AGENDA

Meeting  Police and Crime Committee
Date  Monday 19 October 2020
Time  2.00 pm
Place  Virtual Meeting

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/london-assembly/london-assembly-committees/police-and-crime-committee
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Ed Williams, Executive Director of Secretariat
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Note: This meeting has been called in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. These regulations permit formal London Assembly meetings to be held on a virtual basis, with Assembly Members participating remotely, subject to certain conditions. The regulations apply notwithstanding any other legislation, current or pre-existing Standing Orders or any other rules of the Authority governing Assembly meetings, and remain valid until 7 May 2021. The meeting will be broadcast live via the web-link set out above. The regulations may be viewed here.
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Agenda
Police and Crime Committee
Monday 19 October 2020

1  **Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements**

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

2  **Declarations of Interests** (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Lauren Harvey, lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4383

The Committee is recommended to:

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

(b)  Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and

(c)  Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).

3  **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 50)

The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Police and Crime Committee held on 16 September 2020 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4  **Summary List of Actions** (Pages 51 - 96)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Lauren Harvey, lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4383

The Committee is recommended to note the completed and ongoing actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee and additional correspondence sent and received, as listed in the report.
5 **Action Taken Under Delegated Authority** (Pages 97 - 126)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Lauren Harvey, lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk, 020 7983 4383

The Committee is recommended to note the recent action taken by the Chair under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree the Committee’s Annual Report for 2019/20.

6 **Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service** (Pages 127 - 138)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Janette Roker, janette.roker@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6562

The Committee is recommended to:

(a) Note the monthly report from the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, as background to the question and answer session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Metropolitan Police Service;

(b) Note the report and answers given by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service to the questions asked by Members; and

(c) Delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any output arising from the discussion.
Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Pages 139 - 140)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Janette Roker, janette.roker@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6562

The Committee is recommended to:

(a) Note the work programme for the remainder of the year, and the additional activity undertaken since its last meeting, namely the informal briefing with the Metropolitan Police Service on the work of its Roads and Transport Policing Command; and

(b) Delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree a letter on the funding and support provided to Safer Neighbourhood Boards.

Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, 11 November 2020 at 10.00am.

Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent
Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 19 October 2020

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

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

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests;  

2.2 That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and  

2.3 That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.

3. Issues for Consideration

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

---

1 The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the ‘matter to be considered, or being considered’ must be about the Member’s interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member’s role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X, the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Arbour AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennette Arnold OBE AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon AM MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament, Orpington; Member, LB Bexley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Bailey AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siân Berry AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boff AM</td>
<td>Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léonie Cooper AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmesh Desai AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Devenish AM</td>
<td>Member, City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Dismore AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Duvall AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Eshalomi AM MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament, Vauxhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Gavron AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hall AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Harrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kurten AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McCartney AM</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alison Moore AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Prince AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad Qureshi AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Russell AM</td>
<td>Member, LB Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Onkar Sahota AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Shah AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Whittle AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: LB - London Borough]

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

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
  (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
  (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority’s functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting UNLESS
- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA’s Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising – namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member’s judgement of the public interest.

3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member’s failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.

3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £50 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.

3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority’s on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here: https://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality.

3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £50, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.

3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member’s judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

4. Legal Implications

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

5. Financial Implications

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Background Papers: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Officer: Lauren Harvey, Senior Committee Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 020 7983 4383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk">lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MINUTES

Meeting: Police and Crime Committee
Date: Wednesday 16 September 2020
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Virtual Meeting

Copies of the minutes may be found at:
https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/london-assembly/london-assembly-committees/police-and-crime-committee

Present:
Unmesh Desai AM (Chair)
Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman)
Tony Arbour AM
Jennette Arnold OBE AM
Siân Berry AM
Andrew Dismore AM
Len Duvall AM
Susan Hall AM
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements (Item 1)

1.1 The Chair explained that in accordance with Government regulations, the meeting was being held on a hybrid basis, with some Assembly Members present in City Hall and others participating remotely.

1.2 The Clerk read a roll-call of Assembly Members who were participating. An apology for absence was received from Peter Whittle AM.
2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 Resolved:

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

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the Police and Crime Committee meeting held on 15 July 2020 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

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

4.2 Resolved:

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

5 Responses to Committee Outputs (Item 5)

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

5.2 Resolved:

(a) That the response from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime to the Committee’s review of MOPAC’s commissioning be noted.

(b) That the response from the Justice Secretary, The Rt Hon Robert Buckland QC MP, to the Committee’s letter on the backlog of criminal cases in the Crown Court, be noted.
6 Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service (Item 6)

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

6.2 The Chair welcomed the following guests to the meeting:
- Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime;
- Sir Stephen House QPM, Deputy Commissioner, MPS;
- Claire Waxman, Victims’ Commissioner for London;
- Lisa Ramsarran, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS);
- Rachel Zaltzman, Deputy Director – Strategy and Policy, CPS; and
- Commander Melanie Dales, Head of Profession (Public Protection), MPS.

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

6.4 During the course of the discussion the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime undertook to provide:
- A response to the Committee’s recommendation made in November 2019 that MOPAC would report back on the impact of revised processes for the disclosure and collection of evidence, including the timeliness of cases; and
- Further information on how privacy issues have been dealt with to enable community monitoring groups to view body-worn video footage.

6.5 The Deputy Commissioner undertook to provide:
- A copy of the protocol that outlines how the MPS and local authorities would deal with unlicensed music events (UMEs);
- Details of the process for issuing the new larger fines in relation to UMEs, e.g. £10,000, and how it interacts with a court process, including information on the appeal process; and
- Information on whether removing social media content can be appealed.

6.6 The Committee also noted that they would write to the MPS with additional questions after the meeting.

6.7 At the end of the discussion the Chair thanked the guests for their attendance and helpful contributions.
6.8 Resolved:

(a) That the monthly report from the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, attached at Appendices 1 and 2 of the report, be noted.

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

(c) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any outputs arising from the meeting.

7 Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Item 7)

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

7.2 Resolved:

(a) That the work programme, as agreed under delegated authority by the Chair of the Oversight Committee in July 2020, and the additional activity undertaken since its last meeting, namely the informal meeting with the MPS in advance of the August bank holiday weekend, be noted.

(b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree an Annual Report summarising the work of the Committee over the previous year.

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The date of the next meeting was scheduled for Monday, 19 October 2020 at 2.00pm.

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

9.1 There was no other business the Chair considered urgent.
10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting ended at 12.40pm.

Contact Officer: Lauren Harvey, Senior Committee Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 4383; Email: lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk
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Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Agenda item 6 is a question-and-answer session, our main item of business, with the Mayor’s Office of Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). I would like to welcome our guests: Sir Stephen House [QPM], Deputy Commissioner, MPS; Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime; Claire Waxman, Victims’ Commissioner for London; Lisa Ramsarran, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), Rachel Zaltzman, Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS; and Commander Melanie Dales, Head of Profession - Public Protection, MPS.

We have a number of questions grouped into different sections. The first section is questions relating to rape and serious sexual offences. I am going to start off and then hand over to my colleague Jennette Arnold [OBE AM].

My question is to both the CPS and the Deputy Commissioner. There have been some grim headlines over the summer in relation to the issue of rape and serious sexual offences. As I said, my colleague Jennette Arnold [OBE AM] will be asking questions as to how we go forward, but can I ask you the scene-setting question?

Referrals from the police to the CPS have fallen 40% since 2016/17. The fall in the number of cases prosecuted by the CPS is even more marked and the number of rape convictions fell by 50% in the period 2017-2020. What has gone wrong? What is going wrong? If I could start off with the representative from the CPS, Rachel?

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS): Yes, I am happy to come in on that. First things first, it is important to say that the CPS considers rape to be an abhorrent crime. We share the public’s concern about the growing gap between reported rape and criminal justice outcomes and we are committed to playing our part in addressing this disparity.

The latest figures, which we published in July [2020], show an increase in the proportion of cases being charged but it is clear that there are still too many cases dropping out the system. There is no single reason for this, and we know that we need to fully understand the problem in order to tackle it effectively. That is why we fully support and are actively involved in the cross-Government review into how rape and sexual offences are handled.

We are also committed to making progress in the interim while the Government continues this important work. That is why we launched Rape and Serious Sexual Offences (RASSO) 2025 in July [2020], which is our five-year strategy for delivering the improvements that we all want to see. It includes a raft of measures to improve joint working with the police, improve support for victims, comprehensive training for our prosecutors in particular to ensure they understand the changing nature of these crimes, and it includes our commitment to ensuring that our specialist rape units are fully resourced.

A few examples of the sorts of work that we are taking to drive improvement and turn the trends around include launching a consultation on our rape legal guidance next month --
Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Sorry, we do have questions coming up. Sorry to interrupt you. What I wanted to do was set the scene in terms of what has gone wrong. I do apologise for interrupting you. You said there is no single reason. It would be good to have at least one or two reasons because you are talking about the way forward, which is what my colleague Jennette Arnold [OBE AM] will be asking you questions about.

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director – Strategy and Policy, CPS): OK, no problem. As I say, there is no single reason, but there are a range of factors that we are looking at for the drop that we have seen over the past decade.

First and foremost are resources. Our [Her Majesty’s Crown Prosecution Service] Inspectorate (HMCPSI) in 2019 found that 51% of our rape units were overstretched, while it did find that the rape prosecutors in those units are deeply committed and highly professional.

Disclosure is a factor. In 2019 we saw a change in approach to how rape cases are handled by the police and the CPS in relation to disclosure.

We have seen an explosion in digital evidence, which has increased the amount of resource that we need to put into these cases and also increased the complexity of these cases.

I would also point out that we have not seen, in terms of a single factor, uniformity across the country. If you look at police force level data, there is a range of factors and when we come on to Jennette’s [Arnold OBE AM] questions about the London data, Lisa [Ramsarran] may highlight some areas where London is bucking the trends that we are seeing.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you. Deputy Commissioner, your perspective? Again, to repeat, my colleague Jennette Arnold [OBE AM] will be asking questions about how we go forward.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Thank you for the question. I would have to - and I will not - repeat much of what Rachel [Zaltzman] has said in terms of a multitude of issues. Resourcing is certainly an issue. The extra officers promised by the Mayor and the Government and arriving now are welcome.

Disclosure was a major issue for the police service. Probably about two to two and a half years ago we saw significant changes in relation to disclosure and we have been through a huge learning exercise since then across the organisation to comply with the new expectations on disclosure on all cases, but with particular relevance to sexual offences and to rape in particular.

The final one that Rachel mentioned is data, which is easy to underestimate but the average London household is estimated to have ten digital devices. It is important to remember that most rape investigations are not about stranger attacks; they are a relatively small percentage. The vast majority are relationships that are ongoing or have gone wrong in some way, shape or form. That means that there is a digital history and a digital track record between the two individuals in the sexual assault, which means we have to delve into a lot of digital data. We are working now with a recent court ruling, which gives us a greater definition and a more helpful definition on what is reasonable for us to look at because there has always been a problem with parameters on the data that we have looked at. The narrower the parameters that we can get agreed with our colleagues in the CPS and the courts helps us speed up the investigation, helps us with disclosure and gets cases to court quicker. Getting cases to court quicker, as we all know, is one of the key factors in keeping the victim supported and on board with the prosecution. Speed is important in these instances and we are working to try to be as quick as possible.
I will leave it there, Chair, because I know that Assembly Member Arnold wants to ask some questions.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** For my question, can I go straight to the CPS and address my questions to you, Lisa [Ramsarran], so that the figures that we bring out are about London? We just heard your colleagues speak of the numerous issues that are at play here. It does not fill your heart with joy to hear there is no single issue, just this whole heap of stuff that has to be dealt with.

Rachel [Zaltzman] has mentioned your five-year blueprint for addressing the fall in rape prosecution. How will this help the many victims who have been denied justice, many of them for over two and a half years?

Last week I was on a call with a young lady who called me and was sharing with me her sense of total frustration about the fact that she has not been able to live her life because she has been left in limbo for over two and a half years. She said she knew of many. I will pick that up with the Victims’ Commissioner [Claire Waxman] later because I contacted her office.

How will your blueprint help those people who are now stuck in this hell, waiting for justice?

**Lisa Ramsarran (Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, CPS):** The RASSO 2025 strategy sets out a number of measures and aims that we would seek to put in place as an organisation, and certainly in CPS London we had been doing a lot of work prior to the publication of the strategy to try to unpick some of the complex issues that my colleague has identified.

We have been through a joint rape implementation plan where we have been working collaboratively with the police since last year [2019]. We have put in measures to try to support police officers at the earliest stage of the investigation. We have created a number of early investigative advice surgeries where our CPS prosecutors are going down to police stations and speaking directly with investigating officers to try to identify and provide legal input into cases at the earliest opportunity so that those reasonable lines of inquiry can be identified at the earliest stage. By doing that, we hope to see - and indeed we have seen already - that that will assist with reducing delay in the overall time it will take for that full investigation to be completed and then referred back to the CPS for a charging decision to be made. Certainly, that is one of the measures that we have sought to pursue.

We have also worked very closely with our police colleagues in our rape implementation plan to ensure that we are looking at those investigations that are in the system and perhaps have been in the system for some time. We are looking to try to unpick some of the delay around those cases and make sure that we have clear lines of escalation between our legal managers and senior officers so that investigations are progressed in a timely way and are resubmitted back to us for further consultations.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Can I come back to you? Can we be clear where the blockage is? It is my understanding in some of the cases that I have heard of that the case is with you, the CPS. Is it that you are not running enough courts? Is it that you, the CPS, does not have the resources? I understand in the past we have been told that it was police officers who did not get their cases together. Now we have this bulge of people who, as I say, are hanging in hell, waiting for their day in the court. What can you say about that?

**Lisa Ramsarran (Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, CPS):** When we talk about delay, it is important to be clear about what stage the case has reached. There will be cases, when we are looking at a broad spectrum of investigations, that are still under investigation and are waiting to come back to the CPS for a charging decision. Equally, there will be cases that are with the CPS and are waiting for us to make a
charging decision. Then there will also be a number of cases that have been subject to a positive charge decision and have entered the criminal justice system and, therefore, they may well be waiting for a trial date to be heard.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** The Justice Secretary [The Rt Hon Robert Buckland QC MP] has announced a plan to boost capacity across criminal courts to deal with the backlog of cases built up during the COVID-19 lockdown. What is the current position for rape and serious sexual offences in London?

**Lisa Ramsarran (Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, CPS):** We have been working very closely with our colleagues in Her Majesty’s Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS). The listing of cases is a judicial function, but we have been making sure that our cases are trial ready and making sure that we are liaising with our colleagues in HMCTS to identify those cases where they have vulnerable victims, as many of our cases will have, and to make sure we are passing on details of those cases where we are satisfied they are trial ready and where we suggest they could be listed for trial. We are having that ongoing liaison with our colleagues in HMCTS.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** From your perspective and from your service’s perspective, then, do you have confidence that the backlog will start to significantly reduce by all of these measures and all this talking and all this collaborative working that is going on?

**Lisa Ramsarran (Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, CPS):** The issue around the court’s capacity to list the cases is quite complex. We are one part of the criminal justice system. As I say, we have been working very hard within our RASSO units to make sure that our cases that are ready for trial are well prepared. We are making sure that we pass on details of those cases that we feel are ready to be listed to our colleagues in HMCTS.

We have seen over recent weeks that the courts have been identifying and listing a number of our RASSO trials. That is a very encouraging sign over the over recent weeks, and I am confident that that will continue.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** If we want to seek further clarification about that, what I am hearing you saying is that now there needs to be a significant push and opening up within the judicial function. Is that for us to go back and ask the question about how much longer to the Justice Secretary [The Rt Hon Robert Buckland QC MP]? Is that what you are saying?

**Lisa Ramsarran (Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for London North, CPS):** The position is that the CPS plays but one part in the overall justice system. I have outlined the actions that we have been taking to make sure that we are trial ready on the cases that we need to be trial ready on and that we are liaising with our colleagues in HMCTS and indeed the defence to make sure that we are identifying those cases that we would wish to see listed as a matter of priority. However, there are wider questions and issues around the listing of cases as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Thank you. Can I put my last two questions to the Victims’ Commissioner for London?

Claire [Waxman], can I firstly thank you and your office for getting back to me so quickly regarding the willingness for you to receive this referral from the latest contact that was made with my office?
It is fine that we are sitting here talking about systems and structures and we have been talking about this for so long. Your job was created because of work that was previously done by this Assembly in terms of the heartbreaks and the horrors that we heard from victims.

Do you think that the revised guidance on accessing data held on victims’ phones will make victims more willing to pursue their cases and co-operate with the police, and also given that the information is out there that if they come forward they are going to be held in limbo because the system is not working to progress the cases that we are supposed to be dealing with on their behalf?

Claire Waxman (Victims’ Commissioner for London): Jennette, let me come back to the first point around information on mobile phones. While there has been a lot of work that has been taking place between the police and CPS on the National Disclosure Improvement Plan to try to improve that, what is actually happening on the ground, as we are seeing and I am hearing too regularly from victims and survivors, is they are still having their phones requested and disproportionate amounts of information being looked at. That is having an impact on victims’ confidence about staying within the system.

The Government is trying to address this in its end-to-end review. There is a forensic working group through the national end-to-end review of the Government trying to look at the recommendations that came from the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO), which is what I called on to look specifically at the amount of data that is being requested. That report came in June [2020] and so we have not seen any changes as yet as a result, but I know that the police and the CPS and the Government are working on that review and how to make a change to what is happening to victims on the ground. That is a longer piece of work. It really needs a whole-system approach to really make a difference.

For the victims and survivors that you and I speak to now every day, it is still an issue but less so than what we saw over the last two years. The pendulum has shifted a little bit. There is a lot more from the MPS perspective of trying to push back with the CPS and making sure their reasonable lines of inquiry are being followed. As we saw in the HMCPSI report in December [2019], the CPS was requesting 40% with disproportionate requests and so that is having an impact.

That work is very much ongoing. I am really pleased that the ICO report came out in June [2020] and I hope that all partners, the CPS and the police will work really closely together on ensuring that there are real improvements in that area.

On the second one, you were talking about delays and how that impacts. As Lisa [Ramsarran] was saying and as my London Rape Review clearly identified, it is not one reason. There are a number of interrelated reasons as to what is causing delays. First of all, once the victim reports to the police, the delay was between the police and the CPS. As Lisa has mentioned, because of the London Rape Review and all the work that has been happening in London, they have set up these early investigative advice surgeries and we are seeing an improvement. When I work with the Government on the national end-to-end review, we are looking at London as best practice in this case. I hope that we will start to see that reflected in better numbers and fewer delays.

What also caused the delays, though, is the requests for the mobile phone data and third-party material. The third-party material needs tackling because, as the police know, they can wait six months and that will delay an investigation because they are not getting the medical records or social services records. That was a recommendation from the London Rape Review, and it is very much down to the MPS to work also nationally because it is a national protocol that will resolve that issue. Then we have a number of other issues that create delays because police need all that material from the phones and from the third-party material and that is what is adding to all the delays.
Then, if they do get to court, unfortunately there was a backlog before COVID and COVID has only exacerbated that. I had a rape survivor only last week who was due into court after two and a half years. It was pulled the week before and then is not going in until next June [2021]. That will be close to four years from the time of report to court. The reasons lie very much - and I would welcome your support - with the Justice Secretary [The Rt Hon Robert Buckland QC MP] because that is the fault of the HMCTS and it is coming down to Perspex screens, which for some reason the courts have not set up yet. I could get someone in to do it in a day, potentially, and so I do not quite understand why it is going to take till next June [2021]. We have lots and lots of issues throughout the entire system that unfortunately impact victims and survivors.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Four years is unacceptable, and it is just heart-breaking. It shows the worth of this meeting because I am sure my colleagues will join me in asking the Chair offline if we can think of something that we have to do.

Can I lastly ask the Deputy Commissioner? We know that there have been improvements in terms of the MPS’s response, but can I get clarity from you? What can you do or what are you doing in terms of the support that you give to victims? You are the first, if you like, agency that they meet and that relationship is so important. Do you have any relationship with people who are in the system for two and a half years or three years? Some, as Claire [Waxman] said, will be in for four years. How does that work?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** We absolutely do. Thanks for the question. We absolutely do have a relationship with people, but we could all react with dismay and a bit of horror, frankly, and shame that it takes four years to get to court in cases as serious as this.

I hope I do not have to say to anyone on the Assembly how seriously the MPS does take rape and serious sexual assault with a huge amount of resources. It seems anodyne to say it but I want to. It is in our performance framework to speed up cases and to improve our detection rate, which is far too low. We know it. Even our aspiration, which is 10% detection, is very low, but we have to bite this off in small chunks to try to improve.

We have heard from colleagues from the CPS. We are working ever closer with them. We are making progress. It is good to hear that London is being looked on as best practice in some areas. We have had our difficult times with disclosure and with COVID.

Much of what I wanted to say - a lot of it - is related to COVID. We had a huge bulge. I am sorry to use the phrase, but this is a pipeline. I do not mean that to be inappropriate or callous, but it is. It is an interlinking system that forms a pipe. COVID has put a bit of a blockage into the pipe. Because there was a reduction in the number of cases coming forward, we were able to spend more time looking at the cases that were under investigation and we pushed a lot more through the pipeline more quickly. We have not had any increase in the numbers that we have no further action. We have stayed consistent with our targets on that, but it has created a big workload for the CPS. Frankly, they seem to have coped with it pretty well, but it is now waiting for the courts. I will not comment on that because Claire [Waxman] has done that far better than I would be able to do.

To go back to your question, we are the first agency that responds and that meets them. I would reflect back on five, ten, 15 or 20 years and on how the police used to deal with rape victims or in fact did not deal with rape victims. We are in a completely different place now. We give a lot of training to our officers. We continually refresh that training. Officers from the specialist units stick with the victims and the court cases throughout. It takes far too long. There is a pressure. There is no doubt. If someone is waiting four years,
that is four years of victims who have also come into the system that our officers’ workloads have to take on board. Our officers’ workloads on our safeguarding teams are far too high and we know that from previous investigations and inspections. We are trying to reduce that but it is a matter of resourcing again, Jennette, and making sure that we are trying to cover a few bases. We have targets in there to improve. We are working very closely with the CPS to improve. We are making decent progress. There is a lot more to do.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Thank you for that. I myself and maybe one or two - Assembly Member Arbour and Assembly Member Pidgeon [MBE] - have been at the forefront of working with the MPS. You are quite right. You have climbed a small mountain in terms of where the shift has taken place in terms of the MPS’s response to this very serious crime.

Can I say thanks to the witnesses whom I have asked questions to you and to say that I will be speaking with the Chair after my colleague Caroline Pidgeon [MBE AM] has put some more questions? I do believe that there is some more work that we have to do because we have to on behalf of those victims out there who are in an absolutely unacceptable position. We have to keep pushing and urging and seeking their day in court. Thank you, all.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Thank you very much indeed. While we are talking a lot about process here, it is right to reflect back that this is about individuals and the impact this is having on their lives and not being able to move on because of the huge delays in the system.

I wanted to pick up with the Deputy Commissioner. One of the issues that historically has been a problem has been digital forensics and you may recall I have asked you about this before. Can you provide an update on what work is being done to reduce the time it takes to process digital forensics? Particularly back in March [2020] I was told the MPS was working to enhance and embed digital forensic awareness and skills in all new recruit pathways. Can you give us an update on that work as well to make sure it is rolled out across the MPS?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Thank you. I will say at this point I am going to hand over to [Commander] Melanie [Dales], who will give you a little bit more detail on some of your questions. You are right to remind us that this is about individual cases. We are putting more effort into acquiring the right technology to deal with the digital material that we are dealing with as quickly as possible.

The problem is - I am sure we will all appreciate this - as much as we bring in new technology, which of course we have to acquire through public sector processes which takes some while to do, all the while we are doing that, mobile devices are increasing in the amount of data they store and we are dealing with growing mountains of data not diminishing amounts, which is why the ICO report and the recent court case is so important. It allows us to define down the level of data that we need to look at.

The one thing that has not been mentioned so far and it does need to be mentioned. There is another factor involved in this court process and that is the defence. So frequently the CPS will come back to our officers and ask us for more information and we think, “Why are they asking for this?” The reason is they are trying to win the court case. Their role in life is to achieve successful prosecutions and they are responding many times to what the defence is asking for. The defence needs to be bound into a reasonable approach to this as well. If they are not, the system will not move forward.

I am going to pass over to Melanie, who can talk you through some of the stuff we are doing in relation to digital awareness.
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you. Melanie, could you also address for me the issue of the booths and the equipment you are installing at police stations for the initial trawl and then also what is happening at the labs? There have been some issues with accreditation for your forensic laboratories to be able to retrieve the data that is buried.

Commander Melanie Dales (Head of Profession - Public Protection, MPS): Yes, no problem. Thank you for taking the time to let me answer the question. It is really topical for me at the moment. I have been spending the majority of my time since I arrived in the MPS looking at this very issue because it is a huge one for victims and survivors of rape and serious sexual offences.

If I break it down into two types of digital data, there is a digital table that people allow us to retrieve and that they give us passwords for and there is the digital data that people do not allow us to retrieve, which we have to seize and look at.

The latter of that, the ones we are not given access to, are the ones that generally have to go to the laboratories. There have been issues in relation to timeliness, how we get the information that we need in a timely manner and how it is put into a package ready for a court process. We are currently in the process within the MPS of reviewing that contract and looking to re-procure the service in relation to ensuring that we reduce the timeliness of the forensic retrieval. At the moment, we have reduced it. It has gone from 12 months average down to nine months average and so there have been some successes. The conversations we have already had this morning pivotally show how impactful this is on our victims and survivors and so we must try to reduce it further. That is one aspect that we are doing in relation to the re-procurement of the contract.

Internally, we have a new safeguarding course and at the very heart of that is how we manage the data that we can get from people’s phones and other software when they do give us access. That is where the kiosks and the booths come in, we are just about to go live in October [2020]. We are putting our sexual offences investigative trained [officers] into the Havens. Within that, work is ongoing currently to put the forensic booths into the Havens as well, with the view being that when we get a victim survivor coming to the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, we can at the same time do that forensic download of their phone and then give it back to them at that time. That will hopefully then start to speed things up. That is something that we are looking to start and do and we are currently scoping the feasibility of that.

In relation to the wider investigations as well, we are also currently scoping with the head of digital works for the MPS about how we increase the availability of kiosks and booths throughout the MPS for investigators to use. That is the work we currently have ongoing.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Fantastic. Thank you for that detail. This is something we have looked at before and it was raised with Members when we did a visit to Brixton that this was causing a delay. You have it down from 12 to nine months. That is nine months way too long. We really need to get this down. I realise it is very technical, but we really need to reduce that.

For my next question can I ask the Deputy Commissioner? Thank you for that, Melanie. It might be useful certainly, some Members are particularly interested in this - to maybe get a more detailed briefing at some point on where you are with this.

Deputy Commissioner, could I just ask you about your digital data extraction forms? They were withdrawn by the National Police Chiefs’ Council (NPCC) following a ruling from the ICO. Are you aware if the NPCC is going to issue a new national consent form for mobile phone data?
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We are bringing it out at the moment. We have it and we are starting to use it now. It is in line with the ICO and, therefore, we hope, a much more fit-for-purpose document, which I am sincerely hoping victims will find easier to process and go along with. It will be a lot less intrusive. It will be better for the whole system in terms of the CPS and for the courts as well. Yes, we are rolling it out now.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Lovely. Thank you. Can I ask you and also the CPS? I do not know whether Rachel [Zaltzman] might want to answer this one or Lisa [Ramsarran]. You have already talked about some things you have been doing to improve the process, these surgeries so that you can look at a case early on and so on, but what other measures do you think you could put in place to ensure cases are brought to justice more quickly and that we increase the numbers going to court as well?

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS): I will come in on that and talk about the work we are doing on the joint action plan. In response to the Inspectorate’s report in 2019 the police and the CPS committed to developing a wide-ranging national action plan to address some of the issues that the Inspectorate had identified. We have touched on some of those this morning. The London Victims’ Commissioner [Claire Waxman] mentioned the disproportionate action plans, for example, and that is one of the areas that we are picking up.

We have been working for the past few months with the police to develop a draft action plan, which we will be publishing in October [2020] for consultation. It identifies 20 areas where we have already put task-and-finish groups in place to drive improvements. They range from some of the initiatives that are already taking place locally. Lisa [Ramsarran] has talked about the early investigative advice surgeries, which is one of the ways that we are seeking to improve the relationship and the dynamic with the police. We also have in some of our areas gatekeeper models where police are situated within CPS areas so that they can have day-to-day contact with prosecutors to improve case builds. We have commitments to joint training, for example, in the offender-centric approach and in trauma training. We have areas to improve communications with victims. We have committed to developing a digital walkthrough to make it very clear to victims the different stages that they need to go through and the different interventions, for example, what will happen to their digital information.

We expect this work to take place over the next three years to enable us to pilot new approaches, to evaluate them and to roll them out nationally.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Deputy Commissioner, do you have anything to add from your side on the measures you would like to see implemented?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We do not have anything specific to add to that. We are engaged with the CPS on the joint action plan. We will do anything that we can within the resources we have to speed things up. We have a target to speed up. Our aspiration is that no more than 15% of cases are over one year old. At the moment, I am afraid 32% are over one year old, which is underlining what we have been talking about.

We have covered the forensics data issue, which is massive for us. I would re-emphasise - and [Commander] Melanie [Dales] mentioned this - the procurement side of it. We are constantly looking for software that will do this sort of searching and tabulating quicker and more accurately for us. We can pilot it, but before we roll it out, we have to procure it along public sector guidance. Although we work closely with MOPAC to do that as fast as possible, it is not a quick process. That does slow us down.
We talked about the courts. I will not mention that again.

The other one, I am afraid - and it was mentioned very early on by the CPS - is about resources. The same units that deal with much of the sexual offences and rapes are also dealing with domestic abuse. We know there is a very strong link between the two of these, in many cases anyway. As I said, most rapes are not stranger attacks. We are looking purely at volume and resourcing in that respect. We are fully engaged with the CPS and we have targets to continually improve what is, at the moment, not an acceptable performance as far as victims of rape are concerned.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** To all of you - and I am going to start with our Victims’ Commissioner - do you welcome the decision by HMCPSI that it will undertake a joint inspection with Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services, which will allow it to look in detail at some of the cross-cutting issues that impact rape cases?

**Claire Waxman (Victims’ Commissioner for London):** Yes. I called for it on the back of the London Rape Review. One of the reasons why it is happening is because I kept writing and pushing for it. As I knew, the HMCPSI inspection that happened in December [2019] was only looking at one part. As we heard today, what is really impacting victims is that go-between with the police and the CPS. They are stuck in the middle and these cases get stuck in limbo. It is absolutely important that we have a joint inspection so that we can actually see what is happening in the interplay between the police and the CPS. I am involved in the joint inspection and scoping it out at the moment. I absolutely welcome it.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Wonderful. Thank you. The CPS, Rachel?

**Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS):** I would echo what Claire said. Our Inspectorate carried out its work last year [2019] and it acknowledged that it could not answer all of the questions that it had been set, partly because it was only looking through one end of the telescope, if you like. That dynamic and that back-and-forth between the police and the CPS is absolutely crucial and so it needs both Inspectorates to work together on this. We are also working with them to finalise the terms of reference.

So that colleagues are aware, it is planning to do its work in two phases. The first phase will look at pre-charge, that work has already commenced and will report in April 2021. The second phase will look at the post-charge piece and will engage some of the issues that we have talked about this morning in terms of the journey to court, and that will report in November 2021.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Thank you very much. Deputy Commissioner?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, of course, I echo the comments and I am pleased that that Claire and Rachel are both involved in setting the terms of reference, so long as it looks at solutions, so long as it looks at the cost of doing what they are recommending and so long as it looks at resourcing. The issue continually with inspections is that they will come and look at a particular issue and it is not as good as we want it to be and we need to do more. That is fine but there is a resourcing issue. We have all acknowledged it and it needs to be acknowledged in a report as well so that we can make practical steps and not set up things that we just cannot meet in terms of expectations. A whole-system review is absolutely the right way to go as far as we are concerned.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Deputy Mayor, I am sure you are supportive of that as well. Could I ask you a couple of specific questions?
We did some work on the Committee looking at rape and sexual offences in 2019 and we wrote you in November [2019]. We have one outstanding action from you. Will you provide a response to our recommendation made that you report back to us on the impact of revised processes for the disclosure and collection of evidence, including the timeliness of cases?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Apologies. I did not realise we were outstanding on one of those actions. I can send you a formal note on that. You have picked up a lot of the issues today in terms of forensics. I can get back to you on that.

In terms of some of the discussion today, it is really important - Claire [Waxman] has talked about it and others have talked about it as well - that the delays existed before COVID and that COVID has exacerbated them. The issue that the Deputy Commissioner [Sir Stephen House QPM] has been picking up on, resources, we cannot overlook. It is resources across the system from victim support and the support the victims get, to the policing, to the CPS and to the courts. One of my concerns is that the huge backlog in the court cases that we have at the moment are not going to be properly addressed unless there is an injection of capacity, will and resources. The Nightingale courts that we are seeing set up I am not sure at all are there to take cases such as rape and serious sexual assault. We really need to make sure that part of the process of dealing with the court backlogs picks up these more complex and difficult cases so that those victims, like the victim Claire talked about, waiting for over four years are not left to wait in what Jennette [Arnold OBE AM] quite rightly says is like a living hell.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you for that, Deputy Mayor. I wanted to take this opportunity to ask you about the domestic violence charity Sistah Space, which is a pan-London charity offering specialist services for black and Afro-Caribbean women. I have written to you about this previously. I know you are aware that the charity has been evicted now by Hackney Council from the premises that it was using and asked to return to premises it feels are unsuitable and not secure.

What are you doing with the Mayor to support this charity, which you fund through MOPAC to provide this important service, in order that they can find secure, suitable and appropriate premises for their vital work?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Yes, you are absolutely right. I am aware of Sistah Space. I have visited them and have seen the work that they are doing.

In terms of their accommodation, as you know and as I have written back to you and to others, that is a matter for Hackney Council. My understanding is that they moved from their original accommodation to accommodation opposite the Town Hall while refurbishments took place and that they have now been asked to go back to that. That is a Hackney Council decision that Sistah Space has been discussing with the Council.

In terms of what we from MOPAC have been doing to try to support Sistah Space in terms of the services that it delivers, which is part of the services through the London Victim and Witness Service and specialist support services for black women, it is very right and proper that those support services are there. We have been talking to Victim Support and asking it to support Sistah Space in ensuring that it has the capacity and the ability to bid for extra funding and to support it in becoming more sustainable as part of Victim Support. That is work that we are doing through MOPAC and Victim Support offering that support to Sistah Space.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I hope you might be able to support them further with discussions about accommodation given that it is a service that you fund through your budgets. Thank you very much.
Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Can I come in there on the back of that last question that Caroline put? Of course, as Assembly Members and especially the London-wide Members, we are lobbied and we receive cases, but I do want to put that question in a wider context. I want to congratulate Sophie [Linden] and MOPAC on the London-wide funding that they have given to black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) led women’s organisations around this issue. As the member for Hackney, I really do feel that sometimes we use the wrong platform. This is a matter between the Council and one of its agencies. I defy anybody listening to do more than the Mayor of Hackney on this matter. It has to be resolved between these two parties and work is ongoing.

I do want to go back to the larger issue. We have to look and see how resources are given proportionately to those organisations that are working with BAME women around domestic violence, around rape and around sexual assault. I commend the Deputy Mayor for the work that she has led during her tenure. Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you. One more question from me and then we will move on to the next section. This question is to the CPS.

On 9 August [2020] there were press reports that the Government planned to impose rape prosecution targets on the police and the CPS, something that the Victims’ Commissioner [for England and Wales] Vera Baird warmly welcomed, calling the significant fall in rape prosecutions “utterly shameful”. The following day, again we were informed via the press that the Government was not intending to impose targets.

Can we just clarify this and have an MPS officer put it on public record? Is it the case that the Government is not bringing in targets? Have you had any correspondence or communication from the Government about any plans to do so?

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS): I will come in on that. It is a question for Ministers as to what the Government will bring in, but we have had conversations in the context of the cross-Government review and with our stakeholders about that expectation to close the gap between the number of reports and the number of cases coming to court. We can expect a drive from the Government, as we have from our stakeholders, to see the positive trajectory that we have seen over the last three quarters to continue in terms of an increase in charging and bringing cases to court.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): To get this right, you have had conversations but no indication yet of any firm plans to bring in targets?

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS): That is a question you will have to ask Ministers.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): You have not had any instructions, any directives or any communication from the Government?

Rachel Zaltzman (Deputy Director - Strategy and Policy, CPS): The expectation is for a continued upward trend.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): OK. I will leave it at that.

I should say to our guests from the CPS and to Commander Dales and to Claire Waxman that you are welcome to stay on, but you do not have to. We are moving on to other sections that concern more the Deputy Mayor and the Deputy Commissioner. If you are leaving, thank you very much for taking part in today’s proceedings.
I will move on now to the next section, which is on unlicensed music events (UMEs) and protests.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** Can I start with a question to [Sir] Steve [House QPM]? What are the main challenges the MPS faces in policing UMEs in London?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** That is a good question. The main challenges at a tactical level are the speed at which they can develop, quite honestly, and our lack of information about them developing. It is a grand title, “UME”, but the legal definition makes it clear that it is not that grand an thing, really. If a car pulls up, the hatchback opens up and in the back are two massive great speakers connected to an iPhone and 30 or 40 people start gathering and making a racket at 3am, that is how quickly it can happen. About 90% of the times that we get told about UMEs are direct calls from the public saying, “There is a hell of a racket going on. Can you come and sort it out, please?” We are worried about what is going on”. Speed is a real issue and unpredictability is a real issue as well.

We saw over the summer quite an upsurge in them but that, again, as everything is seemingly at the moment, was definitely COVID influenced. There was a pressure valve release that saw UMEs established across England and Wales, really. Greater Manchester Police deal with a lot. We dealt with many hundreds ourselves.

The legislation gives us decent enough powers to deal with it. We now have a model to deal with it, which is agreed with all the local councils and we work closely with the councils on that. It is a protocol on how to deal with it. The key, really, is a very quick local response by police. When the public call us, we get officers there quickly and we close it down very quickly before it can gather.

There are extremes. There is a continuum here. If you put the car with the hatchback and the two speakers in the back at one extreme, the other is effectively an organised rave, which is why the legislation was brought in in the first place, with hundreds or thousands of people in an abandoned warehouse and that sort of thing. That is a different matter and the challenges there for us are effectively getting in and closing it down and seizing the equipment as quickly as possible, identifying the organisers and dealing with them through the courts if we can.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** Is the protocol a document we can have a look at? It would be useful for us to see the relationships between the MPS and local authorities.

I have had examples in my constituency where the police have not turned up. There was one last Saturday with about 50 people in it, the full Monty, and it went until 6am. It was reported to the police and they did not come. Is one of the issues you are facing a resourcing issue?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** No, bluntly. It is not. If you let me have details, I will have a look at why we did not. No, resourcing is not really an issue.

Can I tell you the figures, which might help? Since the summer started on around 25 June [2020], that weekend, we have had 2,000 of our incident reports tagged as potential UMEs, but you have to bear in mind what I said earlier about a continuum. Some of those will actually be nothing more than family barbecues in back gardens. They may be breaching COVID regulations, but it is probably not what most people call an UME. The busiest part of London in relation to UMEs is Lambeth and Southwark. Since the end of June [2020], they have had 377 reports of UMEs.
As I say, we move in as quickly as we can and we close them down, and we have been pretty effective. We had one or two high-publicity events where big events kicked off and we had to deploy a lot of central resources and public order equipment to deal with those. The vast majority are not dealt with like that. For example, over the Bank Holiday weekend in August [2020], we had about 160 that we actively monitored over the four days and the vast majority were dealt with locally. Only 34 of the 160 required us to deploy central assets and public order equipment to deal with them. A lot of it was down to the positive work with the local councils.

We have a system that works. We can cope with the volume. Per head of population we have not seen the huge volume that other parts of the country have seen. I cannot tell you the reason for that, but I get the distinct feeling that Greater Manchester and West Midlands had, per head of population, a worse problem than we did. I can certainly look, if you give me the details, at the incident that you have mentioned because that is something that I would want to look at. In general, our model has worked well. We also appear to be past the peak. They are very heavily weather-related, and the peak is probably past. We are now seeing a declining number of them.

Andrew Boff AM: If the event, for want of a better word, is in a private house or private garden, can you still intervene?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): If it is inside a private house, we would intervene, or we would want the council to intervene on noise. You saw recently publicity about a party with hundreds of people where a large ticket was issued to the individual who organised it. We would deal with it under different legislation.

For UMEs, the rave legislation is really designed to deal with that upsurge we saw. Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and section 1 of the Licensing Act 2003 is what we use to deal with UMEs because it is an unreasonable amount of noise throughout the night causing disruption and disharmony in the community and complaints from the public. As I say, a huge percentage of the UMEs that we respond to and are told about come from the public saying, “There is something going on. We want you to deal with it.”

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, but if it is in a private garden or private house, you can intervene?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, we would still go along and ask people what is going on. If we have had complaints from the public, we will go and knock on their door and ask them what is happening.

Andrew Dismore AM: How are you working with local authorities to shut down UMEs? One of the problems we have in Barnet, for example, is that they are not operating their out-of-hours service because of COVID. If the council is not operating an out-of-hours service, that must make things difficult for you.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): It has made it more difficult and we have been very grateful for the good offices of the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor, whom we have asked to talk to the various councils to say, “Can we make sure that we have people who can respond?” In the hotspot boroughs, if I could use that phrase, we do have very good relationships and more people are at work.

That is what the protocol has been about, really, which I am happy to send to you so that you can have a look at it. It is to effectively say, “This is a partnership issue, not just down to the police”, and we are expecting councils to respond to noise complaints and deal with licensing issues as well or non-licensing issues in this case.
Andrew Dismore AM: Thanks for that. Can I ask you about the about the £10,000 fines? I am not entirely clear. Are these fixed penalty notices or are they reports for prosecution before the magistrate? A £100 fine you can understand. Even that is just like all the other £100 fines you have for fixed penalty notices, but £10,000 is on a different scale altogether.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, you have hit it here, really, which is that the media has this issue of a cop basically issuing the same sort of ticket that you would issue for a minor public order offence but actually writing £10,000 on it and handing it out there and then. That is not how the process works. Officers will respond to an incident. If they think that the preconditions for the issuing of that ticket exist, they will tell the person that a prosecution under that legislation is being considered. It is then passed to a central national unit, which looks at it. If it is agreed that the conditions are there, then the ticket will be issued.

Andrew Dismore AM: It does not go anywhere near a court? It is dealt with administratively?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): It can be if the person stumps up the £10,000. Let us assume the whole process goes forward and the ticket is issued to the person. If they pay £10,000, then it will not go to court. If they say, “I am not paying”, then, as every citizen has, they have a right to a day in court and they can go to court.

Andrew Dismore AM: Would that be an appeal against the ticket, or would it be a proper prosecution?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I would not want to go on record as saying one or the other, to be honest. I am bound to go the wrong way. I do not know the answer.

Andrew Dismore AM: OK. If you can let us know what the process is, that would be useful.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Sure, I can write to you. What I will probably do is to send you a letter with the whole process laid out as to how it works.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, that would be helpful. Moving on to policing of protests, it is the same question, really, as I started with. What are the challenges facing you in policing protests at the moment?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): The tiredness of our officers is one of our major issues and the injury rate that we have had.

This is a good opportunity for me to pay tribute to my officers. I cannot tell you how proud I have been of their restraint in many very difficult circumstances: abuse hurled at officers; officers of BAME heritage abused in various demonstrations, so much so that their supervisors have had to take them out the line because it was just getting too upsetting for their colleagues; officers injured; officers just tired. I paid tribute to our command teams, who throughout the summer have policed a huge range of events with the added complications of COVID alongside them. I want to get that on record. My colleagues have done a fantastic job.

The difficulty is simply: stretch. You will appreciate that every officer who is deployed on a demonstration is an officer who is not in the community, who is not dealing with violent crime and who, quite frankly, is not dealing with allegations of serious crime. That causes us severe problems. Officers are not able to take their rest days. They are being messed around, particularly if they are public order specialist officers. They do not get the rest days they are entitled to and that puts pressure on their family lives. They all signed up for this,
but it has been a particularly difficult period for them. Resourcing is the major issue for us. Despite the size of the organisation, it is a stretch but it has been coped with well.

We have had a busy two weeks with Extinction Rebellion (XR) most recently. We made nearly 700 arrests. Although that is a lot less than the arrests we have made in the past, the numbers of people unlawfully demonstrating were far less than we have seen in previous excursions from XR. Of course on this instance, I have to say some demonstrators from XR were lawful. They complied with the COVID regulations and they complied with the restrictions that we put in place and then they went ahead and made their demonstrations. When they did not - and unfortunately in just under 700 cases they did not comply - they were subject to arrest.

Andrew Dismore AM: Do you find organisers are complying with discussing their proposals with you or not?

Before I let you answer that, I should say that I am sure we all agree with what you had to say at the beginning about the role of your officers and the problems they have faced and the difficulties they have had to overcome. I am sure we all agree with that and I am sure we are all very grateful for the contribution they made.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Thank you. The issue on organisers is a mixed one. Some organisers do engage with us very well and, where that happens, we can work with them and the demonstration, so long as it is lawful, will take place. It is important that people realise that the MPS is here to allow appropriate demonstrations of concern to take place because we are a democracy. We are here to protect the democracy and not stifle it. When organisers contact us, we can work with them and we can explain sometimes the legislation to them because they will not always understand, and we can have a debate backwards and forwards about it. Sometimes we do that through lawyers. Sometimes it is just face-to-face with organisers. The difficulties come when the organisers will not engage or we cannot identify organisers or, although they engage, they refuse to accept that there is legislation by which we are all bound. It is a mixed picture.

In normal times, if we forget COVID, the vast majority of demonstrations, marches and assemblies take place in London completely arrest-free and completely incident-free. Our officers often will not even be involved in anything more than a cursory way. We are in a slightly more heated and frenetic time at the moment because of a variety of things, but if organisers engage with us, we will always engage with them.

Andrew Dismore AM: You talked about the stretch your officers are facing. Have you had to do any abstractions from Safer Neighbourhood Teams? Normally you would not abstract except for New Year and the [Notting Hill] Carnival.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We have done very little of that. I will not go on record as saying none because there are bound to have been cases where it has happened.

The way it works is we will draw upon our central asset and we will draw upon - and I know we have discussed this before - what we call level 2 trained officers, who are given enhanced public order training but are still officers who operate on Basic Command Units (BCUs). Beyond that, if we think it is going to be a nonviolent situation - and as we know, the vast majority of XR is unlawful but nonviolent - there will be level 3 officers who do not have enhanced public order training.

We try to protect our Safer Neighbourhood Teams wherever we can. We have been fairly successful in doing that through the summer, but it has been a real stretch for us. Going forward, we need to look at the impact
of COVID on our workforce and how that develops. Members will remember that on the first outbreak of COVID we were warned by Government information that we may see up to 30% of our workforce absent from the workplace because of COVID. We had nothing like that. The concern is that in this instance, with test and trace, the numbers ramp up as more and more people identify that either they have the virus, or they have been in contact with somebody with the virus and are required to self-isolate. Roughly, we are finding that when we get somebody with the virus, we are seeing about eight or ten contacts in the workplace who have to then self-isolate. That number is up.

Andrew Dismore AM: Presumably, you are also affected by these problems with testing and tracing?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): That seems to be a national problem at the moment with a little bit of a bottleneck. Yes, we have had one or two isolated incidents where officers have been given unrealistic expectations in terms of how they would get tested.

Andrew Dismore AM: Going on then to the problems you were talking about on the demonstrations, the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis, Dame Cressida Dick DBE QPM] has had discussions with the Home Secretary [The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP] about what is needed to address this not growth in violence but certainly a lot of violence. How have those discussions gone and what protection and support do you think you are going to get from the Home Office?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): What I am expecting from the Home Office is what we have been warmly encouraged that is going to happen, which is that we will see a doubling of the maximum sentence for assaults on emergency workers, which will go from a year to two years. I would certainly expect to see that.

I would still like to see some attempt at ‘two strikes and you are out’ legislation in relation to assaults on emergency workers, the concept being that if you are convicted of a second offence within a particular time period, then the penalty is significantly enhanced and the imprisonment is significantly enhanced.

I have no doubt of the Home Secretary’s [The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP] determination to try to assist us in this and indeed the Policing Minister [Kit Malthouse MP]. They are both very clear that they want to help us. I am pretty confident we will see something positive coming forward in legislation. That would send a positive message to officers.

I have to say though that legislation is one thing. It has to then be implemented through the CPS and then into the courts. As you know, we set up an operation called Operation Hampshire, which is a full-time unit that looks at supporting injured officers both in their injury but also through the court process.

One of the things that we know from looking at all the cases is that we would like to see a situation where body-worn video is shown in evidence even when there is a guilty plea so that the court can get some idea of the situation that the officer was involved in. Often the statement does not quite give it. Cops tend to do what I tend to do with you, which is we talk too much in cop speak and it is like, “I proceeded in a northerly direction”. It does not give the feel and the passion and the fear that people feel when they are involved in these situations. Body-worn video does just that. Therefore, we think courts should see body-worn video in all cases. If it is a contested case they would see it, but if it is a guilty plea we think they should see it also before the sentence is passed.

Andrew Dismore AM: As part of the victim impact statement?
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Exactly so, yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: The last question from me for Steve and also for Sophie is this one. We have talked about it in the past. How are you preparing for future demonstrations across the capital, bearing in mind we also now have this ‘rule of six’?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): If I go first, yes, we are adapting to the new guidance, which we got at the tail end of the weekend. We are adapting to that. We have used the NPCC guidance, which has come out on the back of the Government’s legislation, to explain to officers what the new rules are.

It is important to say that this change in the numbers and the stance does not necessarily drive for us a change in the way we have approached the situation. We will continue with our approach and we will try to explain to people, educate people and encourage people. Only when we come up against resistance will we enforce or if we see repeated breaches by the same individual or group, we will probably look to enforce the situation.

It is important to say that 99% of Londoners have complied as far as policing is concerned with all the requirements on this. There is a small number that do not and usually, when approached and dealt with, they comply then. We are talking about a very small fraction of people whom we have to enforce with. That is in relation to the individual stuff.

In relation to demonstrations, of course, you will appreciate that there are a large number of exceptions or exemptions, rather, to the legislation and one of those continues to be political demonstrations and assemblies. We have to take that on board. Of course, that is not the only thing they have to do. It is not good enough for a political group to say, “All right, we are going to assemble with more than six people because we are a political group”. They also have to have in place a risk assessment. That risk assessment has to be a valid assessment and we have a very good relationship with the councils. Particularly I have to pay tribute to the City of Westminster Council. We pass the risk assessment to them and to their risk assessment experts and they tell us whether or not it is a valid and sensible plan. If it is a plan, so long as we see it executed and reasonable measures are in place to prevent the spread of COVID, then a demonstration or an assembly, as long as it is lawful in all other purposes, can go ahead under the new legislation. They have to be a political body, they have to produce a risk assessment and it has to be implemented effectively, at which point they are then exempt from the ‘rule of six’.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): To follow on from what Steve said, I do not in any way want to sound complacent in terms of any future demonstrations or any future UMEs. We will carry on working in the way that we have been working, which is very much with the MPS and London boroughs and also across City Hall in partnerships.

One of the things I have been doing since the number of protests and UMEs has been growing is to be chairing a Public Disorder Risk Management Group once a week. We all get together across City Hall and have input and feed in from the MPS via our operations to make sure everybody knows what is happening and what actions need to be taken from any intelligence that is coming in and making sure that we have a good view of not just what is happening across London but what is happening particularly on areas where City Hall has responsibility, for example, Trafalgar Square or Parliament Square. We will continue that while we are in this position where we are likely to have a number of protests and we are likely to have a number of UMEs.

I am also regularly meeting with representatives of London Councils as well as the leaders and heads of community safety. I have a meeting tomorrow with the heads of community safety to discuss the action plan,
but also, I have put on the agenda the new COVID regulations and what we can do to make sure that the messages are as simple and understandable as possible for people. As Steve says, most Londoners are complying and want to comply. The question is how we educate people as to what the regulations are and, if they do transgress, how police officers can talk to them rather than moving straight to enforcement.

**Len Duvall AM:** I have two questions. Some months ago, when the first wave of XR protests went on, we talked about the deficit around some of the legislation about demonstrations or simplifying issues for policing those. Of course, the MPS got into some difficulties in some legal cases following that first wave. There has clearly been a change in the laws and regulations that has taken place because of COVID. There have been some changes.

Are there still gaps for lawful and peaceful demonstrations? Do we need to change the law still or has the appetite gone from the Government or the police of England and Wales in terms of lobbying for any changes? Have those issues gone away now? Are we content with the legislation framework that we are operating about lawful protests?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I do not think you mean it to be but that is quite a tricky question.

In terms of lawful protests, we have no problem with lawful protests. If it is lawful, we are happy to stop the traffic and let them get on with it. Just to be clear, I mean stop the traffic to let them proceed on their demonstration, not to stop it for hours on end because that is not lawful. Lawful is fine.

Where it is unlawful, no, we are not content, and we are talking with the Home Office. Again, I am hopeful that we will see some changes.

You referred to the challenge we had in court, which we lost, simply by applying existing legislation, sections 12 and 14 of the Public Order Act to new situations. The interpretation of the court was that we had gone beyond what was intended in legislation. We want that fixed and we are asking for that to be fixed. We want a simplification in relation to sections 12 and 14, which cover static assemblies and marches, so that they are a bit more logical, really.

The other issue we are looking at is we are asking the Government to consider the current legislation on public nuisance to see if that can be strengthened in some way to give us the ability to intervene more quickly and more directly. We think there is a beefing up required in relation to it.

The reason for that is a simple one and we keep coming up against it in our meetings, which is this perception that people have that if a demonstration is nonviolent, then it is lawful. It is not the case. The definition as far as policing is concerned is lawful and unlawful. The violence piece is another factor. A demonstration can be unlawful even whilst it is peaceful. Clearly, a demonstration that is violent cannot be lawful.

Again, I have to say that the vast majority of XR this time was peaceful but was still unlawful. It is important to say we had very few injuries to officers in the XR two weeks and indeed any of the XR weeks. That has not been the feature here. We have tried to deal with the people we have arrested in XR in as appropriate a way as possible.

I will be honest with you. We have asked them to stop being floppy. It might seem like a silly thing to say, but when we arrest them and pick them up, they go all floppy, which is why you see four or five officers carrying them away. It is a complete waste of officers’ time and a complete pain in the neck. They could just behave
like sensible adults. They have made their point. They wanted to be arrested. They have been arrested. They should get up and walk away with one officer and stop wasting police time. This is a real issue and they will not do it and it is a flipping nuisance. The majority of the public will look at that and go, “For goodness sake. You are making your point. You have been arrested. The police are treating you perfectly fairly. Just get on with it”. The problem with them going floppy and four officers carrying them away is that it looks to the general public like the police are overreacting. We are not making them go floppy. They are just being a nuisance. I do not know if we can legislate on that, Len, to be honest with you, but I would plead with XR to, frankly, be a bit more reasonable.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Floppiness legislation?

**Len Duvall AM:** I used the XR demonstrations only to indicate that that was when we last discussed public order legislation in the wider sense. Do we have a timeframe for that or is that really in the hands of the Government, then? Are you expecting something shortly or over the next two years or not?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I hope it is not two years. I can see that there was something on the BBC this morning that I have not been able to read fully about changes to quite a lot of legislation. I do not know if there is a public order element in that or not, but we hope to get it fairly soon, to be honest, because we have been asking for a while now on this. I know they are engaged on it and it is not easy. Writing legislation that actually works is not something to be done quickly.

**Len Duvall AM:** Yes. I am not a fan of legislation unless we really need it. I am looking forward to a debate about it and what it really gives you. Maybe that is something we can plan at future Police and Crime Committee meetings when it becomes live.

My second question is about assets and what we have seen is police tactics changing and different use of assets on UMEs. In terms of demonstrations, probably, tactics have changed on some issues. I am going to talk about the helicopter service and the importance of that in managing demonstrations.

This Monday, the Government announced that the first stage of trials for drones had taken place and it had been effective. Given the volume that London faces of demonstrations and UMEs and everything else, were we part of those trials? I am not saying we should not have been. I just want to know that if there is going to be a future replacement of helicopters, we have the best kit available to help us keep people safe and secure. I ask that question in that sense. Have you been cited by those trials in terms of what they were considering as a replacement for the future helicopter service? I know it will take some time to go through, but it just seems that given, as I said before, the volume and complexity of policing London’s capital, we should have been in there and understand what those implications are.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, that it is a really good question and it is really very topical.

I feel I should apologise to the residents of London for the almost continual presence of the Air Support Unit, which seems to be above every individual’s house. As a resident of Westminster, I understand what people are concerned about, but the reason for it is quite obvious. As a tactical aid to the commanders of the demonstrations and the public order situations, air support is absolutely crucial. We are very keen to have the best air support that we possibly can for London.

At the moment, I am aware of the pilots and the tests that have been carried out on drones and we are actively looking at what we could do to use drones in London. We have used them on a few bespoke operations,
usually around security for presidential visits or things like that. You will see that the forces that have looked at it this time around have been rural forces. For open country search above fields and coastlines, drones are probably nearly ready now to be used by policing and indeed, as we saw in COVID, Derbyshire was using it to do some work above open country as well. The difficulty is above an urban centre.

I get lost in the technicalities, but there is a difference. There are line-of-sight drones, which we have used on occasions. In other words, the operator can see the drone. Then there are beyond-line-of-sight drones. The operator does not see the drone and cannot see what it is doing or where it is.

Beyond-line-of-sight is something that is not ready yet for London. That does not mean to say it will not be in future but, quite clearly, public safety has to be absolutely paramount here. We will be suitably advised by the Government and by the Home Office and by the NPCC on our use of drones across London to replace helicopters. At the moment, we are not there. We will see a new generation of helicopters come in and drones slowly starting to be used more. We will not be at some point saying that our fleet of helicopters will disappear and it will be all drones. It will be a blended approach for a few years to come.

**Len Duvall AM:** Will the next generation of helicopters be quieter? If the drones are silent, policing by consent, Londoners might go for it. I realise it is going to take some time.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** I am sure Steve is aware that the London Fire Brigade has been experimenting with drones for quite some time now and is taking them on. It might be useful for you to learn how they do it because they have a very sophisticated kit. That is point one.

Point two, however, is that drones are entirely dependent on Chinese technology and so that might be a problem for security for you.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I know the Fire Brigade are, but you will find that they are line-of-sight drones. I cannot imagine where the Fire Brigade would need to have a drone that is beyond line-of-sight. We would. To be replacing helicopters, it would need to be beyond line-of-sight and therefore might be slightly more challenging.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** They are using them outside line-of-sight for some of the big incidents.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Are they? I stand corrected. Thank you.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** You still have the problem with the Chinese link.

**Siân Berry AM:** Going back to the questions about protests, yes, Assembly Member Duvall, I too am looking forward to a wide public debate before any law is changed to allow for the banning of protests on a London-wide level, but hopefully we can do that in consultation with the public.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Sorry, straight away, I never mentioned anything like that. Please do not put words into my mouth.

**Siân Berry AM:** It was Assembly Member Duvall who said that. I was replying to him.

**Len Duvall AM:** Sorry, I did not say anything about banning protests. I talked about lawful protest and facilitating that, and I did not say that. I would like you to apologise to me for that because, if you are not
Siân Berry AM: Apologies, Assembly Member Duvall.

Len Duvall AM: I am on record as not supporting legislation willy-nilly and I want to be part of that debate, but I am not into banning demonstrations. I want people to behave lawfully and do them right and fully comply with the law.

Siân Berry AM: That is right. The major problem that the police ran into was with the differences between section 12 and section 14 making it impossible to effectively prohibit protests across the whole of London and that they attempted to do. Yes, if that comes forward as legislation, we need to have a full debate based on balancing that request out with human rights and that needs to take place in Parliament. That is not my question.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I do not even agree with that characterisation of what we got wrong. We did get something wrong. What we basically said was, “Look, this assembly is banned. These other assemblies by the same organisation are again for the same reasons. They are in different locations. We think it is one assembly”. The court said, “No, it was not one assembly. You needed to go around all of them and impose the legislation on each individual”. We accept that and that is what we now do. That was not banning protests across London. It was dealing with lawbreaking across London. That is what we were doing.

Siân Berry AM: Thank you for that. Going back to what we are all more used to, which is lawful, peaceful, supported protest, one of the issues I have found by talking to organisations who organise regular rallies in Trafalgar Square has been the inability for them to find a way to book to use that space and to liaise with the police. The last time we spoke about this was before the Bank Holiday and it was quite clear that the current regulations made it hard for you to say that any of the protests going forward that weekend might in fact be lawful because there was not the clarity in the law.

I have been corresponding with the people who run Trafalgar Square and Parliament Square on behalf of the Greater London Authority (GLA). I had an answer back from them yesterday and it is quite clear they were suffering from the same problem. At lockdown all events were cancelled, but as they thought about trying to reintroduce bookings, they said the guidance and legislation was not clear.

The new legislation that came on Sunday night does have a specific exemption for protest to the ‘rule of six’. What the GLA team have said to me is now that they know this can happen, if people have made a risk assessment and made plans for a COVID-secure protest, they are getting legal advice on how they can begin authorising these activities again. This is a problem because these are people coming forward saying, “Can I organise a rally sometime in the future?” They are unable to do so.

My question to you, Stephen and also to Sophie, is whether you are working together to get this ability to organise and AUTHORISE protest on GLA-controlled land ready as soon as possible so people can start making plans for the regular events, the regular normal rallies, that they carry out in these spaces?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I am not trying to be difficult here. I am a bit surprised at what you are saying because the exemption that I went through in detail there - political, risk assessment, reasonable steps to stay safe - are not new conditions on the [rule of] six. They were in existence before and that is why a number of demonstrations have taken place weeks ago under the old legislation, the
30, which were perfectly lawful and valid because we spoke to the organisers, we saw a risk assessment and Westminster Council said, “Yes, that is a good risk assessment”. Even XR complied with all the requirements of the legislation and the demonstrations went ahead because they were peaceful and they were lawful because they stayed with sections 12 and 14 of the Public Order Act. You saw them a couple of weeks ago in Parliament Square on the Green, which is where they were sectioned to be.

Siân Berry AM: To clarify, I am talking about very much more mainstream groups that normally book Trafalgar Square or Parliament Square and have been unable to do so because the GLA team say they have not had clarity on the law. I wanted to check: are you working with the GLA to help them to produce a new process?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Part of every planning for any demonstration is working very closely with our very close partners in the GLA. We work with them on a daily basis.

Siân Berry AM: However, they have been telling groups they cannot book events.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I cannot speak for them but that is not my understanding.

Siân Berry AM: Sophie, maybe you can help with this.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You have just read out a letter you got from GLA Operations. That is, as you know, a different part of City Hall - it is not MOPAC - and they are the ones who take the decision on that. I know they, as Steve said, work incredibly closely and they will be working closely with the MPS in clarifying legislation and seeing what can be done. I am sure they will be trying as hard as they can.

Siân Berry AM: These groups - that are the ultimate lawful protesters, as it were - that want to have every cross ticked and ‘i’ dotted are currently unable to plan for their regular events and that worries me a lot.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I must say I am surprised by what you are saying here. Our processes are very tried and tested. We work very closely with the GLA team on this and I am not aware that there have been difficulties in booking. The legislation is new as of Monday morning but, as I say, what has changed are the numbers. We have had lawful demonstrations last week and the week before and, as far as I am aware, we have had demonstrations in Trafalgar Square as well and so I am a bit surprised, to be honest.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): If you have examples of groups that are trying to book Trafalgar Square - while I am not the decision maker on this at all - the best thing is to flag that and we can make sure it has been looked at and the appropriate decisions have been taken, which I am sure they are. We have really experienced Operations, as you know, in City Hall around Trafalgar Square who will be doing their best to facilitate and making sure that it is in line with COVID regulations and the law. They will be doing their best to do that, as you know, and they are very, very good at this.

Siân Berry AM: I will forward the correspondence to you because it is clear that the applications process is currently not open.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): OK, thank you.
**Unmesh Desai AM (Chair):** We have to move on now but, Assembly Member Duvall, you are very clear, as far as I am concerned, in the distinction you drew between lawful protest and unlawful protest.

On that note, can we move on to the next section of questions around antisocial behaviour (ASB)?

**Susan Hall AM:** Sir Stephen House [QPM], may I just say very many congratulations on that successful operation in Orpington? We have very brave officers and I am very grateful for that.

MOPAC reported ASB increased by 189% between April and June [2020] as compared to January to March [2020]. To what extent do you believe that the rise in reports of ASB in London is likely to be due to breaches of lockdown measures?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Yes, very much so. We saw, as you have indicated from your figures, a very strong spike when the lockdown started. It was phone calls coming in from the public basically saying they were worried about behaviours, they had seen something on the street or, to use the classic, they were worried about their next-door neighbour, etc. We saw an increase in our response to these. However, we did not respond to every call because much of it was advice that we could give over the phone, so we did not deploy units, but we did see a big increase. As you know, we put a lot of extra asset on BCUs and on boroughs to deal with that spike in calls.

**Susan Hall AM:** We are expecting those figures to come right down now since we have been let out, as it were?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** I am worried they are going to go back up again as people start to think about a smaller number and look at the ‘rule of six’, start worrying about that and seeing that in public. It is understandable that they would be worried, and if they want to call us to alert us to it, we will look at issues.

We are going to employ the four Es. Our officers on patrol will see things but if the public tells us about something then we will respond and try to educate and explain to people that they are breaching the legislation and they need to amend their behaviour or otherwise we will move to enforcement.

**Susan Hall AM:** That is fair enough. What action have the Mayor and the MPS taken to address this large rise in ASB? Have you done anything different? I will ask you, Sir Stephen, first and then perhaps Sophie.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** As you have indicated, it was a spike and it has come down again significantly as people have become more normalised to the lockdown, and then as lockdown eased the calls eased. What I am concerned about is that now that we are seeing a slight change in the legislation, a radical change in the numbers, it may go back up again. However, we have not yet seen lockdown return and that would be what would drive the biggest spike. Across the United Kingdom (UK) we have seen local lockdowns. It is almost inevitable that we may see one of those in London at some point and that would drive an increase in calls. We have already deployed extra asset on boroughs, so each borough has a dedicated response vehicle to deal with calls in relation to the change to the legislation. If calls ramp up we will need to see about increasing the asset that respond to those calls.

**Susan Hall AM:** Sophie, have you anything to add to that? It is a fairly comprehensive answer.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime):** Steve has said most of it. We should link it back to the previous discussion we have had around UMEs as well and the really, really serious partnership work
between boroughs, City Hall and the MPS on this on the ways of trying to drive down not just the criminality that is involved in some of those events but also the ASB. I thought it was really interesting that 90% of the calls around UMEs were from the public because they are disturbed at night and do not want that type of ASB on their doorstep. We have worked really hard throughout the months of the COVID lockdown in dealing with that, which will have had an effect on ASB as well.

**Susan Hall AM:** Do you welcome the introduction of the COVID-secure marshals? How do you think that they will help? Do you think they will help?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime):** I have no idea how they will help. ‘Introduction’ is a grand word for the COVID-secure marshals. There has been an announcement about COVID-Secure Marshals for London boroughs, and authorities across the country have said, “Who are they? What are they? Who is going to be paying for them?” There is no massive amount of enforcement officers waiting to be COVID marshals, they are already at a stretch. They are already working very hard in making sure people keep to COVID regulations, businesses and hospitality venues. We are waiting for any detail on what these COVID marshals are going to be, how they are going to be paid for and whether they will have any new powers.

**Susan Hall AM:** OK, but get beyond that. Do you think they will be helpful?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime):** It is genuinely difficult to get beyond that. It is helpful to have really clear messages, and clear messages from the police and anybody who has enforcement powers - whether that be trading standards officers, environmental enforcement officers or noise officers from councils - to be able to educate the public and hospitality venues - pubs, clubs and restaurants - as to what the rules and regulations are. That is really important because, as we have said before today, the vast majority of people want to do the right thing. The rules at the moment are quite complex and people do need to be reminded as to what is right and what is possible so any ability of people to be able to do that is welcome. COVID marshals themselves is an announcement that has no substance behind it.

**Susan Hall AM:** No, but everything starts with a suggestion and an idea. I am thinking that if other people are out there doing the informing and letting people know what the rules are it would free up our officers, which could only be a good thing.

With reference to the previous conversation, I was thrilled to see Sir Stephen House [QPM] say, “If only these wretched protesters would not go floppy”. I have seen four to six officers having to arrest people. We must protect officers’ time as best we can.

If they get over all that, do you think they might be an additional help to officers so that our extremely well-qualified and talented police officers can get on with their own jobs?

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime):** In principle anything that helps free up police officers’ time to deal with what they are there to deal with, crime and criminality, of course is to be welcomed. However, it is a very strange way of looking at government and looking at delivery for prime ministerial announcements to be ‘flying kites’, an idea. Normally in government - local government, regional government or National Government - when you make an announcement behind that there is thought-out detail as to how it will be delivered, who will do it and who is going to pay for it rather than it just be an idea that is announced. However, of course, the more the public understand - and not just the public, businesses understand - what the rules and regulations are and they are helped to stay within the right boundaries that has to be helpful to the police.
Susan Hall AM: Yes, we must all remember we are in unprecedented times and lots of people are doing their best to see how they can help in various places.

Sophie, the MPS has stated that it is not investigating COVID-19 guidance related issues retrospectively. Do you support this decision?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): As you know it is time honoured, for incredibly good reasons, that politicians do not intervene or interfere in operational decision making about who is or who is not investigated and so that is a matter for the MPS.

Susan Hall AM: Do you think it is a good idea or not? It is a good idea. I can say that. Do you think it is?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): I am not going to get involved in it because it is very much an operational decision about investigation. If I start commenting on individual investigation decisions, I will have to comment on all.

Susan Hall AM: I just wondered whether you had an opinion. Thank you, Chair, I have finished.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): OK, I have some questions. Deputy Commissioner, do frequently changing laws - as many people see to be the case - about meeting friends and family during the pandemic help you and your officers to do your job? We had Ken Marsh, Chair of the Metropolitan Police Federation, saying that a confused public have been left ‘punch drunk’ by frequently changing laws. In typical Ken Marsh language,

“Every week it seems there are new rules. But the public are punch-drunk about all these changes. We have not got a never-ending pot of officers, they will be distracted by curtain-twitchers phoning up saying, ‘I’ve seen seven people in next door’s garden.”

Does this help you and your officers to do your job? It is a serious question but, as I say, I could not put it any better than Ken Marsh.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): It is a serious question and Ken is addressing it in Ken’s inimitable fashion. The Government puts legislation in place. I can only say it is putting it in place to try to control the public health crisis. The police have a role to play in helping to enforce that legislation to control the public health crisis and to keep the public safe, and we will do our part in that.

Of course, it is confusing when guidance changes and we have to try to stay on top of that. As much notice as we can possibly get of the guidance is helpful because it lets our officers get used to the changes and lets us work out how we are going to respond to the changes. That is not always possible because this is quite fast moving. The Home Secretary [The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP] has done a very good job trying to make sure that the police view is always played into any legislative changes so that it is achievable. However, of course, it is difficult. We have a difficult job to do and we ask our officers to do a difficult job and they are doing it remarkably well.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you. Can I say I miss Ken’s presence in the public gallery behind me?

To move on because we are running short of time, Deputy Commissioner, again, how important is public compliance with and support for the new coronavirus restrictions in helping the MPS to do its job effectively? A yes or no answer will suffice.
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): It is absolutely essential. We rely on the vast majority of the public to follow the law as the vast majority of the British and London public do. We will deal with people who do not, and I have explained our four Es approach.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): I am sure you will agree with me then on how important it is for public compliance and trust in the coronavirus laws that those in the public eye and in positions of authority abide by the rules themselves. I would suggest that the downside is self-evident. There have been studies done that breaches by high-profile figures undermine public trust and confidence in observing lockdown guidance rules.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We all have a duty as citizens to try to comply with the law but then I would say that. I am a police officer.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Sophie, I am sure you agree with that?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): It is incredibly important that everybody complies. For those in high-profile public positions it is even more important that they comply because they show what is acceptable and unacceptable. When high-profile people blatantly flout the rules it is incredibly damaging. We saw that for the case you are referring to.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Look, this is not a party-political point. There have been breaches during lockdown of the regulations by people across the political spectrum, from both the main political parties, and high-profile footballers, just last week in Iceland, where two footballers were dropped from the England squad. This is a serious point. Given what you have just said, Deputy Commissioner, do you feel that the MPS should have investigated reports that Dominic Cummings, the Prime Minister’s Chief Adviser, broke the COVID legislation for a second time on 19 April [2020] by visiting Durham again?

To set my question into context, in July [2020] ex-Chief Crown Prosecutor, Nazir Afzal - who has a fantastic reputation for the way he dealt with the ‘grooming gangs’ and child sex exploitation cases in the northwest - wrote to the MPS asking for investigation. He has instructed private lawyers. He speaks from personal experience as he lost his brother to the virus and a lot of the family funeral arrangements were disrupted because of their wish to observe lockdown restrictions. In August [2020] the press reported that further, another four, witnesses have come forward to say that they saw Mr Cummings in Durham on 19 April [2020]. To be fair, the Prime Minister [The Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP] said to the House of Commons that they have looked at the evidence and accept he was not there. Clearly, someone is being rather economical with the truth. There are four witnesses, who say very clearly that they have no axe to grind, who say they saw Mr Cummings in Durham.

In the interests of transparency, given that Durham Constabulary is compromised - there have been complaints made about the way they have handled the whole investigation - and the issue being that Mr Cummings left the London area, should not the MPS investigate where he was on 19 April [2020]. On 12 April [2020] it has been accepted that he probably did break some of the regulations, although nothing much came out from the three-day investigation by Durham Constabulary. We are talking about 19 April [2020].

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): The MPS has already put statements out on this, Chair. I understand the passion involved in it. However, as you know, as a matter of course the MPS is not investigating COVID breaches retrospectively. We have spent a lot of this meeting talking about police asset, police resources, stretch in relation to rape, stretch in relation to public order and ASB. We have to take some decisions, sensible decisions and that is one of the ones we have taken. We are not investigating, as a matter of course, retrospectively breaches of COVID guidance.
Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): I am not going to labour this point but just to say that people out on the streets will say, “Is it one law for some people?” As I say, people across the political spectrum have broken restrictions; a Minister in Wales, a Labour Member of Parliament down in Canterbury, although to be fair she resigned from her position, and high-profile footballers. If people in [high-profile] positions do not set some standards then clearly the public will then say, “Why should we be subjected to the same restrictions?” I have been asked to speak at a political protest on Saturday in Tower Hamlets. I am checking out all the rules whether I can go or not. Anyway, I will not labour the point. We have equally important questions coming up.

Can we move to the next section on violent crime to be led by my colleague, Assembly Member Len Duvall?

Len Duvall AM: Thank you very much. Can we go back? It is a question to both you and Sophie about the MPS tackling all forms of violent crime. We talk about setting some benchmarks of keeping it below pre-lockdown levels but, quite frankly, how do we keep driving down violent crime per se? It does not matter what the level is, how low it is; we want to eradicate it from our communities, but I know that is never going to happen completely. How confident are you about the tactics we are deploying now and in the near future, considering we are in a second wave, of driving down all forms of violent crime?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): It is a broad question, but I am confident that the MPS is 100% focused on this. [Dame] Cressida [Dick DBE QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] has made it very clear from day one of her commissionership that the number one priority was to reduce violence across London, and the MPS is behind that focus 100%. If you look at MPS direction, our strategy, and you look at the performance framework we have, it is very heavily focused on dealing with violent crime in lots of different ways, through enforcement, through partnership working, through trying to get people out of lives of violence and divert them into other areas, to improving our prosecutions processes and we have heard from the CPS. We are putting more and more resources into dealing with violence. We just need to look at the fact that on top of the Violent Crime Taskforce we have established the Violence Suppression Units, which do a very different job but are still focused on violent crime on a local basis. We put over 600 officers into that. We are using the Government’s and the Mayor’s uplift of new officers to release experienced officers and put them into the Violence Suppression Units to work at a local level to deal with violence. We deal with violence in a lot of different ways.

I am keen that we understand as much as we possibly can the links between drugs and violence; all types of drugs, which would include cannabis and violence. I was meeting a murder investigation team just last week in Lewisham that detected a homicide of a completely innocent individual who was targeted. I will not go into the details of it because it is to go to court. There are clear links in a lot of violent crime to drugs distribution of all sorts across London, so we are looking at those issues.

You know our record on dealing with counterterrorism and [Assistant Commissioner] Neil Basu’s [QPM, Head of Counter Terrorism Policing, MPS] efforts leading on that. Domestic abuse remains a focus for us. We are looking at all aspects of violence, trying to drive it down; firearms; gun-enabled crime, shootings. Our record is solid. There is much more to do. Sustainability is really important. We have seen year-on-year reductions in the number of under-25-year-olds who are seriously injured with knives.

The homicide rate is still far too high and is, at the moment, proving utterly resistant to our efforts in relation to that. I reviewed that only yesterday to look at the homicide rates, which are obviously disturbing. We have had a bad couple of days on homicide, but we have a relentless focus on it. We have hugely-dedicated murder investigation teams to make sure that we detect most of our homicides and get people lengthy sentences. I worry about the corrosive effect of homicide on the public.
I have said this before, and I am not going to apologise for saying it again. If you look at the number of under-25s who have been murdered in the last 12 months, the disproportionality of young black men and young Asian men is horrific. Add those two together, young black men and young Asian men, they form 75% of people murdered under 25 in London in the last 12 months. That is a horrible figure that is really damaging families across London. We are determined to do something about it and we are working hard to try to push that figure down.

**Len Duvall AM:** Before I bring in Sophie, we got into difficulty about perceptions and I am not sure if reality was there because, if it is reality, it is still going through various complaints that are going on about the work of the Violence Suppression Units. It does seem to me that that important work has tailed off in certain areas, it has been pulled back. Is that true or is it continuing? In the sense of that, I get a view that, on the issues in social media about stop and search, our stop-and-search figures are pulling back. Is that because officers are diverted to other issues or is that the plan, you are pulling back and reassessing some of the work of the Violence Suppression Units and then you are going to go and relaunch, or not?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Not, in one word. To be clear, Len, the Violence Suppression Units are a relatively new outfit. They are working locally. They work on enforcement, but they also work on partnership issues and diversion issues. You are talking probably about the Violent Crime Taskforce. I am sorry. The two names are similar. The Violent Crime Taskforce was established probably about 18 months ago, maybe a bit more than that, and that is probably what you are referring to. They, together with the Territorial Support Group (TSG), are the ones that do the targeted approach to areas that have suffered violence or are suffering violence.

One of the tactics they will use - and it is only one of them - will be stop and search. We are not reassessing across the board stop and search. It is a lawful tactic and it is extremely effective. It takes weapons off the street on an all-too-regular basis in London. In fact, in August [2020] through stop and search we recovered 360 weapons, with a similar figure in July [2020]. We are keen that our stop and searches are done professionally. Yes, there has been a lot of social media coverage recently of where possibly officers have not reached the standard we expect. However, I have been public before about saying you cannot judge on a 20-second clip. The Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) will look at many of these and come back with their view in due course. I will not comment on that because they do not like us commenting on those cases as they are going through their procedures. In terms of stop and search, of course we are always assessing whether we are doing it professionally. We look at the outcome rate. We look at the levels of disproportionality that exist in stop and search and we are continually questioning, “Is this right? Are we getting this tactic right?”

Let me just be clear before I finish, Cressida [Dick] and I - most importantly Cressida - are absolutely determined that stop and search is a vital police tactic. We encourage our officers to do it when they have the appropriate grounds to do so. We support them in doing stop and search because it drives down crime.

**Len Duvall AM:** There is no level of lowering any activity on the Crime Taskforce and dealing with hotspot areas?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** No.

**Len Duvall AM:** They have not been brought back? That is continuing and the work of the Violence Suppression Units is going on alongside all other activities being dealt with?
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes.

Len Duvall AM: We may come back in greater detail in written form, Stephen, about different tactics in different areas, we may come back to that.

Sophie, do you want to comment on what Steve House has just said? You do not have to, but if you do, I have a further question before I am going to hand over to a colleague.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): To go back to your original question to both of us, which was about how confident we are in terms of tackling violence, pre and post-COVID looking at violence, I would echo what Steve would say. I am really confident that there is absolute focus from the MPS and also from partners and City Hall through the Violence Reduction Unit on tackling violence.

It would feel complacent to sit here, after the week we have just had with the number of murders we have just had, to say, “Yes, I am absolutely confident that it is going to be a huge success”. Whilst we have the focus of the MPS absolutely on using its powers - I will come back to that or I will say that now actually - stop and search can be a really useful tool. It can, and should, be used in areas where there is proper intelligence on individuals, so individuals are stopped and searched and we can get weapons off the streets. That is an important message. Stop and search is a useful tool if it is intelligence-led, it is done appropriately, and it is done in a professional manner. It has to be really clear that is the case.

One of the things why I hesitate a little bit on confidence is because whilst we are absolutely focused on that priority and the Mayor is investing in the Violence Reduction Unit as well as investing in the MPS and putting extra officers out on the street, we are in a moment of danger. Post-COVID we can see the London economy in incredibly challenging circumstances, many people worried, many people in really different circumstances. We know young people have suffered over COVID, during COVID and during lockdown. Their mental health has suffered. The services that have supported them have had to change, have had to adapt. We also know that not just City Hall has huge financial challenges but the boroughs have huge financial challenges as well. Therefore, we have to redouble our efforts and say, “Yes, of course, we have to support the police and make sure the police are supported in the work they are doing in tackling violence”. That is not just in hotspots but also - I am really pleased that you said violence in all its forms, Len, and Steve also picked up on it - we have to make sure that we focus on domestic abuse and sexual violence as well. We have talked about rape at the beginning of today. We should also make sure that there is a real focus on domestic abuse, and that we are making sure that not just the police are doing what they need to do in terms of bringing perpetrators to justice but also that there are others to support, not just for victims but support for perpetrators to change their behaviour. We are at a moment where we have to make sure we do not lose sight of, yes, policing enforcement but also the really important preventative measures that need to be put in so that we not just suppress the violence but we start to shift it and shift it in a fundamental and sustainable way.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you for that. Going back to Stephen, on the practical issues of tackling violence. I have raised this before and I really have a concern about this, the communication from the MPS about its activities within communities. We have had some very good statements from Cressida [Dick] that you have outlined, and from the Mayor, signalling what we are trying to do. However, it is not sustainable. The communication at the local level seems to be to the usual processes of our partners and others, and we have not jumped to try to get that message wider into the communities. One of the issues that concerned me earlier on was where we were losing confidence amongst the black community over some of our tactics or what was going on in certain areas. If our communication was slightly different and slightly better would we have held it through?
I have to say there were some other issues. I understand the process of investigating cold cases, like the Stephen Lawrence [murder victim] affair. However, the communication at the time gave further perceptions from the black community that, “We are being done to, we are not working with. No one is protecting us and no one is interested in any of us”. I know that is not the case, I understand around that. However, that caused such a stir at that particular time.

Are you going to tell me, is the police going to look at how the communication process there in terms of carrying out its issues, in explaining to people why there are police tactics going on in certain areas that means you are going to see an increase in visibility, you are likely to be more challenged or you might see other altercations going on in that area because there are intelligence-led issues that have driven us to these tactics for what we are trying to do? Is there any discussion inside the MPS about doing that? You want community support to do this work but we seem to have gone astray. We need to go back to basics on this around the communication. It is all very well telling me. I am a politician and most of my mates are politicians. We need something that goes out to the wider community around that work and what we are trying to achieve in all forms of violence.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): There is probably a deeper conversation to be had on this. I acknowledge that we often do not get it right on communications and timings look awkward. Sometimes it is not under our control. I will not say any more about that.

We make a huge use of social media. Most, if not all, of our Safer Neighbourhood Teams have their own social media accounts. We are making increasing use of it. We reach huge proportions in terms of numbers of people. We are looking at different platforms that reach younger people. We have a very proactive part of our media outlet here at the [Scotland] Yard that looks at using social media. However, I acknowledge it can always be better. I can look again at what we are doing locally. I do have to say that following budget cuts a few years we, as you know, withdrew local communications professionals from boroughs and brought them to the centre. That is something that caused problems at the time. It may be that it is something we need to look at going forward, is there something we can do to enhance local communications. We really have given it to Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and many of the BCU Commanders also run their own social media lines and talk very openly. I would say there are a couple of BCU Commanders who have a very strong dialogue with their public about local issues and they use social media to do that. That has been very effective on occasions in clamping down concerns. I would reference – I will not reference it because it may be a criminal issue – there was one in the north of London that suddenly blew up and the BCU Commander was on Twitter within minutes of it happening explaining the real facts of what was going on and that worked very effectively. Could we do more of that? Absolutely. I will take it away, Len, and talk to some people about it.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you.

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): Can I just come in on this? Communications, in the traditional sense of communications, is incredibly important for the MPS. With all the Twitter and all the social media, there is a really significant effort to get good messages out. However – I know Steve is not saying this at all and was just focusing on that particular bit – that, in and of itself, will not be enough in relation to bringing communities with the MPS and with us in terms of tackling violence.

We know there have been a lot of tensions in the black community, and that is one of the reasons the Mayor has asked myself and Debbie Weekes-Bernard [Deputy Mayor for Social Integration, Social Mobility and Community Engagement] to work on this Action Plan on increasing trust and confidence. A major part of that, yes, of course, will be communications but also it is about – to use the phrase ‘engagement’ – neighbourhood officers, Dedicated Ward Officers, Safer Schools Officers, Youth Engagement Officers all going out there and
engaging and talking to the community. Social media can only get you so far, you have to have that face-to-face. I know you cannot talk to all Londoners but the MPS has a significant number of officers who are now out there talking to communities and engaging with communities. We need to make sure that we develop that and make sure that we use that, because it is that engagement and that understanding through young people and officers that is going to make a huge difference here. I have seen it with Safer Schools Officers and I have seen it with TSG going into schools, working with young people and talking to them about why they stop and search people and what is going to happen if you run away from a police officer. That is a whole class they have engaged with. It is that type of work that is really going to be crucial in making sure that we can work with communities and so those communities, where there are particular issues, can develop that trust in the MPS.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you. I am going to pass over to Assembly Member Siân Berry to talk about some of the drivers that might be driving up violence in social media. Assembly Member Berry?

Siân Berry AM: Yes, I wanted to ask you about the activities of the MPS in relation to content on social media. I have asked questions about the number of requests for the removal of drill music videos as a part of written questions. What we see there is that the number of requests coming from the MPS has gone up each year that it has been done. In 2016 there were 26 referrals and in 2019, the last full year, we have 110. There is a very, very high success rate when the police ask for this, about nine out of ten of these videos are being removed.

My question is: you are taking quite a hard line now against violent language and imagery on social media, can you tell us more about that and is this going to continue increasing?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, I can say that in general terms we will continue that. We think our social media interventions have been very positive. Yes, commercial enterprises are responding increasingly well to our requests around that but then, of course, they have a social responsibility that they need to think about themselves. Yes, we think that is successful and we intend to continue it.

Siân Berry AM: Is there any right of appeal? Are there any instances where you have flagged something and then it has been discussed? There is some confusion about what drill music is and obviously the police being taken as a judge of a very young person’s medium might not be completely correct. Is there a discussion about refining the definitions and making sure that you are picking out the dangerous things rather than things that may not be?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We do have young people in the police as well, they are not all my age. I assume we would not claim to be an expert.

Siân Berry AM: I would not claim to be an expert either.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We do have people who are very well-versed in this area. We are not making unreasonable requests to bring things down. I do not know the answer to whether there is an appeal process. I can find out and let you know. I do not know the answer to that.

Siân Berry AM: I would like to know that. That would be great. In terms of the police’s own social media contact, you will know that for some time I have been raising the alarm and being worried about the use of images of recovered weapons, particularly knives, on social media from the MPS. There have been further Mayor’s Questions about this and also questions about how many social media channels there are. It turns out
there are over 1,000 social media channels being operated by MPS teams and a large number of those are the small ward teams. When I look at social media and collate the knife images that I see - I have to say I only see knife images on social media when they are posted by the police - I see an awful lot of them coming from these borough teams as well as the Violent Crime Taskforce account itself.

Have you started to take on board the concerns that I, and other people, have about the posting of these images that are quite scary on social media, and are you issuing any guidance to these local teams now about whether or not to post images of terrifying knives?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I am not being dismissive. We have listened to what you and other colleagues have said. We have discussed it, and in fact we discussed it at Management Board as to what was our stance on this. We do not believe that the research we have seen is conclusive. In fact, we have seen research that shows that it does not drive fear. We are not going to say to our teams, “You cannot publish this”.

The point I was going to say about being dismissive, you say they are scary images, but they are a damn sight scarier if you find them on the street or you are confronted with somebody with the knife. I am delighted that there are over 1,000 social media [channels] and I am delighted that Safer Neighbourhood Teams are using them. That is all great news. Thank you for telling us about it because I should have known that.

Siân Berry AM: It was in a Mayor’s Question.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): We are saying, “This is why we do stop and search”. Not only why we do stop and search but that we find things as well and these are the sorts of things we find. I accept some members of the public might look at that and go, “That is really worrying”. However, the violence picture and knife picture in London is a worrying picture, and people need to be educated on that so they understand that when the police do stop and search they are not doing it for frivolity, they are doing it for a reason. Stop and search saves people’s lives. It takes hundreds of thousands of weapons off the street every year and that is why we do it. We publicise that we do it because it also tells people, “If you carry a knife you might well get stopped, and if you are in possession of a knife you will get arrested”. Therefore, we are not going to stop doing it at the moment.

Siân Berry AM: OK, I am very disappointed by that. I would like to see more consistency because either violent imagery is bad or it is not, and we ought to be more consistent in what the police themselves publish if we are removing videos on a routine basis that contain the same kind of imagery.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): You cannot equate a picture of a zombie knife seized by a police patrol lawfully and taken off the street with some drill video glorifying the use of violence against women. The two are completely inappropriate comparisons.

Siân Berry AM: In imagery terms they are not miles apart and it is all increasing the fear and increasing the feeling that things are getting worse.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): You have made your point.

Siân Berry AM: What I would like to see are pictures of police success, of knife-free areas and police being friendly with people. That is partly what Assembly Member Duvall was getting at as well. Let us see more evidence of engagement.
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I can tell you without fear of contradiction that the largest social media impact we have had in the last month has been at the Operation that was referred to earlier in Orpington where we discovered pet dogs that we have rescued and have started to reunite with their owners. Therefore, please do not suggest we do not do ‘nice’. We do ‘nice’.

Len Duvall AM: Continuing along that theme really, county lines have been an important piece of your work but they have been around for a long time, I can go back to early 2000. The Government has put a drive on those and not all our knife crime is down to county lines, but it is an important issue about drug-related issues, as you said earlier on.

The Home Office has given - and I welcome this - £5 million to set up a County Lines Unit. Does that cut across the work of the Crime Taskforce Unit’s work and does it have to be separate around that work? Can you explain a little bit about that? I am not for duplication but in terms of ease - who is talking to who, communication and sharing information - I presume the Taskforce was dedicated to doing some of the county lines work in supporting people. Who was doing that in the MPS then?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Violent Crime Taskforces do not specifically target county lines, they are much more of a proactive and non-investigative unit that deal with geographic hotspots. The county lines outfit was set up to make use of technological developments that allow us to deal with county lines in a very effective way.

I have to pay tribute here to the people in Operation Orochi, which is what it is called. It is led by [Deputy Assistant Commissioner] Graham McNulty who is the national lead on county lines. Our model has been exported around England and Wales now. It has driven some fantastic results, as you indicated. Since it was set up in November 2019, 142 county lines have been closed with 141 line holders arrested. So far we have had 39 convictions with huge sentences, huge numbers of drugs seized and money seized as well. The two are quite separate. It is a specialist unit that does the county lines and Operation Orochi because a lot of it is based on technology.

Len Duvall AM: OK, thank you for that clarification. We set it up in 2014 and in 2020/21 we are not changing what we do. The Government has just given us an extra £5 million for this work?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): The Government has seen what we have been doing and is saying, “This is so successful, have more money and please export this around the country”, and that is what Graham is doing.

Len Duvall AM: Is the £5 million to help us share good practice around the country or is £5 million to expand the work of the Unit and its role?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I do not want to give the impression other forces have not been doing it and are not doing it. They are. We are working very closely with West Midlands and Merseyside and particularly the forces around London. Norfolk Constabulary in particular, hugely positive links with them around it. Chief Constables around London will say quite openly that it has a huge impact on their local crime when we close these lines down. It is to reinforce the work that is already underway, that is what the money is for.

Len Duvall AM: I am quite clear it is another continuing strand because it has been going from 2014, tackling violence and pushing down violence in closing down these county lines because there is a drug war going on. Like the economy, it is going down and they are fighting for issues. I get that.
OK, how will we judge whether this £5 million has been spent successfully? Is it going back to that previous work on what we have been doing from 2014 or have there been other indicators? Has the Government said, “You can have this £5 million but this is what we want to see in return for that?” or what? Are you sighted on that? If you are not sighted, you can write to us.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** The Government has been very clear and the Prime Minister has been very clear that he wants to see - I am quoting him directly - “county lines rolled up” which is a perfectly laudable thing to do. However, it does take money and resources to do that and this is just extra money.

**Len Duvall AM:** OK. We will follow up in writing with some questions, time is pressing. In my final question, some of our successes against the challenges - and we are right not to be complacent, as the Deputy Mayor for Policing indicated earlier on and I know the police are not complacent - have been about police numbers. You have been able to put numbers into certain areas and deploy tactics in driving down violence. We have recruited an additional 1,369 officers. You have paused recruitment at this stage, to take breath I presume and to see where things are at. When do you think you will re-establish recruitment in London?

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** To be clear, we have paused recruitment between now and the end of the calendar year. I have to say that is effectively because we will wait to see what the Comprehensive Spending Review gives us, because we need to understand what our budgets are looking like going forward. I have no doubt that the Government will honour its promise of 20,000 extra police officers in England and Wales, and we still hope we will get 6,000 of those. However, we need to make sure that the funding we have will meet the requirement for those officers. At the moment - Sophie will probably know more than I do - we are around about 32,800, that number may decrease.

Interestingly, the numbers are reducing - losing officers through retirement - month on month a lot less than normal because people are looking at the economy and thinking, “I am not going to retire just yet. I am going to stay longer”. That is healthy because it means we are keeping experience and that is good. We expect in January [2021] to begin recruiting again. It may be at relatively small numbers initially but we will build up again in January as we start to get more Government money coming in and more mayoral money - I hope, if it is possible - coming in and we will boost the numbers again with an ambition of getting up well beyond 32,000.

**Len Duvall AM:** For me to be clear in my own mind, the numbers of officers make a difference in tackling the different strands of violent crime, it gives you the flexibility to deploy those resources. If we do not have the numbers, we cannot do some of this work and we cannot continue to drive down violent crime.

**Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS):** Officers in the Violence Suppression Unit are not brand-new officers because we need experience, but effectively it is because we have had new officers that they are out there. At the moment BCU strength is about 108% of the model, in other words they are actually overspent and that is not counting people at training school. We are starting to see numbers really build here. We have inexperience with officers and they have to get used to it, but we are putting our new officers out with our experienced officers to try to get them up to speed as quickly as possible. The numbers are going up and it is making a difference in terms of visibility and our ability to tackle the violent crime we have been talking about.

**Len Duvall AM:** Thank you very much. Thank you.
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I am sorry, I am really embarrassed about having to do this, but I did say 12pm was my deadline. Cressida [Dick, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] is not here today and so I have a commitment I have to get to, I am afraid.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): We will definitely finish in five minutes. Just two more questions on Tasers. I can assure you, Deputy Commissioner, I will rush through this in five minutes.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I am publicly accountable and so I will not leave.

Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): Thank you for your forbearance, Sir Stephen. You have been very patient, as have I. I will be brief because I just want some of your thoughts around Tasers. The context is, of course, the Home Secretary’s [The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP] announcement that there will be a rollout of 10,000 more [Tasers] nationally, and also the report recently by the NPCC about the safety of officers, which I know you will be sighted on, sponsored by Martin Hewitt [QPM, Chair, NPCC]. It came out with some really interesting figures, about 85% of the correspondence wanted more frontline officers to deploy Tasers. The question I have here is really that I have a sense that the movement of officers’ opinions particularly is more pro-Tasers in the context of the long conversations we have had already about police safety and increasing violence used against officers.

My first question - I will be brief and I will accept your brief answers as well, although you may wish to write to me – is: the Government has announced investment to increase the number of officers carrying Tasers, how many additional MPS officers will you be training to use Tasers in addition to the original number you have?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): When Cressida [Dick] took office in 2017 we had about 4,500 Taser-trained officers. Our stated intent is by the end of 2022 we will have 10,000 officers across the MPS who are Taser trained, so we are looking at a significant increase. I am struggling to find the exact number, to be honest with you, but we are around about 6,000 - I should have this number somewhere but I just cannot see it, I am afraid - but we are headed to 10,000 and we are underway with Taser training right now. Taser training takes time. We have to do the training properly. Tasers are not cheap; they are expensive pieces of equipment and so are the refills as well. We cannot just press a button and go from 4,000 to 10,000.

Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): OK, I get that. I sense therefore if the settled view of the senior management is to train more officers your thoughts are that you would agree probably with the view that Tasers are a great deterrent for those who wish to show violence against police. You accept at senior level in the MPS that there is a place for Taser use in London?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): I do. I have found the figure; we currently have 7,500 Taser-trained officers so it has gone from 4,400 to 7,500 and it will go to 10,000.

I do believe it is a deterrent. The evidence is not entirely clear. My personal belief is that it is. The officers believe it makes them safer and is a piece of equipment that they need. So long as they are properly trained and use their training when they deploy Tasers then it is the sort of thing we should be increasing up to the 10,000 figure. Beyond that, we will have to see what the landscape looks like beyond 2022 when we will have 10,000 Taser-trained officers.

It is important to say - I know you know this - that although the figures show in London that we used Tasers 10,000 times, actually it was only fired on about 900 occasions. The vast majority of times officers draw a Taser they do not fire it, which tells me that it does act as a significant deterrent. In nine out of ten cases it seems to give control of the situation to the officer and reduces injury.
Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): Indeed. That reflects the report’s conclusion that in something like 90% of cases there is no discharge.

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Yes, exactly.

Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): They are used as a deterrent. Also the figures were interesting, over 70% of the public in the last survey welcomed the use of Tasers and certainly the people I know. Unlike Len [Duvall AM], I am pleased to say most of my friends are not politicians and they possibly would agree with many Londoners that it will be useful.

My second point is that on the assumption there are going to be more Tasers rolled out, and in line with the fact London is sadly getting more violent, it is important that the MPS and MOPAC ensure Londoners have confidence in the MPS’s fair and proportionate use of the new Taser. What will the MPS and MOPAC be doing in this context, please?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Can I just challenge what you said? I do not believe the figures show London is becoming more violent, some areas of violence have increased but many are reducing; robbery is down, assault with a knife is down, shootings are down across a long-term trend. However, yes, it is a very valid point, we need to be absolutely certain the training is comprehensive, and we will be reviewing the training to make sure that we sufficiently emphasise de-escalation. I would point out though that the whole point of drawing a Taser is de-escalation, and the figures tend to suggest it does de-escalate because they do not pull the trigger nine out of ten times. That looks, or feels, like de-escalation to me. I am sure as part of the Mayor’s Action Plan there will be more in there about the use of Taser deployments and we are happy to talk to the Mayor about those deployments. Every single Taser deployment is reviewed so there are a lot of reviews going on to make sure that it is being used effectively.

We will happily take on board sensible proposals around how we can continue what appears to be a high generic-level of confidence in our use of Tasers. However, again, we know that populations in London differ in that view, the black population is less happy with police deployment of Tasers and we need to make sure that we are responsive to that concern, try to explain matters to all communities in London and get the confidence and trust gap narrowed significantly.

Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): I am sure we would all agree that is absolutely correct. My last point is that the context is a national review of Tasers and so I assume that the MPS, you and others will be involved very much in that national review to make sure the rollout of this increased capacity, which I believe is welcomed and I believe is a good thing, is properly set under proper timescales. You will be involved, I guess, Sir Stephen, and the Mayor?

Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Lucy D’Orsi, one of our Deputy Assistant Commissioners is the national lead for the Less Lethal Weapons Working Group – a testing title but basically Tasers – and so we will be very well represented.

Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman): That is good. It is in very good hands.

Unmesh Desai AM (Chair): Thank you, Steve. My colleague, Jennette Arnold, has a couple of questions but, Deputy Commissioner, you will be relieved to know they are for the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. I know you have to go, and so can I thank you for your attendance? We will send some questions to you in writing. Thank you again for coming before us.
Sir Stephen House QPM (Deputy Commissioner, MPS): Thanks very much. Goodbye.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Sometimes it feels as if there are some of us on this Committee who are against things that are for the good of Londoners. I remember the first paper on Taser use being introduced to the Metropolitan Police Authority and, in fact, I was on the working party. The issue then, as now, on the use of Tasers is about fairness versus unfairness, proportionate use versus disproportionate use, accountability and transparency. It is when you deal with those issues for Taser use and everything else that you can then relate to the populations, where I do not apologise for their cynicism and for their level of distrust, which is based on how they have experienced the service in so many years.

The good news today, as I understand it, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, comes to transparency and the use of Tasers. I know you will agree with me that that is of utmost importance. Am I right to understand that – something I raised with you in February [2020], you have now dealt with – community monitoring groups will be able to resume reviewing police officers’ body-worn video footage? Will this be on all occasions, so that if there is Taser use, if there is a serious or minor injury, those community monitoring groups will be able to say, “We want to see this particular body-worn video”; am I right?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): You are absolutely right that the issue of community monitoring groups being able to view body-worn videos for stop and search has been resolved. Commander Jane Connors [MPS] has written out or is in the process of writing out to the community monitoring groups, and that should start again by the end of September [2020]. There were privacy issues that have been worked through.

In relation to whether they will be able to see body-worn video for Taser use, the community monitoring groups – as they are set up at the moment – are for stop and search, they are not for use of force. One of the things we are looking at in the Action Plan is much better transparency and accountability around the use of force. It is certainly something that is part of the Action Plan that we will be publishing in the next few weeks, as to how we make sure there is local transparency and accountability not just for stop and search but for use of force. Tasers, you will not be surprised, has been raised a lot during our consultations because of disproportionality with stop and search, and it is absolutely in Taser use the disproportionality, not just for when a Taser is drawn, when someone is ‘red dotted’ as it is called, but also the disproportionality in the amount of times that it is then fired. There are real concerns around that.

In relation to the body-worn video being looked at, that is something we are looking at as part of the Action Plan, not for stop and search but for use of force and better local transparency around that, bringing those two things together.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM: Deputy Mayor, I cannot press on you how really serious this is. Any report that you can come out with that does not deal with the use of force and access to the video image will be unwelcomed is all I can say.

I heard you say that the privacy issues have been dealt with. Are you saying that if you are an innocent passer-by you are going to be pixilated out of the images? That was one of the issues, was it not, that the video image captures more than the interaction between police and the member of the public they are interested in, but the general public. How are images of the general public being dealt with now?

Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime): This is looking at body-worn video just for community monitoring groups in relation to stop and search. They are not being pixilated but because they
have worked through how those images can remain within just that group, and remain private and not for wider dissemination, that is not an issue. I can send you a notice as to what has been worked through in terms of making sure this is going to be possible. It is not around pixilating images because it is keeping it within the community monitoring group setting, not putting it out to wider public viewing.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Yes. I am thinking of an occasion if somebody stops the car driver. Should they pick up the image of the passenger? It depends. They might be suspecting all the people in the car. It gets so complex. There is an issue about how the privacy of the innocent bystander or someone within the close vicinity of that image is dealt with and so I would welcome a note from you on that. Thank you very much.

**Sophie Linden (Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime):** Sure.

**Unmesh Desai AM (Chair):** Thank you. That brings us to the end of the question and answer session. Can I thank all our guests for attending today? Thank you, Sir Stephen [House QPM], and Sophie, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, for your answers to our questions.
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report sets out for noting actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee.

2. **Recommendation**

2.1 That the Committee notes the completed and ongoing actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, and additional correspondence sent and received, as listed in the report.

**Meeting of 16 September 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td>In progress. The Chair wrote to the Deputy Mayor on 6 October 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, undertook to provide:

- A response to the Committee’s recommendation made in November 2019 that MOPAC would report back on the impact of revised processes for the disclosure and collection of evidence, including the timeliness of cases; and

- Further information on how privacy issues have been dealt with to enable community monitoring groups to view body-worn video footage.
The Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to provide:

- A copy of the protocol that outlines how the MPS and local authorities would deal with unlicensed music events (UMEs);
- Details of the process for issuing the new larger fines in relation to UMEs, e.g. £10,000, and how it interacts with a court process, including information on the appeal process; and
- Information on whether removing social media content can be appealed.

The Committee also wrote to the MPS with the additional questions for written answer.

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any outputs arising from the meeting.

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree an Annual Report summarising the work of the Committee over the previous year.

### Meeting of 15 July 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, agreed to provide the following:

- The number of assaults on police officers during the initial period of COVID 19, prior to 31 May 2020;
- The number of inquiries the MPS had with the Independent Office of Police Conduct at the time of the meeting;
- The terms of reference for the review on handcuffing practices;
- Additional information on the work done in boroughs to tackle modern slavery, in particular, details on the modern slavery ambassadors and the new modern slavery coordinator based in the MPS; and
- Additional information on the work done by the child abuse and safeguarding teams to protect children as they began to return to school.

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime agreed to provide the Committee with the number of police officers and staff who would have driven in to work during the COVID-19 crisis and benefitted from an exemption to the congestion charge, as well as the cost to MOPAC providing this benefit.

Meeting of 3 June 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Commissioner, MPS, agreed to provide:

- A list of categories that the MPS use when asking people how they would define themselves;
- A breakdown of the use of section 60 during the COVID crisis by borough and by month, with a comparison of the previous year;
- Data held by the MPS on the use of Tasers over the lockdown period, including ethnicity data;
- Data held by the MPS on Domestic Violence Protection Notices and Domestic Violence Protection Orders during the COVID crisis; and
- The series of commentaries on what the MPS has learnt during this period of time.
The Committee also requested that the following questions be answered in writing:

- Are current stocks of PPE in police custody suites in London sufficient to provide lawyers and other required visitors with PPE?
- What scope is there to allow for video and/or teleconferencing between legal and other professionals and detainees to reduce the need for attendance at custody suites?
- Do you have the resources required to carry out the frequent cleaning required to prevent the spread of COVID-19 on police premises?
- Is there a move to cut back on unnecessary expensive and non-green helicopter use, possibly using drones and other methods, and could you please publish guidance on why and when you use this very expensive operational tool?

**Referral of Conduct Matter to IOPC**

That a review of the powers delegated to the Monitoring Officer, by the Police and Crime Committee, be undertaken and reported to the Committee by September 2020.

A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020. In progress. To be reported to the Committee at its meeting in November 2020. Commissioner, MPS.

**Meeting of 4 March 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner – Met Operations, MPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the course of the discussion, the Assistant Commissioner – Met Operations, MPS, agreed to provide:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The percentage of reported rape allegations categorised as stranger rapes or fleeting acquaintance rapes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The current waiting times for Level 2 in-house Digital Forensics Services and figures on the investment in outsourcing to reduce the digital forensics backlog;
• Information on whether the MPS had been affected by, and was taking action in response to the report from the Forensic Science Regulator that identified that over 1,000 DNA profiles on the national database had been contaminated by police officers and staff and are having to be removed;
• The breakdown in killed and seriously injured pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists and drivers for 2018 and 2019, and the number of hit and run casualties; and
• Detail of whether the involvement of Higher Education Institutions as part of the training contract for new recruits is a direct relationship with the MPS, or through Babcock International.

Meeting of 5 February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service</strong>&lt;br&gt;During the course of the discussion the Commissioner, MPS, undertook to provide the following information:&lt;br&gt;• The number of convicted terrorists that had been released from prison and live in London;&lt;br&gt;• Whether overall knife crime figures included possession offences; and&lt;br&gt;• The number of section 60s issued, including Borough-wide section 60s for 2019.</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting of 22 January 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime Commissioning</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 4 September 2020.</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Safer London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the course of the discussion, the Chief Executive, Safer London undertook to provide the following information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A copy of the MOPAC commissioning template; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Detail of the work of the John Lyon’s Charity in co-ordinating youth services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the course of the discussion the Director of Criminal Justice Services, MOPAC, undertook to provide the following information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The length of delay between the decision to allocate tranche two of the Co-Commissioning Fund (CCF) to the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU), and its subsequent allocation of funding to London Boroughs which incorporated the CCF’s tranche two funds;</td>
<td>Completed. Attached at Appendix 2.</td>
<td>Director of Criminal Justice Services, MOPAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The additional funding, allocated to London Boroughs by the VRU on top of tranche two funds from the CCF; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A weblink to the evaluation reports published on the MOPAC website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A response from MOPAC on the recommendations made by the Police and Crime Committee in its report, <em>A Long Way from Home</em>, on female offending; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The percentage of funding where payment for commissioned services has been withheld as a result of performance monitoring.</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), undertook to provide the following information:

- The number of terrorism-related arrests in London in the last year and the subsequent convictions of those arrested;
- Evidence of what works in terms of investment in police time to reduce the levels of crime, with reference to detection, community policing, stop and search and extra Police Officers;
- The average length of a Released Under Investigation (RUI) term in London before an outcome is achieved;
- The changes in the percentage of bail and RUI for sexual offences suspects;
- Detail of the resources being put into the southern wards in Camden and the West End, and of the meeting with Westminster and Camden Chief Superintendents, hoteliers and residents;
- Clarification on the ongoing costs of prosecutions related to the Extinction Rebellion protests;
- The number of people charged and arrested as part of the Extinction Rebellion protests for the period whilst the section 14 order was in place, as well as how many cases have since been dropped, and how many people who have been RUI, and not charged, are still under investigation;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Confirmation as to whether those who were unlawfully arrested as part of the Extinction Rebellion protests, and put under investigation, have been informed that they are no longer under investigation;
• The reviewed MPS Property Strategy;
• The report on travel times for Safer Neighbourhood Teams to their wards; and
• To write to Len Duvall AM, regarding the MPS decision not to make recommendations to the Crown Prosecution Service regarding the other individuals involved in the Superintendent Williams prosecution.

Meeting of 15 October 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.          | **Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)**  
During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:  
• Confirm the number of current vacancies in the MPS and provide detail of funding for recruitment (noting that last year’s budget was underspent);  
• Examine whether the assessors employed by SSCL, the agency that was undertaking recruitment of police officers, had experienced problems with being paid and obtaining identification cards;  
• Confirm the numbers and coverage of police officers who had been issued with a spit hood;  
• Confirm the number of police officers who had been treated in the last year for an injury from being bitten or spat at; and  
• Confirm the maximum number of schools in which a Safer Schools Officer would work. | In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020. | Deputy Commissioner, MPS. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong>&lt;br&gt;During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:&lt;br&gt;• Provide the total cost of Operation Midland with a breakdown of the costs;&lt;br&gt;• Look into the number of sexual offences and rape cases that supervisors were managing;&lt;br&gt;• Provide details and the context of a letter the MPS sent to a third-party legal firm in which the MPS rebutted that they were responsible for delays to the investigation of the VoteLeave/Leave.EU/BeLeave Campaign.&lt;br&gt;<strong>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to the Rape Review, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime was requested to provide a copy of the action plan to address the recommendations contained in the Rape Review.</td>
<td><strong>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, MOPAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

During the course of the discussion, the Assistant Commissioner, MPS, undertook to provide:

- Confirmation about the number of posts that were vacant, and the number of posts where postholders were on maternity leave or long-term sick leave and which were not being covered in respect of the additional 300 posts which had been created to deal with rape and sexual violence in Basic Command Units (BCUs), broken down by BCU;

- Confirmation of how many of the current digital forensic kiosks were operational;

- Confirmation about the timescales for the next generation of digital forensic kiosks to be fully operational in the BCUs;

- Confirmation as to whether the next generation of kiosks to download evidence from electronic devices would be compatible with the MPS other systems (as highlighted in the report of Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary, Fire & Rescue Services in February 2019) regarding child protection;

- Confirmation about the MPS’s separate investment in digital capability;

- Confirmation as to whether there were any plans to use facial recognition technology at Notting Hill Carnival; and

- Confirmation as to whether the MPS planned to collaborate with private companies to use their technology for facial recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.
During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime undertook to provide a table of progress against the Committee’s recommendations in its report, *A Long Way from Home*. In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020. Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, MOPAC.

### Meeting of 4 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:
- Provide the average time for the vetting process for Independent Custody Visitors;
- Provide the average time for the vetting process in general;
- Look into whether it would be possible to extend the term for Independent Custody Visitors who were going through the renewal process; and
- Discuss with the British Transport Police whether it would be possible to include their figures for Antisocial Behaviour on public transport on the Crime Dashboard.
Meeting of 14 May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis undertook to:
- Provide the action plan for providing digital forensic equipment and training on child protection for police officers in Basic Command Units, together with the timescale for that; and
- Provide examples of materials and guidance provided to schools to raise awareness of hate crime.

Meeting of 6 March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to provide:
- Up to date figures for domestic homicides, and an explanation of any changes in the classification in relation to the figures;
- Updates on Operation Dauntless Plus and Operation Athena, which were tackling domestic abuse;
- Figures on the MPS’s use of “Right to Know” under Clare’s Law; and
- An explanation of the differences in the process at a local level for recording and investigating allegations of domestic abuse and then closing those cases when there are no further lines and screening out alleged crimes.
In addition, the Deputy Commissioner was requested to respond to the following questions:

**EU Exit**

- Is the MPS fully prepared for any additional operational pressures resulting from the UK’s exit from the European Union?
- What preparations have been made in terms of abstractions, cancellation of rest days, and mutual aid?
- Where does EU Exit sit on the MPS’s risk register?

**The Met’s ‘PartnershipPlus’ scheme**

- You have set out details of a new scheme, the PartnershipPlus scheme, to replace the current Met Patrol Plus scheme. Why have you chosen this new scheme and what other options were considered?
- One of the reasons given for the review of the scheme is the pressures on borough budgets. Has there been evidence of boroughs pulling out of the current scheme on financial grounds?
- How many officers will be affected by changes to the scheme?
- Prior to this announcement the Mayor said that officers coming to the end of Met Patrol Plus contracts would be reallocated to duties within the BCU. Is that going to be the case for officers who do not transfer over to the new scheme?
- Where Met Patrol Plus officers do not continue under the new scheme, will they be retained in the BCU in which they currently operate?
- How many boroughs have registered an interest in the new scheme?
### Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:

- Provide the percentage of complaints that had been withdrawn after seeing body-worn videos; and
- Provide the number of complaints that were being upheld after the viewing of body-worn video, compared to those that were upheld before its introduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deputy Commissioner, MPS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner, MPS, undertook to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update the Committee on the outcome of the Crown Prosecution Service examinations into three test cases related to demonstrations outside Parliament in the run up to the exit from the European Union;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brief the Committee in due course on the MPS’s examination of the use of “released under investigation” and bail measures, in the context of recent legislation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirm the number of detectives currently employed by the MPS;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirm whether the Equality Impact Assessment on the Gangs Matrix has been completed and if not, when it will be expected to be completed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform the Committee about how the mental health investigation teams were helping frontline police officers deal with demand arising from persons with mental health issues; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirm with the Committee the procedures for collecting data about sexual harassment within the MPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee has requested a site visit to the Metropolitan Police Marine Policing Unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)

During the course of the discussion, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and Assistant Commissioner, MPS, undertook to provide the materials that the MPS provided to schools to educate young people about their rights in relation to stop and searches both under section 1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984 and section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</td>
<td>Partially completed. The PACE part has been answered through a response to a Mayor’s Question. A follow up request for the actions was made on 26 August 2020.</td>
<td>Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meeting of 4 October 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)</strong>&lt;br&gt;During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Commissioner undertook to provide:&lt;br&gt;• An estimate, when available, of the cost of running the Airwave contract and the delayed Emergency Services Network (ESN) contract simultaneously, as part of a phased implementation of ESN.&lt;br&gt;The Committee also requested a response to the following question on antisocial behaviour:&lt;br&gt;• What progress has there been in assessing the Antisocial Behaviour Warning Notice Scheme in Tower Hamlets and piloting it in the Central North area?</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meeting of 6 June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute item</th>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police</strong>&lt;br&gt;During the course of the discussion, the Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), undertook to provide:&lt;br&gt;• The number of times the MPS had applied for extensions of police bail in the last year, and how many individuals this accounted for.</td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minute item</td>
<td>Subject and action required</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and MPS</strong></td>
<td>In progress. A follow up request for the actions was made on 24 September 2020.</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, MPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the discussion, the Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), undertook to provide:

- Confirmation of how many trials concerning rape and serious sexual assault had been abandoned in the last year;
- Confirmation of how many rape and serious sexual assault cases where a decision still needed to be made as whether to abandon the trial or not;
- Confirmation of how many harassment and how many fraud cases had been reviewed; and
- Confirmation as to whether any of the harassment and fraud cases, which had been reviewed for disclosure, had been abandoned as a result and how many decisions remained to be taken.
Complaints about the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action by</th>
<th>Deadline, if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints about the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC)</strong></td>
<td>No disclosures to report for the period from 7 September to 5 October 2020.</td>
<td>Monitoring Officer.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee agreed, inter alia, to delegate to the Monitoring Officer all of the powers and functions conferred on it by the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations, with the exception of the functions set out at Part 4 of the Regulations which may not be delegated; and guidance on the handling of complaints which requires the Monitoring Officer to report, on a regular basis, the summary details (such as can be reported in public), on the exercise of any and all of these functions to the Committee for monitoring purposes.

**Transparency Procedure**

The Committee agreed Members disclose to the Executive Director of Secretariat or his nominated representative (within 28 days of the contact) details of any significant contact with the MPS and/or MOPAC which they consider to be relevant to the work of the Committee; and such disclosures be reported to the next meeting of the Committee.

| Transparency Procedure | No disclosures to report for the period from 7 September 2020 to 5 October 2020. | Executive Director of Secretariat. | N/A |

4. **Additional Correspondence**

4.1 The Committee received an informal briefing in advance of the August bank holiday weekend. Following the briefing, the Chair wrote a letter of thanks to Commander Jane Connors, MPS, as attached at Appendix 3.
4.2 On 3 June 2020, the Committee wrote to the Commissioner, MPS, requesting additional information on COVID-19 Fixed Penalty Notices data and unconscious bias training in the MPS. A response was received on 9 September 2020, as attached at Appendix 4.

4.3 The Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Committee co-signed a letter to the Commissioner, MPS, expressing the Committee’s concern about the rise in assaults against police officers. The letter was sent on 11 September 2020 and is attached at Appendix 5.

4.4 Following the Committee’s meeting on 16 September 2020, the guests from the Crown Prosecution Service wrote to the Chair with additional information on the work they are doing to improve the response of the criminal justice system to rape and serious sexual offences. A copy of the letter is attached at Appendix 6.

4.5 On 30 September 2020, the Chair wrote to the Mayor requesting that a response to the Committee’s report on Domestic Abuse, published on 3 April 2020, is provided as a matter of urgency, as attached at Appendix 7.

4.6 The Committee is recommended to note the correspondence sent and received.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:
Appendix 1 – Letter from the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, dated 15 September 2020
Appendix 2 – Follow-up information received from MOPAC, dated 2 October 2020
Appendix 3 – Letter sent to Commander Jane Connors, MPS, dated 8 September 2020
Appendix 4 – Response from MPS, received on 9 September 2020
Appendix 5 – Letter to Commissioner, MPS, dated 11 September 2020
Appendix 6 – Letter from CPS, dated 22 September 2020
Appendix 7 – Letter to the Mayor, dated 30 September 2020
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Lauren Harvey, Senior Committee Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk">lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Unmesh,

Thank you for your letter of 6 August and I apologise for the delay in responding.

The Government required Transport for London (TfL) to reintroduce the Congestion Charge and Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), and urgently bring forward proposals to widen the level and scope of the charge, as a condition of TfL’s funding deal. The Mayor is clear that this is not the deal that he wanted but it was necessary to keep London’s Tubes and buses running after fares income fell by up to 90 per cent at the peak of lockdown.

I want to reassure you that all emergency service vehicles continue to be included in TfL’s register of operational vehicles that are exempt from the Congestion Charge. Private vehicles may be included on this register if TfL is satisfied they are being used for policing purposes, and must be taken off the register when this is no longer the case.

I understand that the temporary changes to the Congestion Charge introduced on 22 June have impacted some police officers travelling to work within the Congestion Charge Zone (CCZ).

I, of course, recognise the extremely valuable role played by the police. NHS and care home staff have the benefit of a reimbursement scheme because they come into close contact on a regular basis with potentially significant numbers of people who may be infected with coronavirus or who may be more vulnerable to the impacts of infection. Staff apply for reimbursement for eligible journeys through their employer who then submits the claim to TfL.

As I hope you can understand, we have had to consider the negative impact on congestion reduction and consequential air quality benefits of the Congestion Charge scheme were a wider reimbursement scheme in place. Car traffic in central London had already reached pre-pandemic levels and was forecast to double without the temporary changes to the Congestion Charge.

During seven weeks of lockdown, all Metropolitan Police Officers and Staff did not need to pay road user charges as a result of all three schemes being suspended, but there was no record made of how many travelled by car during this period. By 18 May, car traffic levels in central London had surpassed pre-lockdown levels on weekdays, despite many people still working from home and restrictions on economic and social activity.

Estimates were made about how many officers and staff would be affected by the temporary changes to the Congestion Charging scheme including those who may choose to drive
through the CCZ to get to work as well as those who are based within the zone. This proved very challenging and an approximate figure was calculated of between 2,000 and 3,500 people, based on the number of people who work in buildings in or on the edge of the zone and recognising that a percentage of them would be working from home and of those that do need to come in, not all would choose to drive.

The Federation have provided some data, which shows that 26% of the 3,700 officers surveyed, approximately 1,000 officers, currently drive into the CCZ to get to work. It is not known how many of these officers use vehicles which are already exempt from paying the Congestion Charge because they are used for operational purposes (e.g. vehicles used by dog handlers are exempt from the charge, as well as vehicles used by officers that are part of a rostered on-call rota).

The Federation survey was only completed by 3,700 officers; there are a further 29,000 officers, and approximately 10,000 PCSOs and Police Staff who may wish to have benefitted from an exemption of the Congestion Charge. Therefore 2,000 to 3,500 officers and staff feels like a reasonable estimate. The overall cost could be extrapolated based on the initial £11.50 charge a day and the increased cost of £15 a day, now seven days a week. The cost of reimbursing officers would fall to the MPS and would be a significant additional cost during a challenging budget environment.

It is also important to appreciate the wider context in which these decisions were made. The current deal TfL has struck with Government is just a sticking plaster. The old model for funding public transport in London simply does not work in this new reality – fares income does not cover the cost of running services while so few people can safely use public transport.

London is one of the only major cities in Western Europe without a Government grant for day-to-day transport operations. We need a new funding model with Government – which will have to involve either permanent funding from central Government or giving London more control over key taxes so TfL can pay for it, or a combination of both.

The police and all our emergency services have done, and continue to do, a phenomenal job in responding to the impact of Covid-19 on London. Emergency service vehicles, including police cars, are exempt from the charge and free travel on all public transport across the city is made available to our police officers.

If you have any further questions, do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,

Sophie Linden
Deputy Mayor for Policing And Crime
Meeting held on 22 January 2020: Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime Commissioning

Correspondence received:
Some of the answers to the below are in the attached letter of 14 July. I have indicated below, and provided additional information where this isn’t answer in full in the letter.

During the course of the discussion the Director of Criminal Justice Services, MOPAC, undertook to provide the following information:

- The length of delay between the decision to allocate tranche two of the Co-Commissioning Fund (CCF) to the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU), and its subsequent allocation of funding to London Boroughs which incorporated the CCF’s tranche two funds;

  ANSWER: This is partially answered in point 5 of the attached. Additional info is as follows: Tranche 2 of the Co-commissioning Fund was initially due to commence delivery in 2019/20 and run for two years. As previously documented the funding was transferred to the VRU to allocate to boroughs to deliver projects aimed at tackling violence. These projects commenced in 2019/20, so the same finance year as Tranche 2 was due to start.

  - The additional funding, allocated to London Boroughs by the VRU on top of tranche two funds from the CCF;

  ANSWER: This is partially answered in point 5 of the attached but a figure isn’t provided. Further information is as follows:

  £3.2m of LCPF funding was provided to the VRU to allocate to London Boroughs over the 19/20 and 20/21 financial years. This was part of £8.8m in total allocated to the boroughs in support of delivery against their local violence reduction action plan.

  In 2019/20 the £4.4m allocated to boroughs was funded from the Home Office VRU grant and the £3.2m LCPF funding was carried forward and allocated in full to boroughs in this financial year.

  The £3.2m is being used to fund 90 intervention projects commissioned by boroughs.

  - A weblink to the evaluation reports published on the MOPAC website:

  ANSWER: This was provided in point 10 of the attached.
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Dear Unmesh,

Thank you for your letter reporting your Committee’s review of MOPAC’s commissioning and the recommendations which it identified. I apologise for the delay in my response to you.

I was very pleased to read that your Committee recognised the many strengths within MOPAC’s commissioning practices, and also our focus on continually improving and adapting our approach to best support the vital services we work with. I also thank you and the Committee for recognising the work of taking on additional devolved funding through the London Crime Prevention Fund; commissioning of support services for victims of crime in London, and the Young Londoners Fund since 2013.

With regard to your recommendations, I have addressed each in turn below.

1. **We strongly recommend that MOPAC ensures next year’s funding allocations for SNBs are issued on time and that this year’s issues do not recur.**

   I regret the delays to funding which occurred last year due to changes in the funding process. The revised application process for the funding was in place for this year’s applications. The closing date has now passed, and we have received 20 applications. Several SNBs indicated that due to the ongoing Covid-19 crisis they may not be able to meet this deadline and we are continuing to support them to potentially put in late applications in the near future. You will appreciate that due to Covid-19, there may unfortunately be further delays in allocating the funding this year and we are seeking to mitigate these as far as possible.

2. **MOPAC ensures with immediate effect that funding is provided to commissioned services on a long-term basis and meets the target of 3-4 years for the timeframe of all funding allocations**

   We recognise that longer-term funding gives organisations the ability to forward-plan and provide longer term outcomes. Some of MOPAC’s core commissioned services, such as the London Victim and Witness Service (LVWS), are commissioned on a multi-year
basis, in this case for 2-years, with the potential for 2 one year extensions (so, for a total period of four years). Also, through the London Crime Prevention Fund Co-Commissioned Fund I was able to provide three-year funding for significant programmes of work benefitting multiple boroughs. As core commissioned services are recommissioned, we always consider the options for multi-year funding arrangements.

However, there are also instances where it either not appropriate or not possible to provide longer-term funding. In instances where new approaches or services are being piloted, we look to test this over a shorter period before committing additional funds. However, the biggest barrier to long term commissioning is central government funding arrangements where we are constrained by the requirements dictated by the funder. For example, the Early Intervention Youth Fund ran for only a period of 18 months, creating a significant cliff edge.

3. **MOPAC assesses impact effectively and considers extending data collection beyond the lifespan of a project to properly assess behavioural change, and reports back to the Committee within six months on action it has taken to improve evaluation of longer-term outcomes.**

MOPAC conducts extensive evaluation of services which we fund. We also publish details of our approach to evaluation, as well as all those completed and published evaluations. These can be viewed here: https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/academic-research/mopac-evaluations.

The timeframes of our evaluations vary depending on the specific circumstances but are typically conducted over a number of years and, where appropriate, already measure longer term outcomes. This often means we publish an interim report and then a final evaluation report once the initiative has completed, or a short time later. This approach means that we are able to quickly feed the learning from the evaluations into our commissioning approach to support future decision making.

It would be possible to explore the feasibility of seeking to assess impact over an extended period where initiatives are seeking to achieve longer term benefits to look at the sustainability (or not) of programme effects. However, it would also raise some challenges – especially around resources and data collection.

4. **We recommend that MOPAC publishes the funding formulas that are used for allocations for all main funds and that these should reflect crime levels. We ask for this to be actioned within one month of receipt of this letter and action reported back to the Committee.**

The funding formulas for the London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF) were published in the decision here (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pcd_421_-_london_crime_prevention_fund_2019-20_and_2020-21.pdf). The funding formula used in VRU LCPF funding was explained in a document that is available for all PCC members and was provided to all boroughs on the 9th of September 2019, when they were informed of their individual funding allocations. I have also attached it to this letter.

All decisions pertaining to the LCPF, including the Co-Commissioning Fund, are taken in consultation with borough leaders and Heads of Community Safety, but inevitably it is not possible to find solutions which individually benefit every borough, as there is a maximum funding envelope. The use of a need and demand formula to calculate allocations makes this process objective, and the blend of deprivation factors and offending data means that funding is not solely based on crime statistics.
The new method of allocation by “need and demand” formula was also introduced, which made further changes to the allocations within that envelope. These new allocations were made entirely based on the data. Reductions were felt most keenly where boroughs had previously been receiving a larger allocation under the more competitive process. We provided support to these boroughs to manage the transition in the funding approach, including providing a higher uplift in the first year to help to mitigate the impact.

There is also a funding formula which underpins the allocation of Safer Neighbourhood Boards funding. This is based on a range of indicators, including crime levels and the Multiple Indices of Deprivation. This information was published in previous decisions, but for greater transparency we will put it on the SNB webpage.

5. **MOPAC undertakes a ‘lessons learned’ exercise from its and boroughs’ experience of the co-commissioning fund; and ensures that funding allocations are made promptly to boroughs and within agreed timeframes.**

I am pleased that the Committee was informed that the Co-Commissioning Fund (CCF) is an effective approach. The first round of the CCF was successfully received and we look forward to moving forward with the next round of funding. Within MOPAC we have reflected on the successes of the CCF to date, and also on the areas where we can continue to improve. These learnings will be implemented in the next round of funding.

As part of the consultation with boroughs, following the creation of the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU), it was agreed that the money originally ringfenced for a second tranche of the CCF should be targeted on violence reduction initiatives, and managed by the VRU.

This was an exceptional circumstance and we are now in a position to align funding allocations going forward, and decisions on LC_PF and VRU funding will be developed alongside each other to help ensure a seamless process for boroughs receiving funding. We also appreciate the need for boroughs to understand their allocations and processes as soon as possible to inform future commissioning decisions, so we will endeavour to keep making allocation decisions in a timely manner.

6. **MOPAC reviews its processes and requirements for organisations bidding for funding to streamline and improve processes, in consultation with commissioned services, reporting back to the Committee within six months.**

I am pleased to hear that the move to online reporting has been welcomed. MOPAC is looking to expand this to other grants and contracts to further streamline this across providers. We are also proactively looking to further improve the bidding process. MOPAC recently commissioned a review of procurement and grant awards processes. We will be implementing the recommendations of this in the coming months and would welcome the opportunity to update the PCC on our progress in due course.

7. **MOPAC considers whether a less onerous process could be developed for small organisations bidding for relatively small amounts of funding and reports back to the Committee within six months on changes made.**

We recognise the importance of funding smaller, grassroots organisations which provide vital, localised services across London. We include specific funding opportunities targeted at specialist grassroots organisations within our commissioning processes. One example is the Victims Small Grants Fund, through which, since 2015, a total of £3.8
8. **MOPAC ensures that bidding opportunities are issued in a timely fashion and remove short timescales that may unfairly impact small-scale organisations.**

When opportunities are from MOPAC’s own funding budget we take steps to ensure that we put in place reasonable timescales for bidding, and ensure that organisations have an opportunity to ask clarification questions.

However, where we are responding to a process set by another commissioner, for example the Home Office, we are constrained by the timescales and the requirements of the process they have set out. In these circumstances, we take steps to ensure we disseminate information about the opportunity as soon as possible to maximise the time available to our partners for bidding.

9. **MOPAC considers how it can provide a map or directory of funded services to be updated on a regular basis and improve the existing map of LCPF funded services and reports back to the Committee within six months on action taken.**

MOPAC has produced a contract register of funded services, including both contracted and grant funded services, which details each provider, a description of the service or programme, and the total value of each contract. This is available here [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/contracts_register_2018-19.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/contracts_register_2018-19.pdf). It will be updated again shortly.

We are also working to produce a directory of victims’ services, which will be available on the London Victim and Witness Service (LVWS) website. This will detail all the victims’ services that we commission, alongside the services commissioned by LVWS. In the future, local authority services will also be added.

10. **MOPAC considers how it can promote and share examples of best practice across London boroughs based on the data they collect and evaluations undertaken and reports back to the Committee within six months on action taken.**

MOPAC has developed a unique website that pulls together a considerable amount of learning and practical support for those interested in evaluation. The website includes our published evaluations, but also information on our approach to evaluation; an audit of all our evaluations, as well as a practical toolkit that guides individuals through the evaluation process. Links to the above can be found here: [https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/academic-research](https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/academic-research)

Additionally, MOPAC’s Evidence and Insight team host an annual international conference specifically for analysts aiming to share best practice and learning, as well as quarterly learning seminars and also produce other regular products, for example a bulletin, that share insights and practice. We are currently looking to develop our distribution list of the above products.

11. MOPAC considers how it can develop a dialogue with all funded services to allow them to give feedback and inform the bidding process, and reports back to the Committee within six months on action taken.

MOPAC is in regular contact with providers and welcomes their feedback on all aspects of the commissioning process. We hold market engagement events for providers where we consult and seek their feedback on both our draft proposals for the development of services and the bidding process. Where possible and appropriate, we adjust our approach to reflect providers’ views and experiences.

We also encourage dialogue with providers throughout the bidding process and offer opportunities for providers to ask us questions once tenders are released. For example, when the London Victim and Witness Service (LVWS) tender was published, MOPAC ran a session with interested organisations to answer any questions on the process and requirements that they had before bidding.

12. We recommend that MOPAC publishes clear and easy to follow dashboards on commissioned services so that Londoners can see what services are funded in their borough with information on outcomes and impact; and that it reports back to the Committee within six months on action taken.

I agree that we should be as transparent as possible about how money is being spent and the outcomes which are being achieved. As referenced above, we are currently reviewing our quarterly reporting processes, and defining what details relating to funded services can be published. Once completed, I will make sure that the quarterly reporting documents are easily accessible online for Londoners.

I would like to thank you, the Committee and all of the London boroughs and organisations which have participated in this important and detailed piece of work. We welcome your feedback and look forward to continuing to work closely with you to ensure that the best services are provided for Londoners.

Yours sincerely,

Sophie Linden
Deputy Mayor for Policing And Crime
VRU Area Prioritisation Tool and how it is being used to allocate funding

**Purpose**
1. To present the VRU Area Prioritisation Tool and how it is being used to allocate funding.

**Background**
2. London’s first Violence Reduction Unit was established in 2018 to address an increase in violence across London.

3. The Violence Reduction Unit has three strategic aims:
   - To reduce and stabilise violence across London – violence is a concern for us all; we will all play our part to reduce it.
   - To increase feelings of safety – recognising that London is one of the safest cities in the world.
   - To put community at the heart of our work – only by doing so do we have a sustainable long-term approach towards reducing violence.

4. The Mayor has provided a budget of £6.8 million for the VRU and the Home Office have awarded London £7m from its £35m VRU fund.

5. Further detail on the VRU approach to violence and priorities for the first year can be found in the VRU strategy.

**Introduction to the VRU Area Prioritisation Tool**
6. As part of the evidence base underpinning the VRU, the GLA Community Intelligence Unit (CIU) in conjunction with MOPAC and VRU colleagues have designed a decision-support tool to assist in decisions around resource allocation and funding, such as the prioritisation of geographic areas that have the greatest need. This tool will inform a range of VRU strategic and commissioning decisions.

7. The tool has been designed to be interactive and flexible, and can be used over time as more data is obtained and added to it. The tool can be used to look collectively at all violence and associated incidents/harms, or look specifically at a particular strand of violence, such as Domestic Violence or Serious Youth Violence.

8. The data contained within the tool can be used in different ways to target resources, quantitatively, by formally scoring areas based on their level of need to inform eligibility decisions around funding, or more qualitatively, to provide contextual data on the situation in a given area or how different needs are distributed across the city in order to shape the development of programmes to prevent and reduce violence.

**VRU Area Prioritisation Tool – methodology and scoring**
9. The tool brings together data from a range of sources including statistics on different types of violent crime from the MPS incident records; perceptions of crime, local area and the police from the MOPAC Public Attitudes Survey; and public health data from a range of official sources. Within each of these broad categories are 17 measures that are groupings of around 60 indicators. These data have been set to electoral ward level where possible and London borough-level elsewhere.
Data contained within the tool

10. The crime data has been sourced from the Metropolitan Police Service, London Ambulance Service and the British Transport Police; and has been aligned in to the eleven individual measures listed below. The CIU has also compared this with additional measures addressing public perceptions, and public health measures associated with violence. These data come from the MOPAC Public Attitudes Survey and a range of other sources including Public Health England, Office of National Statistics and various Government Websites.

Crime Measures:

1. Domestic Abuse – Violence with Injury (VWI)
2. Gun Crime
   a. Lethal barrel discharge
   b. Gun Crime
3. Homicides
4. Knife Crime
   a. Knife Crime with Injury
   b. Knife Crime with Injury (under 25-year-old victim, excluding Domestic Abuse)
   c. Knife Crime
5. London Ambulance Service – Assault Incidents
6. Rape
7. Other Sexual Offences
8. Violence without Injury
9. Violence with Injury (VWI) excluding Domestic Abuse
10. Serious Youth Violence
11. British Transport Police – number of violent offences (including possession of weapon offences)

The indicators for Gun Crime and Knife Crime have been combined using the weightings suggested by the Cambridge Harm Index (CHI).

Perceptions:

1. Perceptions about local area
   a. Agree local area is place where people from different backgrounds get on well
   b. Likely to help police find suspect by providing information
   c. Likely to call the police to report a crime occurring in their local area
2. Perceptions about crime in their area
   a. Feel that gangs are a problem in the local area
   b. Feel that gun crime is a problem in the local area
   c. Feel that knife crime is a problem in the local area
   d. Feel that violence is a problem in the local area
3. Perceptions/trust in the police
   a. Agree the police are dealing with the things that matter to the community
   b. Feel the police do a good job in the local area
   c. Agree the police treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are
   d. Agree that the MPS is an organisation they can trust
**Public Health:**

1. Pregnancy and birth  
   a. Teenage Pregnancy  
2. Children in social care  
   a. Children in need  
   b. Looked after children  
   c. Child protection plans  
3. Child development  
   a. EYFS Good level of development  
4. Substance misuse  
   a. LAS call outs to alcohol-related incidents  
   b. LAS call outs to drug overdoses  
5. Skills and training  
   a. Long-term unemployment  
   b. NEET/unknown  
6. School attendance  
   a. School exclusions  
   b. Persistent Absenteeism from School  
7. Health and wellbeing  
   a. LAS call outs to self-harm incidents  
   b. Social, emotional and mental health needs at school  
8. Poverty  
   a. Children in poverty  
   b. IDACI

**Scoring for violent crime data and related incidents within the tool**

11. The tool can be used to score areas in different ways, and for this round of funding aimed to highlight Boroughs that have consistently high scores across the different measures.

12. The first two methods concentrate on identifying the boroughs that show consistently high levels of violent crime/incidents across the eleven identified measures. Whereas, the third method creates a composite score using a weighting system.

13. The City Intelligence Unit (CIU) compared the results of the three different methods, with the following findings:

14. **Method 1. Top quintiles:** In this method, the number of times that the individual borough featured in the top seven boroughs\(^1\) for each of the eleven measures were counted. So, for example, if a borough has the third highest level of Gun Crime, the second highest level of Homicides, the fourth highest level of Violence without Injury offences, and feature outside the top seven highest featuring boroughs for all other measures, then this borough would be awarded 3 points. The maximum number of points a borough could be awarded based on this method is eleven.

15. **Method 2. Levels:** This uses a similar approach to the one above, but awards two points when a borough features in the top two boroughs with the highest level of offences/incidents across the eleven measures, and awards one point when a

---

\(^1\) Closest to the top 20% of boroughs
borough features in the top half of the boroughs. This method produces fewer tied ranks between the boroughs than method 1 does, although it is slightly more complex to interpret.

16. **Method 3. Combined weighted score**: This method compares the above eleven measures to the weightings documented in the Cambridge Harm Index (CHI), and applies the most applicable weighting to each measure. The weightings for each of the measures are then added together to provide a single score. This method has the advantage of no tied ranks between the boroughs, although refers to a measure of harm/severity, opposed to being a representation of boroughs with consistently high offence/incidence levels across the different measures. This measure is thus a bit better than the other two methods for the lower end of our ranking system.

17. **Method 4. Including perceptions and public health**: This method is identical to method 1, counting the number of times boroughs were in the top fifth. But this method includes the measures regarding public health and public perceptions. For this method, the crime metrics were grouped into six measures using similar groupings to knife crime and gun crime. These scores were not used for this exercise on the recommendation of our public health experts at the GLA, but there is a strong degree of correlation between the crime scores and the public health scores for most Boroughs.

### Ranking table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>1. Top quintiles</th>
<th>2. Levels</th>
<th>3. Cambridge Harm Index</th>
<th>4. Including PH/PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>[2:3]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[2:3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>[4:6]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[7:9]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[5:6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[7:9]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[2:3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[7:9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>[17:32]</td>
<td>[16:17]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[8:10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>[17:32]</td>
<td>[18:19]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>[16:20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>[14:16]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>[8:10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 3</td>
<td>Time 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>[17:32]</td>
<td>[21:27]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Jane

I am writing to thank you for updating the Police and Crime Committee on planning for the August Bank Holiday weekend which we found very useful and informative.

I would also like to add my personal thanks to Commander Dr Alison Heydari and the other officers I met for their reception and update when I attended the Command Centre on the Bank Holiday Monday. The relatively low numbers of arrests over the weekend and lack of significant incidents relating to unlicensed music events or the several protest marches that took place attest to the successful management of these and the positive engagement undertaken with the public.

Yours sincerely,

Unmesh Desai AM
Chair of the Police and Crime Committee

Cc Commissioner, MPS
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Police and Crime Committee – actions from 3 June Q&A

1) On the 3 June 2020, the Met Police published data on COVID-19 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) issued by the Met between 27 March 2020 and 15 May 2020. The data showed that the breakdown of FPNs for Black, Asian and minority ethnic Londoners was almost 50 per cent higher than white Londoners when compared to the share of London’s population. The Committee did not have the chance to review this data before the scheduled Police and Crime Committee meeting on 3 June 2020. We are therefore writing to you now to ask for some further information. On the data for FPNs, the Met included a breakdown of the areas where FPNs were issued but did not publish the same breakdown for where arrests were made. Please can you send the Committee an update on arrests and where those took place?

Answer:

Due to overall FPN and arrest numbers being so low this was the first detailed analysis that we have been able to undertake, looking at data over an almost two month period to understand the trends. The volume of arrests for the period covered by the report, 27 March 2020 – 15 May 2020 was very low (36 arrests in total for breaches of Covid legislation where no other criminality was a factor).

The way in which arrest data is recorded means that it is difficult to differentiate consistently the location of arrest from the Custody suite to which the arrested person was taken. This, along with the same sample size, means that we will not publish arrest location data.

In total, from 27 March, there were 89 arrests relating purely to Covid legislation breaches (the last occurring on 1 June) and 838 arrests where an individual has been arrested for a criminal offence and then also arrested for a breach of Covid-19 legislation.

The MPS has adopted a proportionate approach to the enforcement of breaches of the Covid-19 legislation from the outset. Our officers have set out to Engage, Explain and then Encourage people to adhere to the regulations. It is only when this approach has been unsuccessful that Enforcement has been necessary. This approach explains why such a low number of FPNs, and an even lower number of arrests for a breach of the regulations alone, have been seen in comparison to the approximate nine million population of London. Alongside this approach, the MPS has implemented a rigorous quality assurance process to monitor the use of FPNs and to ensure they were issued appropriately and correctly.

Whilst the volume of FPNs and arrests across London has varied from area to area, we have seen a general correlation against the locations which were priority areas for policing, such as high violence areas. It is of note that during this period we have undertaken significant proactive policing activity targeting violence, drugs, robbery, domestic abuse, speeding and other offences to keep communities safe. In the early part of lockdown, when the regulations were new and coincided with high temperatures, more enforcement was necessary. For both FPNs and arrests, young men make up the biggest offending group. In total, more white people received FPNs or were arrested than other individual ethnic groups. However, when compared with the composition of the resident population, higher proportions of those in black and minority ethnic (BAME) groups were overall issued with FPNs or arrested across London as a whole.

The reasons for this are likely to be complex and reflect a range of factors. This includes interactions between the areas subject to significant proactive policing activity targeting
crime hot-spots and both the variation in the age-profile and geographical distribution of ethnic groups in London.

A further detailed report will be released in the next financial year.

2) In March 2019, it was confirmed that 17,000 Met police officers had received training in unconscious bias. Given the news that there are now 32,000 police officers in the Met, can you please send the Committee a breakdown of the percentage of the Met’s workforce who are yet to receive this training, details of the plan in place to roll out unconscious bias training for all officers and Met employees on the frontline and how frequently officers are required to undertake refresher training on unconscious bias.

Answer:

The Metropolitan Police Service is committed to ensuring that unconscious bias training is an integral part of officer and staff development.

Since March 2019, a further 7,000 more officers and staff received training on unconscious bias.

The subject is taught to officers at various stages of their career: as part of recruitment training, during mandatory professional development and as a requisite for some specific roles.

The training of officers and staff is a continuous process and does not have an anticipated completion date. Furthermore, the workforce itself is not static - unconscious bias training is delivered to all newly recruited Police Constables, Detective Constables, Special Constables, Police Community Support Officers, Dedicated Detention Officers, Public Access Officers and volunteers.

The frequency of refresher or additional training is dependent on the role that officers perform and their career path. Those in detective training, safeguarding, Senior Investigating Officers or those on the Leadership and Promotion programme receive additional input.

All officers and staff also have access to LinkedIn Learning which includes content on Race and Law Enforcement.
Unmesh Desai AM  
Chair of the Police and Crime Committee

Steve O’Connell AM  
Deputy Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee

Dame Cressida Dick DBE QPM  
Commissioner  
Metropolitan Police Service

(Sent via email)

Dear Cressida

Assaults on police officers

We are writing to express the concern of the London Assembly’s Police and Crime Committee about the recent rise in assaults on police officers carrying out their legal duties in the capital. It is very distressing that this rise has occurred at a time of increased pressure and stress for police officers on the frontline who have been working so hard to protect Londoners during the global pandemic.

In particular, we were concerned to hear about incidents where officers from black and minority ethnic backgrounds have been singled out for attack and verbal abuse for fulfilling their duties.

We trust that all officers have access to welfare and support where they are recovering from injury or need to deal with trauma and extend our sympathy and best wishes to those officers.

In conclusion, we would like to thank all London’s police officers for their work to protect Londoners and keep the capital safe. We would appreciate you sharing the Committee’s message of thanks via your staff networks.

Yours sincerely

Unmesh Desai

11 September 2020
22 September 2020

Dear Unmesh,

Thank you for your invitation to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to give evidence to your Committee on 16 September 2020. Lisa and I welcomed the opportunity to discuss the work the CPS is doing, nationally and in London, to improve the response of the criminal justice system to rape and serious sexual offences (RASSO).

Rape is an abhorrent crime. We share the deep public concern about the gap between reported rape and criminal justice outcomes, and we are committed to playing our part in addressing this disparity. The latest figures show an increase in the proportion of cases being charged, however, it is clear that too many cases are still dropping out of the system. There is no single reason for this and during our session, we touched on a range of factors, including disclosure and the growth in digital evidence, with more work being undertaken at the pre-charge stage to build stronger cases.

We need to fully understand the problem in order to tackle it effectively. This is why the CPS is actively involved in the cross-Government review into how rape and sexual offences are handled, end-to-end, across the criminal justice system. It is also why the CPS launched RASSO 2025 in July 2020 so we can make progress in a range of areas while the Review completes its vital work.

RASSO 2025 sets out a raft of measures to: improve joint working with the police, improve support for victims, deliver comprehensive training for our prosecutors – in particular, to ensure that they understand the changing nature of these crimes - and our commitment to ensuring that our specialist RASSO units are fully resourced.

We therefore wanted to highlight some of the work that we are currently undertaking and aspects where your Committee might be able to contribute:

- **We have published our draft guidance on pre-trial therapy for consultation.** The guidance makes it clear that no one should be prevented from accessing therapy. We know this is a difficult and daunting area and the guidance seeks to explain the tensions between a victim’s right to privacy, the ability of the Police to conduct an investigation, a defendant’s right to a fair trial and the safeguards in place to manage this. We’ve had a couple of focused sessions with the London Victims’ Commissioner to secure her expert views on this guidance and would also welcome the views of your Committee.

- **We are launching a consultation on our revised rape legal guidance next month as we very much recognise that the world is changing, and our guidance needs to be updated to reflect this.** The revised edition will include updated content on myths and stereotypes and new content about supporting victims with particular vulnerabilities. The guidance will be underpinned by a new suite of training tools for prosecutors, including new training on the impact of trauma on victims, as well as resources to support understanding of the changing nature of sexual encounters and relationships. We would therefore welcome the views of your Committee on our updated guidance.

- **Supporting victims with particular vulnerabilities is a golden thread running through RASSO 2025.** In July we published our same-sex toolkit which addresses the specific issues that arise in relation to abuse involving gay, bisexual and transgender victims and defendants. We are currently engaging with a number of specialist services around the country that support ethnic minority victims to identify gaps in service
provision, as well as good practices that we can pilot and roll-out in the future. Again, we would welcome
your Committee’s thoughts on any specific organisations that it would be beneficial for us to engage with
in London.

We have launched a dedicated microsite for RASSO 2025 where you can find all the information on our work,
including consultations on our work: https://www.cps.gov.uk/about-cps/how-we-prosecute-rape

A key plank of RASSO 2025 is our strategic partnership with the police. We have committed to a wide-ranging
programme of work with the police through a national joint rape action plan. The plan aims to improve case
progression, help us to build stronger cases from the outset, and accelerate the time taken to bring cases to
court. We’ll publish a draft for consultation later in the autumn, ahead of publishing a final plan early next year.
Actions already prioritised include an updated joint CPS-police rape protocol, an offender-centric approach to
investigations and case building, and the use of special measures to support vulnerable witnesses.

The Director of Public Prosecutions and NPCC Criminal Justice Lead, AC Nick Ephgrave, made a joint statement to
the National Disclosure Improvement Board in September making it clear that rape is a top priority for the police
and CPS. As such we are bringing our Joint Action Plan under that shared governance, alongside disclosure and
case progression. In terms of stakeholder scrutiny, we have invited the London Victims’ Commissioner, alongside
the national Victims’ Commissioner and Domestic Abuse Commissioner, to form a senior stakeholder reference
group to help develop our work and monitor delivery.

The police-CPS joint action plan builds on local plans that have already been put in place by CPS Areas and their
police forces, where we are piloting different approaches to support timely decision making and build strong
cases. In London, senior management from CPS and the police have committed to a Rape Implementation Plan in
response to collective concern over declining rape referrals. The plan aims to boost referral numbers through
ongoing work to improve police file quality, better understanding of CPS decision-making and processes to
improve overall timeliness. Both parties agreed better dialogue was needed in relation to reasonable lines of
enquiry, mobile phone evidence and to robustly challenge societal rape myths and stereotypes.

The London Rape Implementation Plan includes:

- Monthly face-to-face Early Advice surgeries, which have been instrumental in building stronger
  relationships, helping to clear case backlogs and increasing referrals to CPS.
- A joint focus on training, which has been key in areas of mutual interest such as the application of the
  Threshold Test, reasonable lines of enquiry and early investigative advice.
- Work to improve the experience of victims, including work with local Sexual Assault Referral Centres to
  consider the use of medical and forensic evidence in RASSO cases; and improving the use of psychological
  evidence of trauma.

Thank you for your continued interest and feedback. We hope that you will remain engaged in the coming
months and continue to hold us to account on this vital area of CPS work.

Yours sincerely,

Rachel Zaltzman
Deputy Director Strategy and Policy – Crown Prosecution Service
Lisa Ramsarran  
Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor – CPS London North

Lynette Woodrow  
Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor – CPS London South

Cc: Claire Waxman, London Victims’ Commissioner
Dear Sadiq

Domestic abuse

Further to my letter to you, on behalf of the Police and Crime Committee, dated 3 April 2020, I am writing to you to ask that a response to the Committee’s report on Domestic Abuse is provided as a matter of urgency. Whilst I accept that the Covid-19 pandemic has disrupted and caused workload issues for different teams, I hold some concern with the length of time that has now passed without a response having been provided.

As you are aware, reports of domestic abuse have increased significantly over the past few months following both the introduction and easing of lockdown restrictions. As Chair of the Police and Crime Committee, I am anxious that the recommendations in our report are noted and acted upon as a matter of urgency.

As originally stated, we acknowledge the pressures that you are under at this particular time and ask that if you have any issues meeting the deadlines set out in the report and would like to discuss in more detail with myself or the Committee, please do not hesitate to contact Janette Roker, Senior Policy Advisor on 020 7983 6562 or Janette.roker@london.gov.uk.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Unmesh Desai AM
Chair of the Police and Crime Committee
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Subject: Action Taken Under Delegated Authority

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat  Date: 19 October 2020

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report outlines recent action taken by the Chair of the Police and Crime Committee in accordance with the delegated authority granted to him by the Police and Crime Committee.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Committee notes the recent action taken by the Chair of the Police and Crime Committee under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely to agree the Committee’s Annual Report for 2019/20.

3. Background

3.1 Under Standing Orders and the Assembly’s Scheme of Delegation, certain decisions by Members can be taken under delegated authority. This report details those actions taken by the Chair of the Police and Crime Committee.

3.2 At its meeting on 16 September 2020, the Committee agreed the following delegation:

That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree an Annual Report summarising the work of the Committee over the previous year.

3.2 The Chair exercised the above delegation to approve the Committee’s Annual Report for 2019/20.
4. **Issues for Consideration**

4.1 Following consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, the Chair of the Committee approved the Committee’s Annual Report, which summarised its work during 2019/20. The report was published on 16 September 2020 and a copy is attached at Appendix 1.

4.2 The Committee is asked to note the action taken by the Chair under delegated authority.

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:**

Appendix 1 – Police and Crime Committee Annual Report 2019/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Background Papers: MDA Form 1217 [PCC Annual Report]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Lauren Harvey, Senior Committee Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk">lauren.harvey@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holding the Mayor to account and investigating issues that matter to Londoners
The London Assembly

The London Assembly is a crucial check on the powers of the Mayor of London. As the most powerful directly-elected politician in the UK, it is important the Mayor is held publicly and democratically accountable.

The Assembly examines the decisions and actions of the Mayor to ensure promises to Londoners are delivered and the money he spends, collected from Londoners, is wisely spent.

The 25 London Assembly Members are elected every four years at the same time as the Mayor of London. The Assembly holds the Mayor and Mayoral advisers to account by publicly examining policies and programmes. In addition, the Assembly questions the Mayor ten times a year at Mayor’s Question Time.

Assembly meetings are open to the public, so Londoners can stay informed about the activities of the Mayor and the Assembly can publicly review their performance.

As well as examining the Mayor’s actions and decisions, Assembly Members act as champions for Londoners by investigating issues that are important to the capital. The Assembly can advance or press for changes to mayoral or national policy.
The Police and Crime Committee

The **London Assembly Police and Crime Committee** is a cross-party body. In 2019-20 it was chaired by Labour Assembly Member Unmesh Desai.

We examine the work of the Mayor and his Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), to make sure that he is delivering on the promises made to Londoners in his Police and Crime Plan. We also investigate other issues relating to policing and crime in the capital.

Our work involves a range of activities, including meetings with MOPAC, the Metropolitan Police and other organisations; site visits; written consultations; and roundtable meetings.

We hold a Question and Answer (Q&A) session in public every month with a representative from MOPAC—normally the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime—and a representative from the Metropolitan Police on current issues, to find out what they are doing to keep Londoners safe. We also carry out in-depth investigations into different topics, such as violence, domestic abuse, modern slavery and hate crime.

We routinely publish the findings and recommendations of our investigations, including the responses we receive from the Mayor. These can be found on our [investigations page](#).
Your Police and Crime Committee Members this year were

- Unmesh Desai AM (Chair) Labour
- Len Duvall AM Labour
- Steve O’Connell AM (Deputy Chairman) Conservative
- Florence Eshalomi AM MP Labour
- Tony Arbour AM Conservative
- Susan Hall AM Conservative
- Sian Berry AM Green
- Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM Liberal Democrat
- Andrew Dismore AM Labour
- Peter Whittle AM Brexit Alliance Group
It brings me great pleasure to introduce the 2019-20 Annual Report of the Police and Crime Committee, in what marks my first year as Chair of the Committee.

Over the last year, we have seen the acute challenges posed by increased levels of serious violence in the capital. We have also seen a growth in particularly heinous crimes, such as sexual offences, modern slavery and domestic abuse.

The nature and scale of crime committed in London in 2019-20 underlines the unique and important role the Police and Crime Committee plays in holding to account the Metropolitan Police Service and the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). We have worked to ask the questions to which Londoners rightly want and deserve answers. Sometimes our questions have been uncomfortable for senior officers in authority, but ultimately our role is to scrutinise the Mayor, senior officials and the Met’s police and crime activities to improve outcomes for Londoners.

This Annual Report highlights our vital work in pursuing investigations that matter to Londoners, including our recommendations to the Mayor, the Met, MOPAC and
others to improve their response to police and crime issues in London.

Among our investigations over the last year, we highlighted the particularly destructive impacts of domestic abuse and modern slavery in London. The investigations led to a call for action to the Mayor to improve his response to both issues.

I am particularly proud of our intensive investigation into the proliferation of hate crime in the capital. Crucially, our approach to the investigation looked at what partners could do to tackle hate crime, not just the role of the Mayor and the Met. The police have an important role to play, but if our investigations have highlighted anything it is that many of the police and crime issues facing London are complex and multi-faceted, and require a sophisticated, joined-up approach if there is to be an effective response.

Looking forward, the Committee will continue to play its important role in holding senior officials to account as they tackle the unprecedented challenges caused by the Coronavirus pandemic.

I would like to thank everyone that has supported the Committee’s work over the last year.

Unmesh Desai AM
Chair, Police and Crime Committee
What we have done this year

Tackling violent crime
• In April 2019, we met the Director of the Mayor’s Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) to assess the early development and future plans of the VRU. The meeting focussed on the strategic vision for the VRU, its emerging work programme and the development of local VRU hubs across the capital. We have continued to scrutinise the role of the VRU, most recently with a letter listing ten recommendations in relation to: the progress and performance of the VRU; its key performance indicators; its work with pupil referral units; and those schools that are underperforming in their efforts to prevent violence.

Tackling hate crime
• In May 2019, we held a meeting with experts across London to discuss the Mayor’s progress in tackling hate crime. We focussed on how the Mayor is delivering
better support for victims of hate crime and how third sector organisations can assist the Mayor and the Met’s response.

- Following on from this meeting, we progressed our hate crime investigation, culminating in the publication of our report in September 2019. The report detailed a series of recommendations for the Mayor to adopt and improve his response to rising hate crime in London. For example, we called on the Mayor to expedite the roll out of the Met’s school education programme on hate crime. The report was launched at Chelsea Football Club with Carlton Cole, former Chelsea and West Ham football player, and organisations working across the city to tackle hate crime and support victims. There was extensive coverage of the report and its findings across broadcast and print media, including BBC London, the Evening Standard and LBC.
**Sexual offences and rape**

- We conducted a short and intensive investigation on sexual offences and rape, specifically examining how the introduction of Basic Command Units (BCUs) have affected the Met’s response to rape and other sexual offences; and to assess the Mayor’s progress in delivering his commitments to support victims. As part of the investigation, we visited the Met’s Central South and South West BCUs and heard from representatives from services providing support to survivors of rape and sexual offences in London.

**Modern slavery**

- In September 2019, we held a bespoke meeting on Modern Slavery, at which we heard from a range of organisations involved in tackling modern slavery in London. The session enabled us to assess the effectiveness and impact of the London Modern Slavery Partnership Board, the support available to victims and the Met’s response.

- We published a letter to the Mayor in January 2020 outlining the findings from the investigation. In the letter, we called for more detectives to be assigned to the Specialist Crime and Vulnerabilities Unit, which deals with Modern Slavery cases.

**Violence against women and girls (VAWG)**

- In December 2019, we were updated on the progress and delivery of the Mayor’s VAWG Strategy and VAWG fund. We also received an update from the
Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime on the Mayor’s activity to address VAWG.

**Domestic abuse**

- We investigated domestic abuse in London and found that in 2019 there were just over 85,000 domestic abuse offences recorded by the Met, compared with around 46,000 in 2018. The Committee produced a report, which recommended that the Mayor improves his response to domestic abuse and service provision for victims across London.

**Holding the Met and MOPAC to account**

- In November 2019, we met with Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) to discuss its PEEL inspection of the Met and the Met’s learning from Sir Richard Henriques’ Independent Review.

**MOPAC commissioning practice**

- We investigated the commissioning practices of MOPAC with the objective of improving awareness of MOPAC-commissioned services. In January 2020, we met services commissioned by MOPAC, including Safer London, Oxygen and the London Borough of Southwark, as well as MOPAC’s Head of Commissioning. We used the meeting to examine MOPAC’s added value to crime and disorder reduction, particularly relating to youth violence, and the provision of support for victims of crime.
Following this meeting, we published a letter to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime outlining the findings from our investigation. The Committee set out recommendations to improve transparency, streamline and clarify the commissioning process and publish more readily available data, including on outputs and effectiveness.

Live facial recognition technology

Following a meeting with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Dame Cressida Dick DBE QPM, the Met Commissioner, in February 2020, we published letters to the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime expressing concern about the introduction of live facial recognition technology and the lack of national guidelines. We also sought further data on the deployments that had already taken place ahead of live deployment.

Released Under Investigation (RUI)

In March 2020, we wrote a letter to the Home Office to recommend a change in the way RUI is used for serious offenders. The letter followed a meeting with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and Sir Stephen House QPM, the Deputy Met Commissioner, where it was indicated steps were being taken to reduce the use of RUI and reintroduce bail.
Domestic Abuse

Our report on Domestic Abuse brought together the Committee’s investigation and highlighted sixteen recommendations for the Mayor, MOPAC and the Met to improve current practice in this area.

During the investigation, we held an informal briefing with Hestia and Rise Mutual, both of which are charities that support victims of domestic abuse, to explore the challenging nature of domestic abuse. This included a focus on the increase in financial and coercive control; the use of technology to carry out abuse; and the need to look at the prevalence, impact and perceptions of domestic abuse across different generations. We also looked at refuge, IDVAs (Independent Domestic Abuse Violence Advocates) and MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference) support across London. We held a public meeting with a range of organisations to hear about the experiences of those working to tackle abuse and what more is needed from the Mayor, MOPAC and the Met on this issue.

We found:

- Domestic abuse in London takes a variety of forms and is significant in scale, accounting for one in ten offences recorded by the Met. We heard that coercive control “is pretty much present in most incidents reported” and accounts for between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of survivors who approach Advance Charity.
• The Mayor aims to encourage more victims of domestic abuse to come forward, but research suggests that this may not be the main factor behind the increase in reporting. More is needed to raise awareness of impact of domestic abuse and to raise victims’ confidence in reporting.

• More should be done to ensure that the Met uses its powers more effectively to protect victims of domestic abuse, recognising that the issue is placing a high demand on the police service.

• The Mayor has made some progress on supporting victims of domestic abuse through his VAWG strategy, however the overall approach risks missing out and excluding certain groups of victims.

• There should be a greater focus on the prevention of domestic abuse, particularly through a public health approach to prevention.

• There should be a Domestic Abusers Register. The London Assembly has previously campaigned on this issue and the Domestic Abuse investigation has highlighted the pressing need for it.

The Committee’s report posed sixteen recommendations to the Mayor and the Met Commissioner, including: the Mayor should consider having measurable targets for reducing the attrition rate in domestic abuse cases and should provide ringfenced funding to ensure dedicated domestic abuse services for children and young people.
Hate Crime

In September 2019, we published the Committee’s work on the impact of rising hate crime in London.

Three quarters of Londoners say that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds can get on together. But despite this, the Met is recording year on year increases in all types of hate crime, in line with a national trend.

The Committee’s investigation looked at the Mayor’s progress in protecting Londoners from hate crime; his progress in delivering better support for victims of hate crime; the effectiveness and impact of the Met’s operational response; and the role of third sector organisations.

On 23 May 2019, we held a public meeting with six charities working to tackle hate crime. In addition, we gathered written evidence from a variety of interested organisations to inform the investigation, representing the police, local government and the third sector.

The evidence we heard suggested that, while some progress is being made, there are further steps that the Mayor needs to take to achieve a reduction in hate crime. This includes awareness training, working with offenders and providing suitable funding to support as many victims as possible. The Committee also found that the Mayor needs to better demonstrate the difference
that is being made by the police, courts and specialist support services, so that, no matter where someone lives in London, or who they are, if they experience hate crime they can have the confidence it will be dealt with and can rely on getting the support that they need.

The report and its recommendations were welcomed, including by the Met and Inclusion London, a charity supporting the capital’s deaf and disabled people’s organisations. The Met stated that it would take on board the report’s recommendations as part of a review of its response to hate crime, including BCU based safeguarding risk and organisational learning reviews.

You can view the launch of the report, which took place at Chelsea Football Club with Carlton Cole, here.
Sexual Offences and Rape

In November 2019, we published the Committee’s work on sexual offences and rape and the role of the Mayor and the Met in tackling these issues.

We examined how the introduction of BCUs had affected the Met’s response to rape and other sexual offences, as well as the broader ongoing pressures across the criminal justice system in tackling these crimes. We spoke to officers working in BCUs about their experiences and heard from specialist support services about the impact of the change on their work and on the experiences of survivors.

In addition to ongoing issues with investigations, evidence and prosecutions, our work highlighted that a reduction in the timeliness and quality of communication between the police, specialist services and survivors appeared to be emerging following the transition to the new working arrangements.

We found:

- The Mayor’s approach to rape and sexual offences must focus more strongly on victim confidence.

- The demand on police officers dealing with rape and sexual offences is well recognised: steps are needed to alleviate that pressure and mitigate further problems in the future.
• The BCU model risks exacerbating a reduction in victim satisfaction with the police.

• The Met is struggling to keep up with the growth in digital evidence and complexity of cases. MOPAC needs to tackle this issue urgently.

In response to our letter to Sophie Linden, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, MOPAC made a clear commitment to prioritise the Committee’s recommendations.
Question and Answer sessions
Throughout 2019-20, we have scrutinised the Met and MOPAC at monthly Question and Answer sessions.

This year, we discussed over 40 different topics at Q&A meetings. These are just some examples:

- Violent crime
- Stop and search
- Preparations for a no-deal EU exit
- Operation Midland
- Notting Hill Carnival
• Antisocial behaviour

• Women in the criminal justice system

• London Bridge attack

• Extinction Rebellion and the policing of protests

• The Met’s structural changes, including the closure of police stations and public access to the police and recruitment of police officers

• We heard from the Met Commissioner in October 2019 and February 2020, where we questioned the Commissioner on a number of topics, including: a rising trend in violence; police officer growth; support provided to police officers; changes to the Met’s estate; facial recognition technology; and the Streatham terrorist attack.
Visits and other meetings

- In April 2019, we met representatives of the Mayor’s Violence Reduction Unit to assess the early development and future plans of the Unit.

- In June 2019, MOPAC provided a briefing to the Committee on its work with the Met to improve police-community engagement structures and processes.

- In September 2019, we met representatives of MOPAC, the Met and the third sector to discuss the effectiveness of London agencies in tackling modern slavery.

- In October 2019, the Chair attended a weapon sweep in Camden, which was also attended by the Met Commissioner and the Mayor.
• In November 2019, HMICFRS provided an update to the Committee on its work inspecting the Met.

• In December 2019, MOPAC provided a briefing to the Committee on the Mayor’s VAWG commitments and additional funding.
Our work for 2020-21

This year we are continuing to hold the Mayor to account for his commitments in the Police and Crime Plan and examining the issues that matter to Londoners.

We will also continue our regular examination of MOPAC and the Met through our Q&A meetings, looking at topics such as the Met’s response to COVID-19, violent crime, drug supply, domestic and child abuse, the Met’s workforce, policing of protests, disproportionality, radicalisation and live facial recognition technology.
Elsewhere in the London Assembly

The Assembly has agreed statements put forward by individual Assembly members which relate to policing and crime. These include:

**Spit Guards**

The Assembly called on the Mayor to support the Met Commissioner in piloting and consulting communities on the full use of spit guards to ensure the safety of police officers, in line with the majority of other forces in England and Wales.

**Police Officer Pay**

Following previous London Assembly motions on police officer pay, in July 2019, the Assembly called on the Mayor to write to the Government to request a pay rise for police officers. The Assembly also called on the Government to fully fund the cost of any pay rise announced in the 2019/20 police pay awards to give the Met the confidence to fairly remunerate police officers for their outstanding work keeping London safe, without the need to compromise other parts of the Service.

**Personal Attacks**

Following politically-motivated attacks in London, the Assembly called on the Met to enforce the law fully when a personal attack occurs, from aggressive intimidation,
harassment and online abuse to milkshake throwing, physical violence and worse.

**Recruitment of Police Officers**

Following the Government’s announcement of an intention to recruit 20,000 police officers in England and Wales, the Assembly called on the Mayor to continue to make requests for the additional 5,000 officers for London. The Assembly also suggested that the Mayor requests assurances that the Government will fully fund the total cost of hiring new officers, including costs for police equipment, training, salary costs and pension costs.

As the Government announced a recruitment target of 1,369 officers in London by 2020/21, the Assembly raised concerns about the lack of clarity over how the Met could reach the target. The Assembly called on the Government to agree to a sustained funding settlement for all police forces.
How can I get involved in the Committee’s work?

• Contribute to our investigations. Details on our current work can be found on the Police and Crime Committee webpage.

• Get in touch with us via policeandcrimecommittee@london.gov.uk.

• Raise issues of concern with Assembly Members directly.

• Tweet us @LondonAssembly and follow Committee Twitter conversations with #AssemblyPolice.

• Watch our meetings live from your computer, mobile or tablet.
Subject: Question and Answer Session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat | Date: 19 October 2020

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report serves as a background paper to the monthly question and answer session with the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee notes the monthly report from the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, as background to the question and answer session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service.

2.2 That the Committee notes the report and answers given by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Metropolitan Police Service to the questions asked by Members.

2.3 That the Committee delegates authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any output arising from the discussion.

3. Background

3.1 The Committee has agreed that it will hold monthly question and answer sessions with the Head of MOPAC and invite representation from the MPS.

3.2 MOPAC produces a monthly report providing an update on policing operational and financial performance, as well as the activities and decisions of MOPAC. The report is used to inform questions to MOPAC and the MPS at monthly question and answer sessions. The latest report is attached at Appendix 1.
4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The following guests have been invited to attend the meeting:
   - Sophie Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime; and
   - Nick Ephgrave, Assistant Commissioner, MPS.

4.2 Questions will be asked on the following subject areas:
   - Custody and police protection;
   - Hate crime;
   - COVID-19 enforcement;
   - County Lines;
   - Violence Reduction Unit and work with young people;
   - Human resources and professionalism; and
   - Huawei and Emergency Services Network.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:
Appendix 1 – MOPAC Monthly report: 4 September to 5 October 2020

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Janette Roker, Senior Policy Adviser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7984 6562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janette.roker@london.gov.uk">janette.roker@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to the Police and Crime Committee: 5 October

Sophie Linden
Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime
1 INTRODUCTION

This report is provided to the Police and Crime Committee (PCC) to assist the Committee in exercising its function in scrutinising and supporting the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and to hold it to account.

This report covers the period from 4 September to 5 October 2020.

In addition to the range of regular meetings and briefings with key stakeholders, including senior Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) officers, below are the main activities I have been involved in during this period.

2 MOPAC ACTIVITY REPORT

- I have attended a number of meetings with senior members of the MPS as part of my oversight and engagement work.
- I have held a fortnightly VAWG sector wide meeting, to assess ways in which MOPAC and the wider GLA can do everything possible to support women at risk.
- I chair a Public Disorder Risk Management Group which meets regularly.
- I chaired a number of board meetings during the period, including London CONTEST board on 10 September, London Child Protection, Improvement and Oversight Group on 21 September and Oversight Board on 23 September. I also attended the London Business Reopening Strategy Group on 15 September.
- On 7 September I met with the Minister for Immigration Compliance and the Courts Chris Philp MP, along with Police and Crime Commissioner colleagues, to discuss the court system.
- On 10 September, the Mayor and I met with the Chair of the Met Police Federation Ken Marsh.
- On 14 September, I met with the Domestic Abuse Commissioner, along with Julia Mulligan, the Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire.
- On 14 September, I attended the Strategic Review of Policing Advisory Board meeting.
- On 14 September I met with the Deputy Mayor for Policing for Greater Manchester, Baroness Beverley Hughes.
- On 17 September, I spoke at the pan London Domestic Homicide Review analysis launch, a report which was funded by MOPAC. At the event I welcomed the publication of this important report, spoke about the challenges of lockdown in relation to domestic abuse, and highlighted the work City Hall has undertaken in this area.
- On 17 September, I spoke to community safety leads across London about the Action Plan, in a meeting organised by London Councils.
- On 18 September, I visited the 4Front project and spent the afternoon with young people to hear about their concerns around policing and the problem of a lack of trust and confidence in the police. I also was given a tour of their new Jahiem’s Justice Centre which will provide a space for young people to meet, collaborate and make music once it is opened.
- On 21 September I met with Councillor Lakmini Shah from the London Borough of Newham, to discuss domestic abuse.
• On 22 September I appeared in front the London Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee, along with representatives from the MPS.

• On 23 September I held my quarterly meeting with Sal Naseem from the IOPC.

• On 25 September I attended the “Croydon One Postcode” community event to discuss the Action Plan and relationships between young people and the police.

• On 28 September representatives from the MPS and I met with the Minister for Policing to discuss homicide prevention.

• On 29 September I spoke at the launch of Advance’s research report, ‘A Space to Learn about Relationships’, which focuses specifically on young women’s early sexual experiences and the impact this has on their health and contact with the criminal justice system. I spoke about the vital work that the Mayoralty is doing in this area, and more broadly about the efforts being made to keep women and girls in London safe.

• On 1 October, I took part in an interview for the Institute for Strategic Dialogue’s Stronger Cities Network. The Stronger Cities Network supports over 140 cities across the world to tackle hate, polarisation and extremism at the local level.

• On 1 October I attended a meeting with the Policing Minister along with Police and Crime Commissioner colleagues.

• On 2 October I attended the APCC’s Race Disparity and Disproportionality Working Group.

• On 2 October I met with Vicky Foxcroft MP to discuss crime prevention, the VRU and the Action Plan.

• During this period I met with a number of MPs, representatives and community leaders to discuss the Action Plan, including the Shadow Home Secretary Nick Thomas Symonds MP, Karen Buck MP, former police officer Dal Babu and former chair of the Met Black Police Association Councillor Bevan Powell, Jermain Jackman, Katrina Ffrench from Stopwatch, councillors Mark Blake and Joseph Ejiofor
### MPS PERFORMANCE

Police data are now fully updated on the London data store. In addition, more police and crime data and information and interactive dashboards can be found at https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/crime-dashboard. An overview of key crime types is below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sept - Aug</th>
<th>2010/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TMO</strong></td>
<td>Total Notifiable Offences (TMO)</td>
<td>099,283</td>
<td>094,139</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMO Victim Based</td>
<td>022,228</td>
<td>020,658</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASB</strong></td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour Calls</td>
<td>267,645</td>
<td>40,167</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence against the Person</td>
<td>218,476</td>
<td>220,909</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence with Injury</td>
<td>77,055</td>
<td>72,009</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Homicide</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>-71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Domestic Abuse VVI</td>
<td>53,970</td>
<td>47,081</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence without Injury</td>
<td>140,484</td>
<td>145,707</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Abuse</strong></td>
<td>Domestic Abuse Notifiable</td>
<td>58,448</td>
<td>53,259</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Abuse Incidents</td>
<td>142,413</td>
<td>133,679</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Abuse VVI</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>24,174</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Offences</strong></td>
<td>Total Sexual Offences</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td>-63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>7,523</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Sexual Offences</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>11,872</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td>Total Robbery</td>
<td>37,260</td>
<td>32,133</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Robbery</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Robbery</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary</strong></td>
<td>Total Burglary</td>
<td>51,570</td>
<td>68,204</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary - Residential</td>
<td>60,007</td>
<td>51,375</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary - Business and Community</td>
<td>31,772</td>
<td>16,831</td>
<td>-47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>Total Vehicle</td>
<td>123,734</td>
<td>110,459</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggravated Vehicle Taking</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>-83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft from MV</td>
<td>74,509</td>
<td>74,346</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft of Veh (non MV)</td>
<td>31,428</td>
<td>36,003</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
<td>Total Theft Offences</td>
<td>247,263</td>
<td>197,226</td>
<td>-24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>30,490</td>
<td>-38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Theft</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,751</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>43,408</td>
<td>38,723</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Damage</strong></td>
<td>Lien and Criminal Damage Offences</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>110.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drugs</strong></td>
<td>Total Drug Offences</td>
<td>45,211</td>
<td>35,192</td>
<td>-28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possession of Weeds</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Crime Offences</td>
<td>14,955</td>
<td>13,370</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Crime Without Injury</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Crime With Injury Victims under 25 (non DA)</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>-17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weapons</strong></td>
<td>Knife Crime with Injury Personal Robbery</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Possession</td>
<td>650,263</td>
<td>645,661</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gun Crime Offences</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gun Crime Levinal Discharge</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gun Crime Personal Robbery</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>-31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hate Crime</strong></td>
<td>Racist and Religious Hate Crime</td>
<td>17,721</td>
<td>17,070</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith Hate Crime</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Semitic Hate</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islamophobic Hate</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>-24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation Hate Crime</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transgender Hate</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability Hate Crime</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Jun-19</th>
<th>Jun-20</th>
<th>p.a. difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Satisfaction</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Digital Investigation - Overall Satisfaction Online</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Digital Investigation - Overall Satisfaction Phone</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Attitude</th>
<th>Jun-19</th>
<th>Jun-20</th>
<th>p.a. difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police do a good job in the local area</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police can be relied upon to be there when needed</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are dealing with the things that matter to this community</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police listen to the concerns of local people</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel well informed about local police activities over the last 12 months</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT

4.1 The external financial reporting of MOPAC is on a quarterly basis. The MOPAC Quarter 2 2020/21 Performance Update Report is scheduled to be published 18 November 2020.

4.2 The finance section of this covers the full year forecast outturn position for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and MOPAC as at end of September 2020. It includes a breakdown of Revenue, Capital and Reserves positions.

The currently available published content relates to Quarter 1 2020/21 and is below for reference.

4.5 At the end of quarter 1, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) overall forecast net expenditure outturn position is an overspend of £19.1m

Key headlines are:

- Police Officer Pay - there is a forecast overspend of £10.9m. The overspend on police officer pay is largely due to the increased officer numbers. At the end of June 2020 there were 32,567 FTE police officers in post against a funded target of 31,890. Whilst the MPS is currently forecasting a £10.9m overspend, plans are currently being worked through to ensure that this overspend is reversed by the end of the year. Forecasts will be amended when the plans have been reviewed for robustness.

- Police officer overtime is forecasting a c£19m overspend. The forecasts currently assume that there will be no future increases in overtime stemming from COVID-19 but should there be a second wave of the pandemic then this could change. The remainder of the overtime overspend is under intense scrutiny by the MPS.

- Police Staff Pay and overtime – is forecasting an overspend of £22.4m. This is currently under review to maintain a balanced budget position.

- Running Expenses – forecasts an underspend of £(49.8)m. The running expenses underspend is predominantly the result of the pausing of investment in a number of areas until funding is confirmed for additional Covid-19 expenditure and mitigating actions bring the forecast expenditure to budget.

- Income – there is an expected under recovery of income and grants of £19.2m. Key drivers are £26.5m lower income and grants for externally funded units being offset by a reimbursement of £9m for COVID related purchases of PPE.

4.6 The capital investment 2020/21 forecast outturn position is a spend of £348.8m against a budget of £414.7m (underspend of £65.9m). The forecast underspends on the capital programme are primarily within the Property Services programme and mainly due to a need to reprofile refurbishment budgets, paused capital activity in
order to finalise the assessment of the impact on the property estate of Police Officer uplift and delay in delivery of schemes due to Covid-19.

4.7 The MOPAC and MPS revenue reserves is forecast to reduce from £438.1m at 1 April 2020 to £424.6m at 31 March 2021. The most significant budget reductions are for the re-evaluation of Property Services reserves and for the re-assessment of the Supporting One Met Model (OMM) reserve.

5. CORRESPONDENCE AND MAYOR’S QUESTIONS

MOPAC manages and prioritises all Mayor’s Questions and correspondence received to ensure that it is meeting its obligation to respond in a timely manner and to a high standard.

5.1 Mayor’s Questions (MQs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Mayor’s questions</th>
<th>Total received</th>
<th>Responded to within the GLA agreed timeframe</th>
<th>In percentage terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>No MQs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>No MQS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2 Correspondence received and responded to within 20 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Correspondence received</th>
<th>Number responded to within 20 working days</th>
<th>In percentage terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. MOPAC BUSINESS AND MEETINGS

In the last month, my office and I have had a range of meetings with key stakeholders and MPS officers in support of the Mayor.

6.1 Regular Meetings with:

- the Mayor and his Team
- the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner
- MPS Senior Officers
- Partners including local authorities, criminal justice agencies, government departments, policing bodies, service providers and community groups.

Other meetings are described in section 2. Please note that fewer meetings have taken place during this period due to Covid-19.

6.2 Boards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>MOPAC Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2020</td>
<td>LCRB Delivery Management Group Away Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2020</td>
<td>CONTEST board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/09/2020</td>
<td>London Business Reopening Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/09/2020</td>
<td>London Child Protection, Improvement and Oversight Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/2020</td>
<td>Oversight Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Decisions

The following formal decisions have been published since the last report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCD</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Procurement Activity for the Supply of Surveying Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>Sourcing Strategy for Energy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Extension of Price Uplifts for Forensic Marketplace Stabilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Eagle House Lease Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Annual Debt Write-Off 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3 Future MOPAC meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>MOPAC Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/10/2020</td>
<td>London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2020</td>
<td>Delivery Management Group (LCRB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/2020</td>
<td>London CONTEST Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: Police and Crime Committee Work Programme

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 19 October 2020

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out progress on the Police and Crime Committee’s work programme.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee notes its work programme for the remainder of the year, and the additional activity undertaken since its last meeting, namely the informal briefing with the Metropolitan Police Service on the work of its Roads and Transport Policing Command.

2.2 That the Committee delegates authority to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree a letter on the funding and support provided to Safer Neighbourhood Boards.

3. Background

3.1 The Committee’s work programme is intended to enable the Committee to effectively fulfil its roles of holding the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to account and investigating issues of importance to policing and crime reduction in London. The Committee’s work normally involves a range of activities, including formal meetings with MOPAC, the Metropolitan Police Service (the MPS) and other stakeholders, site visits, written consultations and round table meetings.

3.2 During the COVID-19 pandemic and the continuing need to maintain social distancing the Committee’s work programme will be focused on COVID-19’s impact on policing and crime. The Committee will meet using video conferencing once a month to hold a question and answer (Q&A) session with the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime. The Commissioner of the MPS has been invited to these meetings. The Committee will use these Q&A meetings to investigate topical issues and review MPS’ performance, including consideration of MOPAC’s approach to holding the MPS to account.
4. **Issues for Consideration**

4.1 The work programme has been designed to proactively examine issues of interest arising from the COVID-19 crisis and how policing and crime will be impacted as lockdown is eased. The Committee will receive informal briefings as well as formal committee meetings to ensure it is up to date with policing in London.

4.2 On 2 October 2020, the Committee met with the MPS informally to discuss the work of its Roads and Transport Policing Command.

4.3 The Committee’s next meeting is set out in the table below. Additional meetings will be agreed by the Assembly in due course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Type of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11 November 2020</td>
<td>Q&amp;A session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no financial implications to the Greater London Authority arising from this report.
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