

Police and Crime Committee – 11 June 2015**Transcript of Agenda Item 5 – Preventing Extremism**

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. I would like to welcome our guests to our second question-and-answer session on preventing extremism in London. We are very pleased that we have Lord Alex Carlile of Berriew QC CBE today. I believe you are the [former] Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation. Your expertise will be very helpful to us today. Also, we have Rebecca Lawrence, Director of Strategy at the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). Thank you both for coming.

We heard in our last session from some academics and others from London boroughs who are delivering the strategy on the ground. Our third meeting will be with the police and we have Assistant Commissioner Mark Rowley [Assistant Commissioner for Specialist Crime and Operations, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)] coming to talk to us about the police perspective.

Can I perhaps start with some general and perhaps topical questions about where we see Prevent sitting at the moment and going? Perhaps I can ask Lord Carlile to start. One of our experts, Professor Martin Innes [Director, Police Science Institute, Cardiff University], raised the issue of Prevent being reactive rather than proactive. He talked about the focus being on de-radicalisation rather than counter-radicalisation. I was just wondering if you feel that that is a fair assessment. Does the balance or the focus of Prevent need to move slightly to that area?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is a tenable viewpoint. I do not think he is right and I do not think he is wrong. The Prevent policy is in a state of evolution, but there has been a sort of "Big Bang" and anything can happen. In other words, what I am saying is that I do not believe that there is a sufficient structure to the Prevent policy to enable the important parties in Prevent to know what they should be doing. As I am sure you know, I was the independent monitor of the new Prevent policy in 2010 and 2011 and I had quite a clear picture then about the way we were going to be moving. Delivery has been very good in some places and very poor in other places and that comment would apply to different parts of London.

The focus on counter-radicalisation has been poor in the sense that, in my view, the Government has been quite slow to create the instruments or the toolkit for effective counter-radicalisation. I have said to Ministers over many years now that there needs to be what is fashionably called a public-private partnership over this. If you sit on the Old Street roundabout, within 100 metres of where you are sitting there are probably 100 experts, mostly very young, who can really provide some inspiration to the counter-radicalisation effort. Counter-radicalisation, for example, has to take place on the internet and Islamic State (ISIS) has formidable propaganda tools. It has learned how to work the internet and how to attract people to its sites. I am not sure the Government has yet come to grips - and our Government is not alone in this; the Americans have the same problem - with the potential of the internet for counter-radicalisation. Create games, literally, in which the good guys win and you are on your way to doing something useful. That has been very slow.

There has certainly been a focus on de-radicalisation and that is largely because of the emphasis that has been given to the Channel project. The Channel project is surprisingly effective. It follows the same sort of pattern as when, say, a very good schoolteacher has a private conversation usually lasting about ten minutes with a recalcitrant student and explains why the student is not performing satisfactorily. Many students respond very well to that kind of one-to-one contact. Channel works well with one-to-one contact. The problem with

Channel is that it is very small. The numbers are tiny. Where it works, it works extremely well. There is not much evidence of people refusing to take part in the Channel project, but it is only a small part of de-radicalisation and we need to find bigger-picture ways of ensuring that de-radicalisation works.

I will just add one thing at this stage because I want to get this in early and I think I have said it to this Committee before. The trick with Prevent is to devolve it down to the lowest possible level. It works at ward level, as Birmingham has shown, despite the education issue. It works at sports club level, as has been shown in Middlesbrough, for example. Devolving it down to real contacts between real people works much better. Big organisations like the Government and possibly the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Mayor are pretty blunt instruments, other than providing the funds and a bit of inspiration.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): If I can go back to those three points you have made, then, when you said there is not sufficient structure, in what sense do you mean? Is it the accountability mechanisms or the delivery mechanisms?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is both. It is a very helpful question, if I may say so. On delivery mechanisms, when the Government was producing the policy, I urged and eventually persuaded it to have something called the Prevent Oversight Board. The Prevent Oversight Board, in my mind, was intended to scrutinise the delivery mechanisms, monitor them and provide quality control of them. The Prevent Oversight Board has very rarely met and very few of its members are consistent. There have been Ministers who have come and gone. There have been civil servants who have come and gone. It has not really had a mission. Very few of us have been to visit projects. I have on a number of occasions, but very few members have been to visit projects. The only bit of 'Prevent Oversight Board' it satisfies is 'prevent'. It is not providing much oversight and it is not really a board. Your Committee is the equivalent of a board because you all attend, you are all members of the same Committee and it does not change between elections very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The accountability structure? We found it very difficult to find out. We know what the accountability lines are - direct to the Home Office - but, actually, where the accountability is taking place is quite difficult to gauge.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Rebecca Lawrence may be better qualified to answer that question than I. My view is that the accountability structure is vague and fuzzy. Saying that everyone is accountable to the Home Office is a very bland statement that disguises a fairly poor reality.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It is difficult. The accountability structure is vague. At the moment, the formal lines are through into the Home Office but, as Lord Carlile says, when delivery is at a very local level, you need an accountability structure at that level.

However, you also need to recognise that you need multiple layers. There are some areas where only the Government with access to intelligence will really have a pointed and focused understanding of the threat and so some accountability lines do need to run that way. However, you also need accountability lines - both executive and political - at the level where leadership can prioritise resources effectively to those pieces of work that need to then be delivered highly locally. Therefore, in some ways, you do need dual accountability lines both to the national and to the local, which is why when we come to talk about a Contest Board we think there is a complementary role that that can play for London in partnership with the Home Office's accountability arrangements.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. You talked, Lord Carlile, about devolving it down to the lowest possible delivery mechanism. Many of us in this Assembly have raised concerns – and it has been raised nationally as well – that, particularly on the police side with stretched police resources, inevitably perhaps, there is a pullback of neighbourhood policing at ward level that might be more difficult. Is that a concern that has been expressed through the Prevent framework?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes. The role of the police in Prevent, in my view, should be very limited. The reason the police have been heavily involved in Prevent is because they in many places have been able to provide consistency. Police officers, particularly at sergeant and inspector level, tend to stay in one place for quite a long time. For example, in the Doncaster area, which is an area where I have spent a little time for other reasons, you find the local police sergeant carries all the history of the area in which he is working. He has information and it is good information.

However, in Birmingham, what they found was that the police were seen to be threatening. Asian minority ethnic communities felt that they were being spied on by the police, even in the context of Prevent. There was a disastrous event in Birmingham in which they put cameras costing a very large amount of money on very high poles, switched them on. There was very strong protest and they were switched off and never used again until they were moved to be part of the security at the Olympic Park for the Olympic Games. At least they proved to be useful in the end, but it made Birmingham think very hard.

What they do in Birmingham with the police now is that the police are there to deal with what police should deal with. If there is a suspicion among those dealing with Prevent that there may be a crime being committed against the Terrorism Act, they tell the police and the police carry out the intelligence and then you will see hard-pressed community police officers around the area, looking at people's activities and so on. The real work is done by community workers, social workers or whatever their particular function is, working in ward-based offices for Birmingham City Council, supervised in the headquarters of Birmingham City Council by a fairly senior officer who has a lot of experience of doing these things. It has worked much better. The police are no longer held in suspicion.

The other thing that is very important, in my view, is something that has certainly happened in Manchester and may have happened in a number of places that I do not know about. A small number of senior staff of the City Council have been vetted so that the Home Office and the police can tell those vetted staff what is going on, "There is going to be an arrest at 6.00pm tomorrow evening", and they are told a day ahead. They are briefed as to how to engage with community leaders and particularly councillors so that the community leaders and councillors can prepare that local community – without giving anything away that is of national security importance – as to what is going to happen and can manage the reaction. It is an extension of community policing but it is not done by the police and that is more compatible with a peaceful neighbourhood.

The truth of the matter is that, in any event, 95% of material about terrorism is available on open sources if you take the trouble to look. There is a very small amount of information that is not fully available. Actually, the Government and those who are at the police can tell the public most of what is happening, anyway. They are too secretive.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. The other thing that was raised at our last meeting was that the Prevent strategy could risk criminalising free speech. We were told that there are nonviolent extremists operating within the bounds of the current law who are often seen as being responsible for radicalising people into committing violent extremism and that tackling those nonviolent extremists would be very difficult through the current law. The Home Secretary has recently said that she wants to introduce new counter-

extremism measures, which would include banning orders for extremist organisations that use hate speech in public places.

I am just wondering whether you have any views on what the appropriate criteria would be to determine whether an organisation is deemed as extremist. How we can tackle these nonviolent extremists who are radicalising others but operating within the bounds of the law while promoting civil liberties and free speech? It seems to be a very difficult exercise.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: The Home Secretary has taken on a really impossible task in saying that and it causes me a lot of concern. I do remember, when I was a young Member of Parliament (MP) or even before that, some of my colleagues including at least one person who became the leader of the Liberal Party or the Liberal Democrats - I forget which we were then - voting for the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) at one of our party conferences. That might be regarded as extremist by some --

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I was a member at the time.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: -- and I am very reluctant to place in the hands of the Government -- I suspect there are one or two people here who may have supported CND. I saw you. I saw Mr Duvall pointing at Mr Arbour.

Len Duvall AM: It was not Mr Arbour. It was Mr Bacon. He thinks we are all Communists, I will not hold back!

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Anyway, the real point about this is that we are actually entitled to hold unusual opinions. No doubt there are people in this room - me included, possibly - who hold some unusual opinions that might offend some people. We have to be very careful about making unlawful what most of us think should be lawful. To make it a crime to express a lawful view is really difficult. What I would say to the Home Secretary is, "Do you really think you would get convictions from juries if you charged people with that kind of offence?" I think it is pretty unlikely.

I like us to be non-partisan in party political terms about counterterrorism issues if at all possible and I really would urge the Home Secretary to go and talk to somebody like Sir Keir Starmer [former Director of Public Prosecutions], who has just become, as it happens, a Labour MP. We happen to have an MP now who has a really profound understanding - as opposed to some who have a very superficial understanding - of free speech and civil liberties issues. People like Sir Keir should be listened to.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. It is going to be an interesting future debate.

Len Duvall AM: There is a fine line between free speech and expressions of hate leading to violence. Much as I share your concerns about the Secretary of State's comments, there has to be something done if we are going to keep pushing the boundaries back or challenging those that say something that we know is moving towards it. At certain stages of this debate, I would say I would not have much concern about Al-Muhajiroun, but we now know and evidence tells us that actually some of those activities around Al-Muhajiroun have led to violence against others. I would imagine that is where the Secretary of State is coming from. We do need to tread carefully.

Where are these boundaries of free speech? How far should we go in terms of that tipping point that pushes people further down the path of hatred that leads to violence or is it a question of, "No, we need to put the

right challenge in"? Does the non-challenge become more dangerous in that sense of not being able to say, "Sorry, that is wrong and we are not going to accept that and that is not acceptable in our society by our values because what you are saying is leading to violence"?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is the \$64,000 question and you are absolutely right to pose it. I would offer you three points in response.

The first is that hate crime leading to violence is already a crime anyway and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), I know, considers these cases at a very senior level, trying to set a standard. It has prosecuted a lot of people, particularly those who have shown religious hatred in their expressions on Twitter, Facebook and so on.

The second point I would make is about organisations like Al-Muhajiroun. We do have available to us proscription of organisations, which does not require proof of criminal activity, and there is an appeal process called the Proscribed Organisations Appeal Commission. It is rarely used, but appeals against proscription can be effective. A group called the People's Mujahidin of Iran successfully appealed against proscription and was de-proscribed a number of years ago. It is a fair system. It is reasonable for the Government to consider whether some organisations should be proscribed not because they are committing crimes but because they have the potential to radicalise people to commit crimes. It is a different issue from banning people for saying certain things in certain meetings.

The third point I wanted to make is about premises. You know obviously - and I know it is something you are considering - that the Government has placed a responsibility on, amongst other places, colleges and universities to deal with radicalisation. I do not regard that as at all unreasonable. The way it came out of Parliament was pretty diluted. I would have thought it was common sense. If I were the vice-chancellor of a university, I would not want women to be discriminated against by there being meetings that they are not permitted to attend because their heads are not covered. That, to me, is offensive in my premises. If I have a community hall and Al-Muhajiroun comes along and says, "We want to run a meeting in your community hall", I have not only the right but the duty to prevent meetings that are going to radicalise people to take place.

What is more worrying is what happens in public places. I live quite near the Angel and I happened to be driving past the Angel the other day when there was a demonstration taking place on the street on the big pavement above the Angel. I think it was last Friday night. There were two placards being held up side by side and they read "No to democracy" and "Yes to Islam". If you take those separately, there is nothing wrong with it. I disagree with the first and I do not particularly have a view about the second. However, if you put them together, as they were, you have a completely different situation. That is where the challenge is. What are the police supposed to do when people crowd around those people and start saying, "Go away", or however they put it and, "This is not acceptable". That is the challenge.

Gareth Bacon AM: In the second of those three points that you raised - and I am paraphrasing here, forgive me - you were talking about possibly proscribing certain organisations that have the potential to incite others into extremist activities.

How is it possible to objectively assess that rather than subjectively? It would depend, surely, on your perspective. Throughout history, different people have proscribed all sorts of different societies, organisations, etc, based on subjective views but not on objective views. They try to present them as objective but they are not. How could it be done in such a way that it does not become simply discrimination in itself?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: The first thing you do - and this has been done - is you set a statutory standard because people have to know roughly what they are permitted or not permitted to do.

The second thing you do is you then take it out of the hands of Ministers and put it in the hands of judges. Judges are not necessarily geniuses, but what they do is an evidence-based analysis so that it then becomes a matter of evidence. That is something that judges are, on the whole, very good at. They may not understand the issues at all and they will forget them the following week, but they are very good at analysing evidence and reaching a conclusion. I did it as a part-time judge for 28 years and it is actually a very good process because you have people from both sides - and someone neutral, if you want them there - putting both sides of the case.

Just a third point, however. I am actually opposed to wholesale proscription. Early in my time as Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation, Hizb ut-Tahrir came to see me and we had a couple of challenging meetings. I decided eventually - contrary to the view of Tony Blair [former Prime Minister] at the time, who changed his mind because he said he was going to proscribe Hizb ut-Tahrir - that my view was to stick them on *Newsnight* with someone decent opposed to them. They would look ridiculous and their views would look ridiculous. It is probably better with some organisations to allow the public to see what they are really saying and then allow Evan Davis [presenter, *Newsnight*, BBC Two] or somebody else in the studio to take them apart with a few well-placed questions. They described themselves to me, for example, as a political party. I said to them, "All right. I would like to attend one of your meetings. Where are they taking place?" They gave me their address, which was a post office box number. It is very easy to destroy something like that in what one would loosely call 'cross-examination'.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): If I may add, Chair, this would also be a really useful discussion to have with the Assistant Commissioner when he comes and gives his evidence because of course, as Lord Carlile says, the police day in and day out are having to make those judgements about public order and about when to intervene.

A number of Assembly Members and Assembly Member Qureshi have very reasonably and very helpfully raised the discomfort that a number of worshippers at the Regent's Park Mosque feel on a regular basis when the mood of Friday prayers is interrupted by regular demonstrations outside. You have heard from a number of people in your last evidence session about those reciprocal protests between Anjem Choudary [British Muslim social and political activist] with his followers and the English Defence League (EDL) and the discomfort that they can create around the community. However, sometimes some good, old-fashioned, community-based British policing using public order powers can help to disperse those kinds of tensions.

I am reminded of the rather wonderful letter there was in *The Times* after Margaret Thatcher's [former Prime Minister] funeral. A tourist wrote a letter to say that he had approached a policeman and said, "Could you tell me the way to the funeral?" The policeman said, "Would you like the formal procession or the protest?" There is something in that reasonableness of the British policing tradition that would be useful to explore.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We are going to move on now to some delivery questions.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to go back to something you said just now about the police not being part of Prevent. That makes absolute sense and I agree completely. However, to some extent, the police offer a structure, not a point-of-use delivery structure - and you have talked about oversight - but also some sort of delivery as well, presumably?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes. I am not saying the police should not be part of Prevent. They should have an appropriate part of Prevent and their appropriate part is in policing. The police do provide a structure.

As you know, I am Chair of the London Policing Ethics Panel and so I have the advantage of occasionally going out on patrol with police officers in London. It is absolutely clear when you go out with perfectly ordinary, everyday police officers that they know their areas well. They know every corner. They know every street. They can tell you in some instances who is driving the car that has just gone the other way. That is very useful information. The whole intelligence piece that the police cover is very helpful and it should be available when necessary to those people who are dealing with Prevent at what I call ward level or community level.

However, we have to be very careful that people do not believe that everybody is a spy for the police. That is not what the police do anyway.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to ask as well about your view on how priority and supported areas are actually identified. From our evidence last time, it came out that there was quite a lot of confusion about this. Do you have a view?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I am as confused as everybody else.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): All right. That is a nice, easy answer.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: We need to provide more structure for this. I may be treading on toes here, but it involves a greater input from some of the boroughs in London. My observation from my outings to various boroughs and my conversations with people in boroughs is that some boroughs are really good at this and they provide the information that enables areas to be identified and profiles to be developed. Other boroughs may have a Prevent co-ordinator but the Prevent co-ordinator is only co-ordinating himself or herself, which is not very satisfactory.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You think it is at borough-level and it is not the fact that the criteria are not well expressed?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I do agree. Rebecca may have a view on this, but I do agree that the criteria are not particularly well expressed. We should know them by heart and we do not and that is a bad sign. The criteria should enable the Mayor of Newham or the officers in Newham to know exactly what they should be doing to deliver the policy.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I would agree with that. In some areas, the Government and the Home Office have gone a very long way towards being very transparent about criteria. For example, in Channel there is very extensive guidance with 22 indicators of vulnerability against which you can assess individuals to see if they would be appropriate for the Channel programme and there is really quite usable guidance that can be helpful for practitioners.

However - and the Home Office, I am sure, will look at this - the process of determining which areas are priorities, particularly for London having a borough-based process, does not seem commensurate with the nature of the threat right now. You heard that very clearly in your last evidence session when, very skilfully, you had witnesses from both a priority borough and a non-priority borough setting out the really tactical and operational problems that that is presenting now. At the moment, it is set by the Home Office based on an

assessment of the threat, a rich picture of the threat and a profile of the whole of the United Kingdom (UK) and, in London, it is borough areas that are identified. You saw the issue with the London Borough of Havering versus the London Borough of Waltham Forest. Is that really appropriate there?

Also, because the prioritisation then affects funding and commissioning of services, it is where you reach limits. Obviously, if you are a priority borough, you have more access to services and you have a Prevent co-ordinator. That makes it very difficult for non-priority areas and it also makes it very difficult to get any pan-London or clustering service provision. That is why we are talking to the Home Office about whether there is a better commissioning model for activities in London than the current model.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Do you think that part of the problem lies with the counterterrorism local profiles? Do you think that that is an effective description?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That is partly connected. It is also a separate issue. No one would say the counterterrorism local profile system is perfect now, far from it. Again, like Prevent delivery, any practitioner will say the quality of counterterrorism local profiles vary around the country and across London. They are only as good as the input that is able to be given. It requires sharing protocols, which are not yet as developed as they could be. The Home Office is reviewing how they are produced. I know that the police in London - and the Assistant Commissioner will speak about this - are very keen to change the way they are produced and to improve their quality.

Part of it then gets back to, actually, the bottom-line purpose of the counterterrorism local profile. If we were producing one now, it would be about all of the people who know an area - quite a local area - of London coming together and giving their input and knowledge about schools, about health institutions, about higher education and about further education. There would be the police's input. They would be getting a really collective, granular and rich intelligence product that can be shared in different layers with different people who need to know with a dare-to-share approach. As Lord Carlile says, very much of this information is in the public domain anyway. The political leadership needs to understand the risks and to have that granular picture. Again, one of the things that we are seeking to do with both the Prevent Board and the London Contest Board is to get that better understanding of the threat.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Alex, you seem to be agreeing. Can I ask you if there is a plan for reviewing these local profiles?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I do not know the answer to that question, I am afraid, Jenny. There should be.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, there is.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I do not want to give the impression that I am knocking the Home Office more than I mean to. The Home Office does need to do more work on this. I have already said that the Prevent Oversight Board could be part of this and could be used much more. That said, more is being done in the UK than in any other country.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Is more always good?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: In Waltham Forest, there was a very distinguished American called Quintan Wiktorowicz [Managing Partner, Affinis Global], who was for a time based in the United States (US)

Embassy in London and who did a lot of work with Waltham Forest on Prevent. It was productive both ways. He went back to the US and was invited basically to set up a Prevent policy in the White House. He gave up after a year and went back to academic life. That may have something to do with the much greater devolution of power that exists in the US, but it rather demonstrates that he thought he was taking back pretty good practice and was struggling to implement it elsewhere.

Therefore, although we are in an evolutionary process and some improvements are needed in the policy, it has not worked as badly as we sometimes think. I do not want to be too negative about it. That is all I really want to say.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I would very much want to echo that and it is important that this Committee recognises that some of the Prevent work going on in the UK and in London really is world class. International visitors from around come and look at the structure that the UK has on counterterrorism with a clear national strategy - Contest - clearly replicated through local areas across all institutions with a Prevent programme that is far more developed than anywhere else in the world.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Doing more is not necessarily good if the work that is being done is not useful and properly targeted and so on. You apparently know about reviewing these --

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, the Home Office is reviewing the way that counterterrorism local profiles are produced.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): When is that going to be published?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I am afraid I do not know the answer to that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is just ongoing?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It is very important in these discussions also to just pause and take a moment to step back and look at how the nature of the threat has changed and changed very rapidly because we are at quite a critical point. In previous roles, I have had the privilege, for example, to attend a number of Contest Boards around the country, which were a very effective means of bringing practitioners together.

But counterterrorism work even four years ago - even maybe three years ago - in some ways was rather niche and that was because the nature of the threat was pretty niche. It was predominantly al-Qaeda based. You needed to be organised and well connected to make travel arrangements to go to the mountainous regions of Afghanistan and Pakistan and to communicate with some very dangerous people. We now have something quite different. As Lord Carlile says, if you read the papers today, Abu Qatada [Jordanian al-Qaeda affiliate] was interviewed in *The Guardian* saying how al-Qaeda has been overtaken by ISIS. We have technology that is putting very slickly presented material straight onto teenagers' phones. The nature of the threat means the police cannot deal with it all. This is about parents, it is about health workers and it is about schoolteachers coping with really quite rapid changes.

I would say we are in a period maybe - I do not know your view - more like the late 1990s and early 2000s in the UK when we had to really rapidly adjust to the fact that the threat to mainland Britain was no longer from Northern Ireland-related terrorism - though, sadly, that is still prevalent in Northern Ireland - but had morphed to al-Qaeda. We all had to adjust and adapt, everyone in the public sector, and we are at a similar turning

point now. If your role is to come up with counterterrorism local profile guidance in the Home Office, it is actually quite a difficult job to do.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Alex, have you actually been consulted on this?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: No.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Are you going to be consulted? Do you know?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I do not know. I am not the Independent Reviewer anymore. I would guess that David Anderson [Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation] is going to be consulted - he is my successor - although he has been a bit busy. This is the report he has produced today. I can barely lift it.

Tony Arbour AM: It was simply the analogy between Northern Ireland and switching to al-Qaeda. Surely there is a difference between al-Qaeda or ISIS and Northern Ireland. Chances are that the same people would not have been attracted to both, whereas I suspect - just looking at it as a layman - that those same people who might have been attracted to al-Qaeda for the reasons you have given have simply bypassed it and have gone to ISIS. It is unlikely, is it not, that an Irish Republican Army (IRA) type of person --

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): You make a very important and sensible point. I was not suggesting that the individuals were drawn to different causes. I was suggesting more that the type of practitioners you would need around the table and the type of skills and information you would need are quite different because you are not going to be able to rely so heavily on intelligence or the work of the security services or the police in understanding how networks are forming with the current nature of the threat. You are going to need to talk to community leaders and teachers about changes in the behaviour of 15-year-olds, which can often be very rapid, if you are going to be able to get a handle on the problem within your community. It is a different group of organisations.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Technology has moved us on.

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

Tony Arbour AM: It is a sort of escalation. Maybe the analogy is - I do not know - moving up from a Ford to a Jaguar in terms of terrorism. Perhaps al-Qaeda is now seen as the Ford.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Can I just go back to the point you made about Northern Ireland? I am still the non-statutory reviewer of, effectively, the activities of MI5 in Northern Ireland. In terms of the nature of the terrorists, we can draw no helpful analogies from what has happened in Northern Ireland. There is useful work done in Northern Ireland that teaches us, for example, how to handle covert human intelligence sources and the use of technology in detecting the activities of terrorists. That is important, but that is as far as it goes.

The problem with ISIS is that it is much, much more professional than al-Qaeda and also much more ruthless, as we see every day on the television screen. Al-Qaeda was in the business of the Glasgow Airport bomb, but that was a bit like the Cold War. We understood what they were doing. Now we have people who are prepared to buy a machete for £25 and cut somebody's head off in the street. That is a completely different and actually far more intimidating picture than even the use of an improvised explosive device (IED). It worries

people enormously and worries the authorities enormously because it has the capacity to create terror in the minds of the ordinary public walking around the streets of London.

That is why we have had to recalibrate the way in which counterterrorism is dealt with and that feeds into all kinds of debates; for example, the communications data debate. It is, as Rebecca [Lawrence] said, a completely different game now, unfortunately. It is going to be with us for probably another generation.

Len Duvall AM: That really takes me to the point about why we have some problems with Prevent. You highlighted one of those about the engagement and trying to explain to people the threat. Unless you are dealing with these on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis, then you do not understand why an action needs to be taken. It needs clarity on the communications issues. People have not caught up on how behind we are and how the others, who wish to cause harm to others, are a bit further ahead and now we have one arm tied behind our back. Unless that information is presented in a way that people can identify and get to grips with, we have this problem with Prevent.

My question goes back to Jenny's [Jones AM, Deputy Chair] question about the threat. Do people really understand the potential threat to us here internationally, why we need to take certain actions, why the Prevent programme is so important and why other related activity is as well? Do you think there is that level of understanding now across organisations and individuals?

I used to have a view about some of my MP colleagues when talking to them post-2007 about the threat that was being faced as part of my role in terms of the Metropolitan Police Authority. I am just beginning to wonder now whether that is really the same with some other people in key positions, whether they really do engage and whether they think it is for them or for someone else.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: That is a really important question and I will let you into a confidence I shared with David Anderson the other day. We communicate regularly. He was talking about his report - which is being published today - and he said to me, "We have a problem. You and I have seen things that other people do not see and we know what is going on". It is very difficult to translate that into information that MPs particularly can use with a proper understanding. This is why I have constantly said to the Government that it should give a much stronger narrative. Even if it uses hypotheticals, it can actually say what has been going on. This is something that the security services recognise but they do not quite have their heads around how to do it.

I knew at some point we would get to cyber and I think we have now got to cyber. I spend a lot of my time talking about what I call 'cyber-activism' these days, which covers the whole area of cyber activity. On cyberterrorism, there is not much at the moment - though there is a lot of cyber-activism - but it is coming. The terrorists are learning how to do it. As recently as February, an organisation calling itself Carbanak attacked 100 banks in 30 countries and stole an estimated US\$1 billion. It did that by intervening on the computers of people like us. Probably most of us do internet banking. I certainly do and more of us are on a daily basis. They managed to get into those sites where you and I might be looking up our bank accounts to see how much money there is that morning and they stole money in that way. Terrorists are going to have the capacity to do that, which will give them huge capacity to commit terrorist acts. In Libya, when we saw 200 Mitsubishi Shoguns being paraded by ISIS, they were all bought with that kind of fraudulently obtained money. They are dividing Libya into three chaotic parts and that will enable them to do all kinds of things. We have to bear in mind that there is a very big story developing that includes the use of fraud as well for terrorist purposes.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): If I might add, you really do raise, as Lord Carlile says, a very profound and important point. I do not think there is enough space in the working life of senior executives and senior politicians to step back and get that understanding of the threat in the way that your question rightly poses. Nothing that we have talked about today is not in the public domain. This is all open-source. It is only when you have an investigation such as the one that your Committee is rightly prioritising that you can put all the pieces from the grisly newspaper stories together.

If I might say so, I know we are coming to the Contest Board later but it is exactly this gap that made the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime want to act in this space because of course - and this is a non-partisan point - he had come from being a council leader with access to Prevent resources but not the regular briefings on the threat that he receives in his current role. It occurred to him that whilst at the London Prevent Board at the executive, tactical and strategic level there is now some very good work going on, you need political support and buy-in above that. You need political awareness-raising so that the political leadership of boroughs, and in this building, can then help the prioritisation through all our work and all of the statutory partners' work to make sure that this area of vulnerability is understood as well as other areas of vulnerability that are also moving up the agenda like sexual exploitation and so on. We should be comfortable listening to evidence about this area of threat, absorbing material and then taking the appropriate prioritisation decisions as a result.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Before I bring Jenny [Jones AM, Deputy Chair] back in, can I ask another question? It was something that Lord Carlile touched on earlier and it was mentioned at our last meeting.

The counterterrorism local profiles have the potential to be very useful documents if you have that data-sharing attitude. We heard from one chief executive who said, "The Borough Commander and I are the only two people allowed to read it". You mentioned earlier about Birmingham and how there was a wider group of people who were securely vetted and who were able to share that. Is that a change you would like to see?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: The narrative should be as open as possible. In fighting terrorism, narrative is actually almost everything. It explains to the MPs whom Mr Duvall was referring to. It explains to the public. It explains to the journalists - forgive me; many of whom are fairly lazy - the factual basis upon which policy is formed. It saves them the trouble of going and finding out. You will know that if you write the press release, you are going to be setting the agenda, very likely. So I think a much stronger agenda should be set.

The Mayor, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and indeed the GLA have very quickly - certainly compared with Wales, which I know well - have assumed a position of great influence and importance pretty quickly and I think people want to hear a narrative from, collectively, you. That would be very influential. I think that if Londoners feel that there is a much more public narrative, that it is supported by the leaders of the various political parties in the GLA and by the Mayor and that you can ask questions about it, then Prevent will become a much greater reality in Greater London.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): There are also things in those local profiles that will name individuals, which should not be in the public domain.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Of course.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It seems to me that there is some wider assessment of your local risk that should be made available locally.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Absolutely. You are exactly right, Chair. However, if I may reiterate my earlier point, you are exactly right that there are improvements that can be needed that everyone recognises to the local profiles, but those local profiles are also part of a bigger system of trusted communication and conversation between the operational people responsible for delivery on the ground and the political and executive leadership of organisations.

Lord Carlile and I have both heard in two very good open and frank meetings the sharing of best practice between cities. We gathered the Police and Crime Commissioners and policing colleagues from the other main cities of England and Wales in this room and then, secondly, in New Scotland Yard to talk about how it really works in their areas. We heard the example of the city of Birmingham, where, as well as its counterterrorism local profile document itself, the rhythm it is in with its Contest Board is about a really rich sharing of information and change in the threat assessment from the council, the police, health and schools. It is still really hard and it is still not perfect but, if you are in that rhythm of trusted relationships, you have a much better picture of what is going on in your communities and then you can respond in times of crisis.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Just a very small point and it is an important one. Publishing these documents is important but it does not stop you from doing what judges do in terrorism cases, which is to have a closed document in the background containing the material that is national security sensitive. That is perfectly legitimate.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You have sort of answered this already, but I am interested in the structure of how the Prevent co-ordinators get supervised and scrutinised. The Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism (OSCT) actually sits in the Home Office and it then directly supervises the co-ordinators at borough level?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I am not sure it is quite as clear as that. The first principle of line management is that the line manager should be a person who can walk into the room and challenge what the managed person is doing. Also, in an era when we now understand appraisal much better than we did, the people who are doing this kind of work should be in a place where 360-degree assessments can actually be effective. It does not work if a high degree of line management is being exercised from the OSCT.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): What I described as the theoretical structure?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Apparently, the Prevent co-ordinator network - and I do not even know what it was - was disbanded.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I believe so, yes.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That was presumably sharing good practice between --

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Can you help with that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Again, Lord Carlile's point is right. There is technical line management responsibility – and I may get this a little wrong – that comes within the local authority. That is the *de facto*. In practice, the OSCT provides also very helpful and effective peer support for Prevent co-ordinators so that they can come together and network. There is a vibrant system of newsletters, etc.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I thought the network was disbanded.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): What happens in London is that you can sometimes get a situation where a number of you gather so frequently that you can become more isolated from the main leadership of the local authority. In Martin Esom's [Chair, London Prevent Board] aim of getting greater strategic prioritisation in the London Prevent Board, he is seeking to support Prevent arrangements in London through a different structure reporting up into that Board rather than the network all meeting together as a group of practitioners.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): How do they share good practice at the moment? Do you know what? This is clearly an area for some recommendations from this Committee.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: There is no system that I am aware of. If neither of us knows about the system, it is unlikely that many other people know about the system or, at best, it is an ineffective system.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Who has a list of all of the Prevent projects in London? Is there a total list? I understand that some of this might be difficult to share, but is there a complete list somewhere? Presumably, the Home Office has a complete list.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): The Home Office holds a list and, again, neither of us has the list. The Home Office will say that given the nature of the work, it is not appropriate to comment on –

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Even you two do not have the security clearance to see that list?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is not a question of security clearance. I guess you are Developed Vetting (DV) vetted as well?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): We are both vetted to the highest level.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: We are both DV-vetted. It is just that I am not sure that I could claim that they should tell me because I am no longer the Independent Reviewer. However, I would doubt if routinely they tell David Anderson.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): No. Martin Esom as Chair of the Prevent network does not have the full list. He is told about it. The Home Office is working with the London Prevent Board. It recognises that the nature of the threat has changed and that there needs to be more sharing of information on a pan-London basis. It is very supportive of the changes that Martin Esom is putting in place so that there can be a very rich sharing of best practice and of what the Prevent projects in London are and how they are delivering, and that that information should not just be held at a practitioner level in the Prevent network but needs to be shared up with executive leadership, hence the programme of reform to the London Prevent Board and then the work of supporting that by a London Contest Board, which the Home Office is actively encouraging and supporting.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): One area that came up last time was that funding is always so short and it is difficult to run in the long term. Presumably that will be an area for some work?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Absolutely. Martin Esom and I are in active discussions with the Home Office about how we could change the commissioning arrangements. We have suggested that there could be co-commissioning across MOPAC and the Home Office to give access to programmes where working across borough boundaries or in non-priority areas or working innovatively over multiple years on a more outcomes-based framework could be appropriate, much as we are innovating in some of our gangs commissioning work. We think that could be really valuable because some activity needs to go on at a very local ward level. For others, there are benefits of scale from working with programmes on a pan-London basis or with particular institutions.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Can I just clarify? The Government provides the funding for priority boroughs, which get more money to deliver Prevent programmes?

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

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Who then agrees the programmes that are being given money? Is it the local authority or is it the Home Office?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It is the Home Office. Boroughs in priority areas are invited to bid for programmes from an agreed Home Office provider list and then the Home Office grants funding after the bidding round and evaluates the programmes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It is the Home Office that does the evaluations as well?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, the Home Office evaluates.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Two boroughs could be running something that is essentially, potentially, a cross-borough project without the other borough knowing.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, exactly. The way that the Home Office has tackled that is of course through having a Prevent co-ordinator network where they share best practice at an operational level.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That has been disbanded, has it not?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Then you are relying on two quite junior officials within boroughs to share best practice. They may or may not have the disposition. It may or may not be in their job description. There needs to be a more systematic link across boroughs in sharing that, which is what the reforms to the Prevent Board are seeking to do.

This is rich territory for debate, discussion and development. Home Office officials are working on changes to this.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: You are making a very good point. The analogy here is the development of counterterrorism units outside London where clusters of police forces have come together and have become much more effective as counterterrorism units. The East of England or Wales would be very good examples of this, but boroughs need to be getting together to share best practice. There are going to be people who are very good at one aspect in one borough and very good at another aspect in another. It is just uneconomic not to share skills in that way.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): And more effective?

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

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I am going to move now to the Channel programmes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. I wanted to try to really understand a bit more about the Channel programme because there is a lack of detail in this area as well around how it works. Maybe I could ask Lord Carlile. Do you think there is or there needs to be effective oversight of the Channel referral process?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes. That is the short answer to the question. Actually, the oversight by the Home Office of the Channel project is good. That is something that it has really looked at in detail. As a result, there are some very good Channel schemes. Let us call them tactics. They need to be more available on a larger scale around the country, but the skill within the Channel project is high and quite diverse as well in terms of what they do.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Do you think the Home Office does have good oversight of it? Obviously it is not available for all of us to look at, but do you think it has a good grip on this programme?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): How do you measure the success of Channel?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: That is a very good question. Some time ago now - probably about five years ago - I did suggest to the Home Office that it should have an app of some kind. You cannot get quantitative results from Channel because it is all very subjective, but you can get qualitative results. My suggestion was that everybody who is involved in the Channel project should have to answer some questions on a regular basis about each client that they are dealing with under the Channel project. By that means, from around the country you would very quickly have hundreds of responses. You could then do the conventional statistician's thing of chopping off the top 10% and the bottom 10% and looking at the bulk and you would have some answers that begin to have some quantitative evidential value. That sort of thing or similar schemes to assess Channel should happen.

Otherwise, it is too anecdotal. I could tell you anecdotes about individuals - and some of them are very good stories - who have been successfully part of the Channel project, but these are stories about those individuals and their aptitudes and their interests, which have been absorbed into the Channel project and have produced a good result. However, it is not a very empirical way of measuring success and we need to be able to measure Channel empirically.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): The first thing you said earlier when you mentioned Channel was that it was surprisingly effective. You know that because you have spoken to people who have been through it or have been involved with it, but there does not seem to be any assessment to really understand what is working and what is not.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes, hence my suggestion that the sort of analysis I described should take place. It is perfectly possible to assess the effect of Channel on individuals, but it is perhaps not being done as effectively as it might be.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Do you think perhaps there should be an independent review of Channel?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: My understanding is that the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation is free to review Channel. At the moment - and you saw the report he has produced today - he is being overwhelmed by work and he has to prioritise, like all of us, in some way or another. Certainly the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation should be required from time to time to review the Channel project and maybe write an occasional one-off report about it. The danger is that we review these things only when something goes horribly wrong.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): If I may say, this is a really interesting and useful line of questioning. I was reminding myself of the Channel programme last night when I was rereading the guidance. I would agree with your comments. It is a very mature and professional programme. The guidance would be well worth reading. It is very evidence-based in terms of the criteria for people going into it and very mature in the system supporting it.

Your point was about an understanding of what works. What would be really useful are more case studies of that for practitioners. We need some good news in this area. We need to know what has worked with some pretty vulnerable individuals so that practitioners - be it child protection, be it schools, be it health - really can understand that there are programmes that can help. The evaluation of what works and the dissemination of that would be very good.

However, I would be loath to start again from Channel. The issue is the very fundamental one that Lord Carlile raised at the beginning: we will only ever capture and support quite a small number of individuals who have made themselves known to people around the various institutions that they may come across, who have presented vulnerabilities and who are then referred on to a programme. There is a lot more we need to do in what people are increasingly calling the 'pre-Channel space' for people who are vulnerable to being drawn into this but have not yet presented themselves so far down that line that they will qualify for a Channel intervention.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): A lot more are being referred to Channel through schools and others because they have this duty.

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

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: There is a very important point arising from that, too. If I am a schoolteacher and I have a concern about a 15-year-old, say, and I am thinking, "Maybe I should go to the head of the school and we should get this referred to the Channel project", I want to have the confidence that

if I refer someone to the Channel project I know it is going to be done sensitively, correctly and with a reasonable prospect of a result. That kind of liaison is not really taking place and it needs to be much more transparent, if that is the right term.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Earlier on, you mentioned that there was not much evidence of people refusing, but what do you think should happen if an individual does choose not to engage with the programme?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It depends on the evidence. However, if there is evidence that the individual's ideations or intentions are likely to lead to him or her departing the country to become a terrorist, then one might have to go to the police and say, "This has gone out of Prevent into counterterrorism policing". There may be other cases in which one simply goes back, say, to the school and asks the school staff to deal with it if they can. Certainly you should keep the individual on the radar.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. Assistant Commissioner Mark Rowley has suggested the possibility that a mandatory counter-radicalisation programme should be introduced. What is your thought on that suggestion?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I understand where he is going. I am a bit iffy about anything that is mandatory if it is not necessary for it to be mandatory. The problem with mandatory programmes is that they get written down and that is all you do. I would prefer to see a code of practice - that is probably the best term - that allows a little bit of wriggle room around the edges so that the people engaged in these programmes can use their imaginations.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): What is your thought on that, Rebecca?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): This will be worth discussing in your next session. There are a small number of incidents, sadly, in London, where you have people with very entrenched ideological views and possibly with violent intent that has not yet been taken to the next level but who, precisely because of their views, will not engage in a de-radicalisation programme. It is very difficult to know what to do with those individuals. As you say, some may reach the threshold where they do need, sadly, police monitoring or other types of disruptive activity but these are the situations that the MPS has to deal with, very sadly, day in and day out.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Would a mandatory programme help that? Even if they were forced to go on it, they are not going to engage with it, presumably.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I suppose it gives the police another lever to say, "We have supported you and you would not engage", and therefore maybe you can use other techniques, but it is very difficult. How do you control individuals when you are very concerned about their desire to get involved in violent criminality but they have not done so yet?

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

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: How does any of this reach into - the Channel programme in particular - prisons and the youth offender institutions? I do not know if that is something that you discussed at your earlier meeting, but my experience has been that prisons are very structurally disconnected from the local

community, the local state and local public services and they have enormous internal constraints. I would have thought that, in terms of the risk-mapping, there are huge risks.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Quite a lot of attention has been given to prisons and I hope I am describing the evidence correctly. The evidence is that there is a lot of radicalised conversation and theoretical activity in prisons, but the reality is that most people when they leave prison do not do anything about it whatsoever. Prisons are really boring places to be and so people get involved in activities that actually just provide them with something to do. Therefore, the problem emerging from prisons is much smaller than we might think.

That said, obviously, people make contacts in prisons that may be very useful to them at a later stage and, also, particularly naïve young men can be manipulated whilst in prison to do things that they might not otherwise have done after they are released from prison. Therefore, we need to keep a close eye on the prisons.

I do believe that the level of prison intelligence is quite high - this is something that may have been learned from experience in Northern Ireland - and that the post-prison situation is under reasonable control. However, it is certainly something that Ministers talk about pretty well constantly and civil servants do have a focus on it. There is a problem, which is about the privacy of prisoners. Prisoners are entitled to some privacy. Having a microphone on the wall of every cell is not acceptable on the off-chance that something is going to be heard. This is quite a sensitive area.

Tony Arbour AM: Do we know they do not do that? Do we know that does not happen?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I do not know. I would believe that there is a reasonable level of intelligence in prisons and I do not know exactly how it is activated. I would be surprised if we did not know roughly what is happening in almost every prison where something significant is happening. It does rely, of course, a lot on prison staff and some prison staff are more receptive than others to tasking of this kind.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: Would a young offender in an institution, if they have been identified as somebody who is at risk, on leaving, would a referral be picked up outside in their home community?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I can maybe answer this. It relates back to your earlier question about Channel. Of course, Channel has now been put, since earlier this year, on a statutory footing and those involved in criminal justice in prison and in probation are now formally required to co-operate.

Being of a somewhat technocratic nature, I have the advantage of having Annex B of the Channel guidance in front of me, which sets out the responsibilities in criminal justice. If it comes to their attention from whatever information source that there is a prisoner or someone about to be on probation who is vulnerable to radicalisation and might benefit from the Channel programme, the partners required to co-operate with that Channel panel are:

"... the governor of a prison ... the governor of a young offender institution ... the principal of a secure college ... [or] youth offending team ... [or the] provider of probation services."

They have to come to the Channel panel, assess that person's vulnerability and determine whether a Channel intervention is appropriate for them. That is actually one of the advantages of putting Channel onto a

statutory footing. Local providers are very resource-strapped but, if individuals within their institutions come to their attention as being at risk, they have to participate with this panel process.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Just as a general observation, I am a former President of the Howard League for Penal Reform. I wrote a long report on the safety of young people and children in custody. Do not get too excited about the effectiveness of what happens to people when they leave prison. It is much better than it used to be but, on a scale of 0 to 100, we have moved from 10 to 20.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: That is why I was asking, actually.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes, it is a perfectly good point. The theory - and you heard it from Rebecca [Lawrence] - is good. In some places, it is happening. In other places, it is not.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have asked the Ministry of Justice for some evidence on this as well. That will be helpful.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is perhaps worth adding two points, actually, on this very important question, which I can get quite excited about.

One is that I have had a brief conversation with the new Secretary of State for Justice about prisons and I believe that he is genuinely interested in prison reform. Quite what he will do about it may be another question.

The other is that Lord McNally, who is Chairman of the Youth Justice Board - like his excellent predecessor Frances Done - is really focusing on release issues. They are dealing with a much smaller group of people in youth custody now. The numbers have fallen very significantly.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: Thank you.

Fiona Twycross AM: My point leads on from that. We can see why people who work in prisons might have gone into their jobs with a reasonable expectation that they might look at preventative work on some level and that might include intelligence gathering. I am clear that you are right that teachers and health and community workers are almost like the front line now. They will not have gone into those professions or jobs with the expectation that that would be an onus on them going forward.

How can we make sure they get the level of support and confidence needed, rather than just having this added responsibility without feeling that they have an understanding of how they should refer? How does that bit work? How do they get the support, training and people doing research into what level of support these professionals feel that they need? They will not have trained in this at teacher training college. I know from friends of mine who are teachers how little time was spent on child protection - which this is an element of - when they were at teacher training colleges. How do we make sure that people get that level of support?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: You hit the nail on the head when you used the word 'training'. I receive a lot of communications from people in education. Two of my three daughters happen to be in education; one in a university, one in a school. They tell me that they have never been trained on these issues and that they have to look to other people for help. We need much more training.

There is another really important point and that is about sharing information. People live in silos with their information because they feel that data protection forbids them from sharing information.

There is one very important group we did not mention, which is housing. That is also very important in this. We have some huge housing managers in London like Peabody and the big housing associations. They know everything about what is going on in the communities they manage at a community level with the local managers. On education, health, housing, local government, central government, they need to share the information. When there is a possibility that someone is going to be a terrorist or possibly be trapped into terrorism through their connections, there needs to be triage at as early a stage as possible. That triage depends on training and the sharing of information.

My experience of talking to teachers is exactly the same as yours. They want to do something. They all have an ethical matrix that tells them they should do something. Most people are actually basically quite good. They have no idea how to do it and so we need to cross the Rubicon.

Fiona Twycross AM: Yes. Presumably this links into the British values debate and the idea that schools are responsible for teaching British values and the governing bodies have to make sure that fits into the ethos of the school. Does that link in with Prevent?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): If I may say so, you have raised an excellent set of questions that is incredibly current to education. I am really pleased you made that link there to governance and to training. Yes, you are absolutely right. Teachers and schools need more training. There is also a role for governance and for training governors. There are systems in place that do this, but again the nature of the vulnerability is increasingly changing so much that the bar is rising all the time.

If I give examples of how some of the systems are currently working, I am a governor of a school in the tri-borough area. As a governor there is an excellent Prevent co-ordinator in the tri-borough. There is safeguarding training for governors that teaches them about the areas of vulnerability and the sort of things they should be raising at the governing-body level and the sorts of questions they should be asking. That has been complemented by the training of teachers to spot areas of vulnerability in a toolkit that you will have seen and that does include the teaching of British values. As a governor, I have put this on the agenda of the governing body meeting and I have been able to, in the context of safeguarding, ask the school if they feel they understand the threat of that radicalisation. Do they feel they know what they would do? It is not a question of whether their pupils come into contact with this material, it is when. They are all coming into contact with this material just as they are coming into contact with material of an extreme sexual nature. Teachers have to adjust very, very quickly. It is not easy. More support to both teachers and governors is important.

The governance relationship is really important. If governors are asking the school how they are coping, then they are saying it is okay within the culture of the school to be asking questions about pupils' behaviour. It destigmatises it and makes it part of the wider discussion of the safeguarding support that goes on within the school. It is not easy.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Last session we heard from Waltham Forest about the training they were giving to everyone on their front line, including road sweepers and --

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Absolutely. It is to make it a normal part of doing business in the school. The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime is speaking at Martin Esom's conference on

7 July, the tenth anniversary. It will be very poignant. He has quite rightly invited not just all the head teachers from Waltham Forest but wider, using that beacon of best practice in the borough to reach out to a wider group of teachers and to reach out to schools that are academies and free schools and not local-authority controlled. It is going to be very difficult to build it into the training curriculum.

Fiona Twycross AM: I have a question on radicalisation in free schools and supplementary schools as well. It seems to be the right point to ask it, if that is all right. I wondered if you could both comment on how Prevent should address the challenge of radicalisation in free schools and supplementary schools and also with the children who are schooled at home who are probably not coming into so much contact with frontline professionals.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That is a great question. I am afraid my answer will be the same as the others you have heard. Of course it should. In a decentralised education system, you do not have the formal levers. You have to rely on the dissemination of best practice, such as Martin Esom is doing. Home-schooled children have a real vulnerability.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes, I agree. There is a whole question about supplementary schools that we have not even begun to answer. There is no control over many supplementary schools. I have been shocked by some of the detail I have been told by people who run them about the way they run them and about how they take their responsibilities, mostly not because they have a malign intent but because they simply do not understand what their responsibilities are.

An awful lot has been lumped on the Charity Commission, which has come in for some criticism because it is deemed to be nosy and politically motivated. Actually, the work that William Shawcross, as Chairman of the Charity Commission, has done was necessary. A wake-up call was needed so that the trustees of charities that run educational establishments actually know that their governance responsibilities are very high and that if they do not carry them out properly they can literally be in a lot of trouble. There is an awful lot of work to do about this. It is not just about counterterrorism; it is about discrimination and it is about diversity. It is about very basic things like bullying and punishment, too.

I was asked as a barrister to advise an educational institution that followed a practice with children that it thought were not pulling their weight of agreeing with the parents that the children should be shut in their rooms at home for a month at a time. They thought this was perfectly all right. First of all, as the parent or step-parent of five daughters, I do not know how they do it because I certainly could not. Secondly, it seems to me to be an absolutely outrageous practice. It is just an example of the sort of practice that we need to have some control mechanisms over so that the state or the local authority can intervene.

Fiona Twycross AM: Would the Charity Commission be the right body for doing that, do you think? Obviously, it has had quite massive cuts in terms of its resources over the past few years as well. Clearly, in terms of charity governance, it does have a role. Does it have the resources and capacity to do it?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: No. The Charity Commission has a role; it does not have the resources. It has a very good board now. For example, Peter Clarke - whom you will have come across as a leading counterterrorism police officer and one of the very best - is part of the Charity Commission now. They cannot send Peter Clarke out to police a school in Stockport, for example.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Quite often, these supplementary schools are held on local authority premises and so local authorities could set certain criteria.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It comes right back to the starting point of Lord Carlile's intervention: that effective delivery and effective oversight of Prevent sometimes needs to come back to the highly local level and to the ward level. You can have in a national regulatory or statutory framework a requirement not to abuse children and a requirement to comply with Prevent, and Prevent being on a statutory footing helps. How you monitor what is going on locally may need to come totally locally. To answer the question of what is happening in London's schools and which schools present a threat - which free schools, which academies and which home schools - you cannot answer that on a pan-London basis. With the best will in the world, the very excellent and highly skilled Radicalisation Unit in the Department for Education - and it is fantastic that it exists - is not going to ever be set up for --

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Also, it is part-time.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): The other side of the coin, of course, is that there is a potential for a real damaging of civil liberties and an intrusion into people's lives, particularly Muslim families. As an example, at a primary school in Waltham Forest, they are asking nine-year-olds all sorts of quite searching questions about their beliefs, practices and so on. It is quite easy to overstep the mark, is it not?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We have some questions on this later on.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Sorry.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: The short answer is, yes, it is quite easy to overstep the mark. This is a very difficult area. The teaching of British values, civics or whatever title it is given requires real skill. Most teachers are not particularly well trained to do it. A number of local authorities have had to meet this challenge. A lot of things have been done well in Waltham Forest. In Hackney, they have given a lot of attention to how to deal with these kinds of issues. Training of teachers is often a weak ahead of the lesson that is going to take place, if it is ahead at all. There is a great deal to be done in this area.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Len Duvall AM: I am going to move into MOPAC's role in this area. Can we clarify where we are with the refocus role? We know that there is a desire to establish a Contest Board. You talk of co-commissioning. Is that a given? Has the Home Office agreed that in the future you will be co-commissioning on some of the Prevent projects?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): As the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime explained at the Police and Crime Committee in March, he used his position on the Home Office-chaired Police Counterterrorism Board to get the former Security Minister's support for piloting co-commissioning in London. We are too late for this financial year because the one-year allocations are already set out. It will be the job of Home Office officials to implement the former Security Minister's guidance and agreement that we should pilot co-commissioning in boroughs for the next financial year. There is obviously now a new Security Minister. We will work with Home Office officials and the London Prevent Board to see if we can pilot this approach.

There is enthusiasm in some boroughs that do not want annual funding and they want their coverage of programmes to be more innovative and flexible.

Len Duvall AM: This is almost like devolvement. What does that look like in commissioning? Will it be MOPAC co-commissioning under the framework of the Home Office or is it generally the Home Office and you sitting alongside the Home Office? Paint me a picture about how this would work.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): We have not reached that level of detail quite yet. Our thinking was that if there were two or three boroughs that have some experience in Prevent that wanted to come forward and look at commissioning in a different way from the current framework set out by the Home Office - perhaps multiyear, perhaps across borough boundaries - they could come forward with innovative projects and a different way of commissioning. It is much as we have done with gangs. We have done some cross-borough commissioning and some pan-London basis quite innovative commissioning. You will have heard of our commissioning of Gangs Diversion Services and London Trauma Centres. That is the sort of thing you can only do with borough consent on a pan-London basis.

As I say, Home Office officials have just recently agreed that they will look at this and it will be on the agenda for the London Prevent Board. We will work with boroughs on that and from the 2016/17 financial year, hopefully, we will have some concrete proposals.

The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime has written to the Security Minister to say he hopes he supports his predecessor's ideas. It is not the intuitive way for the Home Office to have commissioned in this area. It is different from the framework everywhere else.

Len Duvall AM: The benefit of this is that we know some boroughs would like some fresh co-commissioning types of issues. Why is that? We have heard from some boroughs. From a MOPAC perspective, why do you believe that to be the case?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): A number of ways. It allows things to happen across borough boundaries. You could commission on a multiyear framework. It could allow for more innovative commissioning. You could link to other areas of vulnerability that are commissioned already by MOPAC or by boroughs and non-counterterrorism areas like gangs or sexual exploitation where there may be lessons to be learned from service providers. Some of the interventions here are very different. The ideology is very different. Others are not so different. Interventions that persuade young people not to get involved in gangs or to be careful online tackle a number of vulnerabilities, including this one.

Those will be the benefits. You are drawing on expertise from other areas, across borough boundaries, priority or non-priority areas and multiyear.

Len Duvall AM: I know this is unlikely to happen, but if you were given a free hand in terms of your advice to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, by year three what would be the pattern of co-commissioning? What would it look like in London? What would you do?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): You would devolve this to London and you do not have commissioning directly from the Home Office. You would have a pot that can be spent either across London or direct from boroughs, recognising that there is benefit to some pan-London delivery and some highly local delivery. You would still be in partnership with the Home Office because the ideological nature of this type of threat means you absolutely need that specialist expertise. You need its expertise and the list of approved providers. You need that connection to what is going on in the wider threat piece. However, you

need much more local freedom and flexibility. It would be more outcomes-focused, multiyear, innovative and a London-based pot.

Len Duvall AM: Working within a framework --

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Working within a national framework.

Len Duvall AM: -- established by the Home Office and the rest of it?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, also with much more sharing of best practice between London and other cities.

Len Duvall AM: Chair, you might want our officials just to drop a little note to the Devolution Working Party. We do not want to cut across that work but that has not really been spoken of in terms of the ask coming out of this building or from our colleagues in local government. That is quite important, if we could try a bit of co-ordination.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is extremely helpful, yes.

Len Duvall AM: Let us move to the Contest Board. Do we have a start date for a London Contest Board?

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

Len Duvall AM: What does it look like?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): We will have the first meeting on 3 July. We have already had a really good hands-on workshop on the sorts of things it can cover. The Mayor and his London Crime Reduction Board have pulled partners together to get complete buy-in at that political level. At the more working level below to the existence of this Board, we have worked through the relationships, as I explained a little earlier, between the Prevent Board and this. The really hard work will be on the threat material that comes to that and the counterterrorism local profile material, which, as I said, is reviewing and changing.

It is not going to be perfect from the beginning and it is not going to change the world overnight because this is a very fast-moving area. We know we will have senior representatives from a number of organisations across London meeting to agree how they will exercise that strategic accountability over the whole part of the Contest strategy, to be aware of the gaps of delivery, to be aware of the threat and to be able to give that prioritisation and action.

Len Duvall AM: Lord Carlile, you mentioned earlier on one of the issues around the Home Office is that there is no continuity of meetings or some of those activities. What advice would you give the London Contest Board about the order of business? What would be the pointers it should be looking for? You mentioned going out and walking the job, visiting some of those issues, if that is possible. Are there any other pointers you think they should be looking at in terms of their overall work programme and some of the issues they should be looking at?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: The first thing they need is to understand what they are doing. Introductory training in what is Prevent is absolutely vital. It is not obvious. It is not something we all

understand just by instinct. Just because we happen to be involved in political life does not mean we understand Prevent. That is the starting point.

The second thing I would regard as important is that people who are on a board of that kind should have some sense of individual responsibility for something, for some aspect of the work. If you run a company, your board of directors, even the non-executives, will be responsible for something like being chairman of the remuneration committee or chairman of the appointment committee. The same principle can apply to this kind of work.

The third thing is they actually need to see the work in action. You do not have to spend very long doing it but you need to experience it, just as I find going out with the police tells me an awful lot about the ethical matrix of police officers, usually in their favour, incidentally, and against popular prejudice.

Those kinds of things need to be done. You need continuity of activity. You need a work programme that really has some momentum of its own so that people feel enthused about what they are doing. You need to have a reasonable timescale in which to be a member of such a board so that you can become reasonably expert. You are all members of the Police and Crime Committee. You all understand, I guess, quite a lot about the police because you have been to lots of meetings and seen lots of activities. That is really important.

Again, this is art, not science. It is doing the obvious to make people have a proper understanding of what is not their job. The whole country is run by a bunch of amateurs, actually, who are advised by professionals, on the whole. Knowledgeable amateurs are better than ignorant amateurs.

Len Duvall AM: That is a good starting point.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): That is us, is it not? Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Would the Board be vetted so that you can have those high-level discussions? Does it need to be vetted?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I could bore for Britain on vetting. I do not think it is a requirement for every member of the Board to be vetted. It is not a requirement for a Police and Crime Commissioner to be vetted. It is not a requirement for a leader of a council to be vetted. It is a requirement of and the responsibility of the machinery of those in public office to be able to speak freely, frankly and confidentially about highly classified material to those in elected positions of power. You need DV level to have unrestricted, frequent access to top-secret STRAP-and-above material. To do this kind of work, nobody needs that kind of access.

Ad hoc use of top-secret material on a pointed basis is perfectly possible for individuals not vetted if you have trusted relationships and if you are *omertà* about the position. That is why the Home Secretary did not require, for example, Police and Crime Commissioners to be vetted and yet they have a statutory duty on Prevent. It is perfectly possible.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I agree.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Lord Carlile gave an excellent set of advice for the Contest Board, which I have written down. If you did all of those things, these are mature, responsible, professional individuals in the public sector and with that knowledge and expertise they will do the right thing.

Len Duvall AM: They were an excellent set of values but I am now going to talk about how reality meets that. Around that table, you have some of the most senior people in London coming together. Some will have a very advanced knowledge and some of them might have a very limited knowledge of it.

What is the strategy to take something like that and implement it in the real world? You have the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime going off on his mayoral campaign at some stage, which will take some time. How do we get to a situation where it is about understanding of other organisations and issues - not just the overall understanding - to add value to this process that is going to be in place for a very long time? The threat is there. We have trundled along and met some of the threats. Some with success, some with not so much success. How do we keep that?

The second issue is trying to keep the continuity of the agenda? Do you allow some flexibility? What is your strategy and what is your thinking? What is the size of this Board, just out of interest? Do we have numbers yet?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Ten to 15 people. You would have the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, the London Council's Executive Member for Crime and Community Protection - a similar size to other boards - the Chairs of the Prevent Board and the Resilience Forum, the Chairs of the Local Authority Panel and the London Safeguarding Board, the MPS, us, the CPS, health and education.

You are absolutely right. In some ways you have answered your own very excellent question. It does rely on a lot of personal commitment from people to make a board like this work. It does require an evening-up of the knowledge base. As you say, very sadly, the reality is that this situation is going to be with us for a generation. Anyone in a senior position like that will be coming into contact with this type of threat and type of area throughout their career.

Len Duvall AM: The London Prevent Board - which I see as the workhorse of the Prevent side of the issue - presumably is going to continue?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely.

Len Duvall AM: That will then feed reports into the Contest Board?

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

Len Duvall AM: That is how we are going to keep the working relationship, avoiding duplication in good time?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely. You heard from Martin Esom and you completely understood what he said. The Prevent Board is strategic, operational and tactical with deep practitioner knowledge. The London Contest Board covers the entire piece and so it is wider than that. It also provides political support and escalation from the London Prevent Board. If the London Prevent Board is finding that there is a rubbing-up into issues of lack of understanding in different boroughs or lack of prioritisation, it can be an escalation point to give that political and prioritisation support to the work of the London Prevent Board. Absolutely, we want to avoid duplication and nobody wants to be in a meeting for a meeting's sake. This area is too important for that.

Len Duvall AM: Do we have any idea of the proportion of work that Prevent would take up of the Contest Board or is this too early? We know people are talking about things now and having to deal with it in real time. What do we think roughly about these tasks?

There is a further question I want to ask about this, but what do you think the focus of the Contest will be over the next three or four meetings?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Prevent is a very big area for all of the reasons that we talked about. It is a big area of vulnerability given the changing nature of the threat and so that is really important. I do not think I could say the exact proportion now.

Protect: there is in many ways much more limited understanding of the protective infrastructure in London, the bits of the critical national infrastructure or the crowded places within boroughs that need protection.

Prepare: we always need to stay sharp, sadly, on our response to incidents when they occur and it is always worth having your contingency plans health checked.

Pursue: because there is so much more of this activity, we will need to be aware of the kind of work the police will be doing so that at a borough level we are able to support that in exactly the way you mentioned earlier with those trusted relationships, "There is going to be an arrest tomorrow. We need your support".

It certainly will need to cover the Ps. Martin Innes made a very good point at your last session that sometimes the gaps between the Ps and the overlaps are not identified unless you bring them all together. You need to be thinking about the shopping centres and the football match days when they hit against other areas of Prevent work. Martin Esom will say there are issues that will need greater visibility and awareness of escalation but maybe one-third Prevent/two-thirds the other or 50-50, in that range.

Len Duvall AM: We know that one of the issues and barriers to our performance in the past - let us not knock ourselves as there have been some problems, but also there has been quite impressive performance - is about openness and sharing. Are the minutes going to be available of these meetings? Are they going to be redacted? Are you meeting in public for some sessions? What is the strategy about sharing and engaging and getting people to understand the tasks that we need to do?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Lord Carlile might have comments on this area.

Certainly, when you look at successful examples of coming together of senior people in this space, they do tend to exhibit two kinds of characteristics. One is that there is a really shared private understanding and levelling of the knowledge base, in exactly the way you have both described, on quite difficult and sensitive areas. Some of that inevitably needs to happen in a confidential space. You would not want verbatim minutes.

Also, we all need to get much better at confidently describing in the public domain work that is going on and the threat that is going on, and to be much more daring about what is put out in public.

If we were to follow Lord Carlile's excellent set of advice to the London Contest Board - getting that training and sense of individual responsibility, seeing the work in action, the continuity of activity and work, and timescales for being involved - it means with that programme of work you are not going to see hugely rich and detailed minutes of what is happening on a month-by-month basis coming out enormously quickly. What you

should be hearing is much more confident language and programmes of activity throughout all of the service delivery organisations in London hopefully coming enormously quickly.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: May we give you an example of something that people need to be confident about? When Crossrail starts running its trains in two-and-a-half years' time, it is going to have 200-metre-long trains. They will no doubt be wonderful trains but the public are sometimes going to worry about getting on 200-metre-long trains because there will be up to 1,500 people on every train. It is a space in which there could be danger. Crossrail has already set out a Safe Trains policy. It is developing it at the moment but it is going to be very public. That is a very good development. The most important thing is that when somebody gets on a 200-metre-long train - I have slightly exaggerated the length but it is very long anyway - they want to feel they have seen and heard enough to know that they are being protected in a proper way.

Equally, although I would not expect very detailed minutes of the Board, people need to know enough to feel that there is a board, that it meets regularly, that the people who are on it are good, that occasionally they are to be heard on the Nick Ferrari [presenter, LBC] programme or BBC London so that it is a public project and that there is a lot of expertise there. It makes people feel comfortable going around their everyday lives as they go up and down the Kingsland Road or wherever they happen to be.

Len Duvall AM: My final question: if there was a major incident again - and sadly that is a real possibility - what is the role of the Contest Board in those circumstances? What thinking have you done around that? Let us say it is an ongoing issue. Is the Contest Board going to meet quickly to discuss issues or are we going to stick to the other existing methods? Is Contest really about the strategic policy direction along with dealing with the outcomes of other forums?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That is exactly right.

Len Duvall AM: That is quite clear and that is the thinking of it?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely. It would be highly appropriate for the Contest Board to take lessons learned from the emergency response to an individual situation. It would be extremely appropriate - in fact, it is one of the benefits of the Board - but it is not an emergency response mechanism.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Just as a vision, on 7 July 2007 COBRA¹ met within minutes. I would expect the Contest Board to do the same and to be there answering, for London, about the response and the measures that need to be taken possibly in an emergency. If, as happened on 7 July 2007, the whole mobile telephony system is taken down, they would be there partly to explain the rationale behind it, hopefully in co-operation with COBRA.

Len Duvall AM: Do you see that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It does not replace the COBRA machinery --

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: No.

¹ COBRA (Cabinet Office Briefing Room A) is the civil contingencies committee.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): -- but the people in those roles would have a role in an emergency response.

Roger Evans AM: We have already heard about some of the resourcing problems that boroughs are experiencing now as partners. Do you think they are equipped to handle the new situation in the future, particularly the boroughs that are non-target boroughs at the moment, which seem to have very little in the way of support?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That is a very good question. We would always all like more resources. The resources are very strained here, both specialist resources and also - back to Fiona's [Twycross AM] questioning - core mainstream resources. Are teachers stretched in meeting training requirements and understanding all the new safeguarding areas they need to be concerned with? You have a very good evidence base that there is a lot of stretch here. I would not want the resourcing issue to be seen just as a counterterrorism issue. This is a wider issue around all the safeguarding and vulnerability resources, training system, the accountability mechanisms, right across the piece. It is a stretch but this is the world that we live in and it is about prioritisation.

Roger Evans AM: Do you think the increased level in working number of partners is going to lead to you identifying more individuals who require intervention?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I would hope so because there is a huge amount of unmet demand.

Roger Evans AM: That is an interesting statement. What do you think the magnitude is of that unmet demand, say as a percentage of what we already know?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Would you like to answer that one?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: No, thank you. It could be a lot. It depends how deep you want to drill.

Roger Evans AM: Twice as much?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Could be. Who can say?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): The Assistant Commissioner put out material in the public domain a couple of weeks ago. You can ask him about that, about the increase in volume of arrests and investigations. The MPS are making around an arrest a day. Certainly they have seen - in their Pursue work - a very big increase in volume.

The nature of the demand - particularly if you are thinking about Prevent and vulnerabilities - is, as we have said, quite different and the opportunities for other kinds of resources to be brought to bear. There is also the family of community relationships and of the school and, as Lord Carlile talked about, the resources of the private sector in tackling online radicalisation. We have to be really innovative here and think big. It is not just public sector money and the activities of those in public sector organisations that are going to solve this problem.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Some of the most effective things are actually very cheap. If I just focus on one because it is worth mentioning, the role of Muslim women in counter-radicalisation is of huge

potential. Most Muslim women are pretty sensible and do not want their sons, husbands and brothers to end up in jail or be killed fighting for ISIS. The cost of bringing women into counter-radicalisation is very low. It is not easy because some can be very isolated. If you can achieve it - and it has been achieved in Birmingham to an extent - it is hugely productive. The cost-benefit analysis is off the screen.

Roger Evans AM: We have talked a little bit about the way the threat has developed from al-Qaeda on to ISIS. Do you have any big thoughts about where the threat is going to go next and what we should be doing to prepare for it?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Two thoughts. The first thought is that there is a dangerous new area of disagreement between various fundamentalist groups. If you take as an example Libya, there are now competing radical groups fighting among themselves because they regard ISIS as presumptuous, and also more successful than they would wish. There is a danger of people being caught in the crossfire, as it were, between rival groups working and recruiting in the UK. That is the first area.

The second area in which we should be looking is the communications piece. Why is ISIS so successful in communications? Why are we not communicating to the same standard as a nation to try to persuade people not to become involved in that kind of radicalisation? Again - and I mentioned women a moment ago - this involves engaging the community. I do have a criticism of Muslim communities - and I am saying something I have said before and so they will not take offence separately for me saying it - which is that there are masses of potential young leaders in Muslim communities, brilliant young people, successful business people, professional people and so on. They do not yet have the courage to lead their communities because those communities are mostly led by people of my sort of age who are not willing to give up their leadership roles. There needs to be a generational change. If we can help as part of the Contest strategy to help them to make that generational change and to potentiate those brilliant young people, we will then see a step-change in community relations and the attractiveness - or otherwise - of radicalisation.

Roger Evans AM: That is an interesting thought. Do you see that becoming a part of Prevent? It would be a massive increase in its role but its potential is there.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is real potential. Let us take education because we have said a lot about education this morning. There are some young Muslim teachers, men and women, who have the potential to lead - and will be leading - education in time to come. We should be looking to them to provide the knowledge and training so that the whole education profession can actually understand Islam in a non-prejudiced way and can understand that actually ISIS trails a terrible heresy. The word 'heresy' is very rarely used in this context but that is what it is. That needs to be exposed.

Roger Evans AM: That is a bit outside my area of questions but it is a fascinating area that we do need to look at.

Rebecca, do you think that Prevent needs to be more transparent? What is MOPAC planning to do about that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): As I have said a number of times today, there is a case for being much more open about a lot of this. We covered examples about how success stories in Channel case studies could be made much more available with more confidence in speaking openly. As Lord Carlile says, leaders speaking on Nick Ferrari, etc, is completely compatible with the private and confidential space to have discussions and to agree appropriate priorities and actions on.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I prefer accountability to transparency in this context. You are never going to be able to open the documents that explain why somebody is believed to be radicalised but you can give a good public account of it. The difference between transparency and accountability is a bit of a nuance but it is quite important in this context.

Roger Evans AM: I understand that. Looking at the outcomes from this whole exercise, how does MOPAC measure the effectiveness? How are you going to measure the effectiveness of Prevent, given that we have already heard it is quite difficult to provide data rather than the case studies?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): At the moment, Prevent activities are all commissioned directly from the Home Office and MOPAC. No Police and Crime Commissioner in the country has that information and so does not carry out evaluation as you describe. If we move to a co-commissioning model - having outcomes is brain-achingly difficult to do, although we have made some steps in gangs - then you would have criteria and data against which you could evaluate.

Roger Evans AM: What sort of measures do you think MOPAC would be using?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): You would really need to do it on a programme-by-programme basis, depending on what activity you were commissioning. It would be a subject that would be very good to return to at a later point once some co-commissioning arrangements have been established.

Fiona Twycross AM: You did mention online activity, Lord Carlile, but I just wondered whether you could comment a bit more about how Prevent can tackle online radicalism and about the borderless nature of the internet that makes that problematic.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: It is a huge question. We have a great ungoverned space out there. At the moment, the running in that ungoverned space is often being made by radicals and, as a result, people are acquiring the information that, for example, led to girls below the age of majority going on what is sometimes called the 'Mulan trail' with, generally, not very satisfactory outcomes, even for them.

There does need to be a strong counter-narrative. A requirement of creating a counter-narrative is to use the people with the greatest skills. For the Home Office, it would represent good value for money if it used - and I use the analogy of the Old Street roundabout - 'Silicon Roundabout' and the young consultants around it to develop these skills. There is an organisation called the Research, Information and Communications Unit and it has got some extremely good people but, if Rebecca [Lawrence] will forgive me for saying so, it is managed by managers in the Home Office and sometimes they are managing to resource, not to results.

I have used the term 'cost-benefit analysis' before. It is very important. The cost-benefit analysis of investing money in the best brains and the best skills for creating that counter-narrative is not readily demonstrable but I am sure there is a high benefit in doing so. This is something that is going to go on for a very long time. The same skills that enable Amazon, for example, to persuade me when I order a book or a CD that I really want the one that is on the bottom of the screen as well, can be used for counter-radicalisation.

Fiona Twycross AM: Equally, it could be used for radicalisation as well. It is being, is it not?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes.

Fiona Twycross AM: One of the things is that the internet is out there but obviously there are social media organisations working within that. In the same way that the responsibility of somebody with a community hall was mentioned in terms of radicalisation, have we talked enough yet about the responsibility of some of the social media companies? The internet needs these vehicles for people to communicate within it. Can Prevent do more to engage with some of the social media organisations to make sure that they take responsibility, in the same way that we would expect somebody running a community hall to?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: If we constantly talk about the social media companies, we will eventually go blind, frankly. The social media companies are huge businesses, they have economies bigger than many nation-states and their attitude is, understandably - and I have some sympathy for this - "We are only libraries. We simply collect information. If countries or nation-states want to tell us to do things in a certain way or stop us doing things in a certain way, they can pass laws to do that. We will then obey those laws". If you look at the report by David Anderson that is now being published, you will see that he has talked to the media companies about communications data and they are more or less saying exactly that. Parliament then has to get the law out and they will obey it.

We can assume that communications companies will co-operate as long as we make them co-operate. If they understand what we are going to make them do, then they will give advice as to how that is best achieved. I do not really think it is realistic to expect more of those companies than that, frankly. It may be a rather cynical view from their standpoint of what their responsibilities are, but they are trying to make value for their shareholders. That is their governing responsibility.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: I will put the questions to you and if you feel you want to give a briefer answer, please do. One of the MPS commanders, Mak Chishty [Commander for Engagement, MPS], made some comments about the need to move into the private space of the Muslim community to identify signs of radicalisation earlier. There were some examples given about changes in shopping behaviour and all sorts of stuff. Do you think there is something in that view? One criticism was that it is a bit hysterical and the Select Committee talked about how a single focus on Muslims was stigmatising. Was that a helpful contribution?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I actually have a copy of his article here. Sorry, I have a copy of the response that was in *The Guardian*; I do not have a copy of his original article.

Actually, I thought it was very balanced and well-evidenced. The types of changes of behaviour he was describing are exactly those changes of behaviour in the Channel guidance that are some of the identified areas of vulnerability. Anyone who speaks publicly about this difficult area risks being criticised by respondents in the newspaper or others. It is part of the reason why a lot of people do not like to speak in public about it: for fear of offending some sensibilities. My personal opinion is he was right, balanced and evidenced.

The point of stigma is quite an interesting one because, of course, this ideology is quite selective in whom it prioritises. This is an ideology and packages of material that are designed to focus on the young, particularly on Muslims or those wishing to convert to a faith. It is a very focused ideology and sometimes we need to be a bit braver in what we say.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: I was just going to say that what Mak Chishty meant was entirely right but there are ways of going about it. I once gave a lecture to a travel agency conference. My wife, who is an incisive lawyer, was present. Rather rudely, afterwards she said to me, "What you told them was if somebody comes into your travel agency and buys a ticket for Pakistan tomorrow and pays cash, dial 999". That was exactly what I had been saying. There are certain patterns of activity that no doubt any responsible shopkeeper would feel should lead them to alert the authorities, but it is not because they are Muslim; it is because they are a shopkeeper. We should be very careful about distinguishing between businesspeople of one kind or one religion and businesspeople of another. These are actually universal truths, if we can identify them.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: That does show how difficult getting the language right around these discussions is. Just to broaden the point, do you think enough is being done to challenge other types of extremism, like far-right extremism? Would you expect people, for example, who are going to take part in the anti-Semitic demonstration planned in Golders Green to be identified under Prevent? Are we forgetting about all the other dangers?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Anti-Semitic activity is of concern but strong communities should be robust about it. As far as far-right extremism is concerned, happily, in this country far-right extremism has been fairly limited. The attention that has been given to it has been proportionate. I would not like to divert resources from much more threatening and imminent threats in order to symbolically say that we are covering right-wing extremism to the same extent. Right-wing extremists, on the whole, broadly, are pretty incompetent.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: I have to agree with you. There was one elected here and --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): He was incompetent.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: -- it did expose that pattern.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: Yes. If you look at the criminal cases that there have been, mostly they have been bumbling and idiotic; whereas you cannot, I am afraid, say the same about the [people who perpetrated both the] Glasgow Airport bomb plot, for example, and [the bomb plot] which nearly killed 200 young women dancing in a club just at the bottom of Haymarket.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: At Tiger Tiger, yes.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: One does have to put the resources where they are needed and avoid symbolism.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: A last question along that line on recalibrations. It is probably true to say that people from outside of the Muslim ethnic communities do not really understand the sectarianism issues around the Sunni/Shia division. That is a whole new area that needs to be explored and understood and explained, sometimes. Do you think Prevent is adapting and coping with that shift that is going on?

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: People are conscious of this division. I have already referred to the infighting among Islamic groups. Perhaps we should just make sure that we are focused on those differences. There is quite a large Iranian community in London with which I have had some quite intense contact. They certainly are very conscious of those differences and are subject to a degree of interception, surveillance and

so on that they find very uncomfortable. The authorities should be equally sensitive to the potential dangers of those divisions.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I suppose the only thing I would add is that the Prevent framework - and in fact the wider counterterrorism policy framework - has actually been quite resilient to changes in the threat. I do not think you would need to change the whole architecture.

Lord Carlile of Berriew QC CBE: No, I agree.

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): It is just an adaption within. In fact, that would be the tenet of my advice for the whole of this discussion: this is about adaption to a framework that, internationally, is widely respected.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: OK. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM: Just one thing. All of this depends on the co-operation of all the various groups who are involved. There are specific groups who will not engage - CAGE, for example - and I suspect that there are other groups. I suspect you have no sanctions against them. Is that right? You cannot force these characters to come to the table or anything of that sort. Is that not a major flaw in the whole concept?

Rebecca Lawrence (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): You cannot get all individuals to engage, of course. In a democracy, you cannot. Where it is public bodies, you can require that and hence things like the statutory duty are actually a big step forward because then you can require all of those spending public money to comply.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We have come to the end of our questions. Can I just thank you both very much?

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM: Indeed.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): It has been a very enlightening and excellent discussion that we have had this morning. Thank you very much.