need to see it in that broad context.

We have all that work going on through those various groups and, then, where this links particularly is into our proposals for how we want to develop our operating model and the process that we have around the plans for creating Borough Command Units (BCUs), which - as I know Nick Downing articulated to a degree last time - brings together some of those specialist officers who currently work within SC&O in the child protection and sexual offences arenas with those officers who currently work within boroughs in our Community Safety Units (CSUs) so that we are able better to bridge some of the gaps that the HMIC quite properly identified in continuous service provision. Also, very importantly, we want to see children and the vulnerability of children in the full context of, potentially, the domestic environment and the care environment and linked to other criminality as well, which, for me, is as important in terms of protecting children.

Therefore, I am confident that we will get to a situation where we are able to meet the recommendations. It is going to require an enormous amount of work and there is an enormous amount of work going on currently. It will be overseen, as I have said, by the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] and the HMIC will be coming in. We do not have its programme for when it is coming back, but it will be coming back, very clearly, in a staged process to assess our progress.

There is also, for me, that much broader point about us transforming more broadly and out-with just the specific recommendations to better protect children in all the various ways that we have that responsibility.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Thank you, Martin. The work and the action-planning reflects, clearly, the recommendations from the report.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Very clearly.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): The point you made is a good one, which is about also working out how that then works towards delivery and you will get some questions later ---

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Of course.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): -- about MOPAC and Borough Operational Command Unit mergers, etc. You are well placed, being in charge of TP, to see how that is delivered out into the boroughs --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): -- as a practical piece. You mentioned that the HMIC will come back with different schedules and different timings and will set you different timings around your work. What sort of timescales are you working towards?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): You will see from the recommendations that they were based on immediate --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): They were staggered, yes.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): -- three months and six months and so we are working through that process and prioritising those.

The important point to make is that, as I said, we had the "hot" debrief when they immediately finished their fieldwork and the inspection and so this work has been going on. I know that Nick Downing gave some figures on the number of people we have provided training to and provided awareness to, particularly in that initial contact arena, whether it is in our call centres or whether it is with frontline officers. There is a range of work going through and all the action plan has, as you would expect, a timeline and milestones for delivery.

One of the really important elements that came out of the report for me was the disparity. The methodology of the inspection was that they selected a number of cases and asked us to review those cases internally and give an assessment of how effective we thought those investigations were. They then took the same cases and did an assessment. Probably the single most concerning issue for me was the disparity between our internal assessment and the assessment that the inspectors came up with.

We immediately created a team to go over every single one of the cases that HMIC looked at, which were 370-odd cases. That team started out to do that and we have now, effectively, turned it into a continuous improvement team in this arena and it has looked at a significant number of further cases. That will be the process that will provide us with some auditing and checking across the boroughs and within the specialist unit.

That issue, for me, was one an issue of our assessment, which was not good. Clearly, there were some issues and, whilst we had disagreements with the HMIC, they were fairly minimal and so I accept that we were not doing that correctly. Also, for me, the point before that, which is why the decision-making element is a big part of our programme, is that even before you audit them, the normal day-to-day supervision should be providing that Q&A into the quality of an investigation and whether we are doing that correctly. There is a lot of work to be done in and around that arena. We are working it through along the timetable.

I anticipate that they will be back in probably late January or early February [2017] in the first instance. We are working very closely with them and I know the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] is working very closely with them. We will have a programme throughout 2017 when they will be coming back and assessing how we are progressing against their recommendations.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Before I bring Len [Duvall AM] in, this Committee will take an interest continuing into 2017 at appropriate times around it.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is absolutely right.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You mentioned yourself the improvement around the internal MPS scrutiny, which, clearly, was a shortcoming in the report.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You also mentioned the fact that you will have an external group of experts as a scrutiny piece and I will come on in a minute to speak to the Deputy Mayor about the Safeguarding Board. Len, did you want to come in?

Len Duvall AM: Yes. I put my hand up just before you went into that last bit about the assessments, which I was quite interested to hear. Look, this is, no doubt, a damning and shocking failure of the MPS, both at the territorial level and at central level, because that was the sampling that was done.

I get the issues around issues being at different levels, but what I do not understand is around -- there are two different issues, are there not? How come our specialist central unit gets it so wrong when it should not? Is there a particular time period that we are looking at? What was the issue about staffing levels? What were the pressures? Was this because other people were taken off the cases, drilling down into it a bit more on TP, for that failure to happen?

I recognise that we are going to ask questions later on and I do not want to take that away around issues with the MOPAC 7 [crimes], but in terms of supervision where does screening-out crime fit into these failures and what are the pressures that are now falling on those individuals? This does not just happen overnight, does it? With this failure, there is something in the system and, clearly, something was missed. Try to paint some pictures for this Committee to understand those issues and then relate that to your 10-page action plan to put this right.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Just for my clarity, when you said at the beginning about the failures of the specialist central team, can I just be clear what you mean by that?

Len Duvall AM: I presume it is not just TP where this was. There were other units and other levels.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, there were.

Len Duvall AM: I presume they are specialist levels. If I am wrong, correct me and put that right. On the specialist one, I find that really shocking because we took steps to avoid these various issues. Should I expect it? No. I might accept there were problems at the TP level more readily than I would in some of our specialists units, which should be better at this.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. If we break it up, on the TP side, in each of the 32 boroughs we have a CSU, which deals with all of the issues around vulnerability at a local level: domestic abuse, hate crime, some of the lower-level sexual offences and some of the lower-level protection-of-children offences. They will, as boroughs, be working alongside Missing Persons Units and alongside the CSE Units that we have set up.

Then what we have at the centre is the Sexual Offences, Exploitation and Child Abuse (SOECA) Command within SC&O, which deals with the higher level of sexual offences, adult or child, and deals with child abuse issues when a crime is deemed to be more serious.

The reports highlighted that there were gaps in the effective working between those two units. Clearly, some children would be the subject of an investigation over on one side that was related predominantly to them, but there could be other activity going on over here in relation to their domestic setting, their status as a missing person or whatever. There was a gap there.

The report was largely very complimentary about the specialist units. It actually said that the quality of investigation there was, generally speaking, very good, up to and including CSE. Where you are coming from is over the years when we have had other issues. That is why we created a more centralised and specialist unit. That, clearly, has been delivering in that sense.

The criticism about a lot of the investigations that we looked at was particularly at those that remained with TP, which by definition would be the less serious offences. That is a combination of factors. There is an issue in that we have seen a significant increase in all sexual offending, as you will know, and whilst some of that is historic sexual offending, not all of it is historic or non-recent. We have done a good job of increasing people's confidence in coming forward about issues for which, otherwise, there was very significant under-reporting. That has put some volume into the system.

We increased the specialist investigators in the SC&O Command after, as you will recall, [The Rt Hon] Dame Elish Angiolini's [QC DBE] report into rape investigation [*Report of the Independent Review into the Investigation and Prosecution of Rape in London*, April 2015] and also, by virtue of the increase in reporting, we have increased the number of staff in that particular arena. We have, over the period, increased the number of staff that work in the CSUs in boroughs.

One of the challenges, having come into the TP world about seven or eight months ago, is to achieve consistency across the 32 boroughs. This kind of work has always been very important to me and I have worked in it in the specialist world. On every visit when I go to every borough, I will go into the CSU and get a sense of where people are there and how it is operating. I have to say that there is some frustration that we do not see the same model in the same places.

What happens at that level, being frank, is that a lot of this is about making the links between different parts of the system. We will have people over here who are dealing with domestic abuse investigations. We will have people over here who are dealing with missing persons and, in this instance, young people who go

missing. We have a CSU Unit that we have created to start to try to lift and see where are around that. We have the response officers who are, fundamentally, the first people who turn up and deal with many of these things. Then, over here, we have specialist teams that are coming in when it gets more serious. A thread that runs through the report is that we have not tied all of that together.

There is the fact that, by the terminology alone, the specialist units have the more experienced officers. By the nature of the work that the specialist units are doing, they will have more time to undertake the work that they do and there is, to an extent, a greater degree of control over their workloads. For those people who work for me within the boroughs, it is very busy and relentlessly busy and we have a larger number of the less-experienced officers.

I know that you will be familiar with some of the challenges we have had in encouraging people to become detectives. All of our detectives will start in my world and that is where they will learn their trade, but there is no doubt that there is work we need to do on the quality of the investigations and the quality of the supervision.

I have to be really careful because, also, the HMIC looked at 300 cases and there were some very shocking things in those cases. We have been back and have looked at every one of those cases and I am in no way saying that there were not things found. Of course there were things found but these, as everyone will know, are incredibly complex, often, with the situation and the circumstances but there is stuff to be learned.

Equally, day in and day out, we have literally hundreds of officers who are protecting children in London. It really is important to me to make that point because, as I go around those CSUs and as I interact with the people who are in the specialist units, these are incredibly dedicated people who are working hard and, day in and day out, are protecting young people in London.

However, we need to improve the quality of those investigations, particularly the ones that are basic and at the lower level. We need to make sure that the appropriate supervision is in place with the right knowledge and understanding. That is part of what drives where we want to go in terms of the BCU model and bringing some of the specialist and the local together.

There are two reasons for that, in my view. One is that it allows us to bring that quality, that experience and that knowledge closer so that we are bringing everybody up to a standard. Secondly, of course, it allows us to see any investigation or any case in the round with all the factors that may be contributing to that child's vulnerability because often, with children, there are multiple factors. As we have seen, there would have been a time when we were talking in the main about child abuse being in a domestic setting and relatively contained. Over the last few years, that has expanded enormously in terms of where that threat exists, in terms of CSE and what has emerged from the non-recent cases, and in terms of the impact of technology and the amount of time children are spending in a virtual world. There are a whole range of threats now that were not there and what we have to do is to adapt.

That is my point about how this is about transforming our approach as well as transacting against those recommendations because this is constantly changing. A child is vulnerable when they are doing whatever they are doing on the internet and people are able to reach, exploit and groom children in a way that did not exist a while ago. We have to have a system that is able to pick all of that up.

It is about the quality and experience of people. It is about the volume of work that people are dealing with in the different places. To a degree, we have to put in the leadership focus to make sure that that is seen as being an important part of our role, if not the important part of our role.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you. I am going to come back to screening because I want to talk about screening at that level and what was going on and the implications around that because it has a wider impact about reduced resources. How do you actually prioritise and what? I presume there was an element of screening-out somewhere and the supervision said on these cases, "We do not need to do any more". Presumably, that was an issue and so I would like to come back further on that --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): OK.

Len Duvall AM: -- but we will move on, Chairman, if we may. Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are going back to that a little bit later. Thank you for that overall strategic piece.

Turning to you, Deputy Mayor, Martin Hewitt mentioned the fact that you are, as part of the new processes, chairing an oversight board. Tell us how you will be holding the MPS to account in the context of this report and this work, please.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely. Just to reiterate, this report is, clearly, a really worrying report and incredibly concerning. Martin [Hewitt QPM] has set out how the MPS intends to put improvements in place. It was an inspection that took place from January to May of this year [2016] and the results are really worrying, particularly, as Martin has said, around the self-assessment and the ability of officers to understand what they are doing and the quality of what they are doing.

In terms of what MOPAC and I have put in place, it is a strategic board. Alex Marshall [QPM, Chief Executive Officer, College of Policing] from the National College of Policing is on it, Simon Bailey from the National Police Chiefs Council is on it because he takes the lead on child protection nationally, as well as Martin [Hewitt QPM]. Mike Cooke [Chief Executive, London Borough of Croydon] will also be on it from Camden. He chairs the London Safeguarding [Children] Board (LSCB). What it is there to do is to ensure that all the elements that Martin has outlined today are moving in the same direction and are producing the results that, yes, the HMIC wants to see and that we meet the timetable it has set out. It has set out very clearly in the report about the next six weeks, the next three months and the next six months and what we have to report. The Home Secretary and the Minister for Policing [Fire and Criminal Justice] have also asked for the HMIC to report back on a quarterly basis and that is something that the Mayor and I have discussed with the Home Secretary and the Minister for Policing. We are making sure that that happens and those deadlines are met.

As Martin has also said, what is important is not only to respond to this report and the failings within this report, but to make sure that it not just about the structures that are changing but also about what police officers on the front line as well as the specialist units are doing, and to make sure that that changes and to ensure that we are setting up the MPS in the right way to make sure that, where there are new vulnerabilities emerging, they are in the right place to meet those challenges as well. We do not want to make sure just that we ask the questions that are, rightly, in place from the HMIC report but that we know we are in the best position going forward. This is not a static position with child protection. The threats and vulnerabilities of children are constantly changing. We have to make sure that the police are able to be flexible to do that.

I am chairing that group. We have met already. We are meeting monthly and we will continue to do that until we are satisfied that we are making good progress and that we have the right systems in place.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): At an early stage, are you satisfied that the work and the action-planning in the 10 pages of spreadsheets is correct and is heading in the right direction?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I had early discussions on this as soon as I became aware of the HMIC report. I met - and have met on a number of occasions - with Martin [Hewitt] and Graham McNulty to discuss the Gold Group and to discuss what has been put in place. That has been an ongoing process.

In terms of what is in place at the moment, that is what we are assessing. At the moment, I am very confident that the leadership of the MPS is taking this incredibly seriously and that a lot of time, resource, capacity and drive is being put into this. What we will do as a board is to make sure that that continues and that it does produce the results that are needed.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are going to have questions both in this part of the morning's Committee work and also later about the Police and Crime Plan and how you will be holding the police to account on targeting and also the other responsibilities that you will be holding the police to account for, which are the other policing objectives and how that balance needs to be struck.

That takes us into now some questions about the MOPAC 7 [crimes]. That was identified within the report and Unmesh has some questions about that.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I have three sets of questions, Chairman, all directed at the MPS.

Looking to the future, MOPAC proposes to scrap the MOPAC 7 and give local areas greater control of local priorities. How do you see this impacting on safeguarding and child protection investigations?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Martin [Hewitt] has touched on some of this. There is a piece here that is really important for us both internally and externally about how we convey the messages about what the priorities are and it lay under some of the questioning we see today.

One of the concerns we have is that everyone rushes to the other side of the lifeboat, so to speak, and it swings right across because there is a real challenge in London that I am not sure we got over as well as we could have to the HMIC. Some of the issues around volume crime in London are around volume crime that is serious and I can say that as someone who has not grown up in London. I did not start my policing in London. Some of the stuff that elsewhere we would regard as very serious crime is in our volumes. People being stabbed on a nightly basis, to me, is about safeguarding, safeguarding young people from being stabbed and getting the balance right. The Mayor and the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] are absolutely alive to getting it right.

That issue around giving some flexibility locally offers some really good potential. It is certainly something I have done elsewhere and I have seen elsewhere. We have to now look - and the Deputy Mayor was absolutely right - in terms of consulting about how that will be done, but this area of getting the priorities right is the crucial bit of this work on the Police and Crime Plan. That opportunity to consult on that and that and engage people on it is absolutely right.

We are at a different point in the crime cycle. If you look at the latest national stats that are coming out, crime has plateaued across the country and, if you look at London, we are probably a bit behind. Some of our crimes are still falling, but violent crime across the country is rising again and we have to be alive to some of the issues behind that.

In getting this balance right, we are working very closely with the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] and her team to get that balance right about how we get to - and it is good that there is a public debate - those priorities at a local level and also the things that we are going to look at and monitor at a MPS London-wide level. That is a good thing.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Just to ask you very directly, it cannot be right that some areas choose to prioritise tackling CSE and some do not.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In the proposals and I do not want to speak for the Deputy --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): There has to be that consistency across the MPS. I can see Martin[Hewitt QPM] nodding.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, there will still be central control over the consistency. We are talking about local flexibility perhaps with some crimes. There will be some that absolutely have to be there and have to be done.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Martin, do you have anything to add?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. For me, I do not envisage any flexibility around safeguarding activity being a fundamental priority for every one of the Borough Commanders or BCU Commanders in the future.

What the plan is trying to reflect, which I support and which is one of the phrases I often use with the Borough Commanders, is that they have to police what is in front of them. In some places there will be things that are more prevalent and more of concern to the community than in other places.

However, there is running through the centre of that a core of issues and child protection is a core issue. I would put violence as a core issue. However you subdivide what we do, that has to be a core priority activity.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just clarify this? In terms of the Police and Crime Plan and the priority setting, we are quite clear that what we are going to do within the consultation for the Police and Crime Plan is to consult on the priority setting around volume crime. That will be data-driven. MOPAC will provide evidence and will work with local Borough Commanders, local borough leaders and chief executives to set those priorities.

However, in terms of vulnerability and harm, there will be core priorities that every borough must work towards. That will include CSE. It will include violence against women and girls. That is there.

It is almost as if there are two baskets of priorities. One is around volume crime, which will be data-driven and where local boroughs with the local police, working with MOPAC and the MPS centrally, can set their own priorities; but harm and vulnerability across London is absolutely consistent. We expect every borough to have that as a priority and that will be consistent.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Len, did you want to come in on that?

Len Duvall AM: Yes. Sorry, Chairman. I know that we are coming back to the Plan later on in part two --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are, yes.

Len Duvall AM: -- but there is an issue with the way the plan is written, then, for my colleague to ask that question and not understand that. Some clarity might be there.

Let us go back to the MOPAC 7 issue and, clearly, that HMIC looked at this. Was this a case, then, of you taking other officers to work on the MOPAC 7? I have a little smile on my face on this because we had the Deputy Commissioner here and we had the very conversation about the operation. I forget what the operation was, but it had a grand sounding name. I was particularly concerned about violence. Let me just remind the Deputy Commissioner about this.

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

Len Duvall AM: I was saying this and I had assurances that violence would be dealt with rather than thefts from sheds, which are important in terms of tackling crime but, in terms of harm and vulnerability, it was not where I was quite coming from.

When we talk about the evidence given to the HMIC - and this may go to another wider issue about what the MPS needs to think about rather than just looking at this issue in isolation - were we taking other officers off other priorities and is that why HMIC came away with the conclusion about this MOPAC 7? Is there - as I call it - extraction, a wider issue in terms of the MPS? You are quite good at dealing with crises, but is that the issue and is that why the MOPAC 7 is in the frame here for being one of the guilty trends and why we got this so wrong?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will start and I will let Martin [Hewitt QPM] talk about specifically what happened in boroughs.

What the HMIC would say it saw - and it is probably best to ask them directly - in relation to it is that where we went in the organisation, the focus was on volume crime and those seven main crime indicators, particularly in boroughs. Forget the centre because you have the serious crime work, the work that you would expect, the guns and gangs. They would say that when they went to boroughs they did not see "safeguarding" and "vulnerability" as language used in the same way that they saw "reducing crime", "tackling street violence" and "tackling gangs". That is why they attributed that and said that our focus around the MOPAC 7 led to exclusion of language around "vulnerability" and "safeguarding". Several of us have sat with them to try to understand that. I think it is actually more nuanced than that, but that is their explanation. Is that fair?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, that is fair. There is no question that going into the boroughs at that point in time, you would have been very hit by the MOPAC 7 being what the place was all about. In prioritisation terms, they were absolutely right about that. It is fair to say that the performance management regimes were focused on the MOPAC 7, which includes violence offences but they were focused on the MOPAC 7 offences.

The other level to it, rather than a very stark "extraction" in the way you described it, is that if you imagine that a borough has a vast range of things it has to do, you have a core decision about how you are going to deploy your people, how many will be answering calls, how many will be investigating and so on. What you have over the top of that is your deployable asset, if you like, that you can flex to whatever issue. There is no doubt that that deployable asset was predominantly flexed towards MOPAC 7 issues rather than other things

and there was an undoubtedly a sense within those people who worked in the vulnerability arena that they did not get their voices as loudly heard. That is what they saw.

Len Duvall AM: All right. Excellent. Let us go back, then. In your 10 pages of your action plan, it is wider and there are wider lessons for the MPS to use. The word is probably - and I am a bit blunt - "extraction" and there are elements of extraction and "flexing" is the word that I really was looking for. In terms of guidance, really, your good supervision will be on top of that and we understand that. We would like to see consistency across the MPS.

In your 10 pages, what are you saying about flexing resources in the future? It is not saying that this is a priority because it clearly is and we have to get this right, but there are lots of priorities and there are lots of important issues --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are.

Len Duvall AM: -- that the MPS has to get right. We heard of one of the cases earlier on. What are we saying about flexing and the way management and supervision should be used in terms of delivering all of the services of the MPS? This clearly has lessons on other aspects, not just in TP but in other bits of the service.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. It is less of an issue in other bits of the service where they will tend to be very specific. We know what the murder team does and we know what various other teams do at the centre. The real challenge in a borough is that you have to spread yourself across the whole range of everything that involves local policing.

The first thing for me is that those discussions have to be nuanced, intelligent discussions at the leadership level and in the way we run all of the normal business processes that drive the business in the borough.

The first time I ran the TP Crime Fighters meeting was in May, I think, and from May through to today - because they are meeting today in another part of London - we have shifted what is on that agenda to get a balance in what is on that agenda. We are talking about the individual borough response to missing people, we are talking about how we deal with CSE offences and we are talking about all of those other factors that perhaps were not being as routinely spoken about. My expectation is that that then is what is happening with the Borough Commanders when they are running their own processes because we all know that what you put into the main performance meeting is what they are going to go away and focus on and so that is the first lever we have to pull.

It is then, really, about having those conversations with people about how we do flex. There was the phrase Craig [Mackey QPM] used about going from one side of the boat to the other. The other one that I use is about the children playing football and they are all in the corner where the ball is. We cannot do that in policing any borough or any BCU in the future in London. That is what we are working into the plans. How do we get that core establishment right so that we have enough critical mass of people to do the things we need to do? How do we knit it all together to make sure that that unit over there is working with that unit over there?

If I talk about CSE, again, one of the things that I am really pushing is that a lot of CSE emanates from children who are in care in children's homes. Every one of those children's homes is in one of our wards. We have neighbourhood teams and we are going to increase the neighbourhood teams. They have to be the front line of people who are interacting there, who are establishing relationships and who are understanding what the vulnerabilities are. That does not happen as well as it could happen at the moment in my opinion. It is

bringing all of those bits together and then it is making sure, with all the training and awareness we are doing, that everyone in their head gets that this is a key responsibility that we have as the police service.

It is a multi-layered thing, which is really what I was trying to say about it. We can be transactional about training 10,000 people, and we all know that that has a place, but for me it is more about that leadership and governance bit where we are driving it.

Sorry, just one final bit. That that is not to say that that means we do not care about burglary. It was a frustrating-for-them conversation that I had, having spent a lot of years in specialisms, when I came to TP and all the Borough Commanders said, "When are you going to tell us what the most important thing?" I kept saying, "All of it. You have your challenges. You have to be able to deal with everything from road traffic at one end to serious violence at the other end in your patch. Our challenge is how we flex ourselves to make us capable".

Len Duvall AM: Chairman, it is a question for you, but sometime in the future we have to devote more time to flexing, extraction and the issues around that to understand what it means for the MPS in a wider form and what it means for TP as we go into borough mergers and everything else. We might want to return to this.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We should another time but also, equally, in the second part of this morning we are going to look a bit more deeply into priority setting. Did you want to very quickly come in [Sophie]?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, just to pick up on this issue of MOPAC 7, priority setting and the action plan around the HMIC child protection report. There is of course the action plan and the steering group, as we have already set out, but that has to be seen in connection with and alongside the new Police and Crime Plan, which is out for consultation. That has very much shifted the emphasis from only looking at volume crime, which is what has happened over the last four years --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes, we are going to cover that in the next session.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- to vulnerability and harm. Martin [Hewitt] has touched a little bit today on what the performance measurement of the MPS was in the last four years and it was to look at the MOPAC 7. That is what the HMIC has found and has raised and highlighted as an issue.

Frankly, what the HMIC has said in its report is probably what many of you in this Committee and I have found going around talking to people in pre-consultation around the Police and Crime Plan. They have told me that it was a straitjacket and they did not feel that there was the focus on harm and vulnerability because of the absolute focus, through the crime-fighting and the performance management, on the MOPAC 7. It did make a difference in terms of what happened on the ground. That we can see from the HMIC report.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Fine. I am going to be asking some questions about that in the second part of the session and also on the other priorities that you have also set them, which are violence against women and girls and hate crime. Andrew had a quick question and then --

Andrew Dismore AM: Just a quick one, going back. I do not want to get too bogged down in the borough merger stuff because that is going to come later, but it is a very simple question. You said that boroughs set their priorities. I am not going to get into the detail of what the priorities are; Len has been doing that and will no doubt later on. I am just concerned about the merged boroughs.

Supposing Camden and Islington or Barking and Dagenham and Havering and Redbridge decided that they have different priorities from each other. Will they each be allowed to set their own priorities even though they are in the same merged command?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We have this as a question later.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, and they do have different priorities if you look at those two boroughs together. They do have different priorities when you look at the crime types, absolutely.

Andrew Dismore AM: It will not be one-size-fits-all for the mergers?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No.

Andrew Dismore AM: Each borough will definitely be able to do its own thing?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We have some questions about that later specifically.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Just moving on to staffing now, what is the latest assessment of the MPS's child protection staffing levels, in particular with regard to determining the extra officer resources needed, including supervisors?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): As I said earlier on, in response to [The Rt Hon Dame] Elish Angiolini's QC DBE report, there was an increase in the specialist unit. The specialist unit now has just over 1,300 officers and is the unit that sits in the centre. They are the officers who work on the child abuse investigation teams and also on the rape teams and do all of the specialist elements around that. I do not have the exact figure, but in the CSUs across the boroughs, there is something in the region of 900 staff that work dedicated in those boroughs.

I did check around the supervision ratios. The supervision ratios on average will be one sergeant to five or six constables. Generally speaking, it is very hard to do a complete figure because it will vary slightly from team to team. What we reflect in all of those areas is, because of the degree of risk involved in the work, we have to have a higher supervisor-to-constable ratio.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): The specialist unit you referred to is the SOECA?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, the SOECA.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): The SOECA has 1,300 officers. Is this fully resourced?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is. There will always be a small churn, but it is pretty much up to strength in terms of where it is supposed to be. I do have that somewhere and I will try to find it as we carry on.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The ratios in that unit are Detective Inspectors to Detective Sergeants (DSs) 1:5, which is good, and DSs to Police Constables (PCs) and Detective Constables (DCs) 1:4. I think you are running in TP an average of about 1:8, are you not?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Nine.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That gives you an idea. As we said, we would always keep more supervision in that unit and in that space.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): While Martin looks at some figures --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I will try to find that for you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): -- what I want to ask also is where these officers come from? What impact has this had on other investigative units? Have they been transferred from elsewhere?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The officers for the SOECA Command?

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. Where have they come from?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Most of them came from within SC&O, did they not?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They will have come from some of the work we have done in murder commands or some of the work in proactive teams. It is only one pot.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): It is a significant shift.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, it goes back to the point that you have touched on a number of times and you touched on earlier. You have to reprioritise. They only come from one place.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will find this eventually for you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): If I could then ask you, Craig, just turning to the One Met Model, how will the proposed changes for the One Met Model improve understanding and help to deliver a more co-ordinated approach to safeguarding and protecting children?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We will probably touch on this a lot when we get into the Police and Crime Plan. The strand we talk about around that is protecting vulnerable people. One of the things that the HMIC identified is that the way we split the work currently between high-end serious and serious-but-volume [crime] out in boroughs has allowed things to get missed in the middle or we end up in a scenario that is described - as any of you who have spoken to safeguarding boards across London will know - where sometimes we end up with three or four members of the MPS for one family or one issue.

By moving some of that central asset – and it is redistributing existing resources – to those local levels and breaking it down into a smaller grouping across London, we allow it to come together more closely. We will bring protecting vulnerable people, which will bring all of the stuff that was previously in the CSU, some of the SOECA work, the Multi-agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASH) work and the stuff that goes on with registered sex offenders, and bring that to one place locally so that people can join up and offer a better service. Then, working with the local authorities in the new model, we can talk about how safeguarding boards work and how we can better service those as well.

Taking it from the centre and moving it closer to where the point of delivery is makes logical sense. There are some challenges in getting everyone in the model and getting that done, but that is the proposal for the future.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I have found my number. The current staffing number for police officers in the whole command is 1,314. Currently, the child investigation teams are up to strength, apart from the odd bit of movement. They are up to strength. For the teams that investigate rape, there are about 100 vacancies on the teams that investigate adult rape but, in the December posting panel, we put another 25 towards those and so they will get posted in January [2017]. It is pretty much up to strength and certainly, in terms of a vacancy factor, it is a good vacancy factor compared to other parts of the organisation.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): I will leave it there, Chairman.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): It is worth noting now that the Committee, previously led by Caroline Pidgeon [MBE AM], did a lot of work about this and it is a shame that Caroline, for family reasons, is not with us today.

Part of the recommendation that that report and also the HMIC report made was around training and issues with that. Andrew, you have a few questions on this.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. If we could look at the issue of training first, when this Committee looked at safeguarding in 2014, it then highlighted that there was a need for more training but that does not seem to have been picked up.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In relation specifically to what?

Andrew Dismore AM: In relation to child protection and safeguarding children.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There is a range of training that people will go through and certainly those people who are on the specialist teams go through a significant amount of training.

What the HMIC found will partly be a symptom of the fact that we have moved quite a few people in and that people leave, go out and come into the teams in the boroughs. There is a degree to which we have not effectively provided the training for people who work within the CSU environments within the boroughs and that is being addressed as part of the plan.

Then there is the broader issue, which is the more generic training hitting all of our first-responders, which we have made quite significant progress on since May but it is fair to say that we have not kept that up as well as we should have done.

Andrew Dismore AM: The HMIC says that it is “a very serious omission”. It talks about “officers in roles focused on tackling CSE who had not been trained in the subject”, and in particular highlights the issue of command-and-control centres where the staff “could not recall having had any safeguarding or CSE training” at all.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, we have rectified that now within the command-and-control centres.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is good to know. What are you doing to reinforce the message about their individual and collective safeguarding responsibilities to all staff?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That, as you might imagine, is something that we have to do in many different ways. We have routinely for all officers what we call professional development days that are built into their shift patterns and we have agreed that we will use two of the four professional development days for all of the issues concerning safeguarding. We have provided training now - we are up to nearly 11,000 of our frontline officers with about 4,000 to go - in terms of the issues around CSE, safeguarding and missing children.

However, this is not something that is a one-off hit. It has to be something that is continually reinforced. Clearly, one of the other elements of TP is that we get all of the new people and so we can do that through their initial training. We constantly have to be refreshing and bringing this into people’s minds. It has become and has been for some time part of all promotion training and so, for anyone who is promoted to Sergeant, Inspector or above, it is part of the programme they get before they take up their responsibilities as leaders. It has to be something that is continually reinforced.

One of the most powerful comments was from Simon Bailey [QPM], who is the Chief [Constable] in Norfolk [Constabulary] and is the national lead on child sexual offences and sits on the group that Sophie [Linden] chairs. Simon came and spoke to us a couple of weeks ago at the Board. It is important to recognise that his force four years ago had a similar inspection response and, in fact, there have been 12 forces that were inspected prior to us by the HMIC and they have all been fairly challenging. Ours, of course, comes at scale in a way that other people’s do not. The point that Simon made was that as the Chief Constable of Norfolk, in every interaction, in every event that he is involved with, at every point where he is interacting with his staff, he emphasises the fact that they all have a responsibility for safeguarding those who are vulnerable, not exclusively children.

That is part of where we are trying to go which, again, for me, is what I was talking about in terms of transformation.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, certainly, it is a continual process.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: I fully understand that and that is the right approach, but how long is it going to take to catch up before you get to that point?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We are catching up fairly rapidly in terms of that initial hit to people. As I said, we have dealt with all of the people who work in the control centres. We are nearly through all of those who are initial responders, particularly around missing persons. It is just going to be a programme that continually works its way through with the normal cycle of events for our leaders and the normal cycle of professional development days for all our officers. As I said in response to one of the previous questions, every time we are conducting performance or development meetings, it is getting reinforced with our leaders, which is what will be happening --

Andrew Dismore AM: How long is it going to take to catch up?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We will have gone through that initial exposure to everyone by, I would guess, January or February [2017] time, but I do not like to see it in those terms because it really is a continuous --

Andrew Dismore AM: I accept that, but there is a catch-up job to do and that is what I am probing.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Of course, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: The next question I am going to ask about this in particular is about children in custody. I am going to go on to some of the other questions about the protection of children in custody more generally, but one of the things the HMIC particularly highlighted was the lack of awareness of custody officers of these issues. What is happening in relation to training custody officers?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have done a lot of training. As you will be aware, we have one command that sits under me and looks after all of our custody facilities. They have done an enormous amount of training.

However, I want to put some context into that particular finding. The first point is that it talks about having looked at 40 cases. They were 40 cases where children had been charged with offences that would mean they would not be granted bail. Therefore, it is not a percentage of the overall number of children who come through custody in any given year. About 60,000-odd children will be suspected of an offence.

The challenge we have is that if we are going to remand a child, generally speaking, to go to court the next day, there needs to be suitable accommodation for that child. Where we have not been strong enough is in pushing to find that accommodation. I have an examples where children were being remanded in custody, with no bail granted, to go to court the next day and the nearest secure accommodation for some of the more extreme elements was in the northwest of England, which is clearly not an acceptable way of operating.

There is not an absolute lack of understanding on the part of custody sergeants. There is a lack of provision and the custody sergeants are taking decisions about looking after those children.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is not what the HMIC found. One thing that it did find was this about the lack of appropriate bed provision: there is no "evidence of escalation by senior officers with relevant partners to resolve the issue". In other words, you have not been taking this particular problem up with local authorities at the top level, never mind what is happening at the bottom.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is probably fair. What has happened is that custody sergeants, when they have tried, have ended up with results that have not worked. Why has that not been escalated? I do not know the answer to that. What then has happened is that

custody sergeants have almost anticipated that there is not going to be the provision and have taken the decision to care for children in that environment. I can assure you, as somebody who has been a custody sergeant, that you do not want to have a child retained in the cells any longer than you absolutely need to.

However, you are right. We have not pushed hard enough and made enough noise about the fact that there should be alternative provision for someone who is a child.

Andrew Dismore AM: You are right in that they looked at only 40 cases, but I was asking questions about this earlier this year. In the six-month period over the most recent dates available, you had over 3,000 under-18s kept in custody overnight and 483 over a weekend. The youngest child at that time was 10 years old. One child had been kept in detention for 93 hours. That does seem to me to show quite a bit of a failing.

I am not going to go through all the criticisms that the HMIC made because there are a lot of them about the approach to custody, but I am not satisfied, really, that you actually have an understanding of those criticisms from what you have been saying about the approach of custody sergeants.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, I absolutely understand what the criticisms are. What I am trying to point out is that there is inadequacy in the system. Clearly, we have not done what we ought to have done and in those particular cases the criticism can be levelled. At the same time, with the numbers you present there, I do not know of the individual cases or why they came into custody.

However, just to give an example, I went to speak to the LSCB last week or the week before and we were talking about this very issue because, certainly, several people in that group were very exercised about it. The person from the Safeguarding Board in Harrow was talking about a very young child who had been in custody for a very extended period at that point because there was no secure place for that child to go, there was no adequate mental health medical provision to look after that child and she was a very significant danger not only to herself but to other people. The point being made by that non-police member of the LSCB was that there is a real dilemma here that we have to face.

Andrew Dismore AM: One of the criticisms there was that they found examples of custody officers requesting secure accommodation when alternative accommodation could have been requested. I do not know whether that would --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That may be but - and this is not to say that there is not criticism and we accept that - significant work has been done by the Detention Command because that is an area where we can very clearly control the consistency across the piece.

Andrew Dismore AM: The other thing I was going to raise in this particular part is about appropriate adults. The HMIC found that the request for an appropriate adult often was made by the investigating officer rather than the custody staff, which is in breach of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE). That resulted in kids being kept in longer than perhaps they ought to have been; for example, being kept overnight until the interviewing officer was available the next day. That is not appropriate either, is it?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No. As I said, all of those issues that have been raised in that particular detention section have been taken on and are being dealt with by the Detention Command. Clearly, a breach of PACE, if it was such, is a very serious issue.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is being looked at root-and-branch, is it?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is being looked at root-and-branch and we will, clearly, be able to go through precisely what has been done within that particular arena because, as I said, it is a self-contained unit.

Andrew Dismore AM: Are we going to have some effort made to lobby local authorities to provide that? We are?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, and I raised that at the LSCB and we will continue to do so.

Andrew Dismore AM: Can I move on to the issue of missing and absent children? The HMIC was also quite critical of this when it said:

"... absent episodes appeared in the midst of missing episodes and risks were not adequately recognised despite clear indications that the children in question were vulnerable."

What are you doing to improve your response in relation to this?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have a Missing Persons Unit on every one of the boroughs and we have had those for a period of time. Since the inspection, we have undertaken training in that and that is a specific part of the training that is going to all of our frontline officers.

Predominantly, we have the response officers. They are the ones who, when they are on duty, get the task when a person goes missing - and there are about 25,000 children each year who go missing in London - and they will be given the responsibility to try to do that.

We then have the Missing Persons Unit, which will deal with and intervene with the higher-risk cases and those that go on for any length of time. Equally, if a case is high-risk, not only will it be getting reviewed by a duty officer but it will get reviewed by a detective inspector to see whether they need to move some or all of that search into the Criminal Investigation Department (CID). We have done the training for the response officers.

Andrew Dismore AM: When the HMIC talks about there being a rather "inconsistent service", you are going to achieve consistency across the boroughs?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That would be the objective: to achieve consistency across the boroughs. Again, we get a disparity in terms of the number and the nature of the children going missing. In Tuesday, I was in Redbridge Borough, which has a very significant level of children going missing because they have a very significant level of children's residential homes within that borough.

Keith Prince AM: Barnardo's --

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have to also get behind this and look at the broader issues. Our responsibility is to find children, make sure they are safe and well, check and return them to where they have come from --

Andrew Dismore AM: The reason I am concerned about this is that ten years ago, when I was chairing the Joint Committee on Human Rights in Parliament as a Member of Parliament (MP), we highlighted then the problem particularly of unaccompanied minors who were being put into care and were going missing and nothing was being done to find them. It is not a new problem.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, it is not a new problem but, equally, I do not accept that nothing is being done to find them. Every single morning when we - as in the leadership - get our daily overnight [report], a significant proportion is vulnerable missing people and most of the children will be on that list. However, we have to work collectively with all the other partners and agencies and all those places that have a responsibility to look after children to try to get behind why these youngsters are going missing. Some youngsters are going missing repeatedly. Some of the case studies that the HMIC chose to use in its reported talked about looked-after children who have gone missing 20, 30 or 40 times.

Clearly, we have a responsibility. We need to get that risk assessment right. We are asking our people to make challenging risk assessments and often quite dynamic risk assessments. The risk assessment is based on the information provided by wherever that young person has gone from. We have to get that right. We have to equip our people to do that and we are doing that training, but I do not accept that we are not making any effort to find them because, day in and day out, we find the missing children.

What we have to do collectively - and that was part of the conversation I had with the LSCB - is to get behind that and to the reasons why these youngsters are going frequently. Then, of course, the really key one is the link into CSE.

Andrew Dismore AM: The lesson that I pick out of this is the need to join the dots and that has not been happening.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I agree with that entirely.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is going to happen?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. That, for me, is part of that transformation. Part of what we want to try to do in the way that we organise ourselves is about joining the dots and getting behind those. We have some of the information that gets behind the reasons, but it is about joining the dots, as you said.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We now have reassurance around that, Andrew. Do you want to move on to the last part of the questions?

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. The last question I want to ask, hopefully relatively briefly, is about the new investigation into allegations of historic abuse in football clubs and what impact that is going to have on your resources.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will let Craig answer this particular one.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I shall take this. In terms of what we have, I will just find my note ...

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We understand that it is an ongoing investigation, but just some high-level --

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. We made some announcements yesterday in relation to the ongoing investigations into this.

Like everyone, we have seen the reporting nationally and we have seen people coming forward in terms of what is there. We have a specialist capability within our SOECA Command, the specialist command at the centre, which is co-ordinating all of these responses and you probably heard the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis] talking about the range of responses we have had. Yesterday it stood at over 100 but that number changes quite regularly. This goes back to a number of things that we have touched on this morning. It is all being co-ordinated through an operation through the National Police Chiefs Council and through Simon Bailey and his team in Norfolk, an Operation Hydrant team. We are linking in at a national level with the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, which, as you are aware, has started a helpline around this, and so we are getting those.

We will then look at and work through those and we will have to put resources to those that need investigating. They will be broken up in the normal way that you would expect: some where there are safeguarding risks immediately, some where there are historic issues. As you are aware and as we spoke about yesterday, it covers both professional football and also grassroots football in clubs and things that we are associated with, and it will work across London. It is right across the piece. Sadly, I think it is going to grow in terms of numbers and, as we go forward, we will have to look at how we resource that and what we do in relation to those investigations.

Why do we need that national co-ordination? Like many things, people may have worked in sport in a variety of places across the UK or further afield and that is what the national co-ordination does.

Andrew Dismore AM: I have a last question on this issue. There may or may not be some high-profile suspects. I do not know. Have we learned the lessons from the [Sir Richard] Henriques inquiry [*An Independent Review of the Metropolitan Police Service's Handling of Non-Recent Sexual Offence Investigations against Persons of Public Prominence*, November 2016] about how this is going to be done?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely, we learned lessons from all of these. Actually, with all of these inquiries - and it is a really good point - you can see some of the complexities around it. People have immediately started to use language about "victims", which Henriques said something different about. It is quite a good way of highlighting the real dilemmas that we ask our operational officers to wrestle with. Absolutely, rest assured. The best people are looking at this and will work their way through it, but in your question you highlight some of the dilemmas because none of this is an easy space to work in.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am not going to go into that in detail because we went through that with the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis] before, but it is something that needs to be borne in mind.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Thank you. That is the end of that part of this morning's work. We will, clearly, carry on looking at this during the course of the coming months and in the New Year [2017]. I am sure we have some reassurance around it, particularly with you, Martin [Hewitt], taking the lead on that.

I want to move quite quickly into the next part of the morning, which is about the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan. The new plan has just been published for consultation for 12 weeks leading up to February 2017. This

Committee will clearly do some more detailed work in January with invited guests and we are trying to do some work around that at the moment but while we have you here as a panel it is an opportunity to have your first thoughts around it. Clearly the Plan differs radically in many parts, which we have already touched upon, from the previous [Police and] Crime Plan.

We have some questions around the priorities and others in a minute but first of all questions to the MPS, to either Craig or Martin [Hewitt QPM]. What input did the MPS have into the drafting of this particular plan?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you. We were involved in a number of ways. In early November some of our teams worked with colleagues from MOPAC around looking at some of the areas that could be in the draft. We were fortunate that prior to the release of the final version, we had the opportunity to see it and comment. I fed back comments along with another wider submission from the MPS. We have been involved certainly throughout as this starts to emerge. At many of the meetings I often end up sitting alongside the Deputy Mayor, whether it has been with London Councils, whether it has been with chief executives or others, and we have talked broadly about the thrust and focus and the key areas of the plan. There are no surprises in terms of what we saw.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We have already touched upon the prioritising. We have talked around safeguarding, quite properly over a period of time. In the priorities set, there are a lot of targets within the plan. There are over 50 identified crime areas that we want to reduce, although there may or may not be some specifics around that. We have already touched upon a critique of MOPAC 7, which was a hard-edged target area. We have talked around that already with neighbourhood crimes.

The Mayor has asked you to prioritise safeguarding, violence against women and girls and hate crime as three threads, themes or targets that should sit within all the borough pieces and then, on top of that, formulate local crime priorities for those individual boroughs, almost unique to those boroughs, that are prescribed for and by those boroughs particularly in replacement of the MOPAC 7. You said yourself when you visited the boroughs that MOPAC 7 permeated the borough targeting from top to bottom, rightly or wrongly. We did see an 18% to 20% reduction in those crimes.

How do you see that target-setting? Is there enough clarity, do you feel, for you to be held to account as senior police and for you also to judge and hold to account your own officers within that matrix of priority-setting? Is there enough clarity for you to be held to account?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There will be by the time we finish it.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It will be good when it is finished.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): This is important. This is out for consultation at the moment and the consultation questions effectively say, "Tell us your priorities. Talk to us about what you do more of and what you do less of". You have touched on it a number of times. The feedback we have given is around some of the hard choices. We will have to make some hard choices collectively as London going forward and the Police and Crime Plan hopes to provide the framework to allow us to make some of those informed decisions.

It goes to a point that the Deputy Mayor made earlier on. There is a danger sometimes, and it may be in the way that we have all ended up with a draft, but it is not intended that it is a free-for-all. It is intended to be data-led local priority setting. Let us think of an extreme example. I will not name a borough but if someone

came back and said, "Tell you what, I have robbery figures like this, I have moped-enabled crime like this and I have sexual violence like this but I am going to focus on damage to bus stops", we might have to be saying, "Come on, where is the data? Where is the information? That is not a priority". It is now going through the detail of that.

We have had some useful sessions with the teams together saying, "How could this look and how could this work?" If you remember, one of the things that the local bit was designed to address, as we go through a transition and the MPS changes over the next three to five years, is trying to give a much more local feel to an organisation where the critique you often make of us is, "It just feels like you give the same to everyone". This will hopefully give some local flavour to that. It is different and it can work but it is keeping that tight enough.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I heard your comments earlier that when you used to visit, it felt like MOPAC 7 was the only game in town. Of course, that was not true.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Clearly, the leaders of those boroughs were looking at murder and looking at terrorism across the piece. They were not MOPAC 7 and they were properly adhered to. Deputy Mayor, among this cocktail of targets that you are working towards, how will you be able to hold the Commissioner to account? It appears to me there is not the clarity around the targets.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You are valiantly defending the MOPAC 7.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): No, I am not at all.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In terms of the MOPAC 7 --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You are putting words in my mouth. I am not in the slightest. If I may say, they were of their time. They had a success rate in and of themselves. They are then. We are now in the new world. I am talking about your Plan.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In terms of priority-setting in the Police and Crime Plan, we are out to consultation but it is very clear from within - and the consultation we are having is the best way of indicating this - that we expect, through data-led evidence that MOPAC will work with the boroughs, the Borough Commanders and the MPS to produce because we do have very good evidence and insight into this, we will discuss with the boroughs the best way of them setting those priorities.

They will be within two baskets, the first volume crime, whatever is the most prevalent and the most important to those boroughs, and the second basket around harm and vulnerability. I do not think that is a very complicated message. It is a little bit more sophisticated than the MOPAC 7 but the MPS is a large, sophisticated organisation with a large staff and can rise to this challenge. It is the best way forward, ensuring that yes, we make sure that those volume crimes that are producing the most concern in the local boroughs are tackled and are reduced but also that we really have a focus on harm and vulnerability. I hope in four years' time we will not be having the lengthy discussion we have had about that because the performance framework of the MPS will be such that from MOPAC and from my position, we are able to assess very clearly where progress is being made and where reductions are being made because they should be reduced.

Also it is important to state that in some of these areas we would expect reporting of crime to go up. We are not looking for reductions at this stage. For example, with CSE, domestic violence and some of the other

vulnerabilities, we are within this Plan saying we want increased reporting because we know that the crimes, high as they are at the moment, are not being reported in sufficient volume that we know is out there from our own assessments. We have published a sexual violence needs assessment and we know that there is a lot of sexual violence and it is increasing, whether that is through reporting or confidence, we need to get underneath. I believe that through this consultation process, by the end of it, when we come out with our final publication at the end of March, there will be very clear criteria that I can hold the MPS to account to and the public can hold their own local police to account to, local boroughs can hold their local police to account to, and there can be a clear understanding of where progress is being made.

Tony Arbour AM: These are really questions of you, Deputy Mayor. It is very striking that yesterday, at the final meeting of the Assembly of the year, the only thing that was mentioned by the Mayor that related to the Police and Crime Plan was that he took a single sentence out of the Police and Crime Plan that referred to the sale of water cannon. Clearly, the Mayor thinks this is the most important thing in the Police and Crime Plan.

I would like to ask you a few questions about the importance of this. First, was it a manifesto promise of the Mayor that the water cannon should be sold?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, it was.

Tony Arbour AM: It was. When was the manifesto published, Deputy Mayor?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It seems such a long time ago. It might have been at the beginning of the New Year that the manifesto was published.

Tony Arbour AM: When it was published, you knew that that was a commitment. Do you know how many other actual commitments there were relating to police in the Mayor's manifesto? This one said "sell". It was actually going to do something.

Do you know if there was anything else in there where the Mayor said he was going to do something positive, rather than use weasel words like "ensure", "try", "fight" or "encourage"? Can you think of anything else that was in the Mayor's police manifesto where he said he would actually do something?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The manifesto that was published on which, as you all know, the Mayor won a resounding victory --

Tony Arbour AM: No, I am not interested in that.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The manifesto --

Tony Arbour AM: I am asking you what he said in the manifesto, and I should tell you I have it in front of me here.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The manifesto is very clear what the Mayor's priorities would be around policing and crime: tackling knife crime, tackling violence against women and girls, setting up the Harris review around the preparedness for a terrorist attack --

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy Mayor, I asked you what specific things --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- and ensuring the return of real neighbourhood policing.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Stop talking across each other.

Tony Arbour AM: No, Deputy Mayor --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am trying to answer the question but I am being --

Tony Arbour AM: You are not answering the question. I simply asked you if you knew whether there was anything else in the Mayor's manifesto that related to crime when he said he would do something definitive rather than use the sort of words that you have just been using, such as "tackling", "ensuring", "undertaking" and so on. Was there anything else, other than the sale of the water cannon, which he said he would actually do?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Mayor's manifesto very clearly states that he is going to restore real neighbourhood policing.

Tony Arbour AM: No, you are not answering the question.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): With respect --

Tony Arbour AM: The point I am making, Deputy Mayor, is this. There were only two things in the Mayor's manifesto where he said he would actually do something rather than using any weasel words at all. One of them was that he was going to "sell", something that he was actually going to do, a proper verb, the water cannon, and the only other thing he said that I am taking as a proper, active verb was that he was going to "implement" a tough crime strategy. Given that there were only these two --

Len Duvall AM: There is a lot more than that, obviously.

Tony Arbour AM: Given that there were only these two definitive promises in the Mayor's manifesto --

Len Duvall AM: What a misleading --

Tony Arbour AM: No, I will not take these interruptions. The Mayor considered this to be the most important thing and that is why I am -- asking the Deputy Mayor about it. When you took office - I cannot recall when you were appointed; I think it was in May but it may have been in June - you knew that these water cannon were to be sold, didn't you?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If you would give me time to answer your first question, which was what else did the Mayor say in the manifesto that he would deliver --

Tony Arbour AM: No, I did not say that. I said, "What definitive action or thing did he say?"

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let the Deputy Mayor answer now, Tony. Yes, you can.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is a very interesting form of questioning, where you get to question and question and question but I do not get to answer.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Continue.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Chairman, I would ask you that you would allow me time to answer rather than being constantly interrupted by Mr Arbour.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It is yours.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Thank you very much.

Tony Arbour AM: Mr Arbour expects questions to be answered, Mr Chairman.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If you give me the time to do so, I will answer them.

In the Mayor's manifesto it was very clear that we would restore real neighbourhood policing, tackle violence against women and girls and set up the Harris review into the preparedness of the capital city if there was to be a terrorist attack. Not only has that been done - the review has been delivered very promptly, and a comprehensive review it was too - in terms of the manifesto commitment that said he would reintroduce real neighbourhood policing, a commitment has been made and is on track to ensure that there are dedicated ward officers in every ward. The manifesto was very comprehensive and clearly the voters of London thought the manifesto was very comprehensive because they voted for him in significant numbers in order for him to deliver it.

Tony Arbour AM: Please let me continue. I listened to all of that. The very interesting phrase you used there was "very promptly". Let me come back to this. When you were appointed, you knew that one of his promises was to sell the water cannon. Is that right?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Of course I knew, as did you know --

Tony Arbour AM: Thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- and as did the voters of London know --

Tony Arbour AM: No, my questions --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- because it is a public manifesto document.

Tony Arbour AM: My questions, Deputy Mayor --

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Point of order.

Tony Arbour AM: -- are very simple questions designed to elicit either a yes or a no.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I have a point of order.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): Point of order, Chairman.

Tony Arbour AM: So you knew --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Tony, I have a point of order. I am sorry. I have to interrupt you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Deputy Chair): It seems to me that we are straying from the topic that we should actually be considering.

Tony Arbour AM: No, we are not. It appears in the Police and Crime Plan. The Mayor himself yesterday drew attention only to this one aspect. I think, Mr Chairman, I am entitled to ask the Deputy Mayor why the Mayor thought that that was the most important thing. I am asking the Deputy Mayor questions about the sale of the water cannon. I ask very simple, very easy questions, Deputy Mayor, as I say, designed to elicit a yes or a no. I think that your answer to the question about the sale of the water cannon was that, yes, you knew that that was something that was in there.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Was that revelatory to you that I knew what was in the manifesto?

Tony Arbour AM: That leads to the next question.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Go to the next question, then.

Tony Arbour AM: The next question related to this, Deputy Mayor: what did you do when you arrived in office in relation to this manifesto commitment to sell the water cannon?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Clearly, as it is a manifesto commitment to sell the water cannon, we discussed it with the MPS and set in train the processes to do so. That is what the Mayor was highlighting yesterday. It was not because he thought it was the most important.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let the Deputy Mayor finish.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You are forgetting or deciding to overlook all the other analysis --

Tony Arbour AM: No, I am not.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- and the other times the Mayor --

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- has talked about policing and crime.

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy Mayor, the Mayor himself decided to choose this single aspect of the Police and Crime Plan yesterday as being the most important thing and so I am entitled, as someone who is here to scrutinise him through you, to ask questions as to the way he conducts his post as being responsible for the MPS.

You have told me you had lots and lots of discussions about it. When were these discussions held? When you arrived, did you find MOPAC, having read the manifesto, had prepared a plan as to how it was going to sell the water cannon?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): When I arrived, it was very clear that we were going to deliver the manifesto commitment to sell the water cannon. That is what has been put in train. The announcement yesterday was how that was being put in train. I do not think there is a great deal of mystery about this.

Tony Arbour AM: No mystery. I am trying to make it clear to Londoners precisely what happened. You have already told us that you acted very promptly. Now then, at the end of June, a press release was published saying that you were *en route* to selling the water cannon and you were going to, as indeed the manifesto suggests, devote the money to helping young people. That was six months ago when that press release was made.

What happened, Deputy Mayor, between the issuing of that press release and the repeat of the issuing of that press release yesterday?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have to admit, I do not recall there being a press release. I do recall the Mayor answering a question at the Mayor's Question Time around that. If there were a press release, in terms of the time it has taken to put the procedures in train, it is not a simple matter to put three second-hand water cannon on the market. That is what has happened.

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy Mayor, you are deliberately trying to obfuscate the matter.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not. --

Tony Arbour AM: You have been telling us how very punctually you are doing things. I am seeking to demonstrate --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Move this on.

Tony Arbour AM: I am seeking to demonstrate on this issue - which is, as I have already pointed out, one of the very few definitive promises that the Mayor made in relation to policing - why it has taken so long and why it has been necessary to constantly reissue press releases on it. I want to know what MOPAC and you have been doing between the time of the publication of the manifesto and yesterday, when you still have not sold these water cannon. Please tell me exactly what it is you and MOPAC have been doing in relation to this.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): When you answer this, I want to bring this to a head and move on. OK?

Keith Prince AM: Mr Chairman, I have other questions on the cannon as well.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): On the same subject? Let us get this answer and move it on because we are using a lot of time.

Tony Arbour AM: We may be losing a lot of time --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Using.

Tony Arbour AM: -- using a lot of time on this, Mr Chairman, but it is our job to see the Deputy Mayor is doing her job --

Len Duvall AM: I tell you what, Chairman --

Tony Arbour AM: -- and the Mayor is doing his job. I am seeking to suggest --

Len Duvall AM: -- point of order --

Tony Arbour AM: -- that in this particular instance they have been falling down on the job and the Mayor himself has been using this to get a lot of cheap publicity at the expense of his predecessor.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Tony, I have that. I have yet another point of order.

Len Duvall AM: It is not the issue of the Labour Group to frustrate anyone's desire to ask questions of the Deputy Mayor or the MPS but in terms of the document before us and how we pursue it, what I want from you, Chairman, is that if we do not get time to ask our full set of questions, then we are coming back for a second meeting. There are some important issues in this document. I have a number of questions here that I want to pursue, as much as the colleagues there opposite. Albeit it is not for me to suggest otherwise, we are asking the wrong person some of these questions. There may well have been opportunities yesterday to ask those questions.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let us not fall out around this. If you could ask the questions, keep them relatively sharp. Answers to the point, nicely, please. Go ahead, Tony.

Tony Arbour AM: What has been happening? What has been happening in the eight months since it was advertised that you were going to be selling these water cannon?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): A straightforward question. Answer it, please.

Len Duvall AM: It is not our priority, is it?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): All right, all right. Let us not fall out over this.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): We have been having discussions with the MPS, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and the Federal Republic of Germany to put these second-hand water cannon on the market. These things do take time. They are complicated. It is just that the process that has been gone through has taken that amount of time. It is not a simple matter to put three water cannon on the market. As you will see, it has gone from MOPAC to the MPS, and the MoD and the Federal Republic of Germany have all been part of these discussions. Those discussions were finalised in the service level agreement signed very recently and the announcement on this was made yesterday. I hope that is clear in terms of what has been happening.

Tony Arbour AM: No, I am afraid I --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It sounds like that is all you are getting, Tony.

Tony Arbour AM: I am afraid it is not. It is entirely unsatisfactory. Tell me, Deputy Mayor. When did you know that this press release, that was issued yesterday, was to be published?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): When the service level agreement was signed off by the MoD, we made a decision to make a press announcement around this. You are using time around the Police and Crime Plan around the minutiae of this process of the delivery --

Tony Arbour AM: Wrong, Deputy Mayor.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- of the manifesto commitment.

Tony Arbour AM: Our job is to see how you are conducting your office.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Keith [Prince AM], do you have a couple of questions on the same subject?

Tony Arbour AM: Do you know? It is not on, Chairman, for you to seek to inhibit me.

Andrew Dismore AM: This is not the Mayor's priority. It is ridiculous.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Andrew, please. I am trying to get a balance here.

Tony Arbour AM: It really is not. It is not me who has chosen to give this prominence; it is the Mayor and the Mayor decided yesterday that this was the only aspect of the plan that would have prominence.

Andrew Dismore AM: How is --

Tony Arbour AM: He made various statements that I do not believe were right and true, and I am asking the Deputy Mayor, who presumably has the confidence of the Mayor in this matter, to tell us precisely what she has done on this. As I say, I find your answers so far very unsatisfactory. Can you tell me, Deputy Mayor, if, when you came into office, you knew that these machines were to be sold, how much was spent on the maintenance of these vehicles between then and now?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The maintenance of these vehicles has not been spent between the time I came into office and now. The maintenance of these vehicles was spent under the previous administration once they were bought, to make them roadworthy. You will have seen yourself in the press releases what --

Tony Arbour AM: You are telling me that not a penny has been spent on these machines since you came into office?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Nothing should have been spent on these machines since I came into office. They have been stored on land so there may have been some cost. In terms of the cost of the purchase of the vehicles and the initial fit-out, which was published yesterday, that has not happened under our administration.

Tony Arbour AM: Does that mean, Deputy Mayor, that those machines have been completely stationary wherever it is that they are kept, at Gravesend, and not been used in any way?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): They should not have been being used.

Tony Arbour AM: That was not the question. Have they?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): As far as I am aware, they should not have been used. It is certainly not something that has been discussed with me if they have been used.

Tony Arbour AM: I have no doubt that there is some sort of evidence trail of that kind of thing and we should be seeking information on that. Again, in relation to the water cannon, are you aware that when they were acquired, the Commissioner and members of the senior management team of the MPS believed that they were an essential purchase?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am aware of that, yes, because that is what has happened. However, as you are also aware, the Home Secretary and now the Prime Minister did not think they were an essential purchase and did not think it was an appropriate policing tactic for the city of London, for the capital city of the country.

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy Mayor, supposing the police wish to make a purchase again and they advise you that something that they want to buy is necessary for the policing of London, or they come to you and they advise you that some other action, possibly not related to a purchase but related to some kind of activity that they believe is going to be useful to London, would you ignore such advice?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Of course I would not ignore advice but in relation to significant changes to operational policing, which the use of water cannon would be, there has to be the appropriate discussion and response. I know the Assembly itself voted against the purchase of water cannon. The only people who were in favour of it -- the previous Mayor was in favour of it. What would have to happen is that there would have to be --

Tony Arbour AM: That cannot be right, can it?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- proper discussion and consultation around significant changes to tactics, as is appropriate, and as happens already around other tactics as well.

Tony Arbour AM: Of course the statement you made was completely untrue when you suggested it was just the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor who were in support of this. The entire hierarchy of the MPS was, of course, in support of this. They believed it was an appropriate thing to be using. Are you aware, Deputy Mayor, that the police hold baton rounds?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes.

Tony Arbour AM: These baton rounds have never been used, have they?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Not that I know of, no.

Tony Arbour AM: Do you believe it is an appropriate thing therefore for the police to hold these baton rounds?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The police have various tactical options. The water cannon was a significant change in tactical options around operational policing. It is not just me. The previous Home Secretary and the current Prime Minister did not give permission for the water cannon to be licensed. That is where we are. Instead of spending money on three pieces of equipment that cannot be used, we have rightly taken the decision to sell them and to make sure that whatever proceeds that there are from these second-hand water cannon are put to better use.

Tony Arbour AM: I wonder if you would mind telling me what you think the better use might be.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In terms of the proceeds of the sale of the water cannon, as you will know because you have read the manifesto very carefully, the commitment to --

Tony Arbour AM: I certainly have. I have memorised it and framed it.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is not true!

Tony Arbour AM: Deputy Mayor, this has become a matter of levity. I have to tell you it is not a matter of levity. It beggars belief that you have had these great difficulties in selling these vehicles that have only just come to a head. It beggars belief that the publicity machine that surrounds the Mayor constantly recycles this story. The key thing is he wants them to be sold on, as I understand it, to be used again. It is OK for some other police force to use them, conceivably, I suppose, in Ulster, but not in London. Is that right?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): What beggars belief is that there has been a significant amount of public money already spent on the purchase of equipment that was never licensed and has languished somewhere. That to me is the real difficulty in this. We are taking and have taken steps to make sure that we sell these water cannon. What has happened is that the water cannon are now on the market. They are not yet sold. That was very clear from yesterday. We have another step to go through. No doubt when they are sold, you will come back and ask me, step by step, what I was doing, what the press announcement was, and we will go through this again.

Tony Arbour AM: I will only do that if the Mayor considers that to be the most significant thing in relation to policing, which he clearly does, and that indicates --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just --

Tony Arbour AM: -- a great shame.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is enough. Have you finished, Tony?

Tony Arbour AM: Yes.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just --

Andrew Dismore AM: That is completely out of order.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Andrew, please do not interrupt.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Mr Arbour has said a number of times that this is the only thing the Mayor has highlighted in terms of policing and that is just simply not the case. The Mayor launched the Police and Crime Plan and has spent a lot of time talking about the Police and Crime Plan and highlighting the commitments in the Police and Crime Plan. Yesterday there was an announcement around water cannon but that is not the whole sum of how often the Mayor talks about policing and crime or the commitments in the Police and Crime Plan. You are doing an injustice to do so.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I understand your response. Keith, on the same subject?

Keith Prince AM: Yes. Deputy Mayor, are you aware of why the senior leadership team at the MPS wanted to procure water cannon?

Andrew Dismore AM: They wanted a new toy.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Keith, you were in MOPAC when the discussions around the purchase of the water cannon --

Keith Prince AM: I was, and I agreed with the purchase of the water cannon.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You may well have agreed with the purchase of the water cannon. I can only come back to the fact that the Home Security and now current Prime Minister did not agree with the purchase of the water cannon, the water cannon was not licensed and has never been used. It is right and proper that we now sell it to try to ensure that some proceeds can go towards tackling youth violence.

Keith Prince AM: Are you aware, Madam, Deputy Mayor, that in 2011 during the riots, the use of water cannon was authorised with a 24-hour notice? Were you aware of that?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): No, I was not aware.

Keith Prince AM: No, exactly. At that point it was deemed that they would have been an appropriate tool if they had been available. Clearly it would have taken a long time to get the ones that we have from Northern Ireland over and by the time that would have been done, obviously the "riots" - we will put it in inverted commas; it was just civil disorder - would have finished. It is not true that it has never been deemed appropriate that they could be used on the mainland.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I would want to check that. It is certainly not something I have ever heard.

Keith Prince AM: You can check if you like. It is up to you to check. Often we have found you do not know or you need to check stuff.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I do not think that is the case either, Mr Prince, is it?

Keith Prince AM: While you are doing the checking on that, would you also check what they have been used for while they have been down in Gravesend?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): They have not been used while they have been done in Gravesend.

Keith Prince AM: Craig, Mr Mackey, what are the water cannon used for at Gravesend? Are you aware?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Since we have had them, they have been used to be training alongside.

Keith Prince AM: Exactly.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Since the decision was made that they are going to go, they are effectively sitting there waiting to go.

Keith Prince AM: They have been used since we have had them to train the MPS in the use of water cannon --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): That was under the previous administration.

Keith Prince AM: -- because the MPS are often called to Northern Ireland, certainly during the marching season. If we do not have the water cannon, if we did not use the water cannon to train our police here in London in Gravesend, which is just down the road, they would have to be sent on courses to Northern Ireland for a period of time, with us losing the use of those officers and there being a cost. In fact, because they have been used for training in that respect, we have been saving money. The MPS has been saving money because they have been used as a training tool for mutual aid that they give to the , it is not the Royal Ulster Constabulary --

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The Police Service of Northern Ireland.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Clearly you are not aware of that. Maybe you and the Mayor should have been --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am aware.

Keith Prince AM: -- made aware of that. Often we know that you are not made aware of things because of your bad communications with the MPS. You should have known that. You did not know that.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just clarify --

Keith Prince AM: Can you tell me --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Just let him come to a question and then we can respond.

Keith Prince AM: Can you tell me Madam Deputy Mayor, if there was civil disorder like we had in 2011, when our police officers are coming under attack, having bricks thrown at them, being injured, when horses are being injured because they are trying to push back the crowd, when we have a situation where the police have their shields up, they are defending themselves against bricks being thrown, can you tell me what is the next step to push back the rioters if we do not have the water cannon?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just clarify what I am aware of and not aware of? I was aware that the water cannon had been used for training officers but, since we have made the decision to sell it, that has not happened. That is what I am saying. They have not been used. Of course I am aware of that. In terms of --

Keith Prince AM: Then why did you say, in answer to Mr Arbour's question that they have not been used and they have just been sitting there doing nothing?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Under my --

Keith Prince AM: Either that is a lie or you are suffering from some kind of memory loss.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let us keep it civil, if we potentially can.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can we keep it civil?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): On both sides.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Perhaps Mr Prince might not --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Let us answer this because I want --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): -- accuse me of lying.

Keith Prince AM: I did not accuse you of lying.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You ought to be very careful about what you are saying.

Keith Prince AM: You have purposefully misled Mr Arbour, have you not?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have not purposefully misled anybody.

Keith Prince AM: Then why did you say they have just been sitting there doing nothing when they have been doing the very valuable function of training the police for mutual aid purposes?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Answer that and then we are going to move on.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In the new administration, the water cannon have not been used. The decision was made to sell them. They have not been used. In the previous administration, I was aware that training was taking place. That is clear. If there has been some confusion over that, I have now clarified that for you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I appreciate that. Thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): In terms of other operational tactics around disorder, the previous Home Secretary, now the Prime Minister, did not think and does not think that the licensing of water cannon was appropriate for London or that it was needed in order to deal with disorder. We have had some disorder previously in the last couple of months and the police have done a very effective job of getting that under control without the use of water cannon.

Keith Prince AM: Madam Deputy Mayor, with all due respect, I actually did not really mean to accuse you of lying and so I apologise because I know you are a very honest person - I do believe that - and a very nice person, too. The question was: what happens when we are in a situation when the police are under attack, they have their shields up, bricks are being thrown, Molotov cocktails, at a push, are being thrown, what is the next level of action that we have available to us to push that crowd back, to protect our police officers and to restore order in our streets? What is the next step up without the use of water cannon?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is the same as it is previously when the water cannon was unlicensed and we did not have water cannon. It is police operational tactics and they have been very very effective in dealing with disorder on the streets. We have had some pockets of it in the summer and it has been incredibly effective.

There has been no change. The water cannon was unusable. The change is that we are going to sell it and use the proceeds that we do get from that to deal with tackling youth violence.

Keith Prince AM: As you cannot seem to answer the question, let me help you. The first option would be a baton charge, which would of course cause injury to both the rioters and also the police, or a cavalry charge, effectively, where they send in the horses, which often ends up with the horses being maimed and officers being injured. The next round after that, of course, is rubber bullets. We have access to rubber bullets and that is what would be used in order to push the crowd back.

Do you not think, madam Deputy Mayor, on reflection, it would be far safer for the rioters and for our noble police officers if we were just to squirt them with some water? The pressures are all variable. We can do from 20% up to 80% pressure on these cannons. They have all been modified to do that. With very little force they can push back the rioters, they can make space, and it is a well-known fact in Northern Ireland - I have spoken with officers who have used water cannon in Northern Ireland - that what happens is the guys get wet, after a short period of time, especially if it is not nice weather, they get fed up and they go home. Much better than hitting them over the head with truncheons, much better than charging them underfoot with the cavalry --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You have made your point, Keith.

Keith Prince AM: -- and much better than using rubber bullets. Do you not think, on reflection, that makes sense? The senior leadership team of the MPS did and the Home Secretary at the time in 2011 did agree that with a 24-hour notice, water cannon could be used? It is not as if it is a mystery.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Keith, you and Steve are valiantly - and I respect it - defending the policies of the previous administration, of which you were part. I respect that. I have not spent my time in office attacking the policies of the past.

Tony Arbour AM: The Mayor has.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I have just gone ahead and tried to make process. I respect that. This is not about my judgement; this is about the judgement of the previous Home Secretary and now the Prime Minister, who did not give permission for water cannon to be licensed. That is the case. Nothing has changed in terms of the police's ability to respond to disorder. Nothing is changed by the fact that we are putting these water cannon, these second-hand or maybe third-hand water cannon, up for sale.

Keith Prince AM: The basic fact is that they can be authorised for use in the event of a major civil disorder. They can --

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You keep saying that, Keith, but there is no such thing as a special licence. The previous Home Secretary and now the Prime Minister has previously refused a licence. I really do not think that is going to change.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You have already mentioned that.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I keep being asked the same question and so I am not going to --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I am trying to obviate that. We have two quick questions on the same subject. I really did not want this to dominate the whole morning because we have two senior officers there who need to take some more questions about the Police and Crime Plan with a limited period of time because I know you are time-poor. Andrew, without making it tit-for-tat politics, just a question, please.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am not making it tit-for-tat politics; I would just like to put a proposition to the Deputy Mayor. It would have been far better if Mr Prince had been able to convince the previous Home Secretary and the previous Prime Minister, the Home Secretary now being the Prime Minister in this case, rather than putting it to you because it is not your decision in the first place.

Would it not have been rather better had the previous administration actually cleared their lines with the previous Home Secretary and Prime Minister before spending a third of a million of taxpayers' money on these three white elephants?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is it not the case that, of all the things that we have to deal with in policing, the sale of the water cannon is trivial, albeit a manifesto commitment, compared to the time that has been spent preparing this document and the time that has been spent in dealing with issues of hate crime post-Brexit referendum, which led to that huge upsurge that we saw, the time that the Mayor has spent in developing Safer Neighbourhoods, real safer neighbourhood policing, and the time that you have devoted to implementing the Harris review? All those things took rather more time, I suspect, than deciding how to sell the water cannon. Is that the case?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It certainly is. In terms of communication, there may be some miscommunication in the past but we have not spent over £300,000 because of miscommunication.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): My point on this is that I was not defending the previous administration. Bar the gentlemen in uniform, I was possibly the only one around here who stood on the front line back in 2011 at the north end of Croydon. At that time, it would have been of use if we could have had our hands on it. The difficulties then with civil disorder in Croydon were immense. Let us move on.

Andrew Dismore AM: No.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Andrew, it is the Chairman's prerogative to summarise.

Andrew Dismore AM: The Chairman has given three quarters of an hour to these people and he has given me two minutes. The point I want to make is quite simple. If you read the report that this Committee produced, you will find that water cannon could not have been deployed because of their size and that they were dangerous. It is all very well the former Mayor saying he was prepared to be squirted by it but he did not do that, did he?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): All right.

Peter Whittle AM: Mr Chairman, just to make one point.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Please do, Peter.

Peter Whittle AM: This issue surely has been decided. This is going way off.

Len Duvall AM: Exactly.

Peter Whittle AM: It is 12pm. The fact is that there is no point rehearsing arguments all the time that have been settled, surely.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Point taken, Peter. Can we move back to the agenda item, please? I always lose the thread. I have you down, Keith. Have you moved on from your last question?

Keith Prince AM: Yes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Peter, why do we not get back to the agenda with you and your question? Let us get back on track with your question.

Len Duvall AM: My question relates to a follow-up to your question, which was about MOPAC 7 issues, performance issues and local plans.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Please do.

Len Duvall AM: Shall I do it then or should I come at it another way? I have about six or seven other issues that I want to raise in relation to this Plan, some that I have some real concerns over.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We can be here as long as it takes, if that is the case. We have taken the time out.

Len Duvall AM: In terms of your question and the opening issue of differences and priority-setting, thank you, early on, Deputy Mayor, for clarifying the issues between local policing priorities and the issues you were raising that were London-wide. I go into the document - I have read it once - and I did not quite see that there. For clarity, just repeating it for the Committee again because this is important and we might come back to it, what are the London-wide 'reserved matters' that you think must be achieved across the MPS and what are for local discretion and local discussion? Mixed messages have led us into a load of problems in the past in the MPS and we can learn those lessons. This could be quite an important one that we can be clear on.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely. Maybe the best way is to point you to page 16 of the draft Police and Crime Plan consultation document. At the top of page 16 it gives you the two baskets, as I have talked about, one on volume crimes, which is about data-led local priority-setting with some parameters around it so that we do not have too many priorities, and then high harm crimes, which have been included in every borough to make sure that police and local partners are focused on them properly, such as CSE, violence against women and girls, knife crime and gun crime. Also within the Police and Crime Plan we talk about the importance of reducing repeat victimisation and tackling repeat offending. That is also a cross-London issue.

In terms of your question, what is local priority-setting and what is London-wide priority-setting, the top of page 16 gives the parameters of that and we are consulting as to the best way that that can be implemented and delivered.

Len Duvall AM: Going back to one of the issues - this is one I want to ask Martin - on the borough mergers, we have some pilots in the draft plan. Obviously, this is the issue. You answered earlier in relation to an earlier question that we think we can manage two lots of priority settings. If we have a two-borough issue or three-borough, we can handle this.

One of the issues and arguments for merging is flexing and moving one person from a borough into another borough. I go back to the "basket of ten" or whatever it was called, never mind MOPAC 7. Bearing in mind those problems of what problems we do and what we leave, the screening-out bit and also mixed messages, briefing police officers in terms of going into areas, the flexing issues and watching the pilots that are in this document, what is the advice we are giving to police officers of how that would work?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The whole thing works on a number of levels to start with. Even as we exist, if you look at any borough in London, within one part of the borough the priority can conceivably be very different to another part of the borough because of their make-up. The first level for me, and a really important one, is that level of a neighbourhood and those dedicated ward officers. You have the dedicated ward officer and the police community support officer (PCSO). That will increase. They are very much focused at what the real issues and problems are in that particular part of London. We need to give them the space and freedom to allow them to focus on the things that matter to the people that live there; whether it is individuals, groups or organisations within that particular area. You are then going to have, running across the lot, the key themes that are common across the piece that we have spoken about and that the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] has just mentioned. They will drive not only, as I said before, your core resourcing of different teams but will also drive some of your flexibility.

Within any of those BCUs you will then have issues that are common or particular to a borough. Again, this is going to be different across London. In the Camden-Islington BCU there is probably going to be a reasonable degree of commonality between those two. When you go out to the one in the east there will be some differences of priority in particular areas around those issues. We will still have officers who are focused on a particular area. We will still have accountability to a particular borough in terms of what we are doing.

The other advantage - and the really key difference that the merger gives us - is that it gives us the ability to have a bigger flexible pot of officers to deploy to a particular issue; to deploy them in support of a neighbourhood team that have a particular problem in an area or deploy them against a particular challenge in a borough. At the moment in most of my boroughs we do not have a huge flexible asset. That is one of the things the merger gives us, and that then allows you to flex around.

Len Duvall AM: To help the Committee more - because we are going to return to this - I am a great fan of neighbourhood policing. I have lost my way and am now bit of a sceptic of what the MPS. I lost my way in the last administration. Time is out on this administration. Yesterday the Mayor did speak of other priorities. I am quite supportive of the priorities he spoke to. However, in doing so he gave an additional challenge - could be a burden if you are a police officer - of saying what the neighbourhood teams are doing. The theme here is getting closer to the public. We have the local setting of priorities, which is one theme. Then we have the local team that is going to appear or not appear as the case may be. I still want to know about the flexing of these issues, although you say they are dedicated.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They are.

Len Duvall AM: Something that has never been quite explained is whether we are still into sector policing. You do not call it that; you call it “neighbourhoods”. That is not neighbourhoods to me. Do we still have a sector team issue?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Len Duvall AM: It might have been helpful, Chairman, if we had known that. We do need to understand what these different officers are going to do, not just in mergers of policing but in terms of this borough plan. What are the expectations of this local team in their patch or in their ward? In times of woe, we understand, and real emergencies, they will be moved.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Of course.

Len Duvall AM: What we think are real emergencies I think we can agree on.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I agree.

Len Duvall AM: A local Borough Commander might have a different view. As much as we want to get local to people and deliver, surely that should go alongside this in the policing plan. It is almost like a ‘nod and a wink’ to it in terms of resourcing issues. It is about managing and supervision. Their right to manage locally and not really be centrally managed. It is difficult for the MPS because that is how the MPS has always worked.

In a setting of reduced resources, how do we get the best out of that? Do we trust our managers and supervisors? Now woe is me, the last couple of months do not give us much confidence, I suspect, but is that not where the MPS has to be going over the next four years. Should it not be one of MOPAC’s desires to try to nudge and support you in terms of some of those management changes?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Can I just answer some of those before I let the Deputy [Commissioner] answer.

In terms of the neighbourhood bit, I know where you are coming from. I am very clear about what we mean when we talk about dedicated ward officers. That is dedicated. There will be a minimum of two for every ward. For the majority of wards in London there will be more than two police officers, depending upon a whole range of factors around demand, workload and so on. Every one of those wards will, equally, have a PCSO. The decision-making process about how and where we do that increase will be done in conjunction with local authorities so that we are getting a joint decision around where we think priority requirements are. Those individuals will be protected and will be left to get on and do what I think they should be doing. I am going to load some other things onto them, such as, “I expect you to be in your children’s homes and I expect you to be looking for issues of radicalisation if you are in a place where that might be an issue”. However, their primary role is to engage with those communities and deal with those communities.

We have inadvertently stumbled upon how this can work with the Police Now programme that I am sure many of you are familiar with. Like Teach First, you join for two years. Every one of those individuals - good quality people - was placed as a dedicated ward officer. We placed them all in our most challenging wards. Because they are not trained to do loads of other stuff, we have let them get on and problem-solve in their ward on whatever it is the local councillors and other groups in that ward are saying are the issues. They have done an incredible job. That, for me, is how I want to expand that to what dedicated neighbourhood teams look like.

Tony Arbour AM: It sounded like a lot of students will be running our neighbourhood teams.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): They are police officers. I am not aware there is a problem with someone having been a student.

Tony Arbour AM: Forgive me, Chairman; it was a *sotto voce* comment.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Martin, can you just continue? Then we can pick up any supplementary points that you may wish to make later.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): What that has given us is insight, inadvertently as it happens to be. You are right that if there is major disorder, then clearly I will not give the Borough Commander or the BCU Commander the power to move those people around. They will know that. Merging gives the critical mass that allows us to have that resource.

The way you described sector policing - and the way you described where neighbourhood policing went - we had some dedicated officers and then the other neighbourhood officers were effectively that flexing resource. I do not want to call those neighbourhood officers. We will have a flexible resource. The neighbourhood officers will be what it says. They will be working alongside the increase in youth officers who will be in schools, in pupil referral units and in other engagement with young people. Collectively that is a significant number of officers, spread across every one of the wards in London, dealing with what I would regard as neighbourhood policing that I think is the same as you would regard as neighbourhood policing.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): To pick up the second part of your question, your analysis is absolutely right. We have touched a number of times over the last six months or so on what a fundamental change the next four years will be for the MPS. That move away from an organisation that has been very centrally controlled to empowered leaders fits with the work we are doing around delayering and skilling up our leaders for the future. That is how you have to do it. In a decreasing budget environment you have to be more effective and allow those leaders the flexibility to do it.

What comes alongside it is transparency and openness around data. One of the conversations we are having with the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] is how do we make those instruction levels visible to the community. You will see we have a beta version of the website at the moment that allows you - down to a beat level - to look at and have available to you what is going on in your area, what is happening in crimes and incidents in your area and what it looks like against the rest of London. You can have Twitter feeds into it if you do not go on Twitter. You can have all sorts of things done. We are looking at some quite exciting ways to get things to that very local level which fits with that wider performance framework.

What is behind the question is, when we struggle to get consistency across 32 and then suddenly go to a scenario of 12 or something like that, how we create a scenario to get consistency across that and let everyone do their own thing. There is always a balance between tight and loose. You absolutely have to deliver those things around the performance framework. Some of the freedom to move things around at local level has to be there. As Martin said, in relation to neighbourhood it is not. It is non-negotiable.

Len Duvall AM: I have three more points; two quick ones and one that is going to take a little bit longer. The Committee might want me to take a little bit longer on that. I will be guided by you where they come from. Shall I tell you my points? I will give you a 'starter for ten' so you can start preparing for them.

One is on our proposed commitments. I want to talk about the Night Czar and licensing. The other issue is about violent crime, which should be a quickie. The other one was around Prevent. Two quick ones and one big one.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is fine. To pull this together, I have one observation on your point around two in every ward and three in the target wards. This would - and I am probably speaking to my own question - involve the dismantling of the existing policing model, which was the team behind the one and the two. That is legitimate. My point - I will just let it hang there - is that it seems to me that much of the ambitions and priorities are predicated around delivering two in every ward and three. This Committee particularly will be keeping a close eye on that. I know for a fact from my travels - and other Members can probably potentially agree with that - that often you are unable to deliver sometimes the one and the one. A member of the public might say, "I have not had a one and a one for six months or three months and they tell me we are now going to get two". It is going to be a big challenge. If many of the Deputy Mayor's [for Policing and Crime] priorities hang on that, it is something we need to think about.

Keith Prince AM: It is for Mr Mackey but anyone can answer it. This has been half answered. It is about the disappearance of the flexible team that stands behind the neighbourhood team. In future - whereas at the moment in Redbridge we have the one-one system - when there is a particular issue around the antiterrorist squad (ATS) or something else or the mobile team, as I call them, are tasked to do some special work, does that mean that will no longer be able to happen?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): So I can be very clear with what the Chairman said, the minimum will be two police officers and one PCSO for every ward. There will be more dependent on the need in that ward. It will not just be three in some. In some wards we predict it would go up to six and seven if you have a really high demand part of the city. In your particular situation you would have the two plus one as a minimum in each of those wards. Bear in mind they would not be abstracted in any way. Currently, I suspect some of the additional support officers would be abstracted quite a lot. The support officers that currently sit within the neighbourhood teams, as you describe, will be officers that often are having to go and do a duty for demonstrations and so on. You will have a much bigger dedicated group that is there.

What we will build into the model is, as I say, this flex resource that would be there to support if you have a particular problem in a particular ward or there is an operation that needs to be run. That is where you will get the flex to come in and support those officers. We also need to use the broader part. Of course we need to organise a command into different teams but we have to move towards a place where you have more flex between the teams in terms of the way they support one another. You will get a thicker permanent base and then there will be support coming from within the BCU, a flexible asset.

Keith Prince AM: Once you have taken out the extra PCs from what we will call the mobile team at the moment there will obviously be far fewer of those left. You are then going to divvy them up onto the higher demand wards, is that what you are saying?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Some of them will, yes. I do not know exact numbers of how many are in that team in that particular case but, yes, some of those will be. The process at the moment is being run - I was there talking to them about it earlier this week - to identify who will go as the new dedicated ward officers. It will be PCs who have expressed interest.

Keith Prince AM: In the past, as you quite rightly said, abstractions came from that mobile team.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Correct.

Keith Prince AM: That will not exist anymore?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No.

Keith Prince AM: The abstractions will have to come from the ward teams then, will they?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, they will not come from the dedicated ward officers. There will not be abstraction of dedicated ward officers for aid or anything like that.

Keith Prince AM: Are you limiting that to the two plus one? Say for instance in a ward such as Barkingside which is my ward - it is not a troubled ward so it would not really qualify for three but let us say it has three - would that third officer still be liable for abstraction?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, he or she would not.

Keith Prince AM: Once you have said, "There are two going to be two in Clayhall, three in Barkingside and four in Clementswood", for instance, they are fixed assets and cannot be abstracted? There will clearly be holidays and things like that.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Correct, for holidays and *in extremis* - for example, there is a job in Westminster - that is exactly the model. Although the number of overall neighbourhoods now looks bigger it is because of those support teams that spend a lot of time being abstracted. We will have what I describe as a carpet of dedicated ward officers and their PCSO colleagues who will not get abstracted.

Keith Prince AM: I have two more questions. Where does the flex team come from if everyone is divvied up into wards? That is the first question. The second one: where will the abstractions come from?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): You are able to create a much bigger critical mass when you bring two or three of our units together. The problem at the moment is in many of our boroughs, because of the relatively low numbers they have, by the time you divide that up by 10, 11 or 12 different units you get very small teams that do not have the critical mass to be flexible. We will bring those together. That will allow us to roll out those neighbourhood numbers. Then we will also increase the numbers within the response teams, the day-to-day shift teams. Some will be from flexing and some from other places. That will be where we will draw from for aid. Simultaneously we are continually driving down the requirement for aid as well at a central level in terms of reducing abstractions as much as we can.

Keith Prince AM: Have I understood then that maybe two wards will work together?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, no wards are working together. A ward will have its number of dedicated police officers and its one PCSO. They are the immovable element.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. That was very helpful.

Len Duvall AM: In terms of Prevent and Contest, there are, again, some mixed messages in here. You say you welcome the review of the Government on Contest. That is fine. Then we talk about the issue of Prevent and the role that we play in identifying extremists with partners in that sense.

Which side are we on? I do not mean that literally. I know which side we are all on and we are all on the side of keeping people safe. What are we really saying about that side? In my view, it is the only game in town at the moment. We stick with it until something better comes along.

Where are we politically, Deputy Mayor, on - not Contest because I presume we all want to do better and I think we are - the rest of the piece with our partners? Where are we? What are we trying to achieve with this document and what are we saying?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): What we are saying within this document is that tackling radicalisation and extremism is part of the police's response and also part of the response of partnerships, and the importance of that. The Deputy Mayor for Social Integration will have a role to play in terms of social integration and tackling the root causes of radicalisation.

The Contest strategy, as you know, is being reviewed by the Government at the moment. Prevent is part of that. What we are saying within this document is that we know there have been problems with Prevent. It has been controversial in some communities. We have to make sure we are working alongside the Government with communities to ensure we can tackle radicalisation. We are waiting to see what the review of the Contest strategy says. When we know what that says we will work with the Government to ensure that communities, City Hall and the MPS do everything they can to tackle radicalisation. One of the problems at the moment is there is a lot of inconsistency across London and we think that there is a role for MOPAC and the London Contest Board to try to deal with that inconsistency and work with communities and also the Prevent strategy - or whatever comes out of the Contest review - to ensure that that happens.

Len Duvall AM: Sorry to come back but, very quickly again, I get all that and that sounds right. However, lots of things are controversial in policing and there are lots of things the community is unhappy with but we do not stop doing it. We might change how it is done. Are we being very clear that we are not advocating the change? It is the consistency and the quality across the piece in terms of working with our partners that we are trying to achieve. We think we can make a contribution to that. That is what we are saying.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely. It is about consistency and quality. It is about ensuring the Government's strategy is delivered to communities and that where there are problems and issues we can tackle them and ensure we are working with communities. The overall safeguarding approach of Prevent is important and right. It is about safeguarding. That has been some of the successes around that strategy. There have been some successes within the safeguarding arena. We want to make sure that happens.

Len Duvall AM: We have talked about this over the years. We have a new administration now. Is it not the time for the MPS to bring some of its strategies together around violence and harm?

We are getting there in terms of understanding what it means in terms of the community. The Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] has said that. This is a crime that is, sadly, going up on a number of fronts, not coming down or even plateauing. If you are going to stop recording, fine. I hope we are not getting into that in terms of the new ways of working. Along with screening we need to guard against these issues.

What is the thinking of the MPS? We have various strategies on violence. Do we bring them together in an anti-violence/Prevent programme? Is it time you should be saying to the politicians here, "We are ready for this and this type of thinking"? We have talked about it in the past and nothing has happened.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have talked a lot today about the model going forward. Let us use "prevention" rather than "Prevent" because I am with you. A key part of the core strategy of what the MPS will look like for the next five years is an increased focus on prevention. It has to be because that is part of demand management. We have to do work that is everything from Designing Out Crime at one end to focusing prevention work on those key spaces where we know crime occurs and we know are high crime generators. I am absolutely with you on that.

On the point around bringing the strategies together, you will see some of that under this Police and Crime Plan. The way it knits together the violence against women and girls issues and the violence issue more widely gives us the opportunity to do it. It is a point we would absolutely pick up and do.

Len Duvall AM: Prevention is mentioned in parts but there is nothing really bringing it together as the big issue in terms of that. Commitment is sadly lacking on this page.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is written large in the work we are doing for the future. We have talked about this. Prevention has to be a key part of what we are doing. The detail of prevention you will see in some of the strategies underneath this.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Prevention and intervention is absolutely a key part of the Police and Crime Plan. Key to your question - we need to discuss this and it is an important part of the consultation - around bringing all the strands of dealing with violence together in a strategy is to understand what parts of violence we are talking about and what the tactical responses are around that. Yes, there is early intervention and prevention but we know that the night-time economy produces certain types of violence. There is domestic and sexual violence and then there is knife and gun crime. These are quite different types of violence all under the same banner. We need to think very carefully about whether it is one strategic strategy of tackling violence or strategic early intervention and prevention around violence. We have to be careful because there are different tactical responses.

Len Duvall AM: You are right in posing that challenge back. Coming back to you on that, my fear is reduced resources, a number of high priorities and - an area that I do not want to get into because while there are answers to it I do not particularly like those answers - about what you do and do not do as a police service. My personal commitment is that I want to see a police service that does everything from dealing with anti-social behaviour to tackling counterterrorism and everything that goes in between. Increasingly some of the things you have been facing over the past months has shown you cannot get more for less out of your policing resources. We are beyond that now. Despite the good efforts on your part or the Mayor's part there has to be a different type of debate - I am not saying it is here - and something has to give. I want to make sure that violence is at the heart of policing.

If you come to prioritise any crimes we have to do something about people hurting each other in various forms. That has to be at the heart of it. I am not advocating for that in this but I am worried that you, by stealth because of the circumstances you are locked into, will get into not recording crime, you will start discouraging people to do it and you will not have the resources to manage some of the ambitions here. Then we fall back into bad practices. I want to avoid that. I think you want to avoid that. We do not want to go back to those places. At various times in the MPS's history we have been in those places.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I absolutely recognise the risk. To address under or non-recording, you can look at the amount of work we now do around ensuring compliance and we have not taken the foot off the pedal at all.

The challenge with violence - we have discussed this many times - is that it is such a broad bucket you can hide stuff in there. Probably 18 months or two years ago you pointed out something around knife crime in here and I remember having the debate. You could see something was happening. The large bucket of violence was not moving but something within the bucket was moving. When you see the next iteration of the national crime figures, compared to the last published nationally one, violence is up about 5.1 for us and up over 12 most of the country. People will say it is the change in recording practices again. That is a very frustrating answer and quite hard to explain to the general public. We have to get to that level of granularity of the types of violence underneath it.

Len Duvall AM: Looking at the document, under proposed commitments, I did not realise MOPAC had a duty to the enjoyable night-time economy. I prefer to think it is to the safe night-time economy. Nevertheless, I look into the document for some substantiation and background to that. Quite frankly, I am worried. I am worried about what is being said in other places. I do not want to see this document or this work over the next four years be used by dodgy licensees escaping their responsibilities through tested practices. I am concerned.

The Mayor has used a poor example in Fabric, to be honest, to illustrate the importance of the night-time economy. Earlier on you mentioned, Sophie [Linden], what we will do. We want a strong and vibrant night-time economy and we want people to be safe within that. That is the outcome that rules and regulations are about. What I do not want to be seen - and it can be seen and demonstrated with Fabric - are dodgy licensees trying to escape their responsibility for that safe environment. It is on record in terms of the police actions that were taken, the licence authority in terms of listening to those in a quasi-judicial review, and the response. If there had been a different response by Fabric on those occasions, it would not have needed to close. Subsequently there are other issues that have been imposed. I welcome the commitment from the licensee if they do that, and the good work of the police and the Council in trying to achieve a sensible outcome and sensible operational issues.

I want to know that, from a MOPAC point of view and from a peace point of view, this is about upholding the rules and regulations to make our people safe, whatever part of the night-time economy they are in. People sometimes do not like those rules. I am more upset by those who want to try to flout them or get out of playing a responsible part in delivering a safe night-time economy. Quite frankly, I want to be assured this is not some hidden approach that some rogue licensees can pitch up here at the GLA - because they see the Mayor as a soft touch with these issues - that you will be co-opted on to an agenda and be pressurised into rolling over when actually you need to hold the line.

If we go back to consistency, the MPS's record on licencing is not impressive around that. It is one where we need to do some more work. For the very reasons that you said, Deputy Mayor, some aspects of our night-time economy do lead to crime. That is why we have the rules and regulations. I am looking for you and Londoners will be looking for you - users of night-time economy and non-users of night-time economy - that you are going to keep us safe. You can only keep us safe by carrying out your duties. I just want to say that.

There is nothing wrong in supporting a mayoral priority around this. It is not about the enjoyable aspect; it is about ensuring people are safe and others are safe in terms of the behaviours that may come from the wrong type of social activities. I just want to put that on the record about where we are, because I believe someone

should in terms of a policing position and for the safety of Londoners. I want to have some assurances from you all.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Some of what you said makes it sound as if there is some sort of difference between MOPAC and the rest of City Hall. There is no difference. When the Mayor's priority is for a safe and vibrant night-time economy those two things have to go together. This Policing Plan will ensure that the MPS and its partners' ability to do that is upheld. We will work with the Night Czar, Amy Lamé, to make sure that that happens. There is no difference. What the mayoral priority is trying to deliver is a safe and vibrant night-time economy and it is perfectly possible to do both. It is not just about what happens within the licenced premises, it is also about what happens outside the licenced premises and when people go home. That brings in all sorts of other issues around the ability of dedicated warden officers to problem-solve.

However, where there are clusters of licenced premises sometimes there can be anti-social behaviour on the streets at the times that people are leaving. It is also the role of Transport for London (TfL) to make sure that people have safe ways of getting home, there are appropriate taxi rides, there is good night-time services and there is the Night Tube to make sure that not only that is safe but also enables people to get home and get home quickly and safely. All of that together is very much about the priority.

I will just reiterate that a safe and vibrant night-time economy are two things that should not be in opposition to each other and they are not in opposition to each other with the businesses, either, because businesses and the vast majority of licenced premises want to do both.

Len Duvall AM: However, they are in conflict with each other when you make comments on a quasi-judicial process and lead people to another view that, if only people sat around the table we would not need to get to where we are. Sometimes you have to call it as it is: there are decent licence holders who are trying to do the right thing and do the right thing by their customers and there are licence holders who are just not listening and think they can get away with it. Politician's intervention on these issues - particularly in quasi-judicial processes - lead to a different outcome at times.

In your opening remarks I was less assured in what you were going to say about these issues because from your point of view it is upholding the policing and the community safety aspect. I would not put in here about an enjoyable night-time economy, however, if it is enjoyable overly people are calmer and they will not hurt each other in terms of those issues. As community safety aspirations it might well be OK but there are mixed messages at times when there is a quasi-judicial process. I do not think is helpful that the police have targeted a licensee because they fancy targeting it out of the blue and the licensee has not done anything wrong to warrant some further inquiries or some action. As the Deputy Mayor who am I to tell you what to do, but I would urge you to think very carefully about those issues because it is about being on the side of those licensees who want to do the right thing and comply but also going a step further and taking action against those licensees that do not want to listen and continually try to flout the rules. That is the message that most Londoners would want to hear in terms of these processes.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I was just going to say, rest assured - in terms what is going on around licencing - we are never going to shirk away from doing that. It goes back to your earlier point, Len [Duvall AM] around how, if we are serious about prevention, we have to do something around where licensees are out of control. You absolutely have to step into those spaces and that is what we do. We do it on a nightly basis when we close things down when there is disorder. I lead on the work around business crime for the MPS. Businesses, and particularly when we look at the work we have

done with the licencing trade, if you look at some of the stuff on the South Bank and elsewhere, they want people who are not playing by the rules out of the game. That is quite understandable.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is good. In the context that we are going to have two more meetings around the Police and Crime Plan in January and across February, some of our questions we will hold over until then.

Peter Whittle AM: Deputy Mayor, you put in the draft Plan that you want to maintain the strategic target of 32,000 personnel. What will your approach be to going towards that target? Will it be incremental?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Absolutely, as the previous administration did, we want to maintain a strategic target and maintain those officer numbers. Our approach to that will have to be around the budget and around careful budgeting and making sure that efficiencies come out.

However, the real approach to that - and I hope that you on the Police and Crime Committee will work with us on this - is to make sure that London gets its fair share of the Police Grant and gets its fair share of police funding to ensure that we can maintain officer numbers and work towards that strategic target. As you know, at the moment we are significantly underfunded on the capital city grant [National and International City grant] with up to about a £170 million shortfall. I hope you will work with us and our lobbying of the Government to try to bridge that gap.

Also, there is the added threat and the challenge of the review of the police funding formula, where we know that the pot is not growing. It is the same pot and it is how you share it amongst the country. London can only lose out from that. We will be significantly lobbying on that to ensure that we get our fair share. As I said, I hope you will work with us to make sure that London does maintain its police officer numbers.

Peter Whittle AM: How long has the figure of 32,000 been the target? It is not a new one. Roughly how long?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I believe this strategic target was the same throughout the previous administration and we are placed to maintain that strategic target.

Peter Whittle AM: Just one more: is the proportion of that in terms of officers on the front line purely officers or not?

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is police officers.

Peter Whittle AM: Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): With the robustness that this Committee in the past held the previous administration to account around that 32,000, we will continue that and you would expect that.

That is helpful. We have come to the end of that session. As I said, we have the opportunity to pick up this work in January. Hopefully, colleagues had the opportunity to pursue lines to their satisfaction.

The next item we will move on to take us through to 1.00pm is on safer roads.

Sian Berry AM: The reason I wanted this to be on the agenda today is because I have been following up on work that Jenny Jones [former London Assembly Member] did previously asking about hit-and-run casualties.

What we found when we had the numbers from the MPS was just a steady increase in the number of hit and run crashes and a steady increase in the proportion of crashes that are hit and runs. It has gone up in numbers; it has also gone up in proportion. The average since 2009 is a 60% increase in the number of incidents and it has been 40% since 2011. It is definitely a clear trend and I wanted to ask some questions about why you think that is and what is being done about it.

Can I ask about what seems to be an emerging culture of drivers leaving the scene after a crash? Is that something you have observed?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The first thing I would say is on those figures it is really important to make the point that the vast majority of that increase is taken up in the slight injury --

Sian Berry AM: The difference between a slight injury and a serious injury when there is a road crash is not the issue. You could be injured badly or not depending on where your head happens to be.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. I just think it is important to be clear about those statistics if we are going to use them.

Sian Berry AM: There were serious incidents.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I share with you entirely a concern about the number of collisions that happen on the streets of London. There is a range of reasons why people do not stay and report at the scene of an incident. Certainly from our perspective there will be some where they will feel vulnerable as the individual and they will not stay there. You have a number of people that we find will report afterwards, but they want to do that once they have spoken to a solicitor or something because they feel they have some sort of culpability. What is particularly prevalent with larger vehicles - and we have a lot of larger vehicles in London - is they may not even be aware of what has happened. If you are driving an articulated lorry you may not even be aware that there has been some kind of collision. There are no doubt within that group a number of what I would describe as 'criminal drivers'. They are criminal either because they are not properly insured, they are not properly licenced, their ownership of the vehicle is questionable or they have drunk alcohol or they are intoxicated with drugs in some way or another. There will be some who will check, they will see there is no injury and they will go. It is a broad range of individuals. It takes you to a larger issue about people's sense of responsibility on the road. As you know we have a very significant command that deals with policing of the road. The Roads and Transport Policing Command (RTPC), which has the dual roles of traditional road policing or traffic policing in the way we would describe it and then the work with TfL around the surface transport infrastructure.

Sian Berry AM: TfL partly fund that, is that right?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): TfL very significantly fund officers within there, to the tune of about £93 million. We have staffing levels there which are 2,350 officers and PCSOs. It is about 1,600 police officers and some PCSOs who are operating in that environment all the time. We also have what I would honestly call a world-class Serious Collision Investigation Unit, which is a fairly significant team who deal with the fatal and serious injury collisions and who provide a very effective service.

Then it is working towards how we attempt to prevent these incidents, which is around where we do identify drivers and, for lower end issues, education in order to make people aware of the impact of their behaviour.

There is the element of enforcement and we will identify hotspot areas, we will identify places where there has been significant issues and we will enforce there.

Lastly, there is the element which is around engineering. While the police can respond and react and do some preventive activity, some of this is around the infrastructure and the nature of our roads and the nature of the users of our roads.

Sian Berry AM: That would not affect whether someone stopped at the scene.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, it would not affect that particular issue. I see the failing to stop and report in the broader context of the number of collisions that we are seeing in London.

Sian Berry AM: Thank you very much. Do you have any insight into how much this involves young people?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, not specifically.

Sian Berry AM: Do you have data on that in terms of victims and perpetrators?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am sure I could get data on that. I do not have it in front of me now and so I do not want to speculate, but I can certainly find that out and let you know.

Sian Berry AM: Since 2011 you have been able to provide Assembly Members with data by borough and what is noticeable about this data is that it varies so much. You have boroughs like Merton and Hounslow who have had more than a 100% increase in these incidents. Then you have boroughs including Lewisham, Kensington, Greenwich, Southwark, Bexley and Bromley that have decreases in these incidents. What is interesting is that Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley are contiguous boroughs; they are in south east London. Is there something that is being done there that is perhaps effective that you could learn from?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Possibly. I have not seen that. That would be something to look at. As of January we also have a new system for us recording around collisions. This is an automated system which is going to give us some real opportunities; we will have much better and more effective data.

The other important point as well is with the current system at the moment, when an officer deals with a collision, it is a paper trail that eventually finds its way to TfL which is where ultimately we are looking at the data around the road network. That can take up to six months in some cases. Whereas now with the new system that will be an instantaneous updating to TfL when the officer's report is passed off by the supervisor. That will give us a much richer set of data to understand precisely what is going on in a much more contemporary way.

Certainly, with the areas that you spoke about, it is definitely worth looking at why there is a disparity because there is no obvious one that I can think of when you give those names.

Sian Berry AM: You have touched on - and we have been asking questions about this - how many of these drivers who leave the scene of a crash are brought to justice. Both Assembly Member Pidgeon and I have been asking questions about this system. You say that this will come live and you will be able to interrogate these things from January. Will that only apply to cases that occur from January or will it go back?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, it will not go back.

Sian Berry AM: Will you link together previous cases?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It will not be retrospective. It will be from January. All the reporting of any collision by an officer will be on that system and then that will give us a much better data-set and a much more accurate data-set to work from.

Sian Berry AM: From the first quarter of next year we will be able to look at the percentage of these drivers? If drivers knew that they were going to be apprehended, and there must be quite a good chance of them being apprehended with closed circuit television.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There certainly should be. Yes, I agree.

Sian Berry AM: However there have been a couple of prominent cases lately where victims who have had life changing injuries feel like there has not been enough investigation; the driver has gone and nobody has found them. A young boy in my own borough of Camden was killed a few days ago by a motorcyclist who left the scene and there is still no sign that there is going to be arrest there. People feel that that is injustice going on. If there is a high rate of clear-up, people will feel deterred from doing this kind of thing.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes. I understand that entirely.

Sian Berry AM: The other question was about the RTPC. We were told in January that there were going to be 40 more officers this year and 80 by next spring. Has that increase happened?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Forty more officers?

Sian Berry AM: We were told this by the previous Mayor in January.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, I do not recognise that.

Sian Berry AM: Are the numbers increasing in that unit?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If you take the total number for 2014/15 it was 2,350, for 2015/16 it was 2,355 and for this current year we are in it is 2,356.

Sian Berry AM: That is not an increase at all.

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There is very little fluctuation, but it is a very significant command.

Sian Berry AM: Will it be OK if I get the promise that was made and check?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, that would be helpful. By all means send that through.

Sian Berry AM: My final question is about Vision Zero. Maybe the Deputy Mayor will want to answer this question. It is in the new Police and Crime Plan that you are adopting a Vision Zero approach, the goal being to reduce the levels of death and road injury. Can you explain how that differs from current approaches to road safety?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): The Vision Zero approach is a joint partnership approach that has been set up with the Deputy Mayor [for Transport], Val Shawcross [Valerie Shawcross CBE]. This is the connection through the Police and Crime Plan to the priorities of TfL. It is looking at enforcement, which is the role of the MPS, but it is also looking at better education and also engineering out some of the risks and some of the vulnerabilities around roads and how you can reduce serious injuries and deaths on the road. It is part of a joined-up approach around City Hall to make sure that the Police and Crime Plan plays a big part in assisting the MPS in reducing serious deaths and injuries on the roads.

Sian Berry AM: There is much closer working with TfL on this issue?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, absolutely.

Sian Berry AM: That is really good to hear.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Thank you.

Andrew Dismore AM: A couple of points. My theory about part of this is that it has become acceptable for damage only collisions - where you knock somebody's wing mirror or something like that - to just do a runner. These days, people do not seem to stop if they cause damage to a parked car to put a note under the windscreen or anything. To my mind that seems to feed into this attitude that it is all right to do a runner if you can get away with it. I do not know if you would agree with that.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not disagree with your explanation, but I could not support it with hard evidence.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, it is a gut feeling.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is an area where it would benefit from more analysis around it. I suspect there is a whole range of hypotheses, including the costs of insurance for young drivers --

Andrew Dismore AM: That is what I was going to come on to, which is: what discussions have you had with the insurance industry about this particular issue? If there is serious injury caused to someone there is going to be serious damage to the car, which if they have insurance then they claim on. Alternatively car repairers, if they are given a car to repair that has serious damage - it may even have human remains of some sort, blood on it or something - is there any effort to try and get car repairers or insurers to co-operate on this?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The RTPC and particularly the Serious Collision Investigation Unit work very closely with the Motor Insurance Bureau. Particularly in the case of a serious collision or a fatal collision, I can assure you the effort and the breadth of thinking that goes into that is no different than you would get from a murder team. We have an excellent team of highly experienced and generally former murder detectives alongside the people who have gone through all the technical surveying qualifications to do the technical side of any road traffic collision. That work is going on

with all of those and we have to find all those other points where you can intervene, through insurance and through the repairs.

To your first point, again I do not have any evidence, but it is that boarder less respect for property and for people where it does not matter and you move on. There is a feeling that that occurs, but it does also play in to the younger people and the insurance issues and to potentially people who do not have the right insurance and do not have the right to drive legally in London.

Andrew Dismore AM: The last question for me is about automatic number plate recognition (ANPR). Are we running out of ANPR more widely and if so presumably that would feed into this?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes is the answer. We are in the process of refurbishing all the mobile ANPR that we have on our vehicles with an aspiration that we would get to the majority of our routine patrolling vehicles having an ANPR capability. There is a plan and we have relatively recently refurbished the back office so that all the data usage is available there. It is a tool that we use very frequently.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. Also static ANPR?

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Craig Mackey QPM (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The no-insurance operations we spoke before about Operation Cubo. Those are the things you have to keep doing. Make this a place that if you are uninsured you do not drive in London.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, and publicise the car crushing.

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

Martin Hewitt QPM (Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is denying criminals the use of the road in a crime sense, but it also has the advantage in terms of general drivers.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I would like to thank our guests for this morning's thorough answers to this session.

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Summary List of Actions

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 12 January 2017

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out for noting actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.

2. Recommendation

2.1 **That the Committee notes the completed and ongoing actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report.**

Meeting of 15 December 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
6	<p>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, Assistant Commissioner Martin Hewitt, MPS, undertook to provide data on young people involved in hit-and-run road incidents, both as perpetrators and victims.</p>	Ongoing	<p>MPS</p> <p><i>Continued</i></p>

10	<p>During the course of the discussion, Alan Skewis, Director, E20 Stadium LLP, and David Goldstone CBE, Chief Executive, LLDC, agreed to provide the contract between E20 Stadium LLP and London Stadium 185, subject to any information that would not be deemed to be releasable under statutory exemptions pertaining to the Freedom of Information Act 2000.</p>	In progress	E20 Stadium LLP
	<p>During the course of the discussion it was agreed that the Chair would write to Linda Lennon CBE, Chief Executive Officer, London Stadium 185, with questions regarding the licensing hours of the stadium on football match days and on the permanence of the stewarding arrangements.</p>	In progress	London Stadium 185
	<p>Authority was delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree any required output from the Committee's scrutiny of policing and security in and around the London Stadium.</p>	In progress	Scrutiny Manager
	<p>Child Protection Investigations in the MPS</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, Commander Downing, MPS, undertook to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average caseload of staff working in the area of child protection and the supervisory ratio; and • The current figures for staff working on child protection. 	In progress	MPS

Meeting of 17 November 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
5	<p>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan police Service (MPS)</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, the Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a list of people who received a copy of the full, unredacted report of Sir Richard Henriques’ Independent Review of the MPS’s handling of non-recent sexual allegations about public figures, and the conditions under which it was provided for their use; • Write to the Committee about the way in which the MPS would take forward the lessons learnt in relation to its relationships with the media and the impact of social media on policing; and • Provide the figures for the last five and a half years on how many terrorist attacks in London had been thwarted. 	Completed. See Appendix 1.	MPS
6	<p>Police and Crime Committee Work Programme</p> <p>Authority was delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the Committee’s output from its scrutiny review of policing and security at Notting Hill Carnival.</p>	In progress	Scrutiny Manager

Meeting of 7 November 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
5	<p>Policing and Security at Notting Hill Carnival</p> <p>During the course of the discussion the Interim Chairperson, London Notting Hill Carnival Enterprises Trust Ltd, agreed to provide the contingency street plan of the Notting Hill Carnival.</p>	In progress	London Notting Hill Carnival Enterprises Trust Ltd

Meeting of 3 November 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
5	<p>Policing and Security at Notting Hill Carnival</p> <p>During the course of the discussion David Morgan, Operational Advisor for Notting Hill Carnival, agreed to provide comparative figures for the level of crime at Notting Hill Carnival in 2000 and in 2016.</p>	In progress	David Morgan, Operation Advisor for the Notting Hill Carnival

Meeting of 22 September 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
4.	<p>Q&A with MOPAC and the MPS</p> <p>During the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner suggested that Members might wish to observe officer safety training. The Chairman supported the suggestion.</p>	A visit will be arranged later during the Assembly year.	Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

Meeting of 19 July 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
	<p>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) undertook to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a breakdown of the types of hate crime offences committed since the EU referendum, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By hate crime type; ○ A further breakdown of the broad racist and religious hate crime type if possible; and ○ By the number of offences taking place online or offline; • Provide data on what was known about alleged offenders of hate crime, for example age; 	In progress.	MPS

Continued

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm whether any profiling on perpetrators or alleged offenders had been undertaken by the MPS; • Provide a breakdown of from where the 500 supervisory posts within the MPS were being lost; • Confirm how much the MPS received of the £34 million in national funding for firearms officers; • Provide a summary of the types of claims against the MPS and whether they had increased, and confirm the MPS budget for claims; • Provide the current workforce target for custody nurses and confirm whether that had changed since 2013; • Inform the Committee as to whether the Civil Aviation Authority’s guidelines to the MPS for helicopter flights over London were published; • Inform the Committee when a risk assessment was last undertaken for the MPS’s bomb disposal vehicles and the age of the vehicles; and • Provide an update on the number of police officers who had been trained in using unmanned aerial vehicles (drones). 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the number of Section 60 Stop and Searches undertaken as a result of Operation Viper; and • Provide any MPS analysis that was available on the likely impact on crime detection and prosecution in the West End as a result of Westminster City Council's decision to stop monitoring its CCTV cameras from 1 September 2016. 		
--	--	--	--

Meeting of 17 March 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
5.	<p>Question and Answer Session – Review of the Police and Crime Plan 2013-16</p> <p>During the course of the discussion the Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) undertook to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any analysis the MPS has on the reasons for the year-on-year increase in criminal damage; • Information about how comparable forces are using, or whether they continue to use “taken into consideration” in terms of sanction detections; • Details of where information on the number of foreign national offenders is published; • A summary of progress made by the MPS on the action points listed within the MOPAC Hate Crime Reduction Strategy; • An update on the investigation into the fire at the Somali Bravanese Welfare Association, Muswell Hill; and • Figures which indicate what the biggest impact on abstraction numbers are, for example providing local aid for specific MPS operations, or for London-wide Public Order operations. 	In progress.	MPS

Complaints about the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC)

Subject and action required	Status	Action by	Deadline, if applicable
<p>Complaints about the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC)</p> <p>The Committee agreed, inter alia, to delegate to the Monitoring Officer all of the powers and functions conferred on it by the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations, with the exception of the functions set out at Part 4 of the Regulations which may not be delegated; and guidance on the handling of complaints which requires the Monitoring Officer to report, on a regular basis, the summary details (such as can be reported in public), on the exercise of any and all of these functions to the Committee for monitoring purposes.</p>	<p>No disclosures to report for the period from 6 December 2016 to 3 January 2017.</p>	<p>Monitoring Officer</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Transparency Procedure</p> <p>The Committee agreed Members disclose to the Executive Director of Secretariat or his nominated representative (within 28 days of the contact) details of any significant contact with the MPS and/or MOPAC which they consider to be relevant to the work of the Committee; and such disclosures be reported to the next meeting of the Committee.</p>	<p>No disclosures to report for the period from 6 December 2016 to 3 January 2017.</p>	<p>Executive Director of Secretariat</p>	<p>n/a</p>

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 – Letter from the MPS re the Police and Crime Committee meeting of 17 November 2016, dated 12 December 2016.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer:	Joanna Brown and Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers
Telephone:	020 7983 6559
E-mail:	joanna.brown@london.gov.uk ; and teresa.young@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



**METROPOLITAN
POLICE**

TOTAL POLICING

12 December 2016

Steve O'Connell AM
Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee
Member for Croydon and Sutton

(via email)

**Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, MBA, MA
(Oxon)**
Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis
4-5 Buckingham Gate
London
SW1E 6JP

Tel: 020 7230 2598

Email: Comm.PO@met.pnn.police.uk
www.met.police.uk

Dear Steve .

I am writing in response to your letter dated 29 November 2016, which I acknowledged 2 December promising to provide you with the information you requested.

The answers to the questions you raised during the Police and Crime Committee Meeting on 17 November are attached as an Annex to this letter.

Yours sincerely
Bernard

**Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe
Commissioner**

Answers to Questions raised during PCC Q & A, 17 November

- **Provide a list of people who received a copy of the full, unredacted report of Sir Richard Henriques' Independent Review of the MPS's handling of non-recent sexual allegations about public figures, and the conditions under which it was provided for their use.**

The report was provided to the following external bodies:

- *The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime – Chief Executive and Deputy Mayor for Crime and Policing*
- *The Independent Police Complaints Commission*
- *The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse*
- *The Director of Public Prosecutions*

NB: Although Northumbria were provided with a copy, they were only given the chapter pertaining to Op Midland and not the other chapters.

Internally it has been provided to:

- *The Commissioner*
 - *AC Gallan*
 - *Advisory Group members*
 - *Operation Winter Key – (four officers have access to the report)*
 - *The five officers under investigation*
 - *A Senior Lawyer within our Directorate of Legal Services*
-
- **Write to the Committee about the way in which the MPS will take forward the lessons learnt in relation to its relationships with the media and the impact of social media on policing.**

A number of the recommendations in Sir Richard's review impact upon the information released by policing in relation to an investigation, a process covered by MPS and national media policies. These include the details released in connection with the arrest, search, interview or bail of any suspect, the circumstances under which a suspect would be named by police, the public statements made by police if no further action is to be taken and the actions taken to minimise the risk of leaks of confidential information.

Furthermore, Sir Richard also made recommendations that would require legislation including a right of anonymity for suspects prior to arrest, and possible statutory controls on the media where a police investigation is underway.

I said on publication of the review's key findings that the police and criminal justice should give Sir Richard's recommendations detailed consideration.

The MPS has committed to consult with the Home Office, the National Police Chiefs Council, Police and Crime Commissioners, the College of Policing and statutory and voluntary partners in the criminal justice system. This will include organisations representing the interests of the news media.

The Deputy Commissioner will oversee this process, and our Assistant Commissioner for Professionalism will lead the consultation on behalf of the MPS.

The MPS will undertake to update the Police and Crime Committee on progress at the next meeting.

- **Provide the figures for the last five and a half years on how many terrorist attacks in London has been thwarted.**

The Security Service owns the Government data on the number of plots foiled. I am not in a position to provide figures for the last five and a half years on how many terrorist attacks in London had be thwarted - for reasons of national security the number of terror plots foiled is not routinely reported in this way. However there has been a recent release by the Security Service which confirms that 12 terror plots have been foiled in the past three years.

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Action Taken Under Delegated Authority

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 12 January 2017

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report outlines recent actions taken by the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee in accordance with the delegated authority to take decisions granted to them by the Police and Crime Committee at its meeting on 15 December 2016.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the recent action taken by the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee, Steve O'Connell AM, under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree the arrangements for the Committee's scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Mayor published his draft Police and Crime Plan for 2017 to 2021 on 1 December 2016. The consultation deadline is 23 February 2017. The Committee is required by statute to review the draft plan and make a report or recommendations on the plan to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), and must agree its report or recommendations to MOPAC in public. The Committee will use its meeting on 23 February 2017 to formally agree its response to MOPAC.
- 3.2 At its meeting on 15 December 2016, the Committee agreed:
That authority be delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the arrangements for the Committee's scrutiny of the draft Police and Crime Plan.
- 3.3 Following the meeting, police and crime group Leads were consulted on the terms of reference for the scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan and the proposal that the Committee use its meeting on 12 January 2017 and part of its meeting on 26 January 2017 to examine the Plan. It was also proposed to seek the views of representatives from one of the pilot borough merger areas

and the respective community safety team to talk about the priorities in and impact of the draft Plan and the Safer Neighbourhood Board to hear its views on the priorities in the Plan.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The Committee is recommended to note the action taken by the Chairman under delegated authority, following consultation with the Committee, namely to agree the arrangements for the Committee's scrutiny of the draft Police and Crime Plan.
- 4.2 The report at **Agenda Item 7** sets out more details about the Committee's first meeting with invited guests to discuss the draft Plan.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report: None.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: Member Delegated Authority Form 774
Contact Officer: Joanna Brown and Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers
Telephone: 020 7983 6559
E-mail: joanna.brown@london.gov.uk ; and teresa.young@london.gov.uk

Subject: Response to <i>Violence Against Women and Girls</i>
Report to: Police and Crime Committee
Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat Date: 12 January 2017
This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Committee is asked to note the response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to its report, *Violence Against Women and Girls*.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to its report, *Violence Against Women and Girls*, as attached at Appendix 1 to this report.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At the Police and Crime Committee meeting on 8 September 2016, the Committee held a discussion with invited guests on Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG). The Committee explored the nature and extent of violence against women and girls in London, the ways in which partners were working together to prevent it, support for victims, and what the new Mayor, in his capacity as occupant of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), could do to help tackle and prevent it.
- 3.2 The Committee's report, *Violence Against Women and Girls* was published in November 2016. The report is available from the following area of the GLA's website: [here](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/police_crime_committee_report_-_violence_against_women_and_girls.pdf)¹

¹ http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/police_crime_committee_report_-_violence_against_women_and_girls.pdf

- 3.3 The report was sent to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime with an accompanying letter (reported to the Committee on 1 December 2016) which set out that the Police and Crime Committee wanted the Police and Crime Plan to:
- Support women and girls to have the confidence to report VAWG;
 - Ensure London's VAWG strategy is adequately resourced and able to deliver on its priorities;
 - Engage with the third sector – to understand the nature, needs and priorities of survivors in London;
 - Protect and build on London's network of specialist support services, and ensure the right services in the right places;
 - Support an increase in the number of ISVAs (Independent Sexual Violence Advisers) in London;
 - Prioritise smart commissioning, including supporting consortiums of women's organisations to come together;
 - Address the shortage of safe and secure accommodation for victims of VAWG;
 - Work with the Met to ensure adequate training for police officers on VAWG, and in particular, on harmful practices; and
 - Build on London's response to harmful practices, including a focus on increasing understanding of harmful practices and provision of dedicated specialist support services.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime is attached at **Appendix 1** for the Committee to note.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1: Response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to the Committee's report: *Violence Against Women and Girls*, dated 12 December 2016.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Joanna Brown and Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers

Telephone: 020 7983 6559

E-mail: joanna.brown@london.gov.uk and teresa.young@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MOPAC

MAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME

Steve O'Connell AM
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

12 December 2016

MOPAC16112016-24288

Dear Steve

Thank you for sending me the Police and Crime Committee (PCC) report into Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) which provided a helpful insight into many of the key issues surrounding VAWG in London. I am keen to work with the PCC to ensure we are getting our approach to Violence Against Women exactly right.

MOPAC is heavily investing in this area and currently provides £9.315 million in total for VAWG services in 2016/17. Beyond this funding I can reaffirm our total commitment to tackling VAWG which is demonstrated in the draft Police and Crime Plan (PCP).

Once this phase of the PCP development has been thoroughly conducted we will begin to draft an action plan that speaks directly to the key commitments of the PCP and we will be refreshing the VAWG strategy in 2017,

Your comments are both welcomed and useful in terms of how we progress the work which is currently underway.

Yours sincerely,



Sophie Linden
Deputy Mayor for Policing And Crime

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: The Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 12 January 2017

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides background information to the Police and Crime Committee for its meeting with invited guests to discuss the Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the report as background to putting questions to invited guests on the Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan, and notes the discussion.**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Mayor, as London's Police and Crime Commissioner, has a statutory duty to publish a police and crime plan. The plan is required to set out the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime's (MOPAC) priorities for the Mayor's time in office, including police and crime objectives, financial and other resources to be provided to the Commissioner and performance measures.¹
- 3.2 MOPAC is required to send its draft Police and Crime Plan to this Committee. The Committee is required by statute to review the draft Plan and make a report or recommendations on the Plan to MOPAC. MOPAC must "have regard to any report or recommendations made by the [committee] in relation to the draft Plan."²
- 3.3 The Mayor published his draft Police and Crime Plan for 2017 to 2021, a [Safer City for All Londoners](#), on 1 December 2016.³ The draft plan builds on the response to the Mayor's recent Talk London survey, which was completed by almost 8,000 Londoners. Consultation on the draft plan runs for 12 weeks to 23 February 2017. The final version of the Police and Crime Plan for London will be published by the end of March 2017.

¹ [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)

² [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)

³ Mayor of London, [Mayor invites Londoners to have their say on plans for a safer city](#), 1 December 2016
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

3.4 The draft Plan is divided into the following chapters:

- **The city we serve:** outlines the context in which the MPS operates and the future challenges that are emerging.
- **A better police service for London:** sets out new proposals to give local areas greater control of local police priorities, ensuring that police and councils are focused on the issues of greatest concern in their areas and that serious, high-harm, high vulnerability crimes are not overlooked.
- **Strategic policing capabilities:** outlines the specialist city-wide functions that support neighbourhood policing, including protecting London from terrorism; tackling serious and organised crime; being prepared for civil emergencies; managing threats to public order and public safety; being prepared for cyber-emergency; and tackling child sexual abuse.
- **A better criminal justice service for London:** sets out vision for devolving greater powers over the justice service to the Mayor and proposals for plans to improve the treatment of victims and speed up the process of justice.
- **Our priorities:** sets out proposals to tackle three issues of high concern and high harm across London: keeping children and young people safe; tackling violence against women and girls; and standing together against extremism, hatred and intolerance.
- **Transforming services and managing the MPS budget:** describes how MOPAC plans to work with the MPS to ensure that its officers, staff and volunteers have the resources, skills and support needed.
- **How MOPAC will deliver this plan:** how MOPAC plans to oversee the MPS, fund services and deliver its commitments.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The Committee aims to examine the feasibility and potential impact of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan. In particular, it will examine how well it prepares the MPS for current and future challenges; and assess the arrangements for effective oversight of the Plan and its priorities.
- 4.2 This meeting will be used to speak with invited guests about the content of the Plan: in particular, how it addresses current and future challenges for policing, and how effective the proposed performance measures would be. Guests will include academics and think tanks that specialise in crime, justice and policing.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.
- 5.2 Officers confirm that the scope for this thematic session falls within the Committee's terms of reference.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer:	Becky Short, Scrutiny Manager
------------------	-------------------------------

Telephone:	020 7983 4760
------------	---------------

E-mail:	becky.short@london.gov.uk
---------	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Police and Crime Committee Work Programme

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 12 January 2017

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out a proposed work programme for the Police and Crime Committee.

2. Recommendations

2.1 **That the Committee agrees its updated work programme as set out in this report.**

2.2 **That the Committee agrees that a site visit to a Metropolitan Police Service custody suite be held on Wednesday, 1 February 2017.**

3. Background

3.1 The Committee's work programme is intended to enable the Committee to effectively fulfil its roles of holding the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to account and investigating issues of importance to policing and crime reduction in London. The Committee's work involves a range of activities, including formal meetings with MOPAC, the Metropolitan Police Service (the MPS) and other stakeholders, site visits, written consultations and round table meetings.

3.2 The Committee will usually meet twice a month. One of the monthly meetings is usually to hold a question and answer (Q&A) session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. The Commissioner of the MPS has been invited to these meetings. The Committee will primarily use Q&A meetings to investigate topical issues and review MPS performance, including consideration of MOPAC's approach to holding the MPS to account.

3.3 The Committee's other monthly meeting is used to consider a particular topic or aspect of policing and crime in greater detail. These investigations will be conducted either by the full Committee or working groups. Working groups will have delegated authority to prepare reports on the Committee's behalf in consultation with party Group Lead Members. Full reports will be approved and published by the full Committee.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The work programme has been designed to proactively examine issues of interest but also allows for flexibility to respond to topical issues and for the Committee to react to MOPAC's work programme. Topics will be added to the timetable for Q&A meetings as they arise.
- 4.2 The Committee agreed its initial priorities for its work programme at its meeting on 29 June 2016. Since that meeting, the work programme has been revised and an updated work programme is set out below:

January	Thursday 12 January 2017 Thematic meeting – Police and Crime Consultation	Thursday 26 January 2017 Q&A meeting
February	Thursday 9 February 2017 Thematic meeting – TBC	Thursday 23 February 2017 Q&A meeting
March	Thursday 9 March 2017 Thematic meeting – TBC	Thursday 23 March 2017 Q&A meeting
April	No meetings	

The Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan

- 4.3 The Committee's main piece of work in the New Year will be scrutiny of the Mayor's Draft Police and Crime Plan. The Mayor, as occupant of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (equivalent to a Police and Crime Commissioner outside London), has a statutory duty to publish a Police and Crime Plan. The Plan is required to set out MOPAC's priorities for the Mayor's time in office, including police and crime objectives, financial and other resources to be provided to the Commissioner and performance measures.¹ The Committee is required by statute to review the draft Plan and make a report or recommendations on the Plan to MOPAC. MOPAC must "have regard to any report or recommendations made by the [committee] in relation to the draft Plan."²
- 4.4 The Mayor published his draft Police and Crime Plan for 2017 to 2021 on 1 December 2016.³ Consultation on the draft Plan runs until 23 February 2017 and the final version of the Police and Crime Plan will be published by the end of March 2017. The Committee aims to examine the feasibility and potential impact of the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan at its thematic meeting on 12 January 2017 and will dedicate part of its Q&A meeting on 26 January 2017 for further questions on the Plan. In particular, at the meetings the Committee will examine how well the Plan prepares the MPS for current and future challenges; and assess the arrangements for effective oversight of the Plan and its priorities.

Site Visit to a Custody Suite

- 4.5 Site visits are an important part of the Committee's work to assist Members in gaining a deeper understanding of policing issues. From time to time the Committee has included questions about the arrangements of custody suites at its Q&A meetings. It is proposed that the Committee agrees that a site visit be held to a MPS custody suite on Wednesday, 1 February 2017.

¹ [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)

² [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)

³ Mayor of London, [Mayor invites Londoners to have their say on plans for a safer city](#), 1 December 2016

Site Visit to the MPS's Specialist Training Centre

- 4.6 At its meeting on 19 July 2016, the Committee delegated authority to the Chairman in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM to agree arrangements for a site visit to the MPS's Specialist Training Centre in Gravesend to observe training for public order policing. It is proposed that the site visit take place in April 2017.

Policing issues and electoral fraud and mismanagement in London

- 4.7 At its meeting on 20 October 2016, the Committee agreed to review its work programme in order to consider proposals for an urgent scrutiny investigation to clarify the involvement of MOPAC and MPS in relation to tackling allegations of electoral fraud and mismanagement in London, with particular attention to Tower Hamlets, following the Election Court Judgement by the Election Commissioner. The Chairman has written to MOPAC requesting background information. Once a response has been received, Members will then decide how this work should then be taken forward.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None
Contact Officer: Becky Short, Scrutiny Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 4760
E-mail: becky.short@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank