

Police and Crime Committee – 25 June 2015**Transcript of Agenda Item 4 – Part 2: Question and answer session with MOPAC and the MPS**

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): This next session is with Assistant Commissioner Mark Rowley QPM Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), the lead in the MPS on counterterrorism; Jim Stokley, Detective Superintendent in the Counter Terrorism Command; and Helen Bailey again from MOPAC. Thank you.

We have two sets of questions today and I hope we are going to get through all of them. I am going to ask Members of the Committee to keep their questions short and pertinent. One is to look at some of the work we have been doing about preventing extremism and then hopefully we can have some time at the end to talk about the rollout of body-worn cameras as well.

On the issue of preventing extremism, this is the third session that we have had. We have talked to Lord Carlile, the previous Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation. We have talked to local authorities, which are delivering a lot of the work on the ground. We have also talked to a MOPAC officer with regard to the role of MOPAC.

One of the things that has come across quite clearly both from evidence and from news reports is that Prevent has often, rightly or wrongly, been seen as being very police-led and the MPS has the foremost role in this. The Deputy Commissioner, Craig Mackey QPM, told us that actually you are not and you do not want to be perceived that way. Lord Carlile told us that the police should just do what the police are meant to be doing and not be at the forefront of such as a Prevent agenda. What is the MPS doing to change the perception that Prevent is police-led?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): I agree with the comment, first of all. If Prevent is just about the police, then it is not going to succeed. We can all agree with that.

Some of this is a matter of timing. The way the threat has changed so much over the last year or so means that the fact it was perhaps overly police-centric was less of a problem a year or two ago than it would be today. The fact that the last Coalition Government legislated for the Prevent duty was forcing that point, really, and saying, "Actually, we want all agencies to take the matter seriously".

Of the people we are arresting, 17% are under 20. One in nine is a woman. We have families looking to relocate to Syria. All of these issues are part of a completely different problem that is springing out of terrorism to anything we have seen before. Terrorism was about narrowly defined groups rather than about an ideology of trying to build a cult of people who want to relocate to what they refer to as the 'caliphate'. Therefore, the background means that it is essential.

We have always tried to position ourselves, as the police, as straddling enforcement and prevention. That is not just about counterterrorism, is it? It is in our work on gangs, it is in our work on sex offending and it is what policing is about: enforcement and prevention. In this area we have gone too far from that boundary sometimes and have started to cover more territory than the police should do in the Prevent side, and other agencies perhaps sometimes have not been as focused on it as they might be. That is probably because of history, the different threat and all the rest of it.

We are seeing big changes in that now. We help with some of the awareness training and things that get done with schools and health, etc, and we are seeing more appetite for that. We are keen for them to take on the responsibility for that training themselves as soon as possible because we do not see that as our long-term role.

Fundamentally, we are seeing a change in the appetite for solving these problems together. If we look at when cases arise - let us say young people in any borough in London - the appetite and experience for getting around the table in a safeguarding type of board or a multi-agency public protection arrangements type of board, depending on the age and profile of the individuals, to look at these issues is happening much more routinely now. Across the country we have Family Court proceedings increasingly taking place. Just in the last few months, there have been double figures of cases across the country with whole families of children being made wards of the court because of the risk of radicalisation and travel, and a share of those are in London. We are seeing more and more referrals coming in from mental health and health agencies that are concerned about people who are radicalised and a potential threat, and that enables multi-agency groups to work out how to fix those problems.

We are starting to identify new issues that we need to look at. One thing that has come up recently, for example, is that if some of the family is travelling, we are noticing a significant portion have a history of home-schooling. Therefore, that gives you something to look at with partners: is a proportion of those home-schooled [children] something we need to look at? You start to see these different dynamics that are a much more strong part than we have generally ever had before and we are keen to do our corner of that, so to speak, on the Prevent-Pursue boundary but not to get drawn too far into other people's work.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): The statutory duty on other organisations should, hopefully, assist with it.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): It should help. It was legislated in February when the Bill became an Act and its enforcement date is 1 July 2015. It is pretty imminent. The Department for Education and the Department of Health have been working at a pace to try to get advice and guidance in place across the country and lots of local authorities and trusts, etc, have been wrestling with it. The faster they can move the better, frankly, because this threat is moving so quickly, but we are seeing a real appetite for it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to pick up the issue of the Channel programme and I would like to know how you actually know that this is a successful programme. We know the number of referrals has risen but, actually, the outcomes are less easily quantified.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes. We had a number of referrals. The programme is evaluated by the Home Office and I do not have the latest data to hand, unfortunately. Perhaps we need to get that from them. They have been determined to keep quite a tight grip on this process, which some people may feel is overly central. There are some benefits in it as well, though, in a sense of finding providers that are completely trustworthy in this territory, which is quite difficult. When it was less well-gripped, there were examples where the people commissioned to do the counter-radicalisation type of work turned out to be not the sort of people you would be wishing to spend public money on; let us put it that way.

The fact that there is quite a high quality of vetting and quality assurance that goes on at a national level is a sensible thing to do and probably not something you would want to do in every police force area or every local

authority area across the country. They have some data that the majority of people are positively affected by it and we can perhaps get some more of that reported from them. We certainly do see it as valuable.

Channel is a really critical tactic, but it is only one tactic. It is a programme configured for people who are not currently under investigation and who are prepared to volunteer to go on it. By definition, if you are looking to counter extremism and radicalisation, it would be one cohort of the wider pool. There is a need to look more widely at other programmes and more assertive tactics, perhaps, to counter radicalisation.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You have suggested previously that there might be a case for mandatory counter-radicalisation programmes in order to take decisive action when, perhaps, an individual is at risk. Do you really think that is the way forward for this?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I certainly do. There are two points here. One is having the capability that you can use, and the second one is a question of legislation.

Dealing with the first point, there are already times where one can apply legislative levers to force somebody to attend the programme. Somebody on a community order can be made to attend the programme. Somebody who is unlicensed potentially can be made to attend a programme. The temporary exclusion order as part of that legislation, which is about people returning to the country, can be made to attend the programme. There are provisions that exist, and we have been discussing it with the Home Office and it is building a proposal to create such a programme. It may use many of the same providers but it would have some different dynamics because you are forcing somebody to go through this rather than dealing with a volunteer. I am not an expert in diversion and rehabilitation but that clearly has some different dynamics to it.

The follow-up question, then, is whether new powers are required to reach a wider cohort of people beyond the existing law and that is probably something that will be looked at as part of the Extremism Bill that the Government is thinking about at the moment. We will see where that goes.

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

Len Duvall AM: Can we turn to preventing extremism and the challenge of online radicalisation?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Len Duvall AM: Just before we do that, in terms of some of the judgements, there is legislation now so that you can crack down on where people promote violence and those issues. Just where are we with the Home Secretary's view around moving on from, I suppose, a much more aggressive stance? Is it still on the course where the existing legislation is or is it still promoting new legislation around online extremism?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): I am clearly not here to speak for legislative proposals, but the Government has announced two pieces of legislation that are relevant to terrorism. One is about the data and intrusion issue, which is not the subject of today's discussion.

The second one is about tackling extremism. It is very clear that extremism is a much wider issue than terrorism and should not just be in the context of terrorism. Indeed, in the current climate there are extreme right-wing individuals who are looking to exploit the terrorist situation for their own purposes and to then sow discord in communities with what they do. Therefore, extremism is much broader.

The Home Secretary has said - and I do not have a quote to hand - that these challenges to democracy and to the ease within communities and relations within communities are different to what they have been before and that she wants to legislate to try to tackle those. They are talking about issues such as extremism disruption orders. From a policing perspective, we do see extremism causing challenges in communities. Our powers do not always reach into tackling it. Trying to wrestle with whether we can have more impact on those is, in my view, a good thing to do. The challenge will be defining extremism in a way that captures things that everyone agrees are wicked and does not capture simply strong views. That is going to be the real challenge.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you for that. The Commissioner, giving evidence to the Home Affairs Committee, said that the MPS Counter Terrorism Internet Referral Unit was taking down 1,000 sites a week around that.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Len Duvall AM: In terms of removing material from the internet, not just taking down the sites, how successful are you in tracking the authors of the material?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): In terms of taking it down, it has been around 1,000 a week for the last year. It moves up and down as we have seen it. The way it works normally is with the assent of the publishing organisation. Sometimes they are social media companies, websites or various groups. We try to have a relationship with them wherever possible and say, "We found this material. We think you should take it down because it is encouraging terrorism". Usually, they do.

We have seen the number surge up sometimes when new providers change their stance and get more helpful. Then we see the number fall down sometimes when they start to take it down more automatically without our intervention. That trend of taking large amounts down is continuing. You cannot clean up the internet, and that is just the reality, but you can make it much harder for people to find this material. It is valuable. We also capture evidence, and sometimes there is evidence in some of the really gruesome videos that have come out of Syria. Sometimes there is evidence in that that leads to prosecutions of people when they return to the West. There are multiple purposes to it.

There has been a European initiative recently announced where Europe is looking to build a bigger unit based on our model, which is great. People sharing the load on that can only be positive.

In terms of prosecuting those involved, there are offences in section 57 or section 58 of the Terrorism Act about glorifying terrorism and publishing material. A significant portion of our prosecutions in the last year have been for that and we will do that every time we can. Also, as I say, we are catching this evidentially and material posted online has led to people being convicted of very serious offences in the UK. There was a terrorist called Imran Khawaja who came back to this country last year and, because of material we found online and then subsequent material we found on seizing other devices when he returned to the country, we were able to piece a case together to show really gruesome events that he had taken part in in Syria and Iraq. Policing the internet is a big part of what we do.

Len Duvall AM: In terms of the interactions between the work that we are doing in the UK and the work that will be undertaken Europe-wide, it is more of an extension of closing them down and pushing them to, presumably, the darker side of the net, in the sense of making it much harder for the likes of me to find. If I was determined to find it, I probably would, would I not?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): If you are determined and have some IT literacy and can find your way around the darker corners of the internet, then we are never going to completely clean that up. However, when you look at the profile of terrorism and this reaching into families, vulnerable groups and children, serious efforts can make it harder for them to get access to it. Is it going to stop the determined terrorist who has IT skills and expertise to hand finding it? No, it is not.

Len Duvall AM: OK. We have our UK/London resource doing this work. Is there a case for any work to be done in the boroughs through the Prevent strategies by other agencies other than the police service around online radicalisation? What would that role be and how would you think that work might well be undertaken? Maybe there is not a case. If there is not, then --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): No, this takes you into the territory of the wider public debate and the counter-narrative that argues against those who are using propaganda online to push the view of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) that the caliphate is a great place to live and that this is the correct interpretation of Islam. I am sure we would all share the same view about that. Part of supporting young people and stopping this developing is about challenging that.

There are programmes, many of them in the third sector, which are about trying to raise the skill levels of older people within the Muslim community, for example, to be more able online to challenge those ideologies so that the debate takes place, rather those pushing a corrupt view being the only people occupying the internet space. There are a whole range of ways to think about influencing what is going on in the internet. The police are trying to keep the worst of the material off there and capture evidence. The internet as a debating place on which views prevail, there is all sorts of scope for community initiatives and empowering communities in that space. We can get you the details of some of the charities involved. I just cannot bring the name to hand. I do not know if you have it to hand, Jim.

Detective Superintendent Jim Stokley (Regional Prevent Co-ordinator, Counter Terrorism Command, MPS): No. I was only going to suggest some of the other websites that are online already. There is the Prevent Tragedies campaign, which is a portal for young people - for anyone, really - to look up and to try to understand the issues there. In addition, as Mr Rowley has said, we have done quite a lot of work with different groups; for example, with a lot of Somali women's groups.

It is not just about radicalisation online. It is also about cyberbullying as well and children and young people and vulnerable people. It is about trying to educate, where we can, parents around IT skills as well, and that has been very successful. We have reached over 2,700 families across London with that programme. Definitely, there is a place for it locally as well as at a more strategic level.

Len Duvall AM: One of the things that this Committee is going to grapple with is about the resourcing issues around Prevent and the prioritisation, of course, when you are cutting the cake. Is this not the sort of activity that should be funded London-wide on the basis that crime does not recognise borough boundaries, particularly about radicalisation, around the online issue? Is there a case for some London-wide projects on Prevent to support those working at local level? It may be a case for Helen, but I would welcome your comments.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): If you are thinking about wrestling with individual cases, then you naturally drop into the safeguarding partnership space, which reflects local structures. Conversely, if you are thinking about how we empower certain communities across London, then it would make sense to do it at a London level. Likewise, if we are trying to add extra diversionary tactics and tools beyond,

for example, Channel, and we want to apply some extra effects in London, again, it may make sense to procure those across London in the way that MOPAC is looking to choreograph the procurement of extra support around counter-gangs work. You might want to do the same thing, rather than trying to procure it 32 times.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Maybe it is helpful to say that one of things that we are doing is setting up a London CONTEST Board. That is specifically to make sure that all partners understand what the nature of the threat is, that there is some accountability of the activity undertaken, and that it brings everybody to the table. I take your point completely. I was just checking as you were talking. That absolutely includes the London Safeguarding Children Boards and their representatives, as well as the people from the police and the other agencies who know about these things. That is important.

It might be that what that leads to is some London-wide commissioning, but my view is that London-wide commissioning would be pointless if we did not have the support of all the agencies for the work that it commissions. There is already an existing Prevent board, which has a role around local authorities in terms of bringing them to the table and doing the work on the group. The CONTEST board will link that more with us at MOPAC and provide a bit of political oversight. If we have all those ducks in a row, then it becomes possible to spread a bit of money across London in a way that is beneficial to all of those different agencies.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): If I may make one more point, there is an opportunity to join up different agendas here to everyone's advantage. If we look at bullying and abuse online, if we look at child sexual exploitation, if we look at people being drawn into gangs and if we look at this agenda we are talking about today, there are quite a lot of commonalities that revolve around how people are safer online and how people from vulnerable backgrounds get drawn into making bad decisions and joining the wrong friendship groups or get the wrong influences, and there are some overlaps between them.

It is both inefficient and probably less effective to have several different programmes hitting boroughs and schools in different ways on those different subjects rather than having a cohesive package that is actually about safety and dealing with some of these more complex risk areas. Of course, if I try to put myself in the position of being a head of a school, I might want to tailor which bits of it I use based on the demographics and issues I see in my school, but having a joined-up package I could draw from would seem to be better instinctively, rather than having lots of different products that I am trying to squeeze together and make sense of in the personal, social and health education sessions.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Mark, can I just follow up on that? You have talked about some counterterrorism work on the internet, putting an alternative view of the nature of Islam being a peaceful religion and wrong interpretations being made by extremist groups. We have learned recently, for example, from Charleston in [the United States of] America that right-wing ideology can be equally as damaging. You mentioned earlier that extremism is not just about one sector; it is about all. Does that counterterrorism work on the internet involve you in doing some of that counter work as well with regard to right-wing --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): No. We work with communities in terms of doing some of that empowerment and that challenging. It is one of the areas where, if we stray too far towards trying to come up with the right narrative, then the police suggesting the right interpretation of Islam does not sound like a clever strategy to me, frankly. We can work with community groups, we can empower people and

we can support projects, but us moving that far into the Prevent space is not a clever thing for the police to do.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I was asking you if you know whether that type of work is taking place in regard to right-wing ideologies as well.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Sorry. There is some work on right-wing ideologies. There is not as much radicalisation going on online and it has grown out of some of the old-fashioned groups, some of which is well known were associated with football hooliganism. Some of the names of some of those groups are fairly famous.

The challenge today is that they are preying on the current international terrorist threat from ISIS and using that as an excuse to push a more extreme racist or anti-Islam agenda. They look at events overseas with cartoons and videos and they think, "How can we do this in this country?" They look at protests and they try to create protests in areas with high minority communities to aggravate them. You see all of that extreme right-wing activity going on, which is quite tricky. It is nowhere near the volume or threat that international terrorism presents, but there are some people with violent intent and we have to pay attention to it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Yes. Thanks, Chair. Can I come back to you on the comments you have just made about the London CONTEST Board? At our March meeting, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime told us that he was looking to introduce a CONTEST board to London. When was the first meeting and who are the people? You have talked about it including people from various organisations.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: As well as your commentary, can we have all the information there is about the makeup of the board? When was the first meeting, and how many meetings do you expect to have?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): I do not know how many meetings we expect to have. The first meeting will be next week. I have some draft terms of reference in front of me but I would like them to be approved by the board before I share them.

We are expecting, amongst others, the Chair of the London Resilience Forum and that will probably be a local authority chief executive but I cannot remember which one; Gareth Bacon [AM] with his London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) hat on; the Chair of the London Prevent Board, who is the Chief Executive of Waltham Forest and whom you will know well; and the Chair of the London Safeguarding Children Board; the Head of Counter Terrorism from the MPS, whom I believe may be your good self --

Detective Superintendent Jim Stokley (Regional Prevent Co-ordinator, Counter Terrorism Command, Metropolitan Police Service): That might be me, yes.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): -- and so on. There are a whole range of people from across London who are invited to this. It will look at its terms of reference and work out how it can best discharge the task that it has been set by the Deputy Mayor. I am sure we would be very happy to write to you afterwards and tell you how it has gone and when we are going to next meet.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We will do that. The draft terms of reference have been developed by MOPAC and then are going to this meeting, did you say, tomorrow?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Next week.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That will be the first discussion of the membership on the two --

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): It will be the first formal discussion. Clearly, there has been a lot of informal discussion around the setting up of this and a lot of informal discussion with those partners on the board. Then, of course, we had a hiatus and purdah with the General Election, which meant that we did not have a meeting until now, but we have the first one next week.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): This is a really important step that responds to the Prevent duty and responds to the changing threat. The Deputy Mayor's view - and it is the wider view of the group - is that whilst of course CONTEST is about Pursue, it is about protecting communities, it is about preparing for events and it is about prevention, the CONTEST board initially should focus on prevention, given all these different issues that we are wrestling with and talking about today. That is exactly the right thing and that will help the police do our important corner of prevention, bring other partners to the table and have a more joined-up and effective approach across London.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: OK. Is it too early, then, yet to talk about any sort of risks or any fallout from such a body? Your first meeting is next week.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): This might sound odd from a police officer talking about such a body, but I cannot see many risks from it. I can largely just see benefits of people getting together and wrestling with a problem that is changing so quickly.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Finally, has there been a gathering of similar meetings informally and is that why you are now moving to a formal structure?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): There are various panels. There has been a London Prevent panel. Some bits have been picked up in the London Resilience Forum. There has been some cross-London work and it has had some effect. This is a response to changing legislation and a changing threat and trying to have a step-change across London.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: No, because there is a difference between something that has been created out of a need that has been identified by people already involved and something that has been created because somebody had an idea and put it on a fag packet. You are saying that this is something that, if you like, has grown up organically out of informal discussions and identification by the people sitting around the table that there is a need for this board?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): I do not know the full breadth of conversations that MOPAC has had. I can say from a police perspective that this is very timely and very welcome because we need a step-change in partnership to deal with these new issues.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: That is good to hear.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): If I may just add to that, from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime's point of view, it came out of two or three things. Firstly, this issue about how to get the politicians responsible for the allocation of resources in places - borough leaders specifically, but others as well - engaged with this idea was something that he perceived as a bit of a lacuna from his time as a borough leader. Certainly when I was working in a borough, chief executives were all running around doing resilience work, but there was not much of a role for politicians to understand what it was that was known and understood and believed about their communities. There was that.

In addition to that, as the threat has become more serious, the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor have convened now twice the four major forces in the country to think about how they deal with this issue: West Midlands, Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire and us. This is something that already works well in West Midlands. Therefore, it seemed like a good way to do something which happens clearly on a smaller scale because there are many fewer authorities and many fewer players in that area than there are in Greater London, but to see if we could make something work for Greater London that would wind everybody into a shared view about what the situation was, what we needed to do about it and, therefore, what that meant for activity.

It comes back to Len's [Duvall AM] point. If you want to do something across a big space like London, you have to have all the players engaged and believing that you are doing the right thing in, broadly speaking, the right way or it simply will not work.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We are due to visit Birmingham shortly. They have had this sort of board in progress.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): They have, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: We could ask them about their experience arising out of the boards that they have.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): I am sure you could, yes.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Thank you.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We have come to the end of our questions on Prevent itself, but if we can move to body-worn cameras --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Can Jim slide off? He has something else to do.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yes, of course. Thank you for attending, Jim.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Thank you, Jim.

Detective Superintendent Jim Stokley (Regional Prevent Co-ordinator, Counter Terrorism Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Thank you very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is appreciated.

Tony Arbour AM: This [body-worn cameras] of course was a very popular decision. Can we know who made the decision? Was it from the MPS or was it MOPAC and the Mayor?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): It was both. We have a shared enthusiasm for it. In terms of the final decision, it has to be MOPAC and the Mayor's Office simply because the cheque required has to be signed by them and it does not fit with delegated authorities. If you look beyond who is required to sign off the cheque, so to speak, then it is completely joined. We are both excited about it.

We both think this is game-changing for policing on two grounds and both are equally important. There is the transparency point: actually, we are proud of what the vast majority of our officers do and anything that can add greater transparency to contentious contacts with the public, whether it is about stop-and-search or the use of firearms, has to be a good thing. Everyone welcomes that. The second point is then about capturing evidence. In particular cases like domestic violence, where it is really hard sometimes to prove cases, why would you not try to catch a bit of evidence?

For that evidence and transparency, this is a good thing. There is lots of evidence around the world in small-scale places that this works. We have a developing evidence base in what we are doing in London, and we have started the procurement.

Tony Arbour AM: Can I stop you there? Those things are self-evident, but there will be some people who say, "If you want absolute transparency, why is it down to the individual officer to switch on the camera? Why is it not on all the time?"

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): There are two reasons behind that. The first one is that, in consultation with the Information Commissioner's Office on policy, there is a balance on intrusion and if you record everything all the time there will also be lots of people who will say, "That is over the top. That is too intrusive. That is unnecessary". You have to balance it, and we are syncing our policy with that.

The second, frankly, is a practical point in terms of the cost and volume. If we collect that much material, with the number of servers we will have to buy, when we are looking at every one of our patrolling officers having this, we will spend an unmanageable fortune on data storage. It is the combination of factors: the civil liberties balance point and the cost issue. You need to find a balance in terms of when you use it. We have a clear policy about when it should be used.

Tony Arbour AM: What about the point when I am stopped and we see from the --

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Riding your bike on the pavement?

Tony Arbour AM: When I am riding my bicycle on the pavement, yes. We see from the protocols that the officer has to tell the person who is involved in the incident that the camera is on and that they are being filmed and so on. Should this not be reciprocal? Could I not say, "Why is the camera not on?"

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes, you can. You absolutely can.

Tony Arbour AM: If I say that, is the officer obliged to put it on?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I am pretty sure that is in the policy. I have to double-check but that is certainly our intent.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): He has to consider it.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): He has to consider it. Thank you. It is absolutely in the policy. We have given officers discretion on how widely they use it, but there is a minimum standard within the policy. It is not entirely discretion, but it is really clear that if you are going to stop and search somebody or do a stop-and-account, for example, if you are going to something where you anticipate use of force or it is obviously something where there will be evidential value like a domestic violence incident, then in all of those cases the expectation is you will use it. Clearly, for officers who repeatedly do not, then they are not obeying instructions and that is potentially a misconduct issue.

Tony Arbour AM: If I come back to that point, if the expectation is that it will happen - and you talk about people perhaps being unaware that the camera is on - and if it became a general expectation that it was on all the time, the public would become inured to this, just as the public has in recent years become inured to the completely unthinkable, that armed police officers will be commonplace across the city. Why would it somehow or other be wrong for the camera to be on?

Let us exclude the cost point because, as far as the costs are concerned, I imagine that those are reducing at an absolutely meteoric rate. The way in which information can be stored, the cost of that and the ease of storing that similarly is being reduced very rapidly. Why have you not gone - or, indeed, why has MOPAC not gone - for having the thing on all the time? That clearly does provide absolute transparency.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): I go back to what I said before. I do not think you can dismiss the cost issue quite as simply as you do, but --

Tony Arbour AM: I am a simple man.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): -- the volumes and the costs are very, very significant. We are talking millions and millions.

On the freedoms point, for every moment of a police officer's time to be recorded, the intrusion on the public and the intrusion on the officers is disproportionate and that was our view. We did some consultation on that policy and we also spoke to experts like the Information Commissioner's Office and they were all in agreement. We have come to a balance point at the moment now. Maybe that balance point will change as time goes on, but ubiquitous recording feels very excessive and 'Big Brother-ish' and most people would feel that. Whilst we have had some people make the point you have done - and you are not the only one of this view; I recognise that - it has not been a view very strongly held by large numbers of people.

Tony Arbour AM: I would simply say about the intrusion point that you and I are being filmed constantly as we go about our daily business all of the time and we are unaware of it. The only difference between what is being suggested by me in relation to having these cameras on all the time is that you will be aware that that is happening. Most of us - and I have no idea what happens in MOPAC's offices - are under surveillance all of the time and it does not inhibit me. I simply make the analogy in relation to intrusion of privacy that our privacy is being intruded on all of the time anyway, and most of us --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Then we will have members of the public say, "This is intrusive. I want to have a word with the police and I do not trust them because it is all recorded". It is very difficult.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): May I just reassure my staff? I do not believe they are under constant surveillance in the offices and, if they are, I need to speak to somebody in the Greater London Authority (GLA) about it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Perhaps, Mark, if you just tell us. Has there been a pilot already?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): I understand that the full review is coming out shortly, but what were the key findings of that, the decision or the case for rolling it out wider?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): In terms of the evaluation, we will have some early findings in July and the final thing in September. Whilst we have started the procurement, the actual cheque that we will ask Stephen [Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime] to sign after that procurement process is finished will not be done until after we have those evaluations. Actually, if the evaluation says something startling like, "This is a waste of time", which I am sure it will not, then we will not spend the money. That is the first point. We thought we wanted to crack on with this because I think we can all say it is going to work.

In terms of what it is showing, in terms of some of the headlines, in terms of transparency and integrity, there has not been one complaint. There are roughly 1,000 officers now using it. About a quarter of them are firearms officers. We started with 500 and we extended it at the back end of last year. There has not been one complaint that has gone to a full investigation. The initial investigation has sorted it straight away because the video has shown there is not an issue there. That in itself is massively powerful. If there is clearly a case to answer, then, very early on in the investigation, notices get served on the officer as to what the allegation is. We have not reached that point once on these cases, which is an extraordinary statistic in itself. That is really positive and there are some good stories about how those things are dealt with.

Secondly, we are seeing significant numbers of cases, such as domestic violence, that are going to court with extra evidence. We have had several cases - and there was one very recently - where a completely non-prosecutable case without this has gone all the way through to conviction and it is really powerful. Police officers have all done it and some of you may have seen it on ride-alongs and those circumstances. You turn up at a domestic violence incident and the rawness and horribleness of what is going on is never captured well in a statement. You cannot do it in writing. When this is all presented in an antiseptic way in writing in court and the victim is understandably losing confidence in complaining and the offender is nicely dressed and presents well, the court never really gets the full picture. You present the video of the fear of the person when the officer has turned up at the incident and it is completely game-changing in terms of those prosecutions. We are seeing significant numbers of those, and the evaluation will pull out the detail of it.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I wanted to ask. It did seem a bit rash to start this because I presume the cost is quite high. Do you have a ballpark figure for the cost of training and data storage?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): It is significant numbers of millions. I cannot remember off the top of my head.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am going to not ask you now, Helen [Bailey], because we are in a hurry, but I will ask you for that figure afterwards. It did seem rash to go ahead before the pilot was finished and before you had the ethical guidelines from Lord Carlile [Chair, London Policing Ethics Panel].

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): There is a balance point here. When would this roll out? If we follow this through, it should be rolling out in the first quarter of next year across the roughly 20,000 users across London that we want to do. That is what we are working towards. The sequence to that point is, before we actually complete the procurement process and sign the cheque, we will have the evaluation. That is the first point. We have a policy that we think works. It has been tested legally and all the rest of it. It will get another kick-around with the ethics committee and, if that finds ways to improve it, we will take those on board. By the time we get to January, all of that will have been done.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Before any money is spent, you will have results?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): We will have the evaluation, exactly, yes.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): I know you do not want me to take up a lot of time, but I will just say that in the process we are going through here, there are a limited number of suppliers of these things. The kit is pretty much the kit. Then there is the issue about how it relates to certain kinds of digital transfer mechanisms, ie how you can view it and see it.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I am sorry. I will come back to you, Helen. It is just that we need to --

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): No, can I just finish the point? It will be helpful. Because there are a limited number of suppliers and some things that are variable of the sort I was trying to indicate, it is possible to begin the dialogue leading to a procurement before you have all of the detail about the evaluation.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, I have understood that. Thank you.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes. OK, sorry.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): You do not have to repeat that. Could I ask you, Mark, as well, how these cameras are going to be monitored? Is there going to be access for independent advisory groups (IAGs) and groups like that? Obviously, in other places I understand --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): We have already been using them. Across London we have the stop-and-search community groups, etc. Some of the videos have been used with some of those groups and that is very positive, and we will find more and more creative ways to do that.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I gather that in Merseyside the IAGs and the community safety groups and so on are allowed access to the footage.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes, we are doing that as well.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): OK, great. This footage will not appear on police television shows; it is going to be a limited distribution?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): It is not distributed. The first point is that we are capturing something that might then disprove a complaint or might be evidence in a court process. For material that does not have a value to be kept after a month, the policy says to get rid of it. If anyone has decided it needs keeping, it is kept for whatever purpose. It is not for public viewing, as a general principle. It is material that we have captured for policing purposes. If we start bandying it about inappropriately, then the Information Commissioner will be - rightly - all over us.

That said, in the same way that evidence captured in other situations is sometimes publicised because the public has a right to be informed, sometimes it would be publicised. However, turning it, unedited, into a cheap television show would not be a clever idea and would not be legal.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Going back to Tony's [Arbour AM] point about when to use the camera, presumably, when you do the training, there is going to be a lot about turning the camera on in time to capture the sort of thing that you want to.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes. I do not want to go into technical details and I am not an expert, but there is a really important technical point here, which is helpful. The camera, when you press 'go', already has the previous 30 seconds.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Brilliant. I thought it was either on or off.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): We have heard that with Taser. It is really good.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): What is happening is that it is permanently recording the last 30 seconds and deleting itself and so it is rolling over. That is a really important operation. If I walk up to an incident and do not think it is going to be anything significant and then all of a sudden, "Hang on, there is something wrong. I am going to have to do a stop-and-search", or, "Something is going to happen", then I press 'go' and it has the previous 30 seconds and goes forwards. That is a really useful tool, which plays to the exact question that you are asking. It is helpful that, when I spot this, I have a bit of a safety mechanism.

Tony Arbour AM: Is it only 30 seconds? If it is constantly deleting --

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Come on, Tony.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): We are finding a balance point. It is the same as the previous question. That is the balance point we have found. If the evidence says in due course that 15 seconds will be better or two minutes will be better, we will change it. At the moment, that is the balance point that we have found.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): That is really interesting.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): When are you going to start this training? Presumably there are a lot of officers to train and it is going to take quite a long time to get done.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): We are looking at a different way of doing the training. For the initial training we did, we took everybody off the streets for half a day for the training. We do not think it needs that. We are looking at using technology in terms of computer-based learning. There will

be some briefing of officers. The equipment itself is very simple. You press a 'go' button, you press a 'stop' button, you plug it in when you get back to the police station and it all downloads.

There are two things to spend time with officers on. One is the understanding of the policy about when to use it and the second one is, if they have evidence that needs to be preserved, how they log into the system and do that. We are looking at innovative ways to do that so that we can have the speed of rollout that we all have the ambition to have.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Obviously there is the potential of damaging community relations because there are lots of people, as Tony [Arbour AM] was pointing out, who do not like to be filmed. Presumably officers will get 'politeness' training or similar to this. It will not be a, "All right, I am going to turn on my camera now", sort of business. It will be --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Actually, the evidence is that cameras improve everyone's behaviour.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): I agree, yes.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Members of the public - and I know officers sometimes use it - when someone is getting out of hand, say, "Come on, mate. Calm down", and it has that effect. Likewise, we can all have a bad day, we can all be lazy and we can all be sloppy. For officers, that reminder of, "Hang on, I have to keep to the highest professional standards", is helpful. There is a lot of evidence that it lifts everyone's standards of behaviour, which can only be good.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Just quickly, is it all uniformed officers or is it all officers including detectives who have this?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): The mix will be about how much we give personal issue and how much people have to book out, and it is about the circumstances that we want it deployed into. If a detective is going on some sort of intervention or raid and making some arrests, then you want them to have it, but a routine day of a detective does not merit having it. People engaging in public contact, which may involve stop-and-search, may involve evidence collection, etc, is where you want it. That is where we get to the number of about 20,000. Some will be personal issue, probably, and some will be booked out for people who use them occasionally.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): How have you managed to get the Police Federation on board for this? I recall the evidence we had in recent years when they came. On the one hand, they said they wanted every officer to have a Taser. On the other hand, they did not want body-worn cameras at all, which seemed to me quite an interesting position. How have you got them on board with this?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): I have not heard the Federation's latest position. The officers themselves are so keen on this.

What was really interesting culturally - and I can understand this entirely - was that when we gave it out to the first set of officers, there was a degree of nervousness and thinking, "Actually, is this good for me or is this spying on me?" You can understand any of us would find that quite difficult. I would certainly find it difficult.

It is understandable. Within about two weeks, officers were all getting to the point of, "I am not going out if I cannot have it with me". It changed that quickly because they really thought, "Actually, I am proud of what I do. This helps me do a better job and it defends me against the occasional mischief-maker who wants to make a complaint". The cultural uncertainty tipped very, very quickly, and that is part of the success of it.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: Just to go back again, does it have geolocation? If somebody was filming someone - and I know it is not live and you cannot see what is happening to them - and if something happened, could you try to get help for that officer if they had suddenly gotten themselves into something, as you said, that they might not be expecting?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): For the geolocation, you have the radio and the officer can just press 'help'. There is a button on the radio.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: Fine. I just wanted to check whether it had any of that. OK. If, for example, they were ending up using it where there was a bigger incident, as you say, and possibly they came across something that had happened, does it have an opportunity for storing it? In other words, if you then think that that might form data for a larger investigation into something, is there some way of making sure that that is kept?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): It is kept.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: I am thinking back to what we saw after the riots or other things we have seen in the past --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Absolutely.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: -- and we have been able to review footage, which has been quite helpful in understanding where things perhaps did not go according to plan.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Definitely. Nobody can delete the product for a month and so there is no scope for mischief. That is really important. Somebody has to make an active decision within that month. That active decision is not limited to the officer who recorded it. It might be a detective who has picked up the case that it has recorded. It might be the Professional Standards Department because there has been a complaint about it. Likewise, if you had something of the scale of 2011, then it might be that corporately we say, "Everything recorded on that day we are going to retain until we have had a chance to sift it and look through it". There are multiple opportunities to decide to retain it.

It was interesting watching the MPS documentary on Monday, where there was a stabbing at a community barbecue event. Officers turned up and there were lots of people milling around. Capturing witnesses and evidence in that chaotic initial circumstance is a very common problem when it is at a community event like that or outside a nightclub or whatever. The evidence captured from the officers first on the scene of who is there and what is going on from that will be massively valuable, say, to a murder team or a trial investigating a stabbing in a way that we have never had before.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: Just a final quick question. Jenny talked about officers being polite, but do you think by having a camera it will make the people they are talking to also mind their --

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Yes. I think we all behave better. Officers do use it. I know they do use it and say, "Come on", and that is a reminder, "Come on, calm down, the camera is here". A lot of people do calm down and reflect on their behaviour, which is great.

Victoria Borwick AM MP: We all look forward to seeing how it all develops. As soon as you can come back to the Committee with a few more --

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): A couple of years ago, I saw officers do a stop-and-search and the behaviour totally changed when it was pointed out that they had a camera.

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Exactly.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Yes. The officers were extremely polite. I thought, "These are the most polite officers I have ever seen", actually, and it could have been something to do with the cameras.

Roger Evans AM: Would it be useful for you to develop it so that you had a live monitoring facility, for example, if you had officers responding to a 7/7-type incident or dealing with the disorder that we had in 2011 and you needed a view from the ground at headquarters very quickly?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Potentially, in certain circumstances, yes. The technology will move on at a pace; we all know that. One of the things we are asking in our procurement question of the suppliers is, "How will you help us keep track with technology?" What we do not want to procure is something and we have the 2015 version until 2020. You want a solution that is a bit more agile than that. Over the next 18 months, the technology is going to get more affordable in terms of devices that are live-transmitting. I am not sure of the value of that for every officer, but in certain circumstances I can see a real value in it. Our ability to explore that as that technology becomes affordable will be one of the things we want to look at.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. Can I thank you very much, Mark, for attending today?

Mark Rowley QPM (Assistant Commissioner, MPS): Thank you very much.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): We just have a further ten minutes with Helen, if that is fine with you.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Helen, can I take you back to the cost? Do you have a rough cost that the whole rollout will amount to?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): We do. Because we are in a procurement, I would rather not say what it is because it gives the supplier too much of a hint, really.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Are those figures you can let us have afterwards when the procurement is over?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes, of course. Absolutely.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Presumably you are talking to the ethics panel about the guidelines to try to keep a view of what is going on?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): The ethics panel has a piece of work going on to look at how this should be used. It relates to its work about public encounters more generally. They will take a view about whether or not they should comment on this and exactly how far they will go.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Presumably that will relate as well to - and I have not read it - the College of Policing's guidance on these body-worn cameras?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes. I am sure they would be happy to provide you with it because I have in front of me a copy of their guidance already, which covers a lot of the issues that we have just discussed.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): It is online.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes. For instance, it talks about when it should absolutely not be switched on. For instance, if you are with somebody in a hospital who is being treated, you would not have it switched on. It is clear about when it should be switched on. There are obviously some grey areas and they are what you have been exploring with Mr Rowley. It talks about whether it should be switched on when members of the public ask for it to be switched on. It covers all of those issues and a whole range of other issues related to it. I am sure the ethics panel will also take a look at that guidance as well.

Jenny Jones AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Roger Evans AM: We have some questions for you about the London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF). First of all, what lessons has MOPAC learned from commissioning the LCPF?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): I had a warning you were going to ask me this question. I am not quite sure where to start because when we first did it we were a very new organisation and had very little experience of commissioning. The thing that we are pleased about that worked was that we did it jointly with the boroughs, we made our decisions jointly with London Councils and we invited the boroughs to bid for projects that met their priorities and the mayoral priorities. That clearly has worked and is what has happened, and we have a lot of good stuff going on.

The other thing that we have learned over the year or so since is that this is a process of constant dialogue and evaluation, that things that people thought they would be able to do two years ago when they bid and thought would be the most important thing in their world then may have changed, and that as long as we are not changing the focus of the money entirely, we can change a little bit the application of it. We have been doing that through a process of dialogue and bringing people together and having very hands-on involvement between our folk in MOPAC and folk in the boroughs.

Roger Evans AM: As a part of that dialogue, do you have a process for measuring success?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): We do. This is always a fine line when one public authority is giving money to another. You do not want to create a huge bureaucracy

to check that other people employed on a similar basis to you are telling the truth to you. We do invite them to suggest at the beginning of their bids the outcomes they wish to see. We expect to see some decent certification of those outcomes. If those change, we expect that something else will change too, whether it is the allocation of money or the change of the project. We do look very carefully at that and we have regular dialogue about it.

Roger Evans AM: How do you evaluate value for money?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): We go all the way back to what they said they would do with the money they would have. We go all the way back to the evaluation we applied then, which was pretty rigorous. We looked at the quality of the bids, the match of priorities, the value for money and the number of outcomes that they would achieve from that. If they were good enough to get through, then that was our first benchmark. Then the conversation is about, "Are you continuing to achieve that as we move forward in time?"

Roger Evans AM: Is there an opportunity for you to evaluate the performance of different organisations doing similar work in different parts of London so that you can get some feel for best practice?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes, although we have to be a bit careful, given that we do not commission the work on the ground; the boroughs do. The money goes to the boroughs and they commission the work on the ground. For instance, there are a large number of boroughs doing work on gangs and a large number of boroughs doing work around drugs. Those projects are not exactly the same in all places. We have not done the forensic bit of, "This borough had X value out of it and this borough had Y", but we have encouraged them to learn from each other, to share best practice and to explore the successes with each other.

Roger Evans AM: Can you tell us what proportion of the grants have been awarded for more than one year?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): The vast majority. We invited people to bid for four years in the first instance and to say how that money would be spent across those four years. Most boroughs did that. Some were a little less certain about their subsequent years and that is also part of the process. Our constant communication is to check that what they thought they would be able to deliver in year one, they can. We awarded in 2013 and we expected them to go up to the end of 2016/17, which gives an opportunity for another bidding round next year.

Roger Evans AM: How do you make sure that the boroughs are not excluding smaller organisations? I know my colleague Mr Arbour [AM] thought that there was a potential here for the same organisations to continue to be funded all the time. I am sure you would want to reassure us about that.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): I cannot entirely because we do not absolutely make that decision. We do not force the boroughs to work with particular third parties, nor do we tell them that they must not.

Roger Evans AM: Not at all? You must exercise some sort of control.

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): We have exercised that at the beginning when we have approved the rollout. We have exercised the, "Is this feasible? Is this likely to work? How do you know it is going to work?" kind of test and, as I say, going through the process, we get the

regular feedback. I have somewhere in front of me one of the feedback forms that they fill in and they tell us how it is working. If organisations are clearly not delivering, one of the things that we will suggest to a borough is to maybe stop working with that organisation and to start working with another one.

Roger Evans AM: What about Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) funding? Do you have a clear direction with the health sector for dealing with that now?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): All boroughs are funding some form of drug intervention programme. They are doing it in different ways. At the same time we started doing the commission for the LCPF, the landscape changed around public health. As I recall it - and I have some figures - about 26 boroughs are funding drug intervention in part through money they get from us. Typically, what our money does is to leverage other people's money. What they are doing is taking some money from the LCPF, putting it in a pot, taking some money from the public health budget and funding drug intervention that way. The other boroughs - the other six - are funding it directly from their public health money and are doing other things with their LCPF money. They are effectively shunting the money around, but they are still paying for drug intervention programmes of one sort or another.

Roger Evans AM: Those six are taking that view because it is less of a problem for them or because it is so much of a problem that they have more expertise?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Off the top of my head, I do not know the answer to that question. I would have to rummage through and check which six they were. I suspect it is to do with what is available on the ground and the view of the director of public health and the joint needs analysis in the borough at the time, but I do not absolutely know that sitting here today.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): When we had this discussion initially about the DIP funding, there was some suggestion that MOPAC might need to get in some expertise or could leave the commissioning and that expertise where it was in the local boroughs. Is that what you have done?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Yes. Why reinvent the wheel, really? Now that directors of public health are part of the workforce within the local authority with their staff, they should either have that expertise or should have access to it through the health service. They are using their expertise there to commission the DIP locally. We also spend - it is probably just worth reminding the Committee - about £2.4 million on drug testing in police stations for people who are arrested or otherwise brought into a police station. That is separate from the DIP that local authorities are bringing people into, not all of which may be around offending. They will be funding the offending bit of it. There may be more money spent on drugs than we are aware of because we will only be, through the LCPF, funding that part of a drug intervention programme that is specifically focused around offenders or crime. They may choose to think it is a bigger problem in their area for other reasons and put money into it from other sources. It is possible.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): My understanding is that the indications about those budgets that local authorities have for public health are going to be drastically reduced. That is going to be an issue that you are going to have to grapple with, particularly as we try to shift the agenda to prevention, and the drug programmes are key to that. Is that something that has been highlighted to date with you?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): It is a familiar problem. This is a common problem. We know that public spending in general is going to be under pressure. We have a

range of things that we undertake through match funding and partnerships. We know our own funds are going to be under pressure and we know those of our partners are going to be under pressure. The question and the conversation that we are having around the table as we sit around is how we ensure that vital public services carry on being provided when every single partner is feeling the pressure on its own pocket?

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): You hold a pot of this money. Are you looking at perhaps pooling wider so that it is not just single boroughs but perhaps over larger areas?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Where boroughs are coming to us with propositions of that sort, we are absolutely welcoming it. It would not be right for us to make forced marriages, but where people are doing similar things we are encouraging them to work together, absolutely, yes. We are expecting more and more of that.

Joanne McCartney AM (Chair): Thank you. We have no further questions. Can I thank you, Helen, today as well for stepping in and answering those questions?

Helen Bailey (Chief Operating Officer, Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime): Thank you.