

Police and Crime Committee – 16 January 2014

Transcript of Item 5: MOPAC and Met Spending Performance and Governance

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We will now move to item 5, our main business today. It is my pleasure to welcome Stephen Otter, from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). We are delighted you can be with us today. The reason for inviting you is because each year HMIC compiles a value-for-money profile of all the police forces. We want to ask you some questions about that today in relation to the Metropolitan Police Service.

Perhaps I can do some scene-setting to start with. Can you briefly outline what the purpose of the value-for-money profiles is?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): The purpose is to give all 43 forces a profile of themselves in relation to other forces across the country at the time they are building their budgets and making decisions about budgets. Of course, it is not just the forces. It will be the Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in particular to see whether they are higher or lower cost than the average or their most similar family. They are intended to prompt questions between those who hold the force to account and those who are being held to account. They are not, on their own, judgements and cannot be seen as an absolute judgement. We are encouraging bodies like you and like the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to hold the Commissioner to account and to prompt some questions about why things are perhaps higher cost than others and lower cost or why there are lower numbers in one place than in another.

In 2012, we did actually survey forces and I can say the Metropolitan Police Service came back to us with a very positive response around how it uses its profiles. It actively uses the profiles. I know also through the work I do with MOPAC that it uses the profiles a lot, too, for identifying, for example, high information and communication technology (ICT) costs and prompting conversations with the Commissioner. In the questionnaire we sent to the Metropolitan Police Service, they said they were using it for direct management and attention to key issues; influencing decisions about changes made in the force, so how it uses the profiles around change and the cutting of resources; revising budgets when it thinks costs are too high; and overall, using it to improve efficiency and effectiveness. That is the main purpose of them. They are used as a way of prompting discussion like this.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): In relation to the Metropolitan Police Service, what were the most significant findings that you found and - perhaps importantly for us - which issues do you think are worthy of further work?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): If I may go into some detail about what I think those are, but before I do that, it is worth contextualising this. We certainly do. We are looking at a force that is the largest in the country and one of the largest in the world. It covers an area where, for example, 13% of households have no English speaker. London has a younger population than the average with 36% between 25 and 44, whereas it is 27% across England and Wales, so significantly larger. Roughly 15 million people visit every year. An important factor that we bear in mind is that the workforce costs are much higher. The median gross weekly earnings for fulltime employees in London are 27% higher than the national median. That is the 2013 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings survey.

We need to bear those things in mind, but I will now go through what I think the headline things are. Unit costs per head of population are the highest in London in the Metropolitan Police Service across nearly all areas. The Metropolitan Police Service has a budgeted spend of £3 billion. Workforce costs per population are budgeted to be nearly 40% higher than the most similar family. The most similar family group are West Yorkshire, Greater Manchester and West Midlands.

I suppose the question is: is that justified? Non-staff costs per population - and this does concern us - are budgeted to be over 50% higher. Our view is that the unique character of London might help explain the higher workforce costs, but it, in our view, does not explain the higher support costs. Therefore, there needs to be a question. It might explain some of the pay, but it does not really explain the challenge because it is a large organisation. There should be some economies of scale.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): In making those comparisons, London obviously has a lot of national responsibilities. Do you take them out when you are doing the comparing?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): In the value-for-money profiles, we take out all the national costs so that we can compare like with like. Things like counterterrorism funding and those officers who are employed directly from those grants are not included so you can be safe in comparing one against the other. That is the funding we take out. As I say, what I think you need to take cognisance of is the unique nature of operating in a capital city with national responsibility. We take out the funding and the people. The bit that I would suggest we all need to put in place is some questions around: help me understand why it is so different.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Did you look at a London weighting? Is that part of it?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): We do not take those into account. They ought to be by you when you look at this.

Despite receiving no income from collaboration, in fact, earned income per head of population is more than double the most similar family average. It is probably interesting to know why that is the case. Spend on business support as a proportion was the highest of all forces and that is an area that we do speak to MOPAC and the Commissioner about.

The operational front line is those officers who deal as directly as possible with the public. It is not just uniformed officers who are on patrol or in traffic. It is also Criminal Investigation Department (CID) officers, custody officers and all those who actually do what we would imagine would be the day-to-day frontline role. Spend on operational front line as a proportion was the lowest of all forces in England and Wales in 2013.

As a proportion, the force spends more in support functions than the most similar average with 28% compared to 22% and less in local policing with 34% compared to 42%.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Has that spending on the front line figure changed compared to the last survey you did? Are you able to tell us that or not?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I do not know. This report was from 2013. It does not capture much of the additional funding into local policing, which we are conscious of. We would have to wait until next year to work that out. I could find out for you. I do not know off the top of my head.

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

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): In terms of workforce volumes, so the numbers of people, officer numbers per population are the highest of all forces, as you might expect, actually. It is nearly 90% more than the England and Wales average and just over 30% higher than the most similar family average. Staff numbers - so not police officers but staff - per population are higher than the most similar family and 20% higher than the most similar family average.

If we then look at officers in visible roles, they are a subset of those operational frontline officers that we have talked about. They are the ones who are visible to the public, so it does not include those who work in plain clothes, in CID, custody and so on, away from the public eye. The question is how the new change programme is changing this. We are not sure, but certainly the plans look good. It is how it is actually going to change

this. That is low compared with other forces, so 52% in visible roles compared to the other forces' average of 61%.

One issue that is concerning to us is that there nearly double the England and Wales average of officers in business support: 4.9% compared to the force average of 2.5%. These are just drawing the headlines from the profiles which everyone has, I am sure. Finally, on this particular question, Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) numbers as a proportion of the workforce are low compared to other forces.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We are going to go into some detail on some of those issues in a little while. You obviously mentioned something with regards to workforce where the Metropolitan Police Service is an outlier compared to other forces. Are there any other business areas where the Metropolitan Police Service is an outlier? For example, you mentioned ICT a little earlier. Is there anything else?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): In fact, ICT and estates are two areas where it is the highest cost. I am very conscious that the work that is being done around the change programme led by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has those at the top of its agenda, so they are being addressed, in our view, in a very direct way and are concerning MOPAC in a very direct way. I know they concern the Commissioner and his top team, too. Those are the two areas where they are particularly high. I do not know whether you have the profiles there. I promised myself I was not going to trawl through these because they get so complicated. If I do not cover it in the rest of this presentation, perhaps we could go back to that, but those are the two that I know we have identified as particular ones. The fact that the overall business support costs are high concerns us.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): When you are doing your value-for-money profiles - and you talked about increased officer numbers and staff costs - do you make any comparisons or values with regards to levels of crime, for example?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Yes, we do and I hesitate to use those. They are a snapshot in time. The reason I hesitate is that that makes them old in the profiles. Nevertheless, the things you can use are the fact that the levels of crime in London are significantly higher than the most similar family. Robbery, for example, is at the higher end, nearly double the most similar family average, and theft from person. However, if you look at crime reduction - although if you look at five years crime reduction in London has been slower than other forces- in the last year the Metropolitan Police Service is starting to move ahead of other forces. In fact, we are seeing emerging increases when we are not seeing those except in the theft from person area in London. It is bucking the trend at the moment, so it is making steady progress on reductions compared to other forces.

Roger Evans AM: You have drawn our attention to business support costs. How do you define business support? Does that definition differ for the Metropolitan Police Service compared to other forces?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): No, there is a definition in the profiles. We set a standard and we stick religiously to the standard across all the forces. Otherwise, we would lose the opportunity to compare.

What we would suggest - and we suggest to other forces - is that those who are in a place where they are scrutinising ask those who are running the force to explain why their costs are higher. If they are saying, "Our costs are higher because we are unique", they need to define what 'unique' means. We think it is really for the force to explain that. You can then start to take the unique costs out of your comparators, put them aside and start to do some work that says, "OK, we are now on a like-for-like basis".

For the two areas - and I will go back to those two areas, ICT and estates - it is difficult to talk about their unique nature because they are fairly standard areas for organisations. Property costs might be higher and you have to ask them to explain why that makes their estates costs so much higher and so on. It would be more about running your estates than it would be about property costs.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Steve, thank you for laying it out so clearly because I was concerned. In your profiles, I saw that the number of full-time equivalents at the Metropolitan Police Service, officers and staff, working in the local policing function is going to decrease. That explains why they have the lowest spend on frontline policing or part of it.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): We are moving now to valuing the police, which is really about what the plans are for the future. Did you say local policing is decreasing?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Yes.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I cannot remember all the profiles.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): In fact, it already has the lowest spend on frontline policing and in future it will have an even lower spend on frontline policing. Is that right? You could come back to us, if you like, on this, but it is an important issue when the Mayor is claiming something quite different. Can we write to you on that?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Sure, yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Are PCC officers part of the force spend or not?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): No, they are not.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That is completely separate?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Yes, they are completely separately.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You do not do a value-for-money on them at all?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): No, we have no locus at all and no authority to operate in holding the PCCs to account or the local policing bodies.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You could not comment on the fact that the one in London is so expensive, more than the Police Authority? Drat. Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): In looking at officers and their visibility or on the front line, is it possible to have more officers in visible roles officially on the statistics you look at? Even though they may be doing other things in practice? I suppose I am asking whether there is a way to fiddle the figures so you do not know.

For the classifications of officers, for example, who are visible or on the front line, is it possible to hide those in the statistics? You would be presented with figures to say, "We have so many officers in frontline positions", when actually in fact they are not; they are doing something else.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): It is possible because we rely on data that the forces give both to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and to the Home office. These are data returns. That does not mean to say it is happening.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I know. I was just asking. It is an interesting issue.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We are just sceptical.

John Biggs AM: It is very good to see you again, Mr Otter, and you have given some useful evidence to the Budget and Performance Committee as well. I am very pleased that the Metropolitan Police Service has accepted Operational Policing Measures (OPM) and is now measuring figures.

Of course, what is interesting about that is as soon as you start looking at OPM, it then begs further questions about productivity and how one actually measures productivity. We have very limited time here today, but it seems pretty clear to me that in a world full of anecdotes and counter-anecdotes, it is quite difficult to actually nail this down. It is like nailing jelly down. We have so many officers on the front line, but we hear that they are spending half their time in the canteen filling in forms because there is not enough support staff.

Are there measures of productivity? Can you tell us briefly something about that and where we might go to understand and delve further into that?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): This is very difficult. There are in the profiles some signals. If you have high numbers and low visibility, I would argue that that is not as productive as lower numbers and a higher proportional visibility. Visibility is a proxy measure for those who are engaging with communities. It is only a proxy. They could be visible and actually not engaging, or not going out of the police station because they are the people in visible roles. We are not measuring visibility. I know MOPAC is thinking about measures around actually asking the public how visible officers are, so that is one measure.

Although detection rates are not a good measure of police performance, we looked - in comparison with other forces and in a very thoughtful way rather than just using it as targets - at what you are spending money on in investigation and what you are then able to show how many criminals caught, charged, going to court and successful outcomes. Those are good productivity measures of investigation. The danger with these - and I think the force would say this - is that if you crudely use them as targets, you end up with people chasing the detection rather than focusing on the investigation and the outcome in court. That is often the case with any targeting.

However, we are encouraging bodies like you to encourage thoughtful discussion around these questions rather than making judgements. London has a particularly low detection rate. The question should be about helping me understand why that is the case. What are your officers doing? Can you show how productive your officers are in investigative roles? What measures do you have in the Metropolitan Police Service to test how productive they are? What is your engagement with the Crown Prosecution Service like? Those are the questions we would be encouraging you to ask.

In every area, you can start to see that you could look at productivity, but what we have found with policing - and I am a former Chief Constable [Devon and Cornwall Police] - is that there is an inevitable drift into just focusing on the number at the end rather than the quality of the work that is done to achieve the outcome for the public.

John Biggs AM: I am a party politician and so I buy into this as well. It is a bit like the days of the Spanish Inquisition. We have items of faith. The item of faith in City Hall is 32,000 [target police officer numbers]. All the main parties sign up to that. Yet if I step out of my party role and do a more thoughtful piece as a Budget and Performance Committee Chairman or as a thoughtful Londoner, I find myself asking whether that is a blockage to actually thinking through greater productivity.

What I would be interested in doing over the coming year is looking at whether there are ways in which we can nudge ourselves into more productive ways of thinking about productivity which are less tribal and entrenched. HMIC might be able to help us with that with some proxy measures or other measures of productivity. You can do time and motion studies of officers. We can look at the impact of technology. You can hypothesise that having ICT-literate technicians might improve the productivity of officers so you can get more done with fewer of them or more done with the same number and so on.

That is a sort of quasi-question. Is that an area you are interested in at HMIC or is it just too mind-blowingly difficult to actually get into?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): We are very interested in that question and I would agree with your analysis. What I am seeing happening in the Metropolitan Police Service and in MOPAC is they are asking those questions. They are using the need to reduce their budgets to question themselves about how to do this more productively.

For the Metropolitan Police Service, it is the first time probably ever that it has had to reduce its numbers in real terms. That is the opportunity you have, right now, because of the layers of technology that exist in any force, actually, but the Metropolitan Police Service in particular, the high cost but not delivering, arguably, for the officer on the front line. It is about equipping the officer in the field to be able to do the work they want to do so passionately and do it effectively and efficiently, feeling as though they have access to real-time information, they are being guided by their own judgement and experience but actually using the data they have on their systems and it is instantly available.

The current layering of information and the fact that you have to go to lots of systems and there is lots of duplication - and I do not think I am exaggerating; that is the case in lots of police forces - does mitigate against good productivity and of course ends up with a requirement for lots of people, which is not necessarily the most efficient way of doing it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to move on to look at the Metropolitan Police Service's response to the funding challenge. Obviously, we are looking at a 20% cut in real-term funding for police forces over four years from 2011 to 2015. I know you have been looking into this. What do your findings tell you about how the Metropolitan Police Service has responded to the challenge of these funding reductions so far?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): In our last report and the last inspection, we found that there had been a seismic shift in the response from an understandable point where they were having to respond to the demands of the Olympics and all the other demands they had at that time to a real focus on dealing with the cuts that they need to focus on. In our report, we found that there were plans to save £737 million of the £769.4 million that they had to save. That has left £32 million, which is acceptable, in our view. Nobody has plans anywhere in any business to save everything. You would question, actually, whether that is possible and it is a relatively small amount that we would be confident they would find because they have good plans.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): How do they compare to other similar forces and the work they are doing?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): The Metropolitan Police Service needs to save 21% and that is higher than most similar forces. It has already made savings of 51% of the total savings. So far, the proportion of police officers in frontline crime-fighting roles, which unhelpfully is a slightly different definition and I apologise for that, is planned to increase from 86% to 93%. All the things that we are seeing point in the right direction for the Metropolitan Police Service in relation to how it is tackling the deficit. It is reducing police officer numbers by 4% between March 2013 and March 2015 or 1,374, as we understand it. That is a smaller reduction proportionately than most other forces. Police staff numbers are also reducing by 1,244 or 9% over the same period and that is a smaller reduction than most similar forces. Bearing in mind the high business support costs, we would expect to see the largest sum of savings to be made in that area. Certainly the plans are to make 65% of its spending review savings requirement from its pay budget. That is a lower proportion than most other forces. What we are seeing is a higher proportion from the support side of the business.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Can you just clarify the cuts in officers and the numbers you were just giving me? What would that mean the total police officers numbers would be for the Metropolitan Police Service?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I do not know.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You do not know, but you are saying they are going to be cutting 1,374 officers.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): There will be a reduction in police officer numbers by 1,374.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK. We will need to clarify that because they are already 1,500 down in any case at the moment from the establishment.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): That would be a reduction in budgeted posts, not people, and sometimes there is confusion between how many people the force actually has - and we know there are vacancies - and how many posts it funds to fill with people. The budget has to cut funded posts. It does not actually have to cut funded posts, but it is cutting funded posts. It can cut ICT costs and things.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Previously, the work of HMIC has highlighted that the Metropolitan Police Service was seen as an at-risk force, but from what you have said this morning it sounds like you have moved on in your view.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): We do not think it is an at-risk force. We know that if you look at the success of policing nationally in reducing its budget, if the Metropolitan Police Service is not reducing by the required amount, nor is it happening nationally. If you actually brigade that up into a national picture, the Metropolitan Police Service has such a disproportionately large impact. Therefore, it does require particular monitoring for that reason, not because it is at risk but because the management is doing things that are risky. They are doing the right things, but overall it requires an element of careful monitoring. Some forces which are much smaller perhaps would not.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to move on to the issue of neighbourhood policing. There was some work that you have identified concerns in that whilst officers may be officially counted as neighbourhood officers, they are actually spending a huge proportion of their time doing wider police work. You have described it as moving away from neighbourhood policing and returning to basic beat policing.

What effect do you think this change is having on policing in London? Do you want to expand on that point you have made?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Certainly. The general point, looking nationally, is that some forces - not all - often end up removing nearly all of their neighbourhood officers in the way that they were previously defined, so officers who spent time on beats and engaged with local communities were there for local communities and built up knowledge and stayed on their beats, for example. That was the original purpose of the neighbourhood policing project. They are having to take on additional responsibilities. Although they are still called 'neighbourhood police officers', they are doing the work perhaps of what were called 'response teams', the people who would respond to calls, investigate low-level crime - although those low-level crimes were important to the public but locally - and do other things.

We do not think that it is wrong for neighbourhood police officers to do some of those things. It has always been right that the neighbourhood officer is part of the team that investigates crime, prevents crime and so on, of course, and that is a core part of their function. What we are concerned about nationally - and I will talk about the Metropolitan Police Service in a minute - is that there seems to be just using the label when actually communities are saying they have lost contact with their local officers. It is really looking at it from the local people's perspective. We are saying, "Is that right for the public?" That is the concern. We are going to do

more work on that over time because that, if you like, has raised a concern for us rather than evidence that this is actually reducing the service to the public at this stage. That is the connection we want to have a look at.

In London, of course, the opposite is true in terms of funding. Local policing is getting more funding and more officers relative to what it used to be. The Local Policing Model has just been put in place structurally and I know it will take time to fill all the posts and get it up and running, as any change would. The question for us looking at this is whether that money is being invested in a way that is best value for the public in those local communities. Does it provide them with levels of service that they ought to expect? Does it actually improve the service at this time, bearing in mind that at local policing levels it is an increase in resource? They are the questions we would like to answer and I am going to have a look at some of these areas soon, just to get a feel for what they look like at this stage, how the officers are operating. Valuing the Police four, which is the next round of this inspection, will look at these areas in particular in London.

It is too early for me to say what the London picture is because the changes have only just been made. It may even be too early in this new inspection. However, the question has to be whether that investment in local policing and the design of the Local Policing Model provided the best, most efficient and effective service to the public.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You keep saying there has been an increase in resources. It depends where you measure it from to start off with, actually, in terms of the numbers. Also, is there not going to be an impact if you have taken away officers from some of the very specialist teams and badged them as neighbourhood policing when actually they are just a pool of officers who go around the borough and are not dedicated towards it, as we had known? Is there not going to be an impact on confidence in the police and perhaps actually some of the prevention work that neighbourhood teams have traditionally carried out?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): They are absolutely the right questions. Our understanding looking at the plans is that local policing will receive an additional 2,000 staff. It may be arguable whether that is overall an increase, but certainly for that function it looks as though and our understanding is that that is an increase.

The question then is how they are providing the service that the local people need or want. That is a question that we need to test once it has been delivered. There is always a danger that people will fall into a cultural norm of response-type policing and I imagine that that is something the leadership is very switched on to. We would want to see officers dedicated to local policing, understanding local issues, investigating local crimes, making sure that local people know what the police are doing, keeping them informed and engaging with local partners. That is the sort of thing a Local Policing Model ought to provide. It is about building local intelligence about who is committing what crimes because most crimes do happen in the local environment. Certainly this looks good in a plan sense. That is what it is intending to do. Now it is whether it delivers that.

Moving people from specialist roles of course creates difficulty, but the Metropolitan Police Service has to do that. It has to reduce its numbers. It has to reduce its costs. It has to change the way it operates. My experience of working in the Metropolitan Police Service and certainly looking back in from an HMIC point of view is that there is a lot of cultural resistance to change, particularly in specialist areas.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: There is bound to be.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): There is a danger of being held to ransom by specialists who say, "You cannot possibly do this. Suddenly, there will be an increase in terrible things that happen". There has to be proper oversight of it, but there has to be some bold decisions here about reorganising the business. Your question should be and certainly the question we are asking ourselves is how we know if it is successful or not.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I have been asking questions and have not been able to get any answers from MOPAC on this. I have had answers, but they cannot actually, as it were, answer the question of how they are going to really monitor the effectiveness of the new model. Are they looking at the

number of investigations carried out by the new Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the proportion of time spent investigating neighbourhood crime and spent in their wards or whatever? Is that some of the work you are going to be doing as part of your review?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): We are looking at what we think the signs of success should be. One of those is victim satisfaction, which is the lowest in the country in London. Interestingly and slightly paradoxically, London has high confidence levels in its police. That is another measure we would be looking at. They are linked, although in London somehow they are linked in a much more complex way than other places. I would imagine the Commissioner is very keen to see victim satisfaction rates go up as a result of what local policing is going to be doing and that is something you could monitor.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Then in the wider austerity picture, are there any new threats that you envisage and how should forces such as the Metropolitan Police Service be preparing for them?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): There are. The new threats are about further funding cuts. The Government has announced a further 4.9% real reduction for central police funding for 2015/16, as you know. It is likely, although we are not certain, that larger forces such as the Metropolitan Police Service may well face further significant cuts in the future.

There are some threats around the slowness of forces to make best use of digital technology, particularly around access. Forces like the Metropolitan Police Service and, understandably, all forces are rethinking the way people access their services and closing front counters. We actually see that as a positive step because not many people use front counters. However, it has to be replaced by good internet access, the sort of access that you would expect to see from a bank and so on. That is a threat for the Metropolitan Police Service in particular because it is so large but also other forces.

Also, there is a risk in the future that our - and I say 'our' in the global sense, not HMIC's but the public's and the Government's and everyone's - reliance on recorded crime is not taking account of crimes that are happening that are not recorded. We are particularly interested in emerging crimes that happen on the internet, cybercrime or cyber-enabled things that are enabled by the use of digital technology, things that happen within cyberspace and so on. That is a challenge for all forces. I know the Metropolitan Police Service is very focused on that.

Finally, there is a significant risk of demand around child sexual exploitation and hidden sexual crime.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): That is very helpful. Thank you.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): On this issue about the numbers in local policing, what you said just now was that they are increasing by 2,000. I am not sure. In your profiles, the figures are a reduction of about 1,000 this financial year, so what is happening is there is a reduction and you are saying then they are going to go up.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): If you could point me to where it says that in the profile? Did you say it was page 47?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is on page 47 and it is a very pretty picture of a lake now. It is on page 47. Near the top, there is a chart. We will write to you about this, but I wanted to put it on the record while we are still here in public.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): You are talking about the neighbourhood policing numbers?

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The local policing numbers. At the top, it says they are going from 19,700 to 18,900, so it is going down and then it is going to go up again?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I think you should ask the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner. You are right. That is what it says.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Steve, these are your figures.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I agree. That is what we were told about 2013. What I have said is that the plan says there is an increase in local policing numbers.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We will have to sort this out. ? You said there is a lower percentage of staff reductions at the Metropolitan Police Service. Is that because it is from a lower base?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I thought I said there was a higher percentage of staff reductions.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Higher?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Yes, I think so. Let me just check what I said.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That is actually starting from a lower base as well because there has always been lower staff than other forces.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): As a proportion it starts from a lower base, but not the numbers. The numbers in the Metropolitan Police Service are very high, but as a proportion of police officers.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): As a proportion, yes. Thanks.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): Let me just see. Staff numbers per population are higher than most similar forces.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I think they are lower than against officer numbers, but do not worry. This is something I will --

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): OK. I did not talk about the proportion of officer numbers.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I know you have said that the Metropolitan Police Service's national responsibilities are generally excluded, but at the same time you are dealing with the force and its complexities. Does that not mean there is a big hole in any analysis of the Metropolitan Police Service? It is policing a global city, so I have never been able to get my head around why we are not comparing it with other global cities. I know the analysis that you are doing is based on population. That is fine because I represent a constituency in London, so absolutely. I want to know how we are doing versus other areas and nationally. However, I just always feel that there is a big hole in anything that we do because it is our national force, whether other forces like it or not. It has to work with other capital cities like Paris, New York and Berlin. It just seems to me there is this statement that said, "We will not look at that". How can you not look at that? It is an intrinsic part of what the Metropolitan Police Service is.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region): I need to be clear. I am not saying we should not look at it or you should not look at it. Absolutely, we should. When we write down how the force is funded, we feel that including the funding that is for national issues

distorts the picture because some forces do not have any funding and some forces have very low levels of funding for counterterrorism and so on.

However, it is absolutely right - and it is part of the work of those who hold organisations like this to account - to take into consideration the absolutely unique nature of London in certainly British terms, but it is not unique globally. You are right. There are cities like New York and others that have similar challenges. It is right to look to the way in which those organisations are run and how they are funded and make comparisons in order to get a better idea of whether the quantum that we are talking about here is right.

It is certainly the case when you look at the way you fund officers and the frontline operational side. When you look at the business support, the human resource support, the technology support and the infrastructure support, I do not think you have to go far to do that. You are on safe ground to really be challenging around the numbers. Most organisations have to provide that in similar ways. The difficulty with policing is the way in which it has been funded in the past. The way in which procurement has worked and the way in which these barriers have been set up have not helped and have resulted in this layering legacy. There is an opportunity with this change programme for you to be clear that there are some expectations around costs in those areas and that has to be transformational.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can I thank you for coming in? Before you go, though, if there was one area you thought this Committee should prioritise in our scrutiny work, which one would it be?

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region):

Value for money in the Metropolitan Police Service would be best served by all those involved in holding the organisation to account working on getting a better understanding of what can be compared and what cannot be so that there are not these circular debates. This has been going on for a long time: "But you just cannot compare us. We are different." Of course, that is true in a way, but there are some costs where they can be compared. Settle on those and focus and you could make a big difference.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you for coming in this morning. It is greatly appreciated and hopefully we will have you back in the not-too-distant future.

Stephen Otter (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for National and the London Region):

Thank you very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We now move to the second part of our meeting. We are joined now by Craig Mackey, the Deputy Commissioner for the Metropolitan Police Service; Ian Percival, Director of Group Finance for the Metropolitan Police Service; and Lynda McMullen, Director of Police Resources at MOPAC. I especially welcome Lynda because I think it is her first time before us. We are going to ask you some questions on your role a little later on.

We are moving now to look at the Metropolitan Police Service from 2014 onwards. Before I start with Roger, we should formally note in our minutes that there has been a parallel process with our statutory Budget and Performance Committee, which has also had a series of meetings with the police service, with MOPAC and with the Metropolitan Police Service on the police budget. As part of that process, group leads from this Committee who are not automatically members of the Budget Committee were invited to take part in those discussions, so there has been some work going on elsewhere. We have sought not to duplicate that work, but there are issues that we want to follow up on.

Roger Evans AM: Can you begin the debate by telling us about the budget for the coming year, what the challenges have been that you have faced in setting that and how you have sought to overcome those challenges?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): The challenges really for this year have not changed greatly from last year. Clearly, what we did last year was to develop a three-year budget cycle that gave us a balanced budget over the term of those three years. What happened this year with the

announcement was we saw general grant reductions of 3.3% in cash terms for 2014/15 and the indication of another 3.2% for 2015/16, so we have built those into the planning assumptions of where we have gone. We estimated that the Metropolitan Police Service contributions to some of the national initiatives - some of the removal of the central grant before it comes to the police - at about £50 million now for the Innovation Fund, £18 million for the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) and £9 million towards HMIC and the inspection work of that. We have been planning for those sorts of scenarios as we have gone through the year.

What was important was - and I think HMIC touched on it - the change programme was the work that started around the change to begin that transformation process in the Metropolitan Police Service that gave us the space and time to be able to meet those further reductions. We are now looking and planning out for 2016/17 and considering how long we keep having to go with those sorts of direct inputs of cash falling.

Roger Evans AM: Lynda, what would you say are the biggest risks to the Metropolitan Police Service in the coming year?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): We did take a quite detailed paper to our audit panel to go into some of those risks. Some of the things we rehearsed through with them were, as Craig was saying, the issues around funding for future years. In terms of the next financial year, we are quite focused on delivery of savings. It is something we picked up in the previous Budget Committee. It picks up again on what Mr Otter was saying. Some of the savings are focused at some difficult areas, particularly IT and property. While I am confident we will make those savings, the issue for us is making sure we make those savings at pace given all the other changes that are going on within the Metropolitan Police Service.

Roger Evans AM: There is a big property disposal plan going on at the moment. How are you making sure that is running to target and we are getting best value from that?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): The process is we have a joint asset management panel where we come together and talk about those plans. You will forgive me because I am relatively new to the organisation.

Roger Evans AM: That is all right. I am sure your colleagues from the Metropolitan Police Service can help if necessary.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): They help me very much indeed. One of the things that I see as a primary responsibility is to insert myself into the discussions about the plans. From my previous role at the National Audit Office, perhaps I have quite a bit of experience of where things go wrong at a national level, so there are things that I am looking for in those plans to make sure we are covering off some of those risks where things go wrong elsewhere. It is about making sure that those plans are deliverable and we are not falling into any traps with those. It is also making sure - repeating some of the debate you were having with Mr Otter previously - that we have the right information so we know when things are going off-track. It is about looking both at whether the strategic plans right and at whether we have the right data to know whether or not we are on track or not. We have to keep very close to that.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If I may, just to assist you on that, you mentioned disposals. I do not think disposals is the risk area around the estates. Linking it across to the value-for-money (VFM) profiles, Her Majesty's Inspector (HMI) highlighted that the daily run-rate of running the Metropolitan Police Service's estates is higher than everyone else's. That has been shining out from the profile for the last ten years and we are very clear that actually that is the bit that is more difficult to get the money out, but if you asked me which bit worries me in terms of the ones I go and look at straight away, it is that bit rather than the disposals. The disposals programme is going well and some of the returns are above where we would have thought they would be, so we have made some real progress this year on the disposals.

However, as with the technology world, it is getting that annual run-rate of that part of the organisation down. That is the bit that we have to keep going back and challenging ourselves on. I would worry about that bit rather than per se the disposals. I am pretty confident from what we see and the way we are going against the

profile of where we thought we would be on disposals. We are actually ahead of schedule in terms of the capital receipts that are coming in around that.

Roger Evans AM: The two are pretty closely linked. The reason you have always given us for the run-rate on buildings being so high is that they are elderly buildings and they are unsuitable. It follows that if you dispose of those and you use newer state-of-the-art property, you should be seeing those savings on the run-rate?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, absolutely. That is the bit at the moment. If you asked me whether I am seeing savings flow-through directly yet, I am not. The run-rate - or the cost of the central estates team - we know has to come down because it is absolutely where you are. If you look at the overall strategic intent, to go from 900,000 square metres in crude terms of real estate across London to 600,000 square metres, we want the commensurate fall. We will get it in running costs in its purest sense, but it is also about the people and those business support costs that sit in there.

Roger Evans AM: Could I ask you, Lynda, as well about IT, which was the other area that Mr Otter identified as being important? It is something the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has been very vocal about. What value is MOPAC adding to the process of saving money on IT that was not already there within the Metropolitan Police Service?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): If I could go back a little bit, some of the initial challenge about why the costs were higher than average, some of those discussions were certainly led by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. How we are moving forward, we are very closely involved in the programme for the delivery of the savings that are coming out of IT and we also want to focus very much on the improvements to service and the improvements in productivity we will get from IT as well. Those are the things that we are going back and talking to the Metropolitan Police Service about and are involved in very detailed discussions about how we are actually making those results come through.

In my previous experience reviewing IT projects, sometimes things do get delivered. Sometimes they can be late. One of the things we want to be very clear about is that we actually get the delivery of the benefits, not just the hard cash savings that we want out of it, but a different way of working. That is what we want to keep very close to and make sure that we actually get delivered.

Roger Evans AM: HMIC has also said that it may prove difficult to find savings in the future if we keep up this level of approach to savings. Is that something that you see as a problem? How will you face that type of challenge if more savings are required from 2015 onwards?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): The issue is not if further savings will be required. All of us are very clear that looking to the next spending review, whatever happens, further substantial savings will have to come through.

Coming into this role, one of the things I am very pleased about is that what I see at the Metropolitan Police Service is not what perhaps I have seen up and down the country with other public sector organisations: a bit of salami-slicing here and there and looking at quite short-term shrinking down. What I do see at the Metropolitan Police Service is quite an intelligent look at reforming the whole operating model. How does it work differently with a view to what the challenges may be in the future? There are a lot of positive things that I am mentally giving a lot of ticks to.

One of the things that I need to spend a lot of time with the Metropolitan Police Service on and Ian [Percival] and I are already starting to think about is not just the next couple of years but what this looks like looking ahead quite significantly. In tactical savings terms, even when we take some of the headline savings out for big items like IT property and look back to some of the HMIC data, it still looks like there is potential to make more savings. I would say that not all of the savings that we potentially can drive out through some of the reforms around business support have been factored in yet, so there is more for us to go back to on that.

One of the other areas we need to think about more carefully - and we are starting the conversations and talking to other organisations about how we think about this more creatively - is how we start looking at some of these challenges not just within the MOPAC-Metropolitan Police Service conversation, not just within the Greater London Authority (GLA) conversation, but across broader areas within the public service. It does seem to me, if we look at opportunities across the whole criminal justice system - and there are huge challenges with that and that is probably why we have not cashed a lot of those savings yet across the country - those are some of the harder areas we really need to start digging into now to look at the art of the possible for delivery in those later years. That is something that we are very alive to thinking about not just 2015/16 and 2016/17 but even beyond that. That is where we really need to put some effort.

Roger Evans AM: Talking about shared services, then?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): Not necessarily just shared services. It certainly is about collaboration. One of my frustrations over the last numbers of years is that 'shared services' tends to be a discussion about how you reorganise and share back-office services. If we are going to collectively take the amount of money out of public services that I suspect we have to, we need to look more broadly at how we collaborate on some of those middle and front-office areas and how we can manage proactively some of the demand that we have for public services.

Roger Evans AM: It is quite encouraging to meet people who are thinking about where we go next with shared services rather than people who are fighting where we are going now, which seems to have been the approach we have seen from so many parts of the GLA family in the past.

Deputy Commissioner, just coming back to the impact of future budget reductions, looking forward, are there things from 2015 onwards either that you will not do anymore or that you will get other people to do or that you will be doing more efficiency?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Hopefully, the latter in terms of the efficiency. I am absolutely where Lynda is on this. As a working assumption, we think out to 2020/21 in terms of that financial tightening. By doing the work we have done so far, we have been able at our last oversight board to start to commission pieces of work to look at the areas we go to next. What are the parts of the work we do? That is where we collectively and professionally endorse those VFM profiles because they do allow you to look. I would absolutely endorse what HMIC said. They do not allow you to say, "A-ha, we have it", but they allow you to ask the question, "Why is that?" Even after we take some of this money out in the first round, there will be more potential to take more out.

Also, we are seeing something - and we are about two years into it - that happens in many change programmes from my experience elsewhere but it takes a while to get going. People suddenly say, "If that is what you want to do, why do we not do X?" The organisation almost starts to make a leap from where it is, misses B and C out and ends up at D. We are starting to see that in particular cases and people coming up with real ideas.

The really interesting debate is the one Lynda [McMullen, Director of Police Resources, MOPAC] touched on where collectively as the public services in London we start to have a debate around what those services are so that we do not end up with a patchwork quilt where that service is not delivered in this part of London but it is in this part of London because of the way the budgets have fallen and the squeeze has worked. There is a growing maturity amongst people that actually we have to have a much different debate around that to make sure we are getting it right and we do not say, "I will tell you what my core business and I am not doing any of yours". That is not where we are in doing it. At the moment, on the budget profiles we are looking at, our core services will remain the same. At its margins, you can flex things like response times. You can flex the demand for service.

An important point was made by the HMI as well: this is not against a backdrop of static demand. We are just lifting and peeling back that lid that is cyber and internet-enabled crime. We know about the work around serious sexual offences and the work we have seen and done around gangs. There will be new demands. At its

extremes, will we all have to have a mature debate around where the trade-offs are? Yes, we probably will, but it is not as stark as that. I cannot see a scenario at the moment on the basis of a financial picture where we say, "We will have to stop completely delivering that".

Roger Evans AM: In some ways, of course, a patchwork may not be a bad thing because London is not a homogenous city. We do not do or we should not be doing one-size-fits-all policing.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I would absolutely agree with you and probably I did not phrase it in quite the right way. I was not thinking about just policing. I was thinking about if as a result of decisions made in a very local area, at its extreme, you pull out of everything to do with, let us say, gangs and intervention work in a particular borough while it has a gang problem because of a finance thing. That is going to present some real challenges. What we are talking about is how we can do this a bit more collectively.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): There are some immediate risks around this. For example, if councils are under pressure and not investing in closed circuit television (CCTV), what is the impact on the Metropolitan Police Service? We need to have that sort of mature debate, which we have started. It is also about the bigger opportunities looking ahead as well. Both of those things are important.

John Biggs AM: There is £62 million in your budget for improving public access. What are we going to get for that in the next year?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Do you want me to list them all? I am not going to serve a paper, but I have a list. I can either read them or give them to you.

We are looking at front counter reconfiguration and some particular sites where they need new front counters. We are looking at some work around the Directorate of Information (DoI) and IT, so how we get on to the systems and the point Mr Otter made about the move to digital. We are looking at some work around the multiagency safeguarding hubs and getting some access in through those, so it is a range of areas. Some of the big areas are particular police stations, so there is some work around Sutton, Lewisham and Paddington Green. By all means, if you would like a detailed list of spending --

John Biggs AM: If you could share that with us outside the meeting, I am sure it will be examined in greater detail during the year.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I am more than happy to.

John Biggs AM: Following Mr Otter's comments, I am sure you would accept that access is all-important and making a better experience. Can you guarantee that at the end of this financial year the public will experience easier access than they did under the previous access arrangements?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): In terms of physical access, yes. In terms of the DoI and technology thing, Mr Otter touched on it at the end. We are all trying to get there, but I would not want to promise anything. That is absolutely our desire and wish, but I am always cautious with technology projects of any slippage. I have said it here before. You can use the example of the Metropolitan Police Service's website. . Try doing an online crime report, it is not a simple, intuitive process. We have to get to a much better way of doing that.

John Biggs AM: The public is anxious that there are reduced hours in town centres. In Barking, for example, there is a lot of unhappiness. The police station is closed and we now have a 9.00am to 5.00pm access point. Do you have flexibility in your budget to address that if, in the cold light of day, it becomes clear that that is not working?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely. If the demand requires it, we can flex and review that. That is part of the reason for the roadshows and the work that is going on at

the moment, going out and talking and looking at what those experiences are. Let us be really clear: if you flex one bit of the budget, you have to cut another bit of the budget.

John Biggs AM: Goodness. That is an unusual idea. I will tell my daughter about that. No, she is actually very responsible with her money. Can I ask you about Curtis Green? We do not have any information about the costs of improving Curtis Green. Obviously, there may be issues of confidentiality. A simple question: is it going to be completely self-funded by the proceeds of disposing of New Scotland Yard with maybe stuff left over?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): More than. Plenty.

John Biggs AM: There will be plenty left over?

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

John Biggs AM: You will have gold doorknobs in Curtis Green?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): No, we are not allowed to spend it on that.

John Biggs AM: We still have £50 million or £60 million back for recycling into other investment?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I hope considerably more than that. What I do not want to speculate on in public - and I hope you will understand - is what value New Scotland Yard may have.

John Biggs AM: Several tens of millions of additional surplus.

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

Roger Evans AM: A substantial surplus.

John Biggs AM: Good. I am sure we can find useful things to spend that on.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Could you just actually provide us - it may be MOPAC - with the full details of all the costs for Curtis Green, critical dates and other decisions required? We have the decision that was made by MOPAC but it does not have all the appendices, so we are not able to see that. As a decision has now been made, I would hope that you would be able to provide that information to us, please.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): Will do.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Perhaps also for the other sites such as Lambeth Road.

Len Duvall AM: Is it the budget strategy to always be under forecast strength?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): On police officers?

Len Duvall AM: On police officers.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, but the budget strategy last year was always -- and there is a graph in the plan that shows how we go during the three-year budget cycle up to 31,957 as a budgeted establishment in March 2015.

Len Duvall AM: Are you going to get on with some recruitment, then?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We are recruiting at the moment. There are people at Hendon [Police College] as we speak.

Len Duvall AM: You have moved off from the position that you had at the Budget Committee, “We have to really be careful to make sure we follow the principles about getting the recruitment right and the right people rather than chasing numbers”, which I agree with, but some of the figures we have, it is just that you are always under. You are never going to be at your full strength at any time, are you?

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

Len Duvall AM: You think that there will be a time when you will be?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, absolutely. Our recruitment plan is all around getting to at or around 32,000 - and the number I keep quoting is 31,957 because it is etched in my mind - by March next year.

Len Duvall AM: Recruitment is going on right now?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Recruitment is going on now.

Len Duvall AM: Next year when you are in front of us, you will be able to say that you are fully staffed in police numbers?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will be able to tell you when we meet and April and May where we are in relation to the 31,200 or thereabouts. I will tell you exactly where we are doing it.

Len Duvall AM: Sorry, not where you are because what you told me earlier on was that you will be at those numbers.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Sorry, I am talking about in two months' time. My apologies. There is an interim one as well.

Len Duvall AM: OK. I just want to be clear about that.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Would it help? I am quite happy to share the numbers that are currently in training and recruitment and the numbers coming through the process.

Len Duvall AM: I am sure people would because I do not think we share the numbers that we have been seeing through other means that you are going to get there.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): We are concerned about it, are we not?

Len Duvall AM: We will take your word for that and see where we are. Tell me. What impact is the force restructuring having on the stability of the workforce? How in turn might this affect other aspects of policing like neighbourhood policing and the relationship building in communities?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I would probably separate the issues out slightly. I absolutely see the logic of the link. It is different depending on your role and where you are.

For some of the police staff colleagues who currently are in the process of either applying for their own jobs or going through a selection process, it is a challenging time. Force restructuring on any scale is a challenge, but force restructuring on the scale we are doing it is considerable. There are all the things you would expect to see in any organisation from some people who feel quite disenfranchised and say, “There is not going to be a

role for me in the future”, through to those who say, “Excellent. I have been selected for X job or Y job. I am off. I am running. This is fantastic. How did I get from here to there?” That is what you are seeing around police staff.

Around police officers, the move to the Local Policing Model was done in two tranches. As we start to recruit officers, we are looking at the balance of student officers going into the Local Policing Model, so making sure the balance is right. There are a lot of new people coming into the organisation as we go forward. It has helped that this week we have announced a sergeants’ process, so we have done about 12 months where there would have been no promotion. For police officers, all of a sudden some of those things start to come off. Actually, on Monday we finish the chief superintendents’ promotion process, so people are starting to see some of those opportunities open up again.

Where it is challenging is if you have been used to a world where everything was literally at your fingertips and within your control and you are now in a world where some of those services are delivered in another way from a hub or another part of the organisation. That takes some getting used to, so we are doing all the cultural change that is associated with that.

The link around the second part of your question about whether it is destabilising our building of relationships with communities is always a difficult balance to get right. Many of you as previous members of the Metropolitan Police Authority will have expressed your frustration with us over the simple one around borough commanders, the two-year promise and those sorts of things. We are trying desperately to get those things right. We do not always and there are some high-profile ones where we do not get it right, but we are absolutely alive and conscious to that risk of doing it.

Len Duvall AM: Also associated with those changes would be a change in the way that you deliver training and presumably some increases in the training budget.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Potentially. The first biggest change is with one of the bits that does not get a lot of airtime but is actually crucially important. With the new shift pattern in the Local Policing Model, there are eight training days a year. We have tried to address some of those things that keep coming up when we say we cannot give people access to training because we need them on the front line or we need people out there doing it. We have built those into the duty programme and are looking at that with other areas of the organisation. Things like getting the real basics done, the officer safety training, the first aid training, issues around vulnerability, the stop-and-search training that we are rolling out, those sorts of things, those are why we have built that into the model of doing it.

We are now - and we are nearly there; we are not quite there yet - looking at every police rank, the supervisor rank to start with, making sure - and it sounds really simple but it has taken a long time to get there - you have the training to do the next rank and role, rather than you take on the role and two years later we say, “Craig, did you have any training for that?” We are putting those in place and it is something that the Commissioner is incredibly strong on. Every member of the management board knows that he wants to know what the training is for chief superintendents, what the training is for superintendents and how someone going into the role of an inspector actually knows and does that role.

Len Duvall AM: Can we turn to police staff now? Could you provide us with more details about your review of terms and conditions for police staff, what it is seeking to achieve and how you are involving the trade unions in that review?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Importantly, it has not started yet. This is a response from my colleague Robin [Wilkinson, Director of Human Resources, Metropolitan Police Service] who raised it in one of the earlier meetings. We are conscious and both the VFM profiles and a number of other things we have done have highlighted that this is an area we need to look at.

We have a variety of terms and conditions even within a particular grade or role, so it is, sadly, not uncommon that Ian [Percival] and I could be doing virtually the same role and have slightly different terms and conditions

and even different reward structures. That is clearly not where we would need to be long term. It is also clear that in some areas the way we grade and look at roles probably does not reward people as much as they should be or even in some cases there is a suggestion that we have too many roles that are rewarded too well. It is a chance to look again and ask where we would start, and where we would go.

It will have to involve the unions. Is it something that people are going to welcome with open arms straight out? No, because they will see it potentially as a threat. I do not think it should be seen as a threat. It should be seen as a chance to look at some of the inequities that always build up in these systems over a long period of time and also making sure that those staff who are doing the most difficult and challenging jobs are getting the appropriate reward. As you saw before Christmas and as you have seen afterwards, there is an awful lot of pressure around pay and reward for police staff.

Len Duvall AM: One of the problems has been about the way the cuts have been implemented around the support staff that is going to make this next phase a little bit tougher. Let me give you this example. It is really about values. I know you as the senior management have those values, but the emphasis on the uniformed side of the Metropolitan Police Service rather than on the total Metropolitan Police Service workforce. You are all crime-fighters. One just happens to be a warranted officer and another does not. They are all making a contribution to reducing crime.

Do you think your support staff feel that or do they somehow think they are bearing the brunt far more of the cuts because it is quite easy to cut them rather than some of the Metropolitan Police Service staff?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not see it as blunt as that. First of all, I go back to that first session. To some extent, the VFM profiles are pointing towards our business support and the way we have grown organically as an organisation where every bit of the organisation, not just the 98 command units, had its own support structure. If you had a support structure, you needed a manager for that bit and then they needed to be managed by someone, so we had grown --

Len Duvall AM: I have that bit, but it was not just about costs. It was about how you do the support structures. In the nature of the comparisons on the value of support staff, if you compare the way the Metropolitan Police Service operates to other police services, it is different. They operate with less. You may have two people or three people doing it. We are talking about people in terms and conditions now as the next phase. I presume you have taken and changed some of those issues and reduced those costs already or is that not the case?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We have reduced some of those costs. Sorry, I obviously misunderstood your question. I thought you asked me about getting the balance right between where you take the costs from?

Len Duvall AM: Yes. It is getting the balance right, but also it is a question about what you believe. Do you still hold the view that actually, whether you are support staff or a warranted police officer, you have an equal value and that you are all crime-fighters?

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

Len Duvall AM: Fine. Do you tell the support staff the consultation that they are valued?

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

Len Duvall AM: Actually, they do not feel that.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I absolutely recognise the point you make. I was with colleagues from the Public and Commercial Services (PCS) before Christmas - as the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime was - and it was very, very clear. It takes every single person in the organisation to deliver what we deliver.

Len Duvall AM: You are going to provide us with some more details around that, if you can.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Mr Mackey, as ever, you put a very positive spin on this review. You are talking about reward and so on, but of course what the Metropolitan Police Service is looking to do is cut. This is not really necessarily about improving terms and conditions. This could be --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It will be for some, yes, absolutely.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): For some, but some are going to lose out, are they not?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not know because we have not done the review yet.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I know, but you seem very positive about recognising and rewarding people, so it is only fair that you put the other side, which is that it could mean a loss for some people.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It could, potentially, yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I just wanted that clear.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I somewhat balk a bit. I do not spin things. I am not clever enough to do that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): All right, then. You are very positive, not like politicians. That is the next phrase. They will get very annoyed.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I was not going to say that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, you are a positive person and you are putting a positive view of it, but the fact this is not all about improving things. It is about cutting.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No, but I do not think you can underestimate it. If you look at some of our big areas of service like the Central Communications Command, the control rooms, where there are large numbers of police staff, how frustrating would it be for Ian [Percival] to sit next to me and know because of the date --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): No, I take your point.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is the important thing. Because of the date I joined, I get a better overtime allowance than he does or whatever the issue might be, so it is important that we look at those.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is also what Len [Duvall AM] said. You have made a lot of cuts to the staff. There is a feeling of resentment. It is going to be very difficult negotiating.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): That is why I emphasised when I started that this has not started, but we have been very open about the things we think we need to do over the next three, five and ten years of the programme. As a colleague in an earlier question said, the challenge around funding, the challenge around looking at how we deliver services and the challenge around looking at opportunities to do it differently is not going to go away. It does not feel like it is going to go away.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): We will keep an eye on this. That did not sound like a threat, did it?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have obviously been through the Met Change programme recently. Particularly, staff have felt that that was the review of their terms and conditions. Are you saying you are now going to embark on another terms and conditions review?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Please indulge me. Within the portfolio of work that sits under the management that I am leading on at the moment, there are five key streams around it. We have talked about the work - and we might come to it today - around the commercial strategy and whether we test services. We have talked about that. There is a major piece of work around IT and technology, a huge piece of work around that. There is the work around estates. There is the work around Met Change.

The enabler that makes all of this work is the work we have been doing around culture, so the work we have been doing around total professionalism and how we work. You cannot change an organisation and just put a structure in place and say to everyone, "That is it. It is done. We are all walking away. Get on with it. That is how the world works". That is what it looks like. The work around change has been moving from an organisation that for all the right reasons had grown up in quite a siloed and organic way to grouping things around services, being clear how you do it and reducing management overheads around it. It was never looking at individual terms and conditions for people.

Has it had an impact on people? Yes. Posts have gone. People have gone. You have seen how the police staff line has come down close to 12,200 this year. It is down slightly below that at the moment, so it has had a real effect on real people. I do not underestimate that and I know some of that issue around a change programme. If I am asked where the people I talk to around the organisation see it, they say, "Tell us when it is all going to end. When will it stop?" As we have touched on this morning, these things do not stop. They continue going. This drive around actually making sure we are spending every pound that Londoners give as efficiently as we can is absolutely going to continue.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): When is the review you are doing going to start? What is the timescale?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not have a date. It is Robin's [Wilkinson, Director of Human Resources, Metropolitan Police Service] work. He just signalled that that is a piece of work we will come to. It is not in the programme at the moment.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can you tell us whether it is this year or next year?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Without speaking to him, I would not want to commit him to it. It is certainly not in the programme. If you are you asking me if this is something we can start within the next six months, no. Shall I write to you with Robin's answer?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, if you could write to us afterwards. We are not going to ask specific questions on the market testing today, but we have talked before about what I was actually going to write to you about. Perhaps I can ask you rather than writing which areas you have decided to test so we can look at that and perhaps for MOPAC as well.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): By all means, I will send it back to you, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That would be good. Obviously, one of the unknowns is about your current dispute with the PCS, which may have financial implications for you. Could you just tell us what steps you are taking to resolve that dispute and who is leading the negotiations? Is it the police force or is it MOPAC?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It is us. Robin Wilkinson, our Director of Human Resources (HR), is leading for us on that. I understand that there is a meeting sometime this week looking at what the next steps are in doing it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Is that a meeting internally or with the unions as well?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Sorry, with the unions as well, but I had probably better get the exact date for you on that one.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Has there been a suggestion yet that you go to the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) to (sort that)?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I believe ACAS has been in contact with us. Again, I know Robin has had some contact, but I do not know the nature of it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Perhaps you could write to us.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): By all means.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I understand from the information I have that the union was happy to go to ACAS but the police force has rejected that. can you confirm or not?

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

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): When we looked at the pay rise here for staff, all parties agreed that we should look at perhaps tapering it so that low-paid staff were paid more. I am just wondering whether that is something that you are looking at.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We did make the offer to the unions to look at whether that is a way of doing things as part of doing it, but we are very clear about staying within the guidelines around the 1%.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Is that something you are going to follow up on in your talks?

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

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

Len Duvall AM: Can we just return to overtime now? You have set some very challenging targets. How will you support managers in achieving these challenging targets for reducing overtime? If you could just confirm, I think you have budgeted for £15 million less in overtime over the next two years compared to actual spend.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are a number of things. First of all, for police officers, terms and conditions have changed. You will remember the Winsor reforms and some of the approaches around overtime and the replacement of some allowances, so that will have a benefit.

The work that the HMI touched on around trying to get officers out of what I call the back and middle office into the front line, some of that is an uplift around response and the work around neighbourhood policing numbers, so we are trying to get more and more people into doing it. We are also looking at those areas of overtime that we think are avoidable, so putting some proper controls and rigour in doing it and looking at things like handovers. At an operational level, if PC Mackey comes in with a prisoner at such-and-such, do I hand it over or do I carry on with it? At its crudest level, it is also as simple as being clear with supervisors and managers about what those costs of those options are, so it is a whole range of things to drive and manage that behaviour. Over time, it is one of those areas a bit like personal experience. Like squeezing a tube, when you put a lot of focus on it and squeeze, you elicit a change in money and outcome. As soon as you take your eye off it, it moves again the other way.

Len Duvall AM: OK. Can you just explain? Just to clarify an earlier point that I made overtime, it is not just the question of actual police officers to forecast strength. Would it reduce overtime as well if you are up to your actual numbers?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Absolutely, it will help. We reported some of them in the budget. It is always those one-offs that make the budget jump all over the place around overtime. We can cater for those.

Len Duvall AM: An unforeseen would be something like the cycling exercise that took place? Is that one of the unforeseens that we saw in the last month or so?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I cannot remember the figures on that. I suppose the most obvious one would be the funeral of [former Prime Minister] Lady Thatcher and the costs around that. Some of those costs that, in the nicest way, you cannot predict at all would be the ones that cause spikes in overtime spend.

Len Duvall AM: There would not be any overtime used for something like the operation on our streets, in response to the cycling deaths, then?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I genuinely do not know the answer. I can provide it to you.

Len Duvall AM: Yes, please. Of the £15 million, how much would the Winsor reforms contribute to that? Can you give me not an actual number but just a rough estimate of what you think that the Winsor reforms will contribute to the £15 million? You do not have to do it now. You can provide --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I am more than happy to. We did a breakdown at the start of Winsor and they group them out amongst different things, so there is an antisocial hours payment that delivers some and the removal of - I do not know what they were called now - basically the competency threshold payments and a number of other things. Some of those movements have made some changes, but I am more than happy to provide you that breakdown.

Len Duvall AM: I Squeezing the tube or keeping a foot on the back of the neck. How do we stop good practice being penalised by the foot on the back of the neck? Are you going to reduce discretion on the ground in the boroughs around use of overtime around some of their prevention activities or not?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No. That is a really good question. It is not a science, it is an art form, and one of the things we are doing alongside this - myself, Robin [Wilkinson, Director of Human Resources, Metropolitan Police Service] and a number of others - is we are having a debate with chief superintendents and people who are budget-holders around business and those sort of things. They call it that tight/loose debate: do you draw everything into the centre and control it so tightly you have a complete grip on costs and you say, "I have every cost under control" but you completely disempower - I will make it up - the borough commander at Southwark who says, "The centre controls everything. I cannot even decide to put three extra on"? We are just working through where on that continuum we sit because I am where I think you are coming from. You cannot stifle local innovation.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, just as an amendment to the question that Len has been asking, we had the recent case of the sergeant who received £57,000 overtime. Is that a freak?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not know the details of the case.

Tony Arbour AM: Substantial publicity was given to a sergeant employed by the Metropolitan Police Service who received £57,000 in overtime payments last year, which does seem disproportionate.

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

Tony Arbour AM: It may mean that this man did something that nobody else could do, but --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It may have been one of our protection commands.

Tony Arbour AM: -- it does look like bad management.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I do not think I would go as far as 'bad', but I understand the concern and hence why there is a range of work ongoing around overtime. I do not know. If you asked me what the correct level or average is, I would struggle to tell you the correct level, but I would agree with you that that sort of level sounds excessive. The individual has clearly earned it, but it raises questions about how we use individuals in the roles.

Tony Arbour AM: It is that kind of thing which is very bad PR for the organisation.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I absolutely understand that, yes.

Tony Arbour AM: I want to ask about the reconfiguration of pan-London specialist policing and the relatively small sums of money you are saving in proportion to the total amount of budget which is spent on these things like the dogs and the marine service and things like that. I welcome what you said earlier about moving from shared services to collaboration and you talked about the patchwork quilt in your answer to me about what I consider to be a very small saving of the total budget for these pan-London services. As far as collaboration is concerned, a hobby-horse of mine which I have raised over the past 15 years here has been why on earth we run a marine service and so does the Fire Brigade?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): It will not surprise you that in fact I had an email about it not two days ago. We have had those conversations with the Fire Service, even on a simple level, and probably most likely, "Could you share berthing facilities, maintenance costs", all of those sorts of things before you even get to the debate about whether you will need that. There is a live piece of work as we speak around the Marine Unit and how many people are on the river and what can you do. I am also aware when you look at what the Marine Unit does on a daily basis - and if any of you follow Twitter accounts, @MPSonthewater has a lot of followers - you get a feel for what goes on in London on the river on a daily basis. There is always a balance.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, but you understand the point I am making.

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

Tony Arbour AM: Any objective person looking at the services which are provided by the GLA group, that is one that you have, but what about the savings you anticipate making out of consolidating these services? On the figures that I have, you are proposing only to save £6 million from a budget in excess of £1 billion.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Right. Sorry, the last figure I have was £69 million overall from pan-London in terms of where we go. Would it help if I just outline what is in there and what we are talking about?

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, please.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): We are talking about armed policing services, criminal justice, forensic services, proactive and reactive investigation, protection of vulnerable people, offender management, crime prevention, the Metropolitan Police Service Task Force, which is the Territorial Support Group (TSG), dogs, helicopters, and roads and transport policing. Overall, when we started this programme, it was designed to anticipate savings of £69.7 million by 2015/16.

Tony Arbour AM: That is a much healthier figure than the figure I have.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): £6 million might be the figure around the task force.

Tony Arbour AM: I have aired the matter with you. The second area which relates to shared services is the consolidation of boroughs and the brigading of boroughs. My patch is going to be one of the first which is going to be dealt with. You will know that one of the difficulties with this is there is a belief that if you do that, it means that the boroughs which hitherto have had their own borough commander - usually a chief superintendent - may somehow or other be downgraded. Have you considered whether or not there are any implications to that, the regard in which local policing might be held if people who live in one borough think somehow or other all the resources are going next door?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): No. I should emphasise at the moment that while in principle we think those are good ideas and worth exploring, there is not some sort of, "Here is the master plan. Let us get it all done", around it because you highlight one of the key points around it. Firstly, it has to very much be driven locally, but you look at if you were starting again - and we are not; it is not a greenfield site; London is far too complex for that - the answer might not be 32. The answer might be something different. You then get into definitions around it, so I suspect if we asked here, "What are the services that a borough needs to deliver in order to be a borough itself", we would probably get quite a range around it, some of which we actually do deliver at a borough level, some of which have not been delivered at a borough level for three, four or five years. It is really important we get into some of the detail about the definition, but the point you raise around that locally identified leader of a sufficient organisational credibility but perhaps more importantly public credibility is absolutely crucial as you go through this.

It is a shame the HMI is not here. He would know the exact figures, but if you look probably five to ten years ago when HMI did some work around the emergence of boroughs in London and Borough Command Units (BCUs) and called elsewhere 'divisions', there were probably across the United Kingdom (UK) 300 or 400 of those. In fact, there used to be a league table of where you were performing in those days. Now, if you look at most forces outside London, they have a very different model. They do not have something that looks like our boroughs. They will have something that is around local policing and a local delivery unit. In fact, in some cases, they are not even delivered in that force; they are delivered in a collaborative arrangement across a number of forces. Everyone has moved a bit and is the challenge for some of our smaller boroughs of both their size and officer numbers. It is just pure resilience as we go forward. I do not know where the ideal is, but it feels in that 500 to 600-officer range.

Tony Arbour AM: Again, relating to this, is it possible to share resources without sharing leadership?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, providing you are clear about what services you are. It comes back to a number of questions that have come this morning of where we are. The challenge of working in any partnership - and you see this at a local level, as I do, and collectively we do across London - is sometimes you have to work with people to deliver services that you do not directly control. You cannot reach out, touch and say, "Come on, I want that to do that". That is the skill that borough commanders, good sector inspectors and good sergeants do. That skill is there, so you can deliver services and it has actually always happened in London because we focus usually in these conversations on about 60% of the police officers. If you think about counterterrorism support, public order support, roads policing and murder, those have always been services that are delivered from somewhere else, not within the gift of the borough commander.

Tony Arbour AM: I raise the question of the costs: just a week ago, you told the Budget Committee that you had agreed in principle to pool resources. There is no firm plan in place and no decision has been made regarding function, structure or timescales, but this is something you are actively pursuing. In other words and we have already heard about what you will tell us in a year's time about something else --

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): Pool resources in relation -- I am sorry. I do not understand.

Tony Arbour AM: The note here says:

"The Mayor has said the proposal to pool certain resources from neighbouring boroughs has been agreed in principle by the Metropolitan Police Service's management board."

This is the thing you said last week:

"There are no firm plans in place and no decisions have been made regarding function, structure of resourcing or timescales."

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

Tony Arbour AM: Does that mean that you are proceeding with it and that in a year's time when we come here you are going to be able to say to us, "These are the resources which we have pooled and these are the savings that have been made"?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): If the appetite is there and if people want to do it and it is driven, we could do that. But at the moment I go back to the original point. There is not a master plan.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Mr Mackey, I just wanted to ask you to summarise what you told, I believe, the Budget and Performance Committee about staff morale. I am particularly concerned by my favourite grade, the sergeants, because I have heard from some of them - and I think it was raised with you - that we have a situation now where because of the obvious lack of promotion, because you have reduced that particular grade quite drastically, some of the sergeants will have to retake their qualifications because their current qualifications will expire. Will this drive that valued, wise, absolutely beloved group of people from the service? You talk about the top cop grade, but if you talk to most Londoners, their relationship is with their sergeant and their police constable (PC) and their PCSO. We had this argument before, but this is the outcome of your actions, so how are you monitoring this?

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): There are a number of things. Your analysis of that relationship I absolutely agree with. I would see it even more starkly than that. Most people in London know who the Commissioner is and care about what the Commissioner is up to and they know their PC or PCSO.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: And their sergeant, yes.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): To some extent, I always describe myself as probably one of those on-costs in the middle of it all. It is really clear, so I am absolutely with you on that. The issue is what I touched on in one of the earlier questions. There was a group of people. I cannot remember the exact timescale, but part one of your Objective Structured Performance Related Examination (OSPRES) qualification, which is the national qualification, is valid for a certain period of time and theirs expire at a certain period of time. That is why I mentioned earlier on we have just started literally this week a sergeants' promotion process, so there will be an opportunity for those people to apply for it. It is tight on numbers. I will get you the exact numbers who are qualified, but from memory - so, please, if I am a couple of hundred either way, give me some leeway - it is about 3,000-plus people who are qualified. Even on a good thing, we have more people qualified to sergeant than we are going to need and, sadly, that reflects the picture nationally. There are more people qualified than there are opportunities for promotion, so we are going to have to manage that.

I said to the Budget Committee and I was talking what it would be ideal to do long term. Our current reward system for police officers and recognition system is probably not going to be flexible enough five or ten years

out and we need to start thinking how we reward people for skills and how we recognise that good neighbourhood sergeant without saying to them, "You know what? The only way we can reward you is to promote you to inspector", because you have made the point in a number of these meetings and it is absolutely right. I do not think that is what the community wants, that is probably not what the sergeant wants, but at the moment, if they want that progression --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: They have to leave.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): -- that is how they have to do it. It will not happen in the next couple of years because this will have to be done nationally, but it would be a way to go in doing it. The short-term challenge around that group of sergeants, we have absolutely heard that. It has come in on the Commissioner's forums. The Commissioner hears so much when he is actually talking and getting that feedback back. That particular group has come in and said, "Look, if you do not run a process before X, this group of people runs off". That is why there is a process running and we do need sergeants.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is the end of our questioning to you today.

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

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): You have undertaken to provide some information to us, so we will look at that when that comes in.

Craig Mackey (Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service): I will, by all means.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I am going to restart this meeting and we are moving on to asking some questions of MOPAC. I am very pleased to welcome Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, today and MOPAC's new - some of them not quite so new, but relatively new still - directors. Perhaps we could just ask Lynda to start. Just say your name and your role.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): Obviously you have seen a little bit of me already, but Lynda McMullen. I am the Director for Police Resources and Performance, so the key things that are my responsibility, I suppose, are around the medium-term financial planning. Making sure that that is right, helping the Metropolitan Police Service develop and improve their performance culture and framework and assisting challenging around some of the workforce reform initiatives and the whole agenda around professional standards.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Marie Snelling we know and we have had you in front of us a few times, welcome. You are Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Yes, indeed.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Julie Norgrove. I am the Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance for MOPAC and the Metropolitan Police Service, but also shared service responsibilities across the GLA group for heads of audit services.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I am Rebecca Lawrence. I am Director of Strategy, so I have responsibility for the business planning and oversight systems of the Metropolitan Police Service for our private office, our strategic communications and our shared services with the GLA and our strategy and analysis, but also I have particular responsibility for the specialist areas of policing under the Strategic Policing Requirement (SPR), including counterterrorism.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Helen, could you update us as to what the current status of MOPAC's internal change process is? How many vacancies are you still carrying and are there to be any further recruitments?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): We have a total complement that I think you are aware of 105 people. These things are always slightly fluid, but last time I checked we had about 15 vacancies. The reason I am being a little cautious is some of which are filled by interim people. We have been out to recruitment for all of our significant posts and in some cases we have not filled those posts either because we did not find somebody good enough or in one or two cases because the vetting proved an obstacle. We were also clear when we put the structure together that as the directors came into post and took a careful look at their own areas of responsibility. They themselves might want to shift around some of those responsibilities and use some of the flexibility that vacancies gave them in the structure to think about how they allocate tasks to individuals. I am conscious, although we have a full team, Lynda [McMullen], who was the most recent of the team to join us, has only been with us two or three months, so that process is not fully complete.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): Six weeks.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Six weeks, so there we are. I feel she is a long-standing colleague already. Whilst we have completed that part of our structural changes I have talked to you about before, as you are also aware, we are taking some people over from the Metropolitan Police Service as part of the stage two changes. Again, that is slightly fluid, so the intention was that we would take 17 posts in all, not all of which are currently filled. Given that that formally starts in April, we are currently seeking assurances from the Metropolitan Police Service about exactly how many of those posts are filled and what the nature of the budget is that comes with the unfilled posts. We are having some internal discussions both with existing colleagues and with those colleagues who will transfer. I use the word 'transfer' of course erroneously because they are currently MOPAC employees. They are the people who are remaining MOPAC employees rather than transferring to the Commissioner, but conversations about exactly where they will fit into this structure are ongoing and will require us to amend our structure chart slightly at the end of them.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Those posts will not appear on the structure chart, you say, as yet?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): They do not appear on any charts you have at the moment, no.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK, fine. With the different directorates, we know, for example, that in the GLA itself the business plan contains targets and key performance indicators (KPIs) for each team. As Chief Operating Officer, will you be setting overall targets for each of the directorates?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): What you have heard from the directors is that they all have very different areas of operations, some of which are capable of setting very precise targets, some of which less so. Clearly, our driving document is our wonderful Police and Crime Plan and so what we have sitting underneath that is a more informal internal business plan, which as we go into the next financial year I am asking directors to look at and set targets for their own area. Then I shall look at those and ensure with them that what we have done is covered the ground and that we can collectively, by delivering on those, deliver on our shared targets around the Police and Crime Plan. We have a bit of quite informal business planning of that sort at the moment because we have not had the management team to formalise it. We will formalise that now for next year.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I am going to ask each of the directors in turn now - and I appreciate that some of you are newer than others and might not be able to give me full details yet - but Helen talked earlier about you coming in, looking at the organisation you are inheriting and perhaps making some changes. Perhaps I can start with Lynda and work around. From your initial view, are there changes you want to make? Is the structure fit for purpose, as it were?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): Certainly even before I came into the organisation, looking at the overall structure, it seems broadly correct. With the experience of being within the organisation and helpfully being dropped in quite at the deep end coming in at the end of the budget process, I had a fairly quick initiation about what things are working and what are not. Some of the things that we need to focus more on are the strategies that the Metropolitan Police Service are employing to deliver the outcomes that we want to see, so how we get involved earlier in an influencing role with the Metropolitan Police Service is something that we need to really put some oomph into. We have some detailed work at the other extreme of making sure that we really understand the performance metrics we are expecting to see so that that structure actually works.

What I do not want my staff to be doing is spending an awful lot of time marking homework in a very detailed way, but we are using the data and the strategy to understand where the risks are and where we should be focusing and we have some good information to know whether or not we are on or off track. That requires us to change the way that we work within MOPAC and those are the conversations that I am having with my team. I want them to be spending time in different ways than perhaps they are at the moment, so less administration of detail, but thinking more about the big questions that we need to be asking the Metropolitan Police Service and how we know we are getting the right answers. Broadly, structure, OK. We need to think about the detail of what people are actually doing within it, from my perspective.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It is about shifting focus rather than needing extra resources?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): That is what it feels like to me at the moment.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): OK. Marie, can I ask the same question of you?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I would echo exactly the same point of just ensuring focus on the right things. I guess in my area, I have only been there for three months, so I am the three-monther. Lynda is obviously the six-weeker --

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It seems as if we have seen you a lot more.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I know. I am sorry. We have, yes, and I am sure there is more to come as well. I guess I was really conscious coming in that I had a whole set of staff as across the organisation who have been through an inordinate amount of change and that the structure was very, very new to me picking that up, so my priority has been to understand that and how it is working and obviously to get to know the team. My approach is, as Helen [Bailey] mentioned, in the business planning for 2014/16, I will be looking to ensure that the focus of the team is on the right things to ensure that we deliver the objectives of the business plan going forward but, again, broadly the right structure and I am sure we will come on to further conversation around that during the meeting.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Julie, can I ask the same question of you? You are slightly different because you brought a team with you as well.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Yes, I have been here somewhat longer as well, Chair. We probably will not go into just quite how long. For me, we do a continual assessment on an annual basis around what we need to deliver the audit plan. As you can imagine, we have been through some change recently over the last two years in particular to respond to the shared service agenda, so we have had to look at things quite differently from that perspective. That did result in some changes to the way I have organised my senior team to ensure I have an appointed client lead for each one of my clients and that is working particularly well. That was a key focus for us. We will continue to do that and I have to report annually to the audit panel to give assurance that I am properly resourced to deliver the plan that I need to do. I am happy that I am, though we will continue to review that and we do have a couple of vacancies which again

we will be going back to the market, but I am very pleased to say that we have had a recent intake of six new employees and it has been great. It has been really good for us as well to have that new impetus.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I have worked in a number of oversight roles where you are part of a relatively small body overseeing some very complex, culturally difficult, technically difficult areas.

I would say I agree with my colleagues' comments and I will build on that. One of the things about this structure that is right, which has been necessary in the previous roles that I have had, is you will see it is a relatively top-heavy, seniority-rich, experience-rich team and that is important when you are a small strategic body reaching in with our oversight.

I suppose the other thing I would say about the structure is the skills and the diversity of skills that Helen [Bailey] has been able to assemble in her team. For example, I have worked on counterterrorism in the last four years from a central Government and police perspective, but I have not before in my team of colleagues been able to reach into, say, the experience of local government and local government innovation that both Marie [Snelling] and Helen have. I am a great believer in the power and the skillset of audit and what auditors bring and now within the senior team I can reach into the skills that Julie [Norgrove] and Lynda [McMullen] have themselves and amongst their people through the structure that we have, and that is very invigorating and refreshing.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): You are fairly confident it is now fit for purpose?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Yes. I certainly hope so and believe so. I hope you are not going to tell me different.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Jennette, you have a general question.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes, Chair. It is a good point to come in and to congratulate Helen on her premier team of top women. It is very rare in public life that you get to meet - and I mean it with all sincerity and I say it is great - a top team of women working together.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Thank you very much, Jennette. I feel I should give some credit to the Deputy Mayor, whose appointments we all are, as well.

Jenny Jones AM: Do not spoil it. We were doing so well today.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Then you had to go and spoil it, so that then leaves me open to my 'but' question. On your structures, of course it is all about strategy, looking to do the job, but am I to take it that you hold the overall HR responsibilities? If you do, can you briefly tell us what you are doing to ensure that your workforce, irrespective of the number - and I do not take this view because this is a small number, it does not have to qualify - in MOPAC is representative of London's diversity? You are doing a good job on gender clearly at your top level, but who is responsible for ensuring that MOPAC's staff are representative of London and the city that they serve?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): There is two parts to that question and clearly ultimately that is my responsibility and that of the team here, but we are in the process of transition around HR because we have just begun an HR shared service with the GLA, so they are providing --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That will not help you.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): -- our basic HR support, but with the strategy and direction I and the team are setting. It is always an important and difficult question because we want to make sure that we have as diverse a team as we can get and we want to make sure that when we are looking to fill posts we are looking as widely as we can. Of course when we are recruiting to specialist posts, we are

fundamentally looking for the skills and experience of the people who can do the job, so it is also for us about bringing on the staff that we have within the organisation and trying to build and develop the skills that they have. We are all relatively new and it is a youngish organisation, in our experience, although I appreciate many of the staff have been with us for some time, so we are also thinking about how we are going to develop our longer-standing staff.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: You are mindful of the need for your staff to reflect --

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): We certainly are, and it is --

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Not only in junior grades?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Absolutely, and of course, as you will appreciate, it is part of our dialogue with the police service about how they are becoming more representative - that is one of the Mayor's commitments - of London as a whole, so it is not something we can avoid thinking about, even if we were to, and we do not wish to.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes, because you would be in a really weak situation if you could not do it and you were asking the police service to do it.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Then I give you the slight caveat, which is that you always start with the majority of your staff in place and I cannot change the people I have. I can change what comes through the door and in looking for the new people who come through the door, as I say, what we are looking for is people with the right skills but with the greatest diversity we can possibly find.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I have a slightly loaded question here. It is for Rebecca. Think before you answer. What is your evaluation of the MOPAC Challenge?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That is a good question and it is obviously one coming in I have been asking myself. Since I have arrived in September, I have been able to assess, like you, the public meetings, but also the preparations behind the scenes which are a crucial feature of the MOPAC Challenge. It gives us as an oversight body three things. It is one of our oversight levers of the Metropolitan Police Service, but also of partners, on both performance and of policy development. So without the operational intrusion, but with this set piece that you can put in a diary and then schedule in some quite gritty preparations for, so it performs that function. It is obviously a public communication tool; that information is there out in the public. It is important that it is only one element of our suite of tools and we have to see if it is performing that function as well as it could. It is another way of embedding our ways of working with the Metropolitan Police Service, which is both support and challenge, so you will appreciate that there is a rather genteel tone. It is professional and respectful, just like the tone you create in your evidence sessions.

That does not mean that behind the scenes it is not very pointed, if I can perhaps give two examples from the two sessions since I have been in post that I have been able to attend and be part of the preparations for. The first was on business crime. There, having that MOPAC Challenge in the diary at the start, which was launching the business crime consultation, allowed for a period of very intense consultation and preparation with businesses, the Metropolitan Police Service and other law enforcement partners where we were able to flush out in private and in workshops really where those gaps are in Metropolitan Police Service capability and where the challenges will be in the law enforcement landscape in serving the needs of London's businesses.

We were able to get a self-recognition privately from law enforcement partners that we would not have been able to get without that slot in the diary. In the end, this session - sadly, the Chamber was not free; it was in a committee room - was absolutely bursting. It was full of the business contacts that we had, full of the National Crime Agency (NCA), the Metropolitan Police Service, the City of London Police and Territorial Policing, who had never been able to be together in a room like that and speak in public about what they were doing. Another one would be foreign national offenders, where Home Office, Immigration and enforcement and the Metropolitan Police Service had never before been together in a public forum in that way.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Somebody here actually said that the MOPAC Challenge was as challenging as asking somebody if they wanted milk in their tea. That, I am afraid, is how I have seen it. I cannot claim that phrase, but that is how we see it. You used the word 'gritty'. Gritty is as far from the MOPAC challenge as I can possibly imagine. You have used the word 'genteel' and I would say that is more like it because it looks more like a tuition seminar for the Deputy Mayor of Policing and Crime. The real problem is he is taking all the information from the Metropolitan Police Service and is not actually taking any real oversight and information from other groups. How do you see the Challenge progressing and evolving? Can you see that it is not really challenging at the moment?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): In the use of the word 'grit', I was quite precise in saying there is grit in the preparatory conversations and also I will acknowledge I am still forming a view. For example, I am looking forward to next week's Challenge, which will be the first on performance that I have attended, which is chaired by the Mayor but also has the Court Services attending. The fact that that is happening in the diary means that right now on the second floor there is an intensity of conversation going on between ourselves and the Court Service about what information they are going to give us and publish, which has never happened before. We have never had to have that kind of focus and that ability. The music stops and we have to say something in public. The public conversation is genteel, but the private preparations are for me proving to be an effective tool, but it is obviously something that we will want to review and develop. You have to use your tools to the best of your ability, so I hear what you say.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The look is far too cosy. You have to get some sort of backbone, basically, when you are dealing with the Metropolitan Police Service. This instance of water cannon is a classic example. Where is the debate around whether you say yes or no to the Metropolitan Police Service on water cannon? There has been nothing in public and there are a lot of very different views on this, but we will come back to that.

Can I ask you as well, Rebecca? Your performance figures continue to show some fluctuations in how well you are responding to Mayor's Questions and correspondence and I am wondering when you think there might be an improvement there.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Again, this is something I have worked on in the past a lot. When I arrived in MOPAC, I was arriving in an organisation which, as you know, had had a period where the response times were lower than anyone would desire. That was felt extremely acutely by people such as you asking the questions but also felt very acutely by those responsible for answering those.

I need to step back a bit and look at my experience of working in organisations in a parliamentary context with much more established systems of correspondence and parliamentary question response. Sadly, I have had experience of a number of situations where this has happened in central Government, so periods where you get a surge in demand from members, from the public, and the organisation fails to keep track and then you have a huge stock to answer whilst you have an increased flow.

I have used that experience to think, "What are the four factors that move you through that situation? What are the necessary requirements?" You have talked about targets. In my view, there are four necessary requirements, and probably in this order of priority. First, you have to have the capacity in the team and the capacity was thin. Two temps was the total capacity in August. Even before I started in this job, therefore before starting, I recruited the head that Helen [Bailey] kindly put in the structure. She then, in turn, before starting, has put in two deputies and now we are doing the recruitment for the people below that. There is capacity and there is process, which needs to be right. There is a really big piece about skills in the office base, understanding and communicating the strategic context, which has changed since the Police and Crime Plan and all my directors are being very supportive in helping get those skills in officers.

There is something about anticipating the surges of demand that are often sometimes quite unexpected. For example, in correspondence, we saw a huge surge of demand in August, and actually in the parliamentary context, people tend not to ask the Members of Parliament (MPs) questions in the summer. In MOPAC, we

found we had many more questions from Members and from members of the public during the summer when our people are on leave, so it creates an additional stock. We can do more to anticipate that now. We have better data and it is absolutely where we want to be in getting better.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): This is something we all take very seriously. I had the opportunity - and I think you were there then - to come to the Bureau of Leaders a bit before Christmas and talk about this. As Rebecca says, capacity has been something that we have lacked. We have now more of those posts, though, as Rebecca says, not all of them filled. We are determined to make the standard on this. I am confident that we are on the whole getting better. The trajectory is upwards.

Even in December we managed to answer 90% of our correspondence on time. I do not know if that is before or after we have taken Christmas into account, so I have a little humility about that. The number of questions that we get fluctuates but is well over 100 a month, some of which are very easy and routine and we ought to be able to get them out much more quickly than perhaps we have in the past, and some of which are quite complex, requiring us to go back the Metropolitan Police Service sometimes several times. We do know that; we are getting our processes sorted and we are determined to get it right and we are all of us taking a very active interest in it. What I will not do is make you absolute promises about exactly when we will be doing 100% on time because I shall then end up having to come back and eat a certain amount of humble pie, but we are absolutely determined to get it right.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The Deputy Mayor of Policing and Crime once told me that I was 80% of his correspondence. Now I have stopped writing to you because I did not get the answers in time. I have reported you to the Information Commissioner twice or three times because of your failures. Are you telling me now that you have all the processes and the capacity to actually be effective?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): We are saying we are getting better, but we do not have full capacity in place because, as Rebecca [Lawrence] says, we are still recruiting.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am going to start writing again - you know that - and I am going to challenge you on --

Roger Evans AM: Do you have the capacity to handle Jenny's correspondence?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): To be fair, Jenny, I do have a number of letters from you to the Deputy Mayor outstanding for a response, so you are already writing to us and we will do our best to answer them within the timescale.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The fact is of course most of us would get more than 100 queries a month and we are dealing with them in addition to all our other work and we do not have anybody dedicated. We do not have two staff to answer 100 questions a month. It is time you really performed on this. You have now been in place for two years in your organisation. Is it two years? It has gone in a flash. Really, this is not difficult. Do you know what? My assistant actually offered to come up and show you guys in ten minutes how to set up a system for logging because that seemed to be the problem. You were not even logging some of the letters. Some of the letters just vanished.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): That is a historic problem and we do log everything. To be fair, those two people we have talked about will not just be answering letters and those questions. They do a range of support tasks of which those are simply some, but we take your point. We are certainly not arguing with you.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I have just one more question and that is on the Metropolitan Police Service's ICT strategy. Who should I ask about that?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): It will probably be Lynda or me.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): Probably me.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is the Metropolitan Police Service's ICT strategy finalised?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): There is something due to be published in the next - I will not be precise about the time because I am not sure when it will go out the door - couple of months. I have a draft of that, it is imminent. That is not just a strategy of lots of warm words. It is about exactly what we are doing to deliver the investment we need to get the savings that we need out and the improvements.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The Mayor's Office has agreed that, it has gone through and --

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): We are still going through the process, so, as I say, I have a draft of it which I have started going through this week. It broadly reflects some of the conversations we have been having, so it is not news to us. It is not the first time we had a discussion about the contents within it. We are looking quite carefully at the document itself to make sure it covers everything that we would expect to see in there. Some of the things we may want to go back to them on are just being more explicit about some of the outcomes we want to see, but I have still to go through the process of reading and commenting.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I do not really know what the process is, but the Metropolitan Police Service gives you a document after you have had discussions. You then give feedback, which is the process that you are doing at the moment. Does the Metropolitan Police Service update that strategy as you have dictated and then publish that itself?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources and Performance, MOPAC): I do not like the word 'dictating'. We are taking a particular interest within IT because, as we have talked before in the previous session, it is quite high risk in terms of some of the financial issues and it is also really important in delivering some of the broader targets, confidence and visibility. We see it as something as both high risk in terms of delivery and really important to delivering the overall objectives within the Police and Crime Plan (PCP). Therefore, we are putting probably more than average scrutiny oversight into that process. I am working very closely with Richard Thwaite [Director of Information, Metropolitan Police Service]. We are having some of those very broad debates about the direction of travel and the component parts of that. As I was saying before, I am also having a lot of detailed conversations about how we know it is working and how we know you are on track, so there is a lot of that going on. Certainly in the debate that we have had so far there has been nothing that has been pushed back to say he does not think that our comments or suggestions are not acceptable, so it has been a very productive conversation so far.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): This has ramifications for the budget --

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): -- which of course is looming and so it is quite important that this gets sorted quickly.

Roger Evans AM: I would just like to return to the degree of challenge in a MOPAC Challenge really, Rebecca --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Or the lack of.

Roger Evans AM: -- because I am quite interested in what your philosophy is about what you are actually aiming to get out of those sessions. I take the point Jenny made. She said yesterday during an evidence session that she wanted the question answered by the Mayor rather than the other witnesses because she felt the Mayor was the person who did not know the answer to the question rather than the others. I suspect your sessions are more about gathering information than trying to humiliate the witnesses.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): They are not the only two choices, Roger.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I do not think they are the only two choices. I will return to that example --

Roger Evans AM: It is a sliding scale.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): -- of business crime. There you had the NCA and the Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service and the City of London Police being as one at identifying where the gaps in their law enforcement capability were and the priorities of each of those organisations, which they had not been in that position to be able to articulate in the three months prior. It was the existence of the MOPAC Challenge that allowed them to come together with businesses in the preparation for that, to meet with the Deputy Mayor and to be clear in advance of that what their priorities were on which we would consult. The degree or otherwise of challenge at the meeting itself does not describe or reflect the degree of challenge that the Deputy Mayor has given the Metropolitan Police Service and other partners which he does not have a statutory responsibility for oversight of in the preparation of that.

Roger Evans AM: Bearing in mind that you are seeking facts as an element of this, you have these 20/20/20 targets which have been set as big picture targets and you have the information you are getting from the Metropolitan Police Service that tells you about progress you are making towards them. What we seem to see increasingly is stories in the press and admissions actually from the Commissioner as well and from other senior managers in policing that there is a culture of being target-led rather than result-led, in other words that the policing is done in a way to actually achieve the target rather than in a way to achieve the result we want from it. Sometimes the two things can be different. Sometimes the figures can be massaged, to put it bluntly. How are you ensuring that that is not a problem?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): You raise a much broader set of issues there than that very acute question other than the MOPAC Challenge, which of course is not our only information-gathering forum and whose purpose is not primary information-gathering but public exchange, which scrutinises both performance delivery and policy development. On your point about the data that we have and the performance information that we have, Lynda [McMullen] has touched on that already and we are aware of the challenges there and the absolute requirement that we and the Metropolitan Police Service have to have the best information possible.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Part of the MOPAC Challenge, as Rebecca has already said, is asking partners to talk in public about the data they are using, as we will be, for instance, with criminal justice partners on Tuesday next week. They are then nailing their colours to a mast, so it is not just about information gathering. It is about inviting people to stand behind that information and to do something about it. That, to me, forms an important part of the scrutiny, whatever the tone of the conversation.

Roger Evans AM: A feature of a couple of the MOPAC Challenges that I have seen has been the presentation of statistical information to show how the Metropolitan Police Service is doing in particular respects, and that is why it is so important to ensure that that is not built on sand because, if it is, then the whole of the process is built on sand.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): That is absolutely right, and some thought was given to that when those 20/20/20 targets were set, so they have focused on the crimes that are most usually and most carefully reported and not the things which we specifically wanted to see reporting go up. For instance, some of the crimes like domestic violence, which we know to be under-reported, are not in the targets that we have set. In the conversations that we having with the Metropolitan Police Service, we have the data here and the material that the Deputy Mayor took the Public Affairs Select Committee last week when that was discussed there, so we are conscious that this debate is very live. We are happy to rehearse with you some of the thoughts that we shared with him before he went to give evidence to them and we are, and Julie in particular in her role as an auditor, we are doing our best to make sure that they are not built on sand.

Actually, also in those 20/20/20 targets what we are looking at is trends as well as specific snapshot information and the important thing for Londoners is also that crime coming down and hopefully confidence is going up. That is probably more important to follow the trend than it is to go for a precise, "Was exactly every bit of that data on that day precisely right?" We are at the same time taking cognisance of that and Julie and colleagues are doing some work to provide us with as much assurance as you reasonably can have about that.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can I just start by asking you about your structure that I have in front of me? This is a team that is in this directorate of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) programmes and neighbourhoods, yes?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): It is.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: The 28 posts include you?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Looking at it, I am trying to divide it down. I see you have about 17 managers across the piece and I am not making a judgment, just reading it as it is. Then I can identify eight call frontline staff. I have not seen their job descriptions but it seems to me this is about the interface. Given that engagement and the rest of your portfolio is so challenging and so important, is that the right balance? This huge top-heavy management versus possibly with eight interfacing with London?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): It would be worth me setting the context of the overall approach. My teams have a split of responsibilities, both in terms of engagement, policy and programme responsibilities--

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We have that outlined and, if you look at your structure, are you saying that this is how it is right for you, that it is top-heavy with managers? Is the current number that you have at that interface with stakeholders across London in this incredibly challenging three main domains satisfactory?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): There is a terminology here because all of my staff are engaging with partners across London and out with partners and indeed with communities; therefore there is a terminology here. Obviously the description as set, programme managers is not necessarily of overall management capability, if that makes sense, so it is a terminology piece. I have an expectation that all of my staff are out engaging across London both at a strategic partner level and indeed in boroughs and in communities. I feel that at this point in time - and of course I am still relatively new and working that through the key priorities for my area - it makes sense at the moment. There is not a split in some areas where we have management and frontline because actually there is an expectation that we are the external-facing element of MOPAC that is generally going out and about and talking and having conversations across the capital.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you for that. That helps, the answer. Therefore you are all front-facing. That is good. It was not a catch question. That was an observation made and so, no, thanks for that answer.

Tell us a little bit more about your area base model and how that will help MOPAC to manage its approach to this very important area of engagement.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Yes, of course. As I have said, this is setting the context that we have a split around both engagement, policy and programme responsibilities for all those people, and obviously this is set in the context of MOPAC being a strategic oversight body. The bringing together of engagement with policy and programme is important because you then get engagement really informing policy thinking and indeed the development of programmes of work.

It is probably helpful perhaps to touch on three key elements of the approach to engagement as I currently see them. The first is that I, as part of my teams, have people who are actively engaging with community safety agencies and wider criminal justice partners really to support the mission that is set out in the Police and Crime Plan around agencies working and tackling crime together, and indeed more specifically to deliver key elements of the Police and Crime Plan. That is really important obviously because a lot of this is about partnership activity and delivering through others and obviously we were not doing that all together.

I guess a good example of that in terms of that strategic engagement level is our relationship with health and indeed with National Health Service (NHS) England at the London region level. We have been working with them very collaboratively and have engaged really well with them, focusing on health in the justice system, and I know I previously came to a thematic meeting that was focusing on mental health and policing where a lot of the engagement that MOPAC has had with the NHS and with wider partners, the Mental Health Trust, for example, was well recognised in terms of my staff. Talking at that strategic level; that engagement with kind of key partner agencies is really critical.

I guess the second element to touch on is something that is a real passion of mine. It is the whole element around borough engagement and that being a really critical element of our engagement approach as well. I am really passionate about it because in a previous life I spent time as a housing officer and from regeneration schemes and I worked with local authorities across London and worked directly in a number of local authorities as well. It is really, really critical as part of our approach and my encouragement to my staff is that people get out and about and really understand what is going on locally, understand the local perspective, because ultimately that is where delivery happens and that is where we see the delivery of outcomes.

How do we do that? You talked about the area team element. My teams are organised in a sort of geographical focus, therefore in relation to borough engagement I have those teams out and about talking to partners and local stakeholders and indeed with community groups, really understanding local priorities and working out how we can work together to deliver police and crime objectives.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: OK, and I am not going to go into the Safer Neighbourhood Boards today because we had that last time and we shared with you our concerns and the outstanding questions that arose from there, which we are waiting to pull that together.

You talked about the Crown Prosecution Service. The Mayor in November made a statement and said, "Give me power to run jails and probation like New York", so he has that aspiration. Then the Deputy Mayor for Policing told the Chair when he was asked about this that in London, where we have co-terminosity with the Crown Prosecution Service and the Courts, we should have a London Prison Strategy. That is a natural area where we need additional oversight and budgetary responsibilities. Can you say anything about the development of such a strategy? It would seem to me that with all that you are doing you need a framework, certainly so that it can be stated, certainly so that we could understand what it is about and then to be following the direction of travel. Is there a strategy being worked up across this partnership and, if not, what is the framework that you are using currently?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I am happy to provide something, but perhaps Helen would want to come in on that.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): At the moment this is about the crime bit of the Police and Crime Office and what all of that reflects is that - and we have three of those 20 targets are about making the criminal justice system, not just policing work, more effective - it is very fragmented. There are three different Government departments involved in taking responsibility for different bits of the criminal justice system and what you have heard the Mayor say and the Deputy Mayor say is, "Would it not be easier if there was one anchoring body?" That was in this building in the same way that increasingly there is in for housing and development and regeneration with the amalgamation of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA).

We are not on a strategy to make that happen because we have to work within the existing legislation. All of the work that we are doing at the moment around the criminal justice system is about bringing together those agencies and trying to persuade them to work better for London as well as to work better within their existing legislative framework and the direction they get from Whitehall. We are trying to provide that sort of regional focus as well as the nationwide focus that they get from their own Secretaries of State.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: I am trying to now understand then what the framework is that you are using for leadership for integrated offender management. Is that dependent on a discussion forum where tasks are agreed? We do not have an overview of not where you are going but where MOPAC is going with this.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): We have set those 20/20/20 targets in the Police and Crime Plan or the Deputy Mayor has and Marie is probably better placed than I am to talk about the various boards that exist across London, most of which are not actually initiated or chaired by us, but where - particularly since we have had Marie on board - she is providing increasing leadership on our behalf around the criminal justice service and around people working together. Actually, the targets that we have set are the targets that they want to set for themselves. They want fewer cracked trials; they want it to be more efficient; they want the community to believe that the criminal justice system will work swiftly to give them justice.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: So there is no other documentation or framework other than those targets which we have discussed in the past with each partner organisation? Those are the targets you are still working to?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Yes.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Can I just add one point, which is about the approach to integrated offender management? As set out in the Police and Crime Plan, it is a critical element in terms of partners working together and the different ways to reduce reoffending. There are, through the London Crime Reduction Board, an agreed set of principles on which partner agencies work together. Therefore, much of that I would not call it as glamorous as an overall framework. There is an understanding of what is important in integrated offender management and how partners work together to ensure delivery at the local level.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: OK, thank you for that. The other area that I certainly have concerns about is that both you and the Metropolitan Police Service could be doing the same thing on engagement. How are you ensuring that the work is complementary rather than duplicating each other's efforts?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): It is a really useful question and it is a question that I have started to pick up conversations with (overspeaking)

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: When you are talking to women you can get into beautiful questions.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Absolutely.

John Biggs AM: Glamorous strategies as well.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I am still feeling my way of refining our approach, really looking at how we kind of move forward with this. As part of that, I have started a conversation with the Metropolitan Police Service about their approach to engagement and actually how we can work together more effectively and ensure that there is no duplication. Equally, I want to ensure that we understand what they are doing around engagement and have some oversight of what that looks like and indeed what that is achieving as well. That is really, really important for us going forward. Therefore that is absolutely work in progress. It is worth saying in terms of at borough level, in terms of my teams engaging, the number of key partners will include the local police teams, the local

authority and other partners. Therefore, they will be actively having conversations together at a local level about what engagement is going on. Some of that work is going on already but there is more to be done and I am really looking forward to having further conversations about how we develop engagement going forward.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We will not be able to exhaust this because of time. The other big area that you cover of course is the Probation Services and we will just start the conversation today with this question of how you expect this role to change in the coming years and MOPAC's role particularly as you take over the role of commissioning the Probation Services from 2015 onwards. Is that right?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): No, not us; that is not a MOPAC role of commissioners.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: You are commissioners?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): No, not for Probation Services.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: The Probation Service is being privatised.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): That is right, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Then you have an overview to ensure that it delivers the appropriate services for London?

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): In terms of context, just taking a step back from that, it is worth just reminding ourselves that the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor are absolutely supportive of the overall intentions of the reforms and therefore the subsequent changes to the Probation Service and the role of MOPAC, both now and going forward, is a strategic leadership role for London and that is important. Since I started in late-September I have been working with key partners across London, both with the Probation Service as it is at the moment, with local authorities and others, to really plan for and to aid the implementation of those reforms at a London level and that strategic leadership role is there at this point in time. Obviously we have also been working to work with the Ministry of Justice with bringing together those key partners to influence and support how this will actually work in London.

Going forward, many of these relationships of course are going to change. Probation is a really key partner to us at the moment and MOPAC has invested a lot of time and effort working with colleagues in the Probation Service because they play such a critical role in terms of integrated offender management and of the overall outcome around reducing reoffending. Of course one of our 20s, which is about community compliance, is delivered there.

Going forward with the split of Probation Services into the National Probation Service and the Community Rehabilitation Company, we will continue that engagement and in fact I have started now to engage with those new senior leadership teams and we will continue to work with them going forward because they are absolutely critical as a partner to deliver the Police and Crime Plan objectives and indeed MOPAC targets.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): To be really clear, as Marie said, we are the oversight body; we are not the commissioners. The commissioners are going to administer justice.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, that was my fault, but you have significant responsibilities here for planning and implementation, therefore it is as important as commissioning. Sorry; that was my mistake in bringing forward that word. I am just going to say to my Chair that this is such an important area that we are not going to do justice to it by just exchanging a couple of questions because I really would like to understand what it is you are planning, what it is you have key lead responsibilities for implementing or, if not, how you are going

to, what will success look like, and your relationships with all of these provider bodies, whoever they are, and across London. Chair, I do not think I will be able to do that area of questioning any justice.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): The timing might be really crucial on that because at the moment, although the broad shape is in place, some of the questions about exactly how we are going to be involved are still being negotiated. Therefore, in a few months' time we will be in a very clear position to explain that to you, whereas at the moment there will be some areas where we are saying, "This is what we would like to do but we do not know whether we can or not".

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have had probation in before and looked at the impending changes. One of the key things, and I know the Mayor shared this concern, was how you get a private company around the table at the strategic partnership level and it is a big bit that is missing from the legislation.

Marie Snelling (Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programme and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I completely agree. It is one of the key elements that we have been working with local authorities, local strategic partnerships and others to raise. It is really important that going forward that they understand their responsibilities both at the statutory level but also of integrated services, which may not be formalised in that way. As Helen says, those conversations are ongoing. Our influence is around really looking post contract award as well of how this is actually going to work in practice, both at a local level, but also across London. Therefore I hear your point, thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We will return to this no doubt.

Tony Arbour AM: My questions are to Lynda. One of the things that concerns us in relation to your key risks and you giving us confidence about policing has been the very substantial shocks that have just been provided to us by the Metropolitan Police Service rather than MOPAC saying that the way offences have been categorised, how offences have been screened out, all of which flatters to deceive the performance of the Metropolitan Police Service. In your time here, had you noticed that yourself?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is to Julie rather than Lynda.

Tony Arbour AM: I am sorry, Julie; I am sure you understand what I am driving at here?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): I do. Maybe if I could start by providing context around the review that I know the Chair is aware that we are undertaking as I speak and the other activity that is planned around HMIC, the review that we are currently undertaking is very much focused around systems and process. We are looking to give some assurance around how robust the controls are in place for both receiving the initial reporting of the crime, how it is subsequently classified and then how it is reported on. It really is a very significant piece of work that is looking at the end-to-end process. That will then inform the work of HMIC who are about themselves to come in, in February, and conduct a greater and more in-depth review around the statistics themselves, but it will be informed by the work that we do.

Really I just want to emphasise the context that we are providing that systems advice to them and they will then be able to provide that greater review around the statistics themselves. We are looking at the controls around no-criming and screening out; that is something that we will come back and we will report on how effective we think the controls are around that. At this stage, Tony, we have not actually come out the end of that process and we will be evaluating the strength of those controls and will subsequently be happy to report around that.

Tony Arbour AM: That sounds a bit post hoc. My question was whether MOPAC had noticed that there might be a discrepancy there. Is it not something that maybe you ought to have uncovered rather than it being revealed? Those of us here who have long memories will know that we have constantly raised this business, both at the old Metropolitan Police Association (MPA) and here, that the figures all look a bit wrong. The categorisation of crime, grievous bodily harm (GBH) becomes just assault, that kind of thing. Are you saying that internally this was something that MOPAC had not been looking at or had not been aware of?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Certainly the importance of ensuring the integrity of data is something that was on the agenda of the Deputy Mayor back to the beginning of the year and we were asked to look at the process in place to support that. Indeed, that is what we are now in the process of doing and we will draw a conclusion around that.

Tony Arbour AM: Chairman, the important point that relates to this is, if MOPAC is supposed to have oversight of these things, is it not that the right way it ought to have been revealed was for MOPAC to have flagged it up?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): (If I may interject, at the moment we are in a stage where a lot of allegations have been made; the full truth of all of them is yet to be entirely flushed out. Julie's work, as she has explained, is part of that. When the Commissioner appeared before the Public Administration Select Committee, he himself talked about a degree of judgement and error, which in an organisation of 30,000-odd people, (a) not everybody is going to get it right all the time and (b) some of those things that you have talked about, when is something one crime and when it is another, may be at the discretion of the police officer recording it. It may also be what is reflected in the prosecution that subsequently ensues.

Therefore, we just need to follow through the work that Julie is doing, which has been on our radar, because this has been on the audit plan for this year for some time. Therefore, it is something we have constantly been asking questions about. The Deputy Mayor has spoken to this Committee before about questions about crime reporting in other areas. Therefore, this is not news to us; it is something we are looking out for, but I am wary - and I think Julie would be, too - of leaping to conclusions on the basis of our own anecdotal and sampling judgments as we would about anybody else's. I am really keen that we see the outcome of Julie's work and then perhaps can answer those questions a little more fully then.

Tony Arbour AM: Forgive me, this is not based on anecdote. I thought that - indeed, I have it before me - you are responsible for auditing information provided by the Metropolitan Police Service. That must have been an ongoing thing ever since MOPAC was set up. I appreciate changes of personnel and so on, but it must have been a risk which was flagged up. I do not want to be unduly critical, but it reflects on us since we are supposed to have oversight of MOPAC.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have raised the issue many times, Tony.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): You have indeed, and that is what I was seeking to reflect in my overall statement, and that is why it has been on Julie's audit plan for this year and appears on her audit plan reasonably regularly. It is something that she thinks she ought to take a look at and we agree with her that she should. When I used the 'anecdote', I was not referring to anything said by a Member of this Committee, but there is quite a lot of stuff around and about at the moment and the truth of all of that is yet to be driven to a final conclusion and we are also waiting to see the conclusions of the Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) and others as well as HMIC.

Roger Evans AM: This was drawn to our attention by no-criming practices within parts of Sapphire Command quite some time ago. That certainly was not anecdotal; it was a major shortcoming in the way that the information was being reported and it was something that we felt needed to be looked at, not just as a part of the important Sapphire work, but the way that other crimes were dealt with as well and the degree of no-criming that went on. The Deputy Commissioner told us last time that there was a difference between no-criming and something being a non-crime. It was all a very complex area that certainly needs sorting out.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Chair, if I may, there are two points in there. One is the issue about Sapphire and whether there are some kinds of crime on which we knew there was a real concern. We did and, as I have said earlier on and the Deputy Mayor has answered questions about this as well, that is why those crimes - particularly Sapphire type crimes - are not in the MOPAC-monitored crimes. We have no targets for them. We have set no targets for the Metropolitan Police Service, except that we want to see police reporting of crimes of sexual offences and domestic violence, which are predominantly the Sapphire-

type crimes. I completely get the point about Sapphire and absolutely it is there in our dialogue with the Metropolitan Police Service.

The more recent allegations are about systematic abuse of the system and there we do want to understand what the various reviews come out and tell us, of which Julie's is one, and doubtless the Deputy Commissioner has told you - as he keeps telling me - there are about 600 pages worth of advice about what constitutes precisely which crime and how you are supposed to record it and so some of what we see will be down to interpretation and understanding of that. Some of it is a question about whether there is a deliberate falsification, if any at all, and that I do not think we can comment on at all unless we see the outcomes from these reviews.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It is interesting that yesterday the UK Statistics Authority said that all police statistics are now not to be recognised with the official Office for National Statistics (ONS) badge because they cannot be guaranteed, so it is not just for the Metropolitan Police Service but wider.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Julie and I were looking at the press release this morning. They are actually quite cautious in what they say. They say there is a question and they are in the same place that we are in; there is a question.

Tony Arbour AM: When they say there is a question, there is a question. There may be several questions, in fact. Another thing that relates to this of course, is there not a danger that maybe part of the reason why - if I can put it this way - the figures have been massaged in this way by the Metropolitan Police Service was that the way they sought to achieve a target, which had been set for them by MOPAC, and is there not a risk therefore that the basis on which the targets are being set is based on false figures? If we are using as a baseline, i.e. the level of a particular category of crime is such that it transpires that level of crime, the information that has established that was false, that is going to mean that all our targets are going to be false because they are based on a false premise.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): I do not know if Julie wants to say something. Of course that is possible. It would take a significant amount of management organisation to ensure that consistently behaviours were applied that achieved that. Just rummaging through the latest borough reporting on the various MOPAC seven crimes, in an organisation that did that, you might expect them to sort of linearly decline in accordance with the target rather than sort of fluctuate around in the way that they do. It is speculation and I do not think we want to speculate and I certainly do not want to invite the auditors to speculate.

Tony Arbour AM: We of course employ very bright people. If I was a conspiracy theorist, if I was Sherlock and if there was a conspiracy theory, I would say that because they are so bright and they sought to achieve the targets they would say that is the first thing that would be spotted if it was linear.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC): Now we are all speculating.

Tony Arbour AM: Yes, of course.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Do you believe that MOPAC has sufficient resources to oversee the Metropolitan Police Service and have you set your 2014/15 budget yet?

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): On some of the questioning that we have had before, both Helen on behalf of all of MOPAC and us individually do think broadly we have got the right resources, but it is something that we will keep under review as we sort of become more sort of bedded-in delivering what we think we need to deliver. At the moment, yes, we do have the right resources.

Setting the 2014/15 budget, it was aligned within the budget submission for the MOPAC and Metropolitan Police Service budgets, so beneath that there is a level of detail of how we are taking it over the Mayoral term,

the 20% savings, so there are some issues of growth within that and there are obviously areas of savings and efficiencies within that, which we will be very happy to provide some detail on, or give you more detail on that.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That will be very helpful, and also perhaps areas of risk that you may have identified as well. It would be very helpful if we could have a bit more detail because the budget figures we have at the moment do not go into a great deal.

Lynda McMullen (Director of Police Resources, MOPAC): I have a lot of detail here, but rather than read it out to you, it might be easier to--

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It would be very helpful, actually, if we could do that following the meeting. Can I thank you all for attending? No doubt in the forthcoming months we will see you individually at different topics, but thank you.