# MOPAC

#### **DMPC Decision – PCD 969**

## Title: Funding Research into Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM)

#### **Executive Summary:**

The use of vehicles by terrorists as a weapon has grown in recent years, and though there is considerable expertise and products available to prevent such attacks there remains a less developed part of the market. That is where the risk is less grave but still warrants action to mitigate a wider pallet of measures is required which is proportionate to the risk and often a more sympathetic approach to the design is required. The Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure are currently working with industry to research, develop and test further products for this market. In order to increase the pace of development, funding is required. This decision enables London, as a prime beneficiary of this work, to contribute towards this accelerated work.

## **Recommendation:**

The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime is recommended to fund research and development work into hostile vehicle mitigation by granting the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure £50,000. The grant will be for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 and will be funded by underspend from the MOPAC Strategy directorate's 2020/21 budget. The £50,000 will be carried forward from year 2020/21 into 2021/22.

## **Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime**

I confirm I have considered whether or not I have any personal or prejudicial interest in this matter and take the proposed decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct. Any such interests are recorded below.

The above request has my approval.

due henden. Signature

Date 19/03/2021

## PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE TO THE DMPC

## 1. Introduction and background

- 1.1. The attacks on in London on Westminster bridge, London Bridge and Finsbury Park have shown how devastating an attack can be using a vehicle and driving it at pedestrians. Terrorists can easily secure a vehicle and the number of crowded places in London offers them a wide choice of venues. Clearly, some areas are more attractive to terrorists than others. There are places in central London or at major venues where the risk highest, and in these cases the best protective measures are called for and are used.
- 1.2. However, we also know that crowded spaces occur throughout London, and if anything the pandemic, has made these locations even more disparate and widespread. The risk might not be of the highest order but the harm caused should an attack occur can be devastating. Sadly, although different in methodology, the attack in Streatham, demonstrates that these attacks can occur on any High Street.
- 1.3. The Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure is a Government body, who provide world class services and standards in protection. They are Government funded but given the breadth of the threat they manage and try to mitigate, there is always likely to be a need to prioritise programmes. They have a strong track record of developing innovative security solutions.
- 1.4. At present there is a limited choice of HVM that can manage lower speed/smaller vehicle impacts, and in particular there is a limited choice for the off-the-shelf crash rated street furniture from the traditional suppliers. Suppliers of either HVM or street furniture.
- 1.5. The CPNI work in this area; the Secure Regeneration of High Streets Programme will provide local authorities and transport authorities with a range of risk based options for HVM schemes and a suite of cost effective and proportionate crash tested street furniture. In essence the programme will support Counter Terrorism Security Advisors and Planners with authorities deliver affordable and achievable protection schemes.
- 1.6. The need to address this issue is made all the more pressing by Government led work on refreshing the Crowded Place Advice and on the potential introduction of a Protect duty. The programme aligns with the MHCLG strategy (Future High Streets Fund) to renew and re-shape high streets and town centres.

## 2. Issues for consideration

2.1. MOPAC have had long involvement in ensuring the safety of London. As one of the Mayor's first actions he asked Lord Harris to conduct a review of how prepared London was for such an attack. In the intervening years the attack methodology has changed, and it is right that MOPAC are along with others ensuring steps are taken to mitigate this new risk.

- 2.2. Clearly, the responsibility is not solely that MOPAC, but unfortunately other key agencies that were supporting this activity have had to withdraw due to the devastating effect on their budgets caused by the pandemic. We are still engaging with other agencies so that others contribute. The Government budget for CPNI next year is already heavily committed.
- 2.3. The advice we have received indicates that the market suppliers in this area of business tend not to be innovators and are cautious. The market tends to see commitment from authorities before they invest. It is anticipated that MOPAC's investment will encourage such investment choices.

# 3. Financial Comments

- 3.1. The MOPAC grant award to The Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure amounts to £50,000 covering the period 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022. The grant will be funded by underspend from the Strategy Directorate's 2020/21 budget. The £50,000 will need to be carried forward from financial year 2020/21 into 2021/22.
- 3.2. The overall cost of the project is estimated to be £250,000, of which MOPAC will contribute £50,000 with the remaining £200,000 funded by other government agencies.

## 4. Legal Comments

4.1. Paragraph 4.8 of the MOPAC Scheme of Delegation and Consent provides that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) has delegated authority to approve all bids for grant funding.

## 5. Commercial Issues

5.1. The Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure are the only agency in a position to deliver this requirement to the appropriate and recognised standard.

# 6. GDPR and Data Privacy

6.1. MOPAC will adhere to the Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018 and ensure that any organisations who are commissioned to do work with or on behalf of MOPAC are fully compliant with the policy and understand their GDPR responsibilities.

# 7. Equality Comments

7.1. MOPAC is required to comply with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This requires MOPAC to have due regard to the need

to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations by reference to people with protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. There are no such implications in regard to this decision.

## Public access to information

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and will be made available on the MOPAC website following approval.

If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary.

## Part 1 Deferral:

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? NO

**Part 2 Confidentiality:** Only the facts or advice considered as likely to be exempt from disclosure under the FOIA should be in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

Is there a Part 2 form – NO

ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION	Tick to confirm statement (✓)
Financial Advice:	
The Strategic Finance and Resource Management Team has been consulted on	$\checkmark$
this proposal.	
Legal Advice:	V
Legal advice is not required.	
Equalities Advice:	
Equality and diversity issues are covered in the body of the report.	$\checkmark$
Commercial Issues	$\checkmark$
Commercial issues are not applicable	
GDPR/Data Privacy	✓
GDPR compliance issues are covered in the body of the report	
Director/Head of Service:	√
The Head of Operational Oversight has reviewed the request and is satisfied it is	
correct and consistent with the MOPAC's plans and priorities.	

## **Chief Executive Officer**

I have been consulted about the proposal and confirm that financial, legal and equalities advice has been taken into account in the preparation of this report. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime.

Signature

Glandhichford.

Date 18/03/2021