

AGENDA

Meeting **Police and Crime Committee**
Date **Wednesday 7 February 2018**
Time **10.00 am**
Place **Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts where you can also view past meetings.

Members of the Committee

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman)
Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair)
Tony Arbour AM
Unmesh Desai AM
Andrew Dismore AM

Len Duvall AM
Florence Eshalomi AM
Susan Hall AM
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Peter Whittle AM

A meeting of the Committee has been called by the Chairman of the Committee to deal with the business listed below.

Ed Williams, Executive Director of Secretariat
Tuesday 30 January 2018

Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: Teresa Young; Telephone: 020 7983 6559; Email: teresa.young@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458

For media enquiries please contact Lisa Lam, External Communications Officer – London Assembly on 020 7983 4067. Email: lisa.lam@london.gov.uk. If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf.

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা assembly.translations@london.gov.uk এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے assembly.translations@london.gov.uk



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda
Police and Crime Committee
Wednesday 7 February 2018**

1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements

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

2 Declarations of Interests (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

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 - 52)

The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Police and Crime Committee held on 11 January 2018 to be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

The appendix to the minutes set out on pages 11 to 52 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website: www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee

4 Summary List of Actions (Pages 53 - 60)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to note the completed and ongoing actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report.

5 Response to London Assembly Brexit Directive III - Security after Brexit (Pages 61 - 64)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Teresa Young, teresa.young@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 6559

The Committee is recommended to note the response from the Mayor to the letter from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee in respect of London Assembly Brexit Directive III, attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

6 Policing the Tower Hamlets Mayoral and Local Elections (Pages 65 - 68)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Richard Derecki, Richard.derecki@london.gov.uk, telephone 020 7983 4899

The Committee is recommended to:

- (a) Note the report as background to putting questions to invited guests on policing the 2018 Tower Hamlets Mayoral and local elections and notes the subsequent discussion; and**
- (b) Delegate authority to the Chairman, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any output from the discussion.**

7 Police and Crime Committee Work Programme (Pages 69 - 72)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Becky Short, becky.short@london.gov.uk; 020 7983 4760

The Committee is recommended to note its updated the work programme, as set out in the report.

8 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, 21 February 2018 at 2pm in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 7 February 2018

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 interests¹;**
- 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.

Member	Interest
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley
Shaun Bailey AM	
Sian Berry AM	Member, LB Camden
Andrew Boff AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Leonie Cooper AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Wandsworth
Tom Copley AM	
Unmesh Desai AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Newham
Tony Devenish AM	Member, City of Westminster
Andrew Dismore AM	Member, LFEPA
Len Duvall AM	
Florence Eshalomi AM	Member, LB Lambeth
Nicky Gavron AM	
Susan Hall AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Harrow
David Kurten AM	Member, LFEPA
Joanne McCartney AM	Deputy Mayor
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Keith Prince AM	Member, LB Redbridge
Caroline Russell AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Islington
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Fiona Twycross AM	Chair, LFEPA; Chair of the London Local Resilience Forum
Peter Whittle AM	

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. The appointments to LFEPA reflected above take effect as from 1 October 2017]

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 £25 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:
<http://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 £25, 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.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985	
List of Background Papers: None	
Contact Officer:	Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officer
Telephone:	020 7983 6559
E-mail:	teresa.young@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES

Meeting: Police and Crime Committee
Date: Thursday 11 January 2018
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/police-and-crime-committee>

Present:

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman)
Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair)
Tony Arbour AM
Unmesh Desai AM
Andrew Dismore AM
Len Duvall AM
Susan Hall AM
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Joanne McCartney AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements (Item 1)

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Florence Eshalomi AM, for whom Joanne McCartney AM attended as a substitute; and 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 30 November 2017 be signed by the Chairman 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 outstanding and completed actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, as listed in the report, be noted.

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 5)

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

5.2 Resolved:

That the recent action taken by the Chairman under delegated authority, following consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, be noted, namely to agree a letter to the Mayor regarding security issues arising from Brexit, attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

6 The Functions and Impact of MOPAC (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, as background to putting questions to invited guests on the functions and impact of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC).

6.2 The Chairman welcomed the following guests from MOPAC:

- Rebecca Lawrence, Chief Executive;
- Julie Norgrove, Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance;
- Siobhan Peters, Chief Financial Officer;
- Paul Wylie, Director of Strategy; and
- Dan Hales, Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and

Neighbourhoods.

- 6.3 A transcript of the discussion is attached at **Appendix 1**.
- 6.4 During the course of the discussion the Chief Executive, MOPAC, agreed to provide:
- Details on the sign-off process for MOPAC's response to the College of Policing's public consultation on Indicative Sanctions, including who the responsible officer was for signing off such responses;
 - Details on the engagement structures that were in place to work with borough Heads of Community Safety on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan; and
 - Details of when the issue of the Metropolitan Police Service's response to child protection was first recorded on MOPAC's risk register.
- 6.5 During the course of the discussion the Chief Executive, MOPAC also agreed the following:
- To look into whether MOPAC's responses to consultations could be published on its website;
 - To provide the Police and Crime Committee with copies of responses to consultations and other significant documents, e.g. inspection reports; and
 - To improve the timeliness of the publication of minutes and decision reports on the MOPAC web pages.
- 6.6 At the end of the discussion, the Chairman thanked the guests for their attendance and helpful contributions.
- 6.7 **Resolved:**
- (a) That the report and discussion be noted; and**
 - (b) That the Chairman writes to the Chief Executive, MOPAC, requesting the follow-up information as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 above.**

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 updated work programme, as amended and set out in the report, be noted.**
- (b) That authority be delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the arrangements for an event in January 2018 on anti-social behaviour, as part of its investigation into anti-social behaviour in London.**
- (c) That the delegations of authority to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the reports on anti-social behaviour and gun crime in London, be confirmed.**

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The date of the next meeting was scheduled for 31 January 2018 at 2.00pm in the Chamber, City Hall.

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

9.1 There was no other business the Chairman considered urgent.

10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting ended at 12.42pm.

Chairman

Date

Contact Officer: Ozu Okere, Committee Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 5825;
Email: ozu.okere@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458

This page is intentionally left blank

London Assembly Police and Crime Committee

Transcript of Agenda Item 6 – The Functions and Impact of MOPAC

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): Good morning, everybody. Our main item today is to speak to and ask questions of senior directors of the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), and again, very much welcome to you.

I understand we have not had this glorious opportunity for some considerable time. It is the first time we have had Chief Operating Officer, Rebecca [Lawrence], in front of.

The first set of questions is under the broad title around operating model, and I will take the lead question around that. MOPAC has been in operation for six years. I know that from my own experiences. First question, Rebecca, as a lead-in, is: how has the MOPAC changed in its function and work, in essence, since it was first set up?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): First, if I may say so, thank you very much for inviting us, for giving us the opportunity to speak, because I think that is a really welcome development by the Committee. It is quite proper that the Mayor [Sadiq Khan] and the Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime, Sophie Linden] are more commonly the public face held to account by this Committee for policing in London, but MOPAC does have quite a significant range of functions, some of which have developed since it was first established. It is a good opportunity to be able to set those out and introduce my team, so thank you.

As you say, we were established six years ago. Our statutory functions are extensive and have in some senses developed but in some senses matured since we were first established. You have a note that summarises those, but in some ways they go slightly more than your note may suggest. Our principal statutory function is to set and establish a Police and Crime Plan (PCP). We have had considerable experience after one mayoralty, and now a second mayoralty in terms of content, style and consultation and engagement on that PCP.

We have experience in holding the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to account, our statutory function of efficiency and effectiveness, and I think that has matured quite considerably in terms of our oversight model in that area, both in terms of our budgetary oversight, our performance oversight and the assurance that we take of the MPS systems, and our Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Siobhan Peters, may be able to expand on that later. Also, our programme management and project management of the issues and risks that the MPS criminal justice partners and MOPAC hold, and our Director of Strategy, Paul Wylie, has done a considerable amount of work on that and will be able to set that out.

Of course, in the time since we were established, MOPAC has developed its own self-assessment and self-assurance of how we discharge our wide range of statutory functions through our annual governance statement and processes there, which I am happy to talk about, which Julie [Norgrove] can develop.

Your note rightly talks about our PCP responsibilities. We also have - and this is an area which has developed significantly over the last six years - the ability to commission services and to set grants. We can talk about that in a lot more depth. In this period of time we have been able to be much more innovative in the services we commission, and we have been able to access much wider sources of income, both nationally from the Performance Innovation Fund and the Transformation Fund, which I can talk about, on a pan-London basis

through commissioning with pan-London partners such as the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), and in our commissioning with and in partnership with local authorities through the London Crime Prevention Fund (LCPF), whose format under this mayoralty is really quite different and has emerged in partnership with local authorities, which Dan Hales can talk about. We have really extended in our oversight function.

We also convene very significantly and we have a very significant delivery function and national influencing function, which again I am able to pick up and talk about in more depth. Our convening role and maturing of our processes of convening with many, many delivery partners in the PCP has established and developed quite significantly in that time. Our ability to mobilise partnerships across local partners, central Government, national Government and the private sector has developed, and our ability to convene across different forces and offices of Police and Crime Commissioners.

Key to being able to do that really has been the team in MOPAC because you have here a really broad set of professional experience, with members here who can maybe talk about their experience from both experience in central Government, in local government, in other sectors, in health, professional qualifications, operational experience, local delivery experience. Having that multi-disciplinary team has been quite important to our development of stretch and reach. That would be my overview, Chair. I am very happy to expand on that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Thank you. Yes, we will be asking some questions really about how effective it is. You talked about your commissioning role and scrutinising role and convening role, and we are asking questions about how you have described what you are set out to do, and what we need to do in the next couple of hours is see how effective that is.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Going back to the model and restructuring, I think you are undergoing a restructure at the moment, I read, but how many restructures over a period of time has MOPAC gone through from a model restructure? It is several, is it not? Is that fair to say?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Let me clarify. We are not undergoing a whole-organisation restructure.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You are not. OK. Tell me what you are doing.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We are undergoing some adjustments. You will recall - and some Members, in particular those who were on the [Metropolitan Police] Authority (MPA), will recall - that MOPAC was a creation of a number of different groups of staff: the former MPA staff, a number of the Greater London Authority (GLA) Community Safety staff. Then, when MOPAC was established, we also took on the evidence and the insight function that previously had been hosted in the MPS and then came into MOPAC as a shared delivery function. The largest change to MOPAC organisation was in that period of its initial establishment.

Since then, looking at the experience of what these really significant new statutory functions require - particularly the weight of public accountability that I think is absolutely appropriate for a city of this size and for policing of this kind of impact and profile - are the skills base that we need on finance, on efficiency and effectiveness and on value for money on commissioning, it has led to a number of further adjustments to MOPAC's staffing. On Julie Norgrove's side, there was a restructure process around the audit function, which she would be very happy to talk about. On the finance side, under our CFO, as well as the recruitment of the CFO, we had a recruitment of the small and highly skilled Finance Team to allow us to discharge our

responsibilities in overseeing what is one of the biggest transformation programmes in the public sector. Then, in addition to that, we looked at both the Strategy Directorate on Paul's [Wylie] side and the directorate currently called Integrated Offender Management (IOM) under Dan's [Hales] side, and a colleague who is off on maternity leave and other reasons. We looked and said, "Are there any pockets of skills there which either need supplementing or adjusting?" which would need restructure methodology, not whole-organisation restructure because that can be hugely disruptive when you have such a weight of delivery. We have looked at where there are pocket adjustments to capacity and capability that would help the better functioning of MOPAC in those areas, particularly in commissioned services, value for money and effectiveness, in community engagement, and in public accountability.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I will get on to that. Thank you. Numbers-wise, just to help me on this, what is your full-time equivalent (FTE) (staff) at the moment?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): The FTE at the moment is 118, so we have about 48 in Strategy, distributed 50-50 between Evidence and Insight and other policy and public accountability functions, 28 in IOM, 12 in Finance, and mid-20s in Audit. Actually, that is approximately 150.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): MOPAC is a distinct organisation.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): There are not really many or any comparables.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No. It is a very unusual governance structure.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): How does that influence the way that you structure? How has that been informed, then, if you are quite distinct, certainly in the GLA and elsewhere in the country? If you look at other Commissioners' offices, it is a distinct organisation, is it not?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely, set up with a statutory function clearly set out in a number of pieces of legislation, not just --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You have talked about the structure, and we hear from, obviously, lead directors, as we digress. We are talking about effectiveness. A couple of things that interest me particularly around engagement, so I will drill down on a couple tied to the organisation. Engagement is a really important part. You are delivering the Mayor's priorities around the Plan. You are looking at supporting the boroughs out there. I sense there has been a change in the engagement grouping, and the feedback that I and other colleagues have got around the boroughs is that there appears to be less visibility of MOPAC out in the boroughs to support the boroughs. Would you agree with that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I will turn to my two colleagues here for that. No, essentially, I would say it is a different model of engagement, but a perhaps more multi-layered and developed model of engagement. Perhaps Paul Wylie?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Paul, do you want to tell us? There is a feeling that there is less support out there.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): One of my responsibilities is the overall programme management of the PCP, and particularly how we deliver that through community engagement, which is why,

as Rebecca [Lawrence] said, we looked, when I arrived in May, to restructure those components. The community engagement team is part of that restructure, and we also recognise that we could do more proactively in terms of identifying those key strategic stakeholders that we need to be briefing much more often. At a separate level, those people who are actively interested in our business, be they charities or local partners, and then the public more widely. It is a top-down approach to a different style of community engagement.

We have through a number of processes this year had feedback as you have described, and we want to learn from that. The Basic Command Unit changes the public access strategy. We are constantly learning, and the restructure allows us to have a different skillset within.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I know other colleagues no doubt will bring it up, but you refer to Borough Command Unit (BCU) mergers. How is MOPAC influencing or consulting or working on that with boroughs?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): As the Deputy Mayor [Sophie Linden] has said in this chamber many times, MOPAC is in that convening role to assist the MPS to make these very important changes. Right now, the MPS is finalising its evaluation for the BCU in the north, central and east BCUs, and we are working with the relevant boroughs, but also hopefully with constituency Assembly Members and the Police and Crime Committee more generally, to feed into that evaluation and inform how the MPS rolls out its important changes.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We will talk about convening later, particularly in terms of other parts of the criminal justice system, and how the previous model, the MOPAC challenges, has been superseded by another model, and we can talk about the effectiveness of that or otherwise later.

I am interested in the relationships between the Mayor and the MPS and MOPAC and the MPS. This was an unusual relationship in 2011/12, and it has probably taken a while for people to get a feel of it, certainly back five or six years ago. Also, you got the layer of the Deputy Mayor as well. When there is work that MOPAC is doing with the MPS, can you just explain where it will go to the Mayor? This is for Paul, possibly. Where would the Mayor be involved and where would the Deputy Mayor be involved, without going into massive detail about signing off? Where does that strategic lead sit between the two of them?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It is a quite well tried and tested system but invariably it depends issue by issue, and the relevant issue. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act [2011], as you will note, discharges some particular functions statutorily to the Mayor. The agreement of the PCP is for the Mayor, who cannot delegate that to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, although the Deputy Mayor has discharged a significant proportion of the consultation and engagement. It is the Mayor's budget. Again, that is signed off by the Mayor, but MOPAC has a statutory responsibility to keep the Police Fund and to oversee the Police Fund, and there is a very established structure of responsibilities there for the CFO, and also a scheme of delegation on decision-making and investment which is discharged by the Deputy Mayor. The overarching budget is for the Mayor, but individual investment decisions are for the Deputy Mayor. Those would be some examples in statute.

In practice, this system - which, as you say, is very unusual in governance terms as a holding to account of an operationally independent force - requires a depth of relationships across MOPAC offices, the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor to the MPS. We have a structure of working-level arrangements, we have a structure of bilaterals between the Deputy Mayor and the MPS, we have a structure of bilaterals between the Mayor and

the MPS with care around escalation points and important points to know. Of course, yourself, you hold the Mayor to account through Mayor's Questions (MQs) and your invitations to the Mayor through Plenary and your invitations to the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor through this Committee.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We will get on to the scrutinising panels in the next set of questions. For signing off contracts and commissioning and investment --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): That is the Deputy Mayor.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): -- it would tend to drop down to the Deputy Mayor.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, and that is as envisaged in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. It is a weighty responsibility and that is why there is the statutory Deputy Mayor [for Policing and Crime] to carry that out. I do not know if you --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That answer is fine for the moment because we can pursue that a little bit later. I have a question - this is a difficult one - about the complexity or, in essence, the uniqueness of this tripartite relationship of the Police and Crime Committee, MOPAC, the Mayor underneath, the Deputy Mayor. Do you think Londoners and the public and people understand it? Have we got to that stage where people can work it out other than people in this building?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): That is a very good and interesting question, and of course it is a shared model. As I say, I think it is properly the case that, for the public, they see principally the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor and yourselves in this Committee as the holding to account of what is happening in policing and criminal justice more generally in London. That is properly the case. It is not the aim of MOPAC that MOPAC in itself is a visible, public-facing organisation. I think Londoners expect democratic accountability to happen at this level.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You are the guardian of public funds, so there is an interest in that.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely, which we need to discharge properly, with professionalism and effectiveness.

Susan Hall AM: I have been made aware of something. I was just interested to see who had signed off on it. This is to Rebecca, really. In 2016, MOPAC responded to a public consultation by the College of Policing on indicative sanctions guidance, in which there was a question about police officers misusing police computer systems. The MOPAC response I will read to you so you will know why I am concerned about this. MOPAC responded by saying:

"I think there is a balance needed here, and restrictions on the purpose of access are often too strictly applied. For example, if a police officer is purchasing a house or a car, I think that it should be legitimate for the officer to make inquiries of the car, if it is lost or stolen, or in purchasing a house. It is surely good practice for an officer not to move into a house knowing or not knowing an active criminal lives close by. This activity is very different from accessing information on a basis, for example, to sell or release information more widely."

Who in MOPAC actually signed off on that response?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I believe that was a response to an MQ.

Susan Hall AM: Somebody must have prepared for it, and it was from the College for Policing. I am just wondering who in MOPAC thinks that that is a good idea and how senior are they?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I will have to come back to you on that one.

Susan Hall AM: If you would. Given that it is in the name of MOPAC, do you agree with that response?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I think it is important to have some more background. This is not something --

Susan Hall AM: No, I have read you the response. You are in charge. Do you agree with that response? Do you think police officers should be able to just access information from their computers in that way for personal use?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It is difficult without the wider context of the whole document in front of us, but as described in that way, that would be a description of the MPS which had been overseen by MOPAC. Clearly, we would not endorse any inappropriate use of police information, and there is quite --

Susan Hall AM: This has not been brought to your attention before?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I am not aware of that document and I would like to go --

Susan Hall AM: If you could send us the details, then, on who actually signed off on that. Clearly, this is not acceptable, I would not have thought, but if you think it is acceptable, I think we should know that you think that would be acceptable.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes. I will gladly take that away and look at the full context. That would be --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): If you could, and write to us accordingly, that will be fine.

Len Duvall AM: It does raise some other issues. If the MPS influences national policing, then MOPAC must also influence or have an impact on that. In signing off documents and consultations, is that done by the Deputy Mayor or is that done by the professional cadre? Is there a sign-off process for that, or would it be the Mayor? Who drives those issues around consultation?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely there is a sign-off process, and the sign-off is proportionate to the issue at stake. For example, on MQs, they are signed off by myself or a director, consistent with policy endorsed by the Deputy Mayor, and through to the Mayor's Office for final sign-off.

Len Duvall AM: Do you make those public, then, on a website, so people can see what you are responding to in terms of Government or professional bodies, in terms of their requests or consultations they do?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Sometimes. That is a good question. We can think about how we record that. Usually, it is the receiving body in terms of a consultation that addresses the nature of their responses and whether it is appropriate to release all of them, but it is a good question and we can look at it.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Where it is statutorily deemed that we must publish - for example, we write to the Home Secretary [Rt Hon Amber Rudd MP] after every Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) report on the MPS, that letter - we are required to publish it, and we do.

Len Duvall AM: Do you ever copy that to us?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): They are published on our website.

Len Duvall AM: They are just published. Should you not formally copy that to us, as we are holding you to account, where there is an inspection report, and what you are saying about that inspection report? Sorry, it is the first time I have heard that. Just the fact that maybe we should be part of the procedure. You write to the Home Secretary about a response to MPS inspections, which maybe you should copy to us, so that we can maybe pick up on it in terms of our future work programme.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We could. We could.

Len Duvall AM: If I can quickly just go back over a point that is in answer to a question from the Chairman about engagement issues. The PCP: pretty essential, pretty *de facto* the issue is. In terms of pursuing that, I get the "back into the MPS" bit around that engagement issue, and I think the Chairman was trying to tease out about not just public engagement, but you mentioned about how you talk to stakeholders. Later on there is a further question around the governance in the London-wide bodies. On the PCP that is there, how often do you call in to just talk about the progress of the Police and Crime Community Safety Units of London boroughs? Do you ever bring them together, or do you just add up and speak to them generally about engagement of those issues? On the PCP, essentially, can you tell when was the last time you brought them in to say, "Let us talk about the PCP"? I am trying to understand this engagement. Paint a picture for me. Is it a passive engagement, that we are just sending out briefing notes, or is there an interruption between partners on the ground who can contribute to the PCP in pushing it forward, because that is one of your main issues?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Len Duvall AM: How often do you bring them together, then? When was the last time you brought them together?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Perhaps I could describe briefly the overall programme planning, and Dan [Hales], my colleague, can describe the Community Safety Directorate. Overall, we are developing and have a programme plan for the PCP, with the risks and the issues management that you would expect. Within that, we are identifying both within the MPS and through local partners where things are either off-track or we are more concerned about them, or perhaps issues are arising - like mopeds, for example - during the course of the year that we need to take further action to mitigate. There is escalation criteria for that, and we would proactively identify that mopeds, for example, are an issue for which we need to convene the Community Safety Directorate. There is an established process for that on a routine basis but also on a bespoke issues management basis. Dan can describe the routine.

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Yes. It is probably multi-layered, I would say. The London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) obviously has a lot of partners around that table from local authorities, criminal justice, all the partners needed to mobilise and implement that delivery. That is on a regular basis on sub-groups that reflect the elements of the PCP we need to deliver. We have regular engagement with London Councils and leaders at chief executive level on

individual issues, and they call the agenda on that a lot of the time as well.

We regularly attend the London Head of Community Safety's (LHOC) meeting, and again there is a two-way process where they ask us to update on certain issues but we can also take issues there as well.

We also provide a single point of contact function for the Community Safety teams there, so making sure they all have a MOPAC officer allocated to them that they can go to and from. I have been on the other side of this previously in the borough as a Head of Community Safety, so I am aware of how that functions and works. Different boroughs want and need different levels of engagement as well, which is understandable.

Then, as Paul [Wylie] said, on an issues management basis, we might convene individual pieces of work to bring together representatives from Heads of Community Safety, the youth offending service, and the AD network (Youth Offending Team Assistant Director Network) across the spectrum of London.

Len Duvall AM: OK. Chair, maybe we could ask for some more information about some of those agenda items. I am just trying to get an idea about how we try to pull those levers in terms of the PCP but it could equally apply to the Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Strategy about how you are engaging with those other partners outside the MPS in terms of delivering that strategy. I would just like to have a bit more of that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That would be helpful because, from our work in our boroughs, clearly, when we speak to people, they talk about work in MOPAC around this issue and that issue, and that is a given. What we are trying to understand is how that structure is. If you can write to us, perhaps in tabular form or in a detailed briefing.

Andrew Dismore AM: There were a couple of questions I was going to ask later, but perhaps I can fit them in now. One is following on Susan Hall's point, the substance rather than the process. The London Policing Ethics Panel, set up last year: how many times has it met?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): The new Ethics Panel was constituted. We conducted interviews in summer 2017. It has held three meetings so far. I believe it last met last week. It was an open recruitment process, again, highly transparent, the first open recruitment process for the Ethics Panel. The Chair was appointed first, and then she helped recruit her own team. It is establishing its work programme and working methods but has a very highly skilled and diverse membership. It is still establishing its work programme but it will make that fully, fully transparent.

Andrew Dismore AM: It seems to be a bit behind the curve at the moment. We were told it was set up in early 2017. That does not seem to be --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, so the recruitment - there was an open national competitive recruitment process, which needed to take place in stages: first the Chair, and then the Chair, Suzanne Shale, rightly wanted to appoint her panel. It is also really important that the work programme - do not forget these reports both to the Deputy Mayor and to the Commissioner - can be endorsed and signed off and discussed and co-designed with the incoming Commissioner of the MPS. The summer, as you appreciate, was a high pace of operational events. I think it is highly, highly appropriate for it to be operating on those timescales to get that depth of recruitment expertise and buy-in to its work programme.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is the work programme going to be published?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Will it come to the sorts of things that were in that response to Assembly Member Hall?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It is for the Chair of the Ethics Panel to set out her work programme, and I know she is very keen to work with the London Assembly, to work with the principles of transparency. I would suggest, once the Committee is established and in flow - I have already spoken to her on this - she would be very, very happy to come and meet with the Committee.

Andrew Dismore AM: Another issue I was going to raise, following on from Len's [Duvall] questions, was about the 'policing matters' meetings. There has been one in September 2016 for public engagement. Have there been any since?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No. It is back to your initial question, Chair, about establishing a style of oversight that works for each partner on each side. We have a different style and rhythm and approach to transparency and oversight under this deputy mayoralty and under this mayoralty in general. You will see that we have moved to a system of quarterly financial and performance information, which I hope you are finding usable and rich. We hold quarterly oversight meetings with the MPS around that information, rather than that initial policing matters format, which, as you say, was used in September 2016.

Andrew Dismore AM: This is now done in public?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We publish the performance information, the finance information. We publish data dashboards. We publish the minutes of our bilateral meetings. Of course, you rightly have the Deputy Mayor and the MPS each month at this Committee.

Andrew Dismore AM: I will come back to that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes, we are going to go back. The point that we will pursue probably, as I touched upon earlier - and this may be in the spirit of devolution in the criminal justice system - was that there was a rhythm, in your words, of MOPAC challenges, where we will bring into this building the whole range of partners from other organisations and have that challenge. That did not seem to be a like for like, and we can pursue that later.

On the subject of the Ethics Panel, I am fortuitously, at 2pm this afternoon, meeting the Chair.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Good.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I looked at their website this morning and it is pretty moribund. It has the previous Chair on it, and it just looks like nobody has looked at it for about a year, so I am not so sure about that one.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I can just add a technical note it is that the membership of the Panel, the newly appointed members, are still undergoing vetting, which is why the names are not yet in the public domain.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That would explain it. OK.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): She will be able to assure you this afternoon that they are appointed.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I am sure she will. We touched upon and you mentioned transparency, and again, some colleagues in the past have had some challenges, shall we say, around some dealings with MOPAC, around information flow, etc.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): If I can follow on a little bit from the previous questions and talk in a little bit more detail because, obviously, this is the first time we have had you here. Some aspects of transparency under MOPAC I think are good. The quarterly reports, we have discussed those and we like those. The dashboards are very useful, and that is a good thing.

That is public information, and there is a bit of a loss now because the public meetings have been scaled back. As you rightly say, we have public meetings and we have the job of scrutiny here. The things we are interested in are things like the minutes of meetings, the details of decisions, and those are things we have had problems with in the past. There are still some problems on the website that I have identified this week. For example, the bilateral meetings between the Mayor and the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [Cressida Dick CBE QPM], the Deputy Mayor and the Commissioner. The last time we have meeting minutes up on the website at the moment is July 2017. I am sure you have had meetings since then.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, we have.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): If we cannot look in a timely way at what is being discussed on those agendas - we ask MQs to get more details when needed - we cannot really do our jobs. The meeting minutes themselves are very, very short. They just list topics. They say, "discussed something". That is literally all they say. Again, we would really like to see more there, but if we at least know the topics then we can dig deeper with the powers that we have to ask questions.

You said the Ethics Panel has met, and yet there is no note of that yet on the website at all. Then the other ones seem to be up to date. The LCRB, the Oversight Board and the Reducing Reoffending Board all have autumn, October, November [2017] meeting notes in there. The VAWG Board has only met once in 2016. That seems to be the last thing that is on the website.

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): No, it has met more than that in the last year.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): In that case, that also needs updating. You can see the problem I have. The disclosure log for Freedom of Information (FOI) - again, that is something that is really important and I think we highlighted that in the GLA Oversight Committee - the last things we have there are for June. Given that you are not a public-facing organisation, I am not sure how many FOI requests you get compared with the MPS, which I think gets the most out of any of the GLA. Again, I would have thought you would have fulfilled FOI requests since June [2017]. My question is, can this be sorted out? Is this part of the MPS's Public Engagement Strategy review that I think you mentioned, Paul [Wylie]? Is MOPAC coming into that, or is that something separate or a separate piece of work you are doing to improve the public information and the information we use as well?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Thank you for that, and much of that is a fair challenge. The issue around the meeting minutes: they are shortly going to be uploaded. You are also right that those

minutes are in a sense more skeletal. Of course, we write detailed reports to you each month on all of the Deputy Mayor's engagement, and in the questioning of your Committee she gives, I would hope, very full answers across the range of areas of MOPAC's delivery.

There is a balance to be struck, of course, between a meeting minute style that is highly detailed and one that protects some of the nature of the operational and commercially sensitive material discussed, which is why we err on the side of detail in our monthly reports to you in our answers to MQs and in the discussions in this chamber. You will see from the subject matters that the issues that appear on bilaterals are issues that are absolutely driven from and fed by our system of risk, our risk registers, which are in the public domain. We publish those as part of our Audit Panel meetings. They are absolutely fed from the PCP and the priority areas of delivery. There is a transparent structure to the issues that we discuss, but sometimes the nature of those meetings is that the public-facing side comes out in the written documentation.

A very good example would be investment appraisal, where of course we publish the full decisions. Occasionally, there is a delay due to a commercial sensitivity, a contract still under negotiation, but I would hope that you find our decisions and investment appraisal material very, very extensive.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. The decision reports are as we would expect them to be, but it is more the timeliness. If you are discussing a topic and it is a topic that we have been interested in, we can ask for more detail if we know it has been discussed. If we do not know until six months later --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): That is a very, very fair challenge, but I would assure you that the themes in those bilaterals are ones that also appear in our monthly reporting to you. It is a fair challenge, and I will improve the timeliness of that.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. My question about the Public Engagement Strategy.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I can take that. The short answer is no. The Public Engagement Strategy is primarily concerned with how the MPS informs, engages and empowers communities. What we are doing, as all public-sector organisations are, is putting much more emphasis on General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) compliance ahead of May [2018]. This is one of those issues which we will be focusing on right now.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you very much. Following on from that really, to you, Paul, given the amount of administration there is to do and the amount of putting things out, why is it that MOPAC has its own secretariat and does not share these things like other people do within the GLA?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): MOPAC is an organisation in and of itself. It is a statutory organisation. I think it is fair to say that we work very closely with the rest of the GLA, and it is not a case of duplication. If you can appreciate that, for example, this month alone we have had seven oral MQs, and so we have a substantial secretariat in order to feed that machine. We have the same number broadly as Transport for London (TfL), for example, which is of course a much bigger organisation. We work with the MPS, so the MPS has its own secretariat to assist with the operational questions, but largely we want to ensure that we are allowing the MPS to deliver and we are, where we can, responding on behalf of MOPAC and the Mayor directly.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): That does not just relate to MQs, though. We are talking about organising meetings, the transparency webcasts, all of those things, the infrastructure we already have within the GLA. Potentially, you could save by sharing that.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I gave MQs as an example, but the GLA as a wider body has of course its own secretariat and its own policy departments, which each have a secretariat function for administering that. I do not think it is a case that we have anything that is different from what you would recognise in the rest of the GLA.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We did previously, about three years ago, look at the business case for having a combined secretariat function, but our secretariat of meetings, our roles in MOPAC, are dispersed through the organisation and also combined with roles that have the professional, subject matter and stakeholder relationships. For reasons of, therefore, efficiency and effectiveness when looking at the business case, it was difficult to replicate that through a shared model because those members of staff who carry out secretariat functions also carry out issues management or convening functions. It was a dilution of sectoral expertise to move to that model. You would have to build in co-ordination with subject matter experts in a different way which would prove more time-consuming.

Tony Arbour AM: Are you saying there are no synergies at all?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): There are functional synergies across secretariat skills, but there are also synergies with the subject matter.

Tony Arbour AM: Forgive me, Chairman. From Mr [Paul] Wylie's answers, it suggests that what MOPAC has it wants to hold.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): I would suggest that that is not what I said. Are there synergies? Of course there are. Most of the GLA is a policy functioning body, so you need to devise the policy and also be held to account for it. As Rebecca [Lawrence] said, the secretariat functions best sit with those people who are the subject matter experts.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We are going to explore this point in the next question.

Tony Arbour AM: I am sure that Len [Duvall] will remember. Over the years we have had these sorts of arguments about every other bit. TfL said, "No, we cannot possibly share anything because we have all the experts". The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) said exactly the same. Yet we have been driving through the common, if you like, administrative processes. It does not appear to be happening with you.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely not. We have a very extensive programme of shared services. Our Human Resources (HR) services are provided by the GLA. Our finance services are provided by the MPS. Our Information Technology (IT) services are provided by the GLA. Our media and communications services are provided by the GLA Communications Team. When you look at secretariat functions, it is a very small, focused part of a small number of individuals' time, which you could either centralise in a single individual, who could do secretariat, but you risk needing to introduce capacity into the jobs of the subject matter experts to ensure that the generic secretariat function is well informed, or you can bed out secretariat functions within individual subject matter expert roles. For the volume of staff time and the level of staff time when you compare like with like, we have deemed it is the more efficient and effective model to have secretariats for particular meetings bedded out within the subject matter experts.

For example, MOPAC has convened meetings, taken issues management, hostile vehicle mitigation, on bridges in London after the attacks. We have capacity and skills that are vetted skills on counter-terrorism, with trusted relationships with counter-terrorism security advisors, with a range of local authority partners. The

member of staff who drives the policy on that area can also secretariat the meeting, and I would say that that is a more effective model than there being a clustered secretariat, which would potentially be really buffeted in many directions and it would be difficult to manage their work flow unless it is bedded out within the issues management and subject management system that Paul [Wylie] described. As I say, it is a small capacity compared to the much larger areas of spend on the shared services that we have on IT, on finance, on HR, and facilities is the other, of course, which is shared.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): MOPAC was physically moved to this building, you will remember, from across the way, with an aspiration: (a) to site it all under one roof; and (b) to look at sharing resources. The simplistic question around this is: are there other parts of this building or the GLA that could - I do not really expect a simplistic answer to this - deliver the functions and do the work that you are doing, particularly in mind of the budgetary savings?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely. We are always, always horizon-scanning for opportunities to share and make efficiencies and increase effectiveness. It is just the conclusion in all of those, looking at those different areas, does not always naturally lead you to a shared solution. In this case, with the secretariat - which, as I said, is a relatively small amount of spend - you could view it either as a specialist skill set or a skill set bedded with subject matter experts. We think that the latter view would be more effective in our context, with our information requirements, our security requirements and our complex web of stakeholder relationships.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): No, we understand. They are splitting out the specialisms and the expertise with more administrative secretariat pieces of work, but this building is full of many people that may be able to do that. Anyway, we have explored that enough.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You said at the beginning you feel the weight of public accountability, which is a great phrase, but that does not reflect my impression at all of MOPAC. Too often it has come across at the Assembly as a forgotten; it is an add-on; it is selective, what you do choose to share with us and what you do not. Last-minute, "the Deputy Mayor will meet you about this consultation" when we have been criticising it. What are you doing to review how you engage with the Assembly as a whole, as well as perhaps constituency Assembly Members (AMs), in order that we can feed into your casework and get timely responses? When we ring up with an inquiry, "Who is in charge of your estate sell-off", we cannot find out. Call after call, trying to find out. These are really basic things. We find it impossible to get through your barriers. What are you doing to address that, given you have been in existence now for six years?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I am very sorry to hear that and I am very sorry to hear that you do not have the service that you would wish to have. I was not aware of that example. There is learning from the different styles of engagement that we are carrying out, and there is learning about how we could better plan, which are the activities where you would actively want to input. I suggest that we take that away and do a joint piece of work. I do not know if you wanted to nominate a lead Member or if you wanted to nominate one of the officers to the Committee. Those are fair points. It is not how I want the Assembly to feel, so we should definitely take that away and work together on what could be a better-designed system to meet your needs.

As I say, we put a lot of work into our monthly report, our quarterly reporting, our dashboards, our MQs and our correspondence from you, but if it is not working for you -- I have huge numbers of staff at the moment working on priority order MQs for the Assembly and this Committee. If that effort is not yielding the returns that you would like and there are better ways of doing things, I think you make some very valid points, and so do you, Deputy Chair, and I am very happy to take that away. If you wanted to nominate a lead or a working

method, I think that would be really constructive.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Also, as Joanne [McCartney AM] mentions to me, how the MPS treats Assembly Members compared to how they treat Members of Parliament (MPs), particularly if you have a constituency, I understand that. It was very different when I was on the MPA or on LFEPA. If there was something happening where I lived, they might give me that area just so I was aware that sometimes -- I know, Joanne, you have mentioned to me before that you have had issues and you have not been briefed on it at all. It is looking at all those things that slipped through.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, clearly that is not good for either side. Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Also, your consultation, the front counters consultation. We criticised from the start, and you guys just defended it and defended it, saying, "No, this is great, this is perfect", and at the end of it you were criticised by an institution about your whole process. You are now admitting, "Yes, perhaps it wasn't the right way to have gone about it". How do you take suggestions and whatever and learn from this to make sure all your future consultations are genuine and engaging and timely?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): What I said earlier was that we absolutely want to learn from both our successes and where people find criticism. I was in the chamber listening to you, Assembly Member [Caroline Pidgeon MBE], when you said about the nature of those initial questions, and it was the Deputy Mayor who said to you afterwards, "Yes, you have a point", so we changed it immediately, and we are very much interested in making sure that this is the right process. I would not say that that was a bad consultation. We have met with the Institute for Consultations, and we recognise they have a view, but we do not actually accept it. What is important with that is that it gives the MPS the ability to make the savings that it needs to in order to prioritise for the front line, and that is continuing. In that respect, it delivered, and I think what you will see this year is the second half of that, which is the public engagement strategy, very, very keen to work with the Assembly as to how your views can be fed into that at an early stage, and more generally on a process point of view. Like I said, we are interested in learning.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I may add to that, this is a theme we are taking up jointly with the MPS. Only yesterday, the Deputy Mayor, myself and the entire team here spent the day with the MPS management board on an away day focused on looking back over last year, looking forward to what we want to be successes and achievements of the year to come. We had a session specifically focused on the future transformation of the MPS and the public engagement techniques that are appropriate to the very many changes that are going to have to come in in policing in the coming years. It is absolutely a live area of focus. We took to the MPS examples of engagement from a wide number of other public services and other parts of policing in a presentation led by Siobhan [Peters] to get active discussion between ourselves and the MPS, so I can assure you there is a continuous learning journey on engagement with the public on this. Your points are timely, very well made and very welcome. Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): We always like to hear that, do we not? Certainly, the point around the Public Engagement Strategy, if there is one emerging this year, we would like an involvement in it to inform it. It is absolutely right, Caroline's [Pigeon AM] point around almost a perceived blind spot institutionally within MOPAC. Sometimes we perhaps unfairly criticise the Deputy Mayor when we have not been copied in on engagement or events, but frankly it is for yourselves to advise the Deputy Mayor, and I think that is a fair point.

Joanne McCartney AM: Does MOPAC have a forward plan, perhaps, that they could share with the Committee so that we are aware of consultations or decisions you are making?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): This is a very rich and valuable discussion. I think we need to set up a system that can meet your needs of visibility and engagement.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): There has to be a better interaction.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely. I know.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You sense quite a criticism of MOPAC and, by extension, the Deputy Mayor's interaction with the Police and Crime Committee that has gone on over, clearly, years and needs to change.

Andrew Dismore AM: Just following up what Caroline [Pidgeon AM] and Joanne [McCartney AM] have been saying, having been an MP and now an Assembly Member, I can see the difference.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You can see the difference.

Andrew Dismore AM: A significant difference. It was much, much more accessible when I was an MP, even though technically none of it is answerable to an MP, which is rather peculiar.

The other point I would make about public engagement is that public engagement is with the public as well as elected people. That is the real part that has been missing over the last year.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Apologies, but, as you can see, there is more or less a consensus among us. That is the reason we get down to these questions of, should you not be more within the GLA? You feel so much like an outside organisation, and it is quite hard to find out the right person to talk to. That is why we wind up asking those kinds of questions. I think it is a good offer that we can discuss with you, a new strategy. I think that will be really good.

I want to move on to Julie [Norgrove] and audit, if that is OK? You are from the Directorate of Audit, Risk and Assurance (DARA), but you are part of MOPAC.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): That is right. I am.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): You carry out audit functions within MOPAC, and you are looking at things like value for money and things like that, but also governance and risk and issues like that. What is your assessment of governance within MOPAC and where improvements might be needed at the moment?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): I can. Thank you. Actually, I published a report last year, which was in June and July [2017], and if I just build on what is in the public domain and where I think we are now, just noting that there will be another annual report, which will be published in June of this year, which will give my assessment falling this year. We are partway through. I would just caveat what I am saying on that basis.

Looking back at what was reported last July [2017], I did note that at that point in time the governance control environment had continued to improve but was not yet fully effective. Within that, opinion was very clear. I felt that there were robust plans in place to improve the effectiveness of governance and risk management in particular. The Audit Committee has overseen the plans that were put in place to secure those improvements, and in fact there was a report that went in December [2017] on the latest position, and they themselves noted the level of improvement, which I would hope to reflect in my annual report in July [2018].

Having said that, I still have some reviews to complete in the next four months which will inform my opinion, but it is very much an improving picture. We are seeing that governance is becoming more embedded, that risk management is becoming more effective, and I think in particular the integration of the MPS's business plan with the PCP was, to me, a significant development that I was looking for this year that we had not seen before. In terms of governance, it was a real, major move forward, both for the MPS and for MOPAC. I would be hoping to reflect the improvements.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Chair, if I may, we have put a huge focus on this and this has been a huge part of the work of Siobhan, [Peters] our CFO, in terms of maturing and building our governance and risk management structures. I take great assurance from Julie's opinion and from that, but you may want to hear about what we have actually built and how that works.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. The three risks that I have down here in the last report, I think MOPAC writes the risk management report and it goes to you. Is that right?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): The risk management report goes to the Audit Panel for update.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): We will get on to the Audit Panel in a moment.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): It is something that I would use to inform my review activity, yes.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): We have the three risks. First of all, attracting adequate funding - that is within MOPAC, presumably - addressing vulnerability effectively and fulfilling duties under the Equality Act. We have some of the people here who are responsible owners of those risks. I do not know if we can run through what is being done about that.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Siobhan, do you want to talk through our risk framework?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): We were asked to look at and align our risks with the MPS, so we have been through a process this year to really understand not just the chance that something might happen but a formal approach to risk management and to go more in-depth with that. We have looked at alignment, and those three risks are reflected very clearly, not quite in the same words, but very clearly within the MPS's own risk register. The MPS's top risks are around the financial sustainability, around safeguarding vulnerable people, and around fairness in everything they do.

What we have done is to think very hard about what is MOPAC's role, though. We do not have exactly the same risks; our roles are different. It is really important that our risk register, our approach to risk, picks up on what our role is in that, on the finances in particular, on attracting funding and securing effective use of funding, because our risk has both components in it.

It is important that we are carrying out our role in making the case for MPS funding and the Mayor is very active in that. We provide him with the support to make the case for additional funding, but it is also important that we are securing the effective and efficient use of funding in the MPS. It is both sides: that the MPS has adequate resources means that we have attracted the resource and we have also overseen effectiveness and efficiency. A lot of our work has been focused on how we are doing. I guess it is supporting

both that side of that coin and what controls we have in, what mitigating actions and where we need to go with that in the future. I can talk in even more depth on that, but in terms of the approach, that is what we have looked at.

In terms of vulnerability, the MPS clearly has the operational role in that, but it is important that MOPAC thinks about what is its role, given that it has the convening across the wider criminal justice system, and that we perhaps rate our understanding of our risk on that more clearly in the system-wide issues and what our role is in the system-wide issues. We have child protection oversight of the MPS, but we also have roles through the LCRB and through the work that Paul [Wylie] and Dan [Hales] do, other levers we can pull. Our understanding of our key risks needs to be framed in terms of what do we control, what levers can we pull, what should we be trying to address? This is definitely an emerging and maturing framework. I would not say after six months that this is fully fledged and all-singing, all-dancing, but this is about the process of really being very rigorous about understanding what is MOPAC's role in the system above and beyond what the MPS goes out and does.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): That sounds really positive, as I say, to go beyond what the MPS actually do on a day-to-day basis and not just sort of overseeing that or keeping an eye on that or being led by what it is doing, but looking at the wider piece. Does that include things like the new public health approach to violence that the Mayor and the Commissioner have both been talking about recently?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): It does. Again, it comes back to thinking about what our different roles are in that. There is not a specific risk. The risk register is more thematic than that, but I would agree that that comes out, absolutely, of the key themes that we have, including public safeguarding, vulnerability and responding to issues, which is another one of our key risks there in the risk register. Obviously, in terms of driving the response, the Deputy Mayor and the Commissioner were just together yesterday talking about that public health approach and what we can do and thinking about perhaps going up to Glasgow to learn, to really scrutinise it in more depth. Both have had familiarity with it from the past, but we think this is a good time to refresh our understanding of it. Those come to the top of the conversations that we need to have.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): The final one is the Equality Act duties. Presumably that aligns quite closely with public engagement and failing to spot vulnerable groups or particular groups and things.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): As Siobhan said, it is multi-layered. Equality as an organisation, we publish our agenda and ethnicity data in terms of our employees, for example. Then as you get through the oversight, to convene and deliver, there is overseeing in the MPS on how we are supporting it in terms of equality, convening the disproportionality and the Lammy report [Rt Hon David Lammy MP, 2017] follow-through, and in our delivery, equality impact assessments for what we are delivering ourselves as well as when we are commissioning, making sure that that is built in from the start to ensure that we are not convening any of the Equality Act provisions. We put that as a risk because we felt that it remains an issue that has not been resolved, but we are confident in the mitigating actions that we have.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): OK, thank you. Just to go over the Public Access Strategy again, that is one of the criticisms we had: it was done in maybe too much of a rush and, therefore, some vulnerable groups might not have been able to feed back into that. Hopefully you are going to be looking at all of those type of things.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): That has been the subject of a few pre-action protocol letters,

but what we are very confident in our response is that both there is a draft equality impact assessment between us and the MPS and a final one. Throughout the consultation process, we specifically went to see several protected characteristics representative groups.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): OK, thank you. Can I go back to Julie and ask about the independent Audit Panel? Can you tell us more about that how independent it is?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): It is truly independent.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Very independent?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Again, it was a competitive recruitment process, an open recruitment. We went out to the market and recruited the independent Chair, who is Suzanne McCarthy [Chairman of the Joint Audit Panel, MOPAC and Metropolitan Police Service]. Suzanne was then involved - similar to the Ethics Panel - in the recruitment, so the panel members themselves. Reshard Auladin, who some of you may know from previous MPA days, is now on the panel; Graeme Gordon, who has a lot of experience around strategy and policy; and Mike Adam. They were all independently appointed and there was an independent process throughout, so they are all independent.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): As attenders of the panel, we can testify it is very rigorous and independent in its approach and its style.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Can you give an example of where it has given an effective challenge in recent times?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): In particular, one of the challenges that we did set for the panel at the beginning of the year was around the governance and risk management process. One of the points I made in delivering my annual report was that I was very pleased with the level of the plans that we had in place, but we really needed to make sure that those plans were translated into action. That is something that the panel have taken very, very seriously and have really gone into some in-depth analysis, looking at what actions have been taken to be assured that we are going to get to where we need to. I think that challenge has really been effective and has led to - I am sure our colleagues were going to do it anyway - the MPS and MOPAC going back and giving further assurance around what progress has been made throughout the year, so not just having a plan, but making sure that it works. I think they have really delivered on that. Siobhan can probably vouch for it, being on the receiving end of it.

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): I think they have a very, very appropriate and sharp focus on, "What exactly are you going to do and by when are you going to do it? If you told us last time you were going to have done it by September and it is October now, why can we not see that you have done it?" It is providing an appropriate degree of rigour and challenge and, "No, you are going to be back here in three months explaining it, so do get on with it" in terms of the kind of governance and risk management process improvements that we have been making. I think it has been really helpful.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Joanne, do you want to come in?

Joanne McCartney AM: Yes. Your risk register is, for obvious reasons, restricted. I know, Julie, when you read your opening statement, you talked about parts of your report being in the public domain and some will obviously not be. How can we be assured that those that are not in the public domain are being dealt with? If

I remember from the MPA days, it used to present reports to us which had the number of recommendations that had been taken up, those that had not and those that were disagreed with. Just some bare figures like that might give an overview. That is my first question.

My second is has there been instances where MOPAC has disagreed with some of your recommendations and what would then happen in those circumstances?

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): Of the overview of my activity, that is actually published on the website, so each quarter I will provide a summary of the reviews that we have concluded. Within that, I like to focus on what I feel is working well, where the areas of improvement are and what actions I have agreed with management to take that forward. That is reported each quarter. My annual report will then show how much those actions have been implemented and what actions have been taken, so again that is in the public domain, that is accessible.

In response to your question around has MOPAC disagreed, absolutely not. I think the level of engagement is high. That is not to say that we do not have very useful conversations around what is the appropriate response to audit recommendations, because I think that is really important. It is something I encourage both within MOPAC and the MPS, that we do have that level of discussion, because I really want people to understand why we think an area needs to improve. No, we have not found ourselves in a position where we have disagreed. If we did, then I would take that to the Audit Panel and it would be something that the Chair would raise. If we could not reach any further agreement, we can raise that personally with the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor, as indeed I can. I meet with the Deputy Mayor and every six weeks we have a one-to-one, where I advise her on the issues arising from my review activity. I have several avenues that I can pursue should I need to, but I have not had to.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I could add, from my perspective, it is a privilege to work with DARA. Julie is after all a National Police Audit Lead. She has a national leadership role there because of her professional experience and she is right in line with best practice for audit. The idea, when we come together, is to really understand her recommendations and to be in a place where I would never want them to be disputed. From my own professional background, I always welcome the challenge of audit. It is an insight, it is a mirror into your own organisation. An example of where we have good discussions around improvement is exactly - and the priority area has been in this - governance and risk framework, which is so fundamental to the relationship between ourselves and the MPS and the wider impact on Londoners. To have Julie's professional input, validated by the Audit Panel, reflected back into MOPAC's annual governance statement and then discharged by the CFO is very much the way that we want to work. We welcome audit recommendations. That is the role of audit.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): OK, thank you for that. We have spent some good time on the model, which I think is helpful to understand that. We are now going to turn to some questions really around the effectiveness of said model. Andrew, you want to lead on this.

Andrew Dismore AM: On scrutiny, yes. Can we just start with the Oversight Board? The last Oversight Board we had a list of the things that were looked at, including the quarterly performance report, the budget, the borough mergers, but there is no indication on the notes of the meeting what outcomes there were from that meeting or any actions to follow. Why is that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I think perhaps the key there is again to locate the role of the Oversight Board within the wider governance and risk management architecture. You would expect the outcomes of the Oversight Board, so the issues that are there, finance and performance, a quarterly look on

the issues that are emerging from that data. BCU, through issues of management and risk identification, was identified as an issue. The way that that formulates back then is into your risk management strategy and your mitigating actions there as part of that framework.

Andrew Dismore AM: Before you go on, the question is, were there actions or outcomes from that meeting, and if so, are they recorded?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): I think it might be helpful to look at this. It is a new format, a new approach that aligns with the quarterly reporting pack that we have got. We did this for the first time in August [2017] and the second time in November [2017]. We have the quarterly performance and finance update report and the large majority of the topic of the meeting really takes this pack and is almost a page-turner. It highlights key issues that are coming out of the different sections of the performance report, including through to victim satisfaction, complaints, workforce, capital, revenue and finances. It is a discussion that takes us through the draft of that pack and the pack is then published and it comes to the Committee. We also had a conversation about the MPS's draft budget submission. The discussion of that is reflected in the final budget submission to the Committee. It is not an operational action meeting. It looks at the performance and finance material that has been brought together, it identifies the key issues from it and those key issues are then reflected into the material that is published and comes on to the Committee.

Andrew Dismore AM: That sounds to me rather a laborious thing. What I do not get is why, if you have a meeting, what comes out of that meeting is not recorded as part of that meeting's notes. That would be the normal way of doing anything, in my experience of being in politics for 36 years now. You have a meeting, you have the notes of the meeting and you have the action points that come from it. The risk is if something is not recorded as part of those notes, it somehow disappears in the wash. I will come to an example of that in a minute. Are there two sets of books or is it just not recorded?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): There is one set of books and it is the published report that comes out of the meeting.

Andrew Dismore AM: We do not know directly what actions and outcomes are coming from that meeting?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): I think we have a different perspective. The product of the meeting is something that we publish and give to you and so that is how currently we see it and approach it. This is another one perhaps for our longer discussion on working methods, but the meeting at the moment is set up to ensure that this performance and finance information is brought together in a holistic way once a quarter, looked at together and can then be published on to you.

Andrew Dismore AM: Let us take the BCU pathfinders one, for example. That is a nice self-contained thing. We had a discussion about the borough mergers. Obviously, that is a hot topic with us, and indeed the public, if they know about it. How is that being taken forward?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): I have to say that, in the event, the November meeting covered the performance and finance report and the budget and deferred the borough merger discussion to a bilateral.

Andrew Dismore AM: How do we know it was deferred? It does not say so.

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): It probably should in the minutes and I am sorry it does not say that in the minutes.

Andrew Dismore AM: It just seems to me a rather sloppy way of doing business --

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): That should have been recorded.

Andrew Dismore AM: -- that you do not record the actions. If the action is, "OK, this will be reflected in X, Y or Z document" that is an action point or an outcome and I would expect to see that recorded. If I use another example - I am sort of doing my questions back to front - in February last year we were looking at the Tower Hamlets affair and I was questioning Mr [Robin] Merrett [Head of Operational Oversight, MOPAC] about that. I was asking about whether or not MOPAC had interrogated the response from the MPS about this - I will come to the detail later on - and the question I asked was, "Do you know about this?" He was unable to answer it; he said he was not involved. Then later on, MOPAC was unable to confirm whether the information provided by the MPS was interrogated or not. That seems to me to mean either it was not, in which case that should have been recorded as, "OK, we accept what the MPS says" or it was and there was no record kept. His argument was, "I was not there at the time". Fair enough, but why was there not a proper record kept that he could go back and look at? This questions, to my mind, the extent to which MOPAC is properly recording its relationships with the MPS and indeed other organisations.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, I hear what you say and I take that point. Of course, subsequent to that, there was the work of your Committee and then the HMIC.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am using that as an example of record-keeping. I grew up as a lawyer and I was trained to write down everything: immediately after a meeting, make an attendance note of who said what to whom; immediately after a phone call, make a note of who said what to whom. Then you have a record and then if you have to look it up a year later, you know who said what to whom.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Sign it and date it.

Andrew Dismore AM: Sign and date it, yes, exactly, and the time as well. This comes back to discussions with the MPS. Are proper records kept of these?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It is a fair point. There is a difference between meetings, as I said earlier, where you may have commercially confidential - such as our Investment Advisory Board - discussions or operationally confidential discussions, which are going to lead to a product which properly will be in the public domain. There is an issue about the timeliness or the point at which all of that information is in the public domain.

Andrew Dismore AM: No, that is not the point. If we go back, OK, commercially confidential, operationally confidential, you have a discussion about it. It may be a confidential note, but is that note kept?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes. I can assure you, we do record --

Andrew Dismore AM: Is there an electronic paper trail? What happens?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): -- and store our confidential information and notes of confidential information. We do have running action logs, for example, on our investment appraisal and on confidential Oversight Board discussions. That subsequently manifests in material that is in the public domain. I can absolutely assure you of that.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, but if we take, for example, the Tower Hamlets one, without going into the

Tower Hamlets *per se*, it just seems to me it is an issue. It comes to the Deputy Mayor/MOPAC that this was what the MPS has said. I will go into the detail in a minute, but we do not know whether any questions were asked. Why?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): At the time, when there is a confidential operational investigation and there are discussions between MOPAC officers and MPS officers, MPS officers who may be briefing in confidence about what is found, you would not expect ongoing publication, but you do have internal recording.

Andrew Dismore AM: No, that is not the question.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I can assure you we do have internal recording of those kind of points.

Andrew Dismore AM: All right. In that case, why was this not recorded? Is it because it did not actually happen, in which case where is the note to say, "OK, we are happy with what the MPS has had to say" or did it happen and nobody bothered to write it down anywhere? This is the problem about proper record-keeping. It goes back to some of the other things that everybody else has been talking about as well. I am quite happy and I accept that certain things are confidential and you have a confidential note of it, but I am probing whether in fact you do have those confidential notes so you can answer at least the fact does that note exist.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): On the subject of Tower Hamlets, I can confirm that I have seen confidential records of discussions between MOPAC and the MPS and then subsequently of course there has been a lot through the HMIC work on that investigation.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is after the event.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Obviously, you cannot expect me to comment on the content.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is after the event. You did comment, because we were told, and I have the note here, "*MOPAC was subsequently unable to confirm whether the information provided by the MPS was interrogated*". That is a fact. That is what we were told by MOPAC. If you are now saying that that is not what happened, I would like to know. I have been trying to get to the bottom of this for a year.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We can --

Len Duvall AM: Chair, if I may, it goes to the very heart of police performance and choosing to investigate crimes. We know where we are. We have an up-to-date situation where we are in terms of what is actively being investigated. There could have been potentially a lot more if they were investigated properly at the time, which clearly they were not. That is why we have got ourselves into this situation. The question is was MOPAC asking the right questions at that time or just accepting what the police was telling it?

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, I mean asking any questions, rather than the right questions. The point I am making --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes. No, I understand the point you are making.

Andrew Dismore AM: -- I am taking this out of the Tower Hamlets issue and using it as an example, because

if this is what has happened with this particular investigation and, “OK, we accept what the MPS says” what about all the other sensitive, difficult things that come forward? Are you simply saying, “OK, thank you very much, we have ticked the box. You have given us a response and we are happy with it”? This comes back to, “It sounds all right, therefore we accept it”.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, I completely hear what you are saying. It comes back, if I may, in fact, to the very first part of our discussion, which is there is a quite delicate relationship between a strategic oversight body responsible for efficiency and effectiveness and an operationally independent force, where the Commissioner is also statutorily responsible for efficiency and effectiveness. There is very active discussion and debate to be had generically which then manifests itself very acutely obviously on individual items, particularly ones that become controversial or high profile, on the degree of where are those touch-points and the degree of intrusion or otherwise.

Andrew Dismore AM: If we take the Tower Hamlets one, it did not take us long in this Committee to expose pretty clearly that it was a pretty shambolic investigation, did it? That is without access to any confidential information at all, it was just asking some very basic questions about the number of witnesses that have been asked and whether these great number of files have been looked at and so forth. Very simple questions, and it did not take us very long in this Committee, maybe half an hour or so, to show that something had gone very badly wrong. I suppose the generic point I am making is this: has MOPAC become so close to the MPS that objective scrutiny of what it is doing on these sorts of important investigations just is not possible?

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): It is a fundamental point. I am bringing Tony [Arbour AM] in as well. The fundamental point here is around the effectiveness of your scrutiny. This is a glaring example that has been well cited.

Andrew Dismore AM: It comes down to the more strategic question: are you too close to the MPS to allow objective scrutiny of these sort of things or will you simply accept what the MPS says, in which case, what is the point of MOPAC?

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): Let me add to that. You are giving this question some thought and that is fair enough. In previous examples, Rebecca, I have had experience, I have been in meetings where the previous Deputy Mayor [of policing and Crime, Stephen Greenhalgh] was very challenging and forthright in his challenges to the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner. They were confidential, but I believe minuted. I sense there was a strong challenge at that particular time. That does not mean that I was there all the time and that does not mean that that was consistent. The point we are making here is that what we are concerned about in recent years and of now is: is MOPAC too close to the MPS? Is MOPAC taking for granted what the MPS is responding to them? We have an example here of that. Tony, did you want to add to that?

Andrew Dismore AM: I have not finished yet.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I can respond. The feedback we have from discussing this with MPS colleagues, which, as I say, we were doing only yesterday and we do on a very regular basis, is that this system of oversight, which does have differences from the previous system – as I say, we have the published pack of information and we have a highly rigorous investment and budgetary oversight framework – feels very detailed, rigorous and strong for the MPS. The feedback from the MPS is that this is a relatively high degree of intrusion and rigour and oversight.

Steve O’Connell AM (Chairman): Do you ever fall out? Do you ever argue, row and shout at each other?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, there are --

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): If you did not, there would be a problem, would there not?

Andrew Dismore AM: Have you ever publicly criticised the MPS about anything?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, there are strong, I would say, creative and professional tensions within our oversight model and discussions, as is the structure.

Unmesh Desai AM: That is not answering the question.

Andrew Dismore AM: Have you ever publicly criticised the MPS about anything?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): The big strategic issues we do through the Oversight Board and others.

Andrew Dismore AM: Give me an example of where you have publicly criticised the MPS.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Last month there was a discussion in the media around an individual of questionable immigration status who was arrested whilst in a haven and the Mayor came out very strongly and said, "That is not what we want from our police service or our immigration service and it needs to change" and put that out very publicly. I give you that as a small example of an issue where the issues tend to be more public, but the big strategic questions are quite rightly done in our Oversight Board and bilaterals.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Our response to the HMIC report on child protection very much concluded and went with the grain of the seriousness of what the HMIC had been reporting. As the Home Office Minister said on the floor of the House, there was a discussion between the Mayor and the Home Secretary. MOPAC and the Deputy Mayor have set up an oversight structure and a group meeting with great regularity overseeing and holding the MPS to account on their delivery of improvements on that, which is, as I say, chaired by the Deputy Mayor, attended by partners, attended by our Head of Audit or her team. Yes, that was absolutely accepting those criticisms.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am trying to make the point to you, but if we take the Tower Hamlets example again, somebody in MOPAC signed it off and then somebody in MOPAC advised the Deputy Mayor that there was nothing in it and we should just accept it. The Deputy Mayor was actually left, I think, with a certain degree of egg on her face when it turned out that was not the case. Who, how or what went wrong within MOPAC to come to a position where the Deputy Mayor was told there was nothing in any of this?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I come back to my earlier point. As I say, it can be at times an art rather than a science, the degree and the issue on which MOPAC takes a highly intrusive role, as I say, on HMIC child protection, where there was a strong and deep structure set up. On Tower Hamlets, as you well know, and as this discussion shows, a strong and deep structure was set up. As a strategic oversight body, I return again to the sort of size of our organisations, so in terms of our discretionary resource, we have our IOM directorate, which delivers and manages our commissioned services. Within strategy, of the 50-odd people, half are evidence and insight and the remaining half is our discretionary resource to serve our public accountability and meet the needs of this Committee, which also rightly puts questions in the public domain. We do not have a huge capacity to man-mark every area of the MPS, so it relies on risk management systems, which themselves will yield a range of results, but as you have heard from our --

Andrew Dismore AM: Somebody told the Deputy Mayor - because she said this to us - the MPS had been "robust and proactive in this investigation". Clearly that was not the case and HMIC found it not to be the case as well. If what you are saying is true and you do not have the resources to do this job properly, why was the Deputy Mayor just advised, "It is not something we have actually had a proper look at" rather than dropping her in it?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We do not have the resources, and nor would it be appropriate, to man-mark everything within the MPS. We have to take a risk-based approach.

Andrew Dismore AM: If I accept that point of view, why then do you actually express a view when you have not had a chance to do the job properly? Why not say, "We have not had a chance to do a proper job on this. Over to you, Assembly Committee, and see what you can do with it" or why was the Deputy Mayor told, "This is all tickety-boo, nothing to worry about" when you clearly had not done the job on it?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): As the Deputy Mayor has said, she was told there were review mechanisms again with the MPS. You are absolutely right to raise the question of to what extent do we take assurance from those and where do we direct our resource into our own self-assurance. There will be a judgment call on that. There are checks and balances in the system and this Committee plays a very useful role in being part of those checks and balances, because for a strategic oversight body of our size, I do not think the public would necessarily want a massively bigger MOPAC at the expense of the MPS and the front line. There will always need to be those checks and balances in the system.

Andrew Dismore AM: Accepting the point of view you make about your staffing, then what triaging is there done to decide what you do look at properly rather than looking at everything superficially?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): From our overall programme management, we are clear about our priorities and then we have what we call an issues log, which we use on the basis of issues that we should be able to resolve within six or eight weeks. We have a list of those and clear mitigating actions for each of those. If we are not able to resolve those, then they are much bigger than what you might call an issue and that is where we work with Dan's [Hales] team to ensure that there is an actual project or a programme to mitigate them. Acid attacks, for example, were an issue brought to all of our attention, which increasingly came out in 2017. We conducted an oversight aspect in terms of operational assurance with the MPS, a convene aspect in terms of identifying who was using it etc, and then it feeds very well into the delivery arm of MOPAC, which is around gangs and knife violence, because it is in effect another weapon.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is an example where things may be going OK. The point I am making to you is, as you cannot do everything, how do you decide which ones you do, and in relation to the ones that you decide not to do, why in this case, for example, do you express a view rather than simply saying, "It is something we do not have the resources to look into properly"?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): On the Tower Hamlets, I think it is worth a separate conversation. We are happy to write to you.

Andrew Dismore AM: Presumably there are other examples where you decide not to do something. We would like to do all sorts of things, but we cannot do them all, so we just do not do them, but we do not say something about them if we have not done them.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, it is a very, very fair challenge. It is also at different

points in MOPAC's cycle of course we have had different levels of resourcing. 2016 was a time where there were a number of vacancies from mayoral transition, so we were recruiting a CFO, we were recruiting a director of strategy at the same time.

Andrew Dismore AM: I have moved on from the specific to the general now in asking --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, you are right. Part of that is our overall assurance framework and I think Julie [Norgrove] would be helpful in terms of the structure of assurance. As an oversight body, you do also need to rely on the first line of defence on both value for money assurance and operational assurance, the MPS's own internal assurance processes. Part of our role is to look at the reports and assessment that Julie makes as to how well their own first line of defence is operating.

Andrew Dismore AM: Fine, that is OK. I still come back to the same question. Half a dozen issues: you decide you are going to take two on. Why did you then express a view on the other four if you have not looked at them, or do you express a view?

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is the nub of the matter. The nub of the matter is: is there a selective scrutiny? If so, we could understand that, if it is a resources piece, but what are your procedures and systems around that? We do not sense that kind of response to that particular point, really. We have examples around safeguarding at the moment that Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] is going to come on to. The question has been posed. I do not think you have got a response really, because we have picked out a glaring example - unbeknown to us, there could be others - and you have admitted that you do not have the breadth of resource, and we understand that, for the reasons that we have said, and you are not keeping the records necessarily. There is a selectiveness in what you can do and what you cannot do. We have an example here of one where MOPAC, as an organisation, did not really look into it, but rather than say, "We have not done so" came back with a wrong answer to the Deputy Mayor and put her into a difficult position and I think that is probably not right.

Tony Arbour AM: I think the real problem is we are all politicians around this table. Many of us, when we have been challenged, either at this authority or other authorities where we have been represented, have often said, because we cannot think of a proper answer, "Oh, it is confidential" or, "It is *sub judice*" or something of that kind. You have now kind of extended that to saying, "We have not been able to do such and such a thing because of resources" and you, Chairman, have said, "We all understand this about resources". However, bigness and having resources does not prevent you from being robust. Our concern - and it has been expressed really quite widely here - is there is a fear that you are going native as far as this is concerned. You have told us, Rebecca, about the sensitivities occasionally when you are discussing matters.

The truth of the matter is that MOPAC is a unique authority. This was the first proper authority where the Commissioner, if you like, was an elected person, the Mayor was the elected person, and we should have been creating precedent here. Manifestly, just me listening to what is going on and having been with the police function of this authority from the beginning, it does seem to me that we, on this side, do not have the whip hand in deciding what is going to be precedent. I can imagine that many of us, as I say, will have spoken to senior officers who have come to us with a particular thing - and I can appreciate that in policing there is probably going to be many times when a matter might be sensitive - and the Commissioner or a chief executive says, "I am telling you this in confidence, Mr Duvall. I do not want it to go any further" and immediately you are compromised. My concern is that this may be what has been happening here.

What is being said here is that you should be selecting your grounds - we appreciate you cannot cover everything - and you should be robust on it, saying, "This is MOPAC's proper and legitimate role on this".

What we have been hearing, particularly in relation to Tower Hamlets, you were not willing to take such a robust line. Not only that, and I think this is the thing that is worrying me about today, is that you have not simply put up your hands and said, "We have been wrong on these things". Maybe you do not think you have been wrong on these things.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I have said there is always a judgment call to be made. You intervene according to the evidence in front of you and the resources that you have. Some of this is a discussion about the consequence of the system that is set up and those lines between an oversight body and an operationally independent force. You have asked me if I think we are going native. The best I can do is assure you, as an officer I do not believe that to be the case. That is my honest and professional assessment. Some of these are a product of the system and functions that exist around this part of the policing landscape.

As I say, I think our feedback from MPS colleagues is not that we shy away from oversight, quite the reverse. Their expectation is that an operational oversight body operates at a strategic level and takes a risk-based approach to direct and particular interventions. Clearly in any system, as events turn out, on any risk-based assessment a risk may crystallise and materialise which you were not aware of at the time, to which you have risk mitigation strategies. I think, as an officer, there is a limit to how much further I can go, other than to say I believe our oversight is part of a structure involving the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and ourselves. It is experienced by the MPS as appropriate and effective.

Tony Arbour AM: Can I put it very simply to you? You say, and obviously Scotland Yard would say this and the MPS would say this, "Yes, you are doing a jolly good job and we are really worried when you are coming in". Do you think that there is a tremor in the Commissioner's office when she receives a note saying, "MOPAC is looking into this"?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I think the Commissioner is really clear in terms of our decisions. Where she needs approval and where she has intrusion, she is really clear about the Deputy Mayor and MOPAC's needs in terms of information and assurance in order to take a decision, in order to make a statement, are important and relevant. This is why she and her senior team give so much of their time to building a deep, functioning relationship, to sharing huge amounts of information and to spending such significant amounts of time together. I think they are absolutely clear where they need MOPAC onside, endorsing and supporting. The money is spent by the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the budget and investment decisions are met there.

Will the Commissioner of the MPS guard and defend her operational independence? Absolutely. Will she say to the Deputy Mayor and to MOPAC where she thinks we are intervening in a line which is not appropriate for that? Absolutely. These discussions go on up and down the country. The relationship between the Police and Crime Commissioner, or in this case, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, and the Chief Constable, it is a fine and two-way calibration, but absolutely those are the discussions that we have. I can do no more than to state that to be the case.

Tony Arbour AM: It is clearly right that we should explore this.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): I think it is absolutely right that we have explored it in some detail. We need to move on a bit.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I want to pick up the HMIC report into child protection arrangements. You said

at the beginning that one of your areas of risk is around vulnerable people and you have a huge role here to play in the wider system, but if you were scrutinising the MPS so effectively in this area, why was this report in 2016 so damning about fundamental deficiencies? It has basically been putting children at risk in London and yet you were not all over this.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): The report came out in 2016, so at the end of the previous mayoralty. This is not a political statement in any sense, it is a statement of fact, of course. HMIC and Sir Tom Winsor [Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary] were highly critical of the prioritisation of the MPS and the previous PCP, with its focus on high-volume neighbourhood crimes, saying that that had diverted the attention of the MPS away from issues of vulnerability, including child protection. That is written clearly into the report. Of course, at the time that report came out, in fact we had done our pre-consultation on this PCP and what the themes should be in this PCP and we were launching our consultation on the PCP, which as you know diverted the effort of focus away from those high-volume neighbourhood crimes towards areas of harm and vulnerability. In fact, the report was a helpful source of validation, to say that that shift in emphasis from high-volume neighbourhood crime with a quantitative approach to areas of vulnerability and protection was exactly the right one.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK, but going back though, in 2014, this Committee produced a report [*Keeping London's children safe*] on safeguarding children in London. Within that we raised huge concerns about the caseload that officers had, about the supervision, about the staffing levels because of more women working in the area, high levels of maternity leave, the pressures on them.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: We flagged this with you in 2014.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Why was it not on your agenda and on your radar, rather than this coming in 2016?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I may say so, I think there is a difference between questions you can appropriately ask of an officer and questions you can appropriately address. That one in some ways you could address to the former Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime [Stephen Greenhalgh], but as an officer, it is our duty to collect the evidence and ensure for the mayoralty that we serve that we ensure we use our levers and tools to ensure that evidence gets its very best airing, which is why in the consultation and the evidence base for this PCP there was such a high emphasis on exactly the sort of material that your Committee brought to bear. Some of that questioning, I do not want to shirk it, but I hope you are pleased at the focus that this PCP puts into this kind of area and our specific work. I cannot comment, besides it is not for you to address me on the prioritisation of a previous regime, if that is OK. I feel slightly uncomfortable in that space.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I am not trying to get into the politics of this. I am trying to understand you, as an organisation, that we obviously had flagged this with you. There were stories in the media, the huge volume, the Jimmy Savile stuff historically, all this stuff going on, there was a huge pressure there. This must have been flagged, presumably --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: -- on the risk register, through Julie's [Norgrove] work. Are you saying that you were presenting this to the previous administration and it was not being picked up? Was it on your kind of list? Like Andrew [Dismore AM] was describing earlier, when the police come back with a response, were you saying, "That is fine" or were you saying, "Actually, we are not sure, because we are hearing all this stuff", interrogating it further and placing it before the previous administration?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): This is where I think the boundaries again I am a little uncomfortable with, but the published documents show that our risk management in that previous time was focused on that PCP and the priorities within that PCP. It of course looks at other issues and you will be aware that MOPAC, in the previous mayoralty and this mayoralty, for example, provides funding to the London Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). I hope you would see that that evidence then really came through in the consultation on this PCP.

Joanne McCartney AM: Can I just take this a little further? I hope I am not being political in this, but as officers, you collect evidence and then you present it and then whatever your political masters do with it is up to them. When that first PCP was published and presented on a cross-party basis, we said we disagreed with the focus on the MOPAC 7 and we said that we thought violence against women and child protection were two of the areas where there may be a shift of focus.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I cannot comment on that. I was not in MOPAC at the time of the drawing up of the last PCP. We have an Assembly Member here who was an advisor to the Deputy Mayor, so I really cannot comment on that, but I can comment on the evidence that we, as officials, put to our Deputy Mayor now.

Joanne McCartney AM: Perhaps I can ask this then. Was the HMIC report the first time you were aware there were problems?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No. We had been aware of the evidence prior to that, which is why in all the pre-consultation on the PCP, the strong steer, and in our document, our PCP here that was --

Joanne McCartney AM: MOPAC had picked up there were issues in child protection before the HMIC report?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely. Yes, completely, which is what --

Joanne McCartney AM: What had MOPAC done? Can I ask when those had been picked up?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Throughout. As officials, we monitor very carefully the excellent work of your Committee. Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM], you have done some fantastic work on this area over many years. You did a fantastic piece on Prevent.

Joanne McCartney AM: I am asking when. Can you give me a time? If not now, could you write as to when these were flagged within MOPAC and how and when you raised them with the MPS?

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Paul [Wylie] mentioned earlier an issues log. Is that the right place, to see if it appeared on that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes. Child protection is on our risk register under

vulnerability as one of our key risks, as Siobhan [Peters] has described.

Joanne McCartney AM: I do not want to take Caroline's question; please tell me if I am stepping over. Then at that stage, what did you then do to the MPS to make sure it was addressing them rather than waiting for the HMIC report?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, we did not wait until the HMIC report. It is a matter of public record that under the last mayoralty - and this was not my area of responsibility, but other colleagues - there were partnership events around safeguarding, there was a child sexual exploitation partner event in this chamber, the VAWG Strategy at the time included material on child protection etc, but our core risk processes and delivery focus was around, as you would expect, the PCP.

Joanne McCartney AM: I think the HMIC criticism was particularly around practice. I am going to hand that back to Caroline.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It is a fair point. We are going back to Caroline, but I think that is a fair critique, as you say.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I think we have raised the historic [issue]. We then get the HMIC report, which is damning. You have set up the Child Protection Policing Oversight Group that Sophie [Linden, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime] chairs and so on, so you have a process in place. Last November we had the latest quarterly review and in that, I just got this from my office --

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It still has very disappointing progress, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: -- the HMIC pulled out 135 cases of the MPS, 93% demonstrating policing practice needed improvement or was inadequate.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You may have this group, but what is it actually delivering and has that group not itself thought about doing dip-sampling and that sort of work, which we used to do regularly on work when I was on the MPA?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely. I think Paul can talk about the work of the group and perhaps Julie [Norgrove] on audit, because the audit function sits on that. No, very important questions.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): This is one of those issues, as you will appreciate, that will take years to resolve. It is a fundamental shift in terms of the culture and training and resources of the MPS. I think the MPS is praised by HMIC for having taken those early actions to enable it to do that. What has been also praised by HMIC is that the MPS's own assurance processes have flagged more areas of concern than HMIC found themselves. It is not the case that the MPS is not aware of the issues that it requires to be dealt with. What we are trying to do with the MPS, with all of the other partners in this space, is that long-term reform to ensure it is prioritised within the MPS, within our society.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: It cannot be long term, really. This is something we have raised and others have been raising for years and the idea that most cases are inadequate, this is children at risk in London. Some of the case studies, they were harrowing, if you have read them.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Len [Duvall AM] actually read some of them out at the previous meeting. The idea that it is long term, it is going to take ages, what are the short-term measures? What are you doing through this Committee or does it just sit there, the police say, "We are doing this" and you say, "OK, that is fine" and you go away? Where is the challenge? Where is the pressure to make this happen?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): As the Deputy Mayor has sat here and said, this is a series of short-term, medium-term and long-term actions. What I am trying to convey is that this is a fundamental shift in how the MPS resources and operates and even the skillset and the people it employs are part of that consideration. You absolutely have had short-term actions and HMIC recognise that. There are going to be a series of reforms that has to take its time.

Len Duvall AM: Just to be charitable here, what the HMIC saw - and look, it is in my interests to always blame the former Mayor with those issues, but in terms of the old PCP, it has got a lot to answer for - this was a fundamental failure of policing in protecting young children. This was not about something in terms of civil, this is about criminal practice, which the police is the number one agency to deal with. I was amazed at the response that came from the police and I do not want to pre-empt in terms of that, because we have some further work to do there. Yes, there may well be some issues that take years, but no, this has got to be solved pretty quickly. This is a scandal for us. I am surprised that there are not officers being held to account for this at different levels of the MPS, because it is not something that has just continued and come out of the blue. I think there are some warning bells that should have been picked up and signposted. I accept there are political choices, and we can deal with that in other places and all the issues. I would not want to dash that. You have choices to make on those, but professionally, the police should have been on top of this, first and foremost. They clearly were not. In fact, the last HMIC report tells us the police are still not on top of this.

You have picked this up since 2016, so my colleague has told me, and you are having regular reports back, but I think then it comes into is the appropriate challenge there? Is it more of the same? It is clearly not working. Some of the questions that even we asked that were staged to the senior police officers, quite frankly, some of the answers that came back were very vague about actually speeding up these issues and getting into the right place. If you are telling us that is the case - and, Chairman, we need to follow that up outside this meeting - we need to work much differently about where you are going on this and where we should be going on this. All these issues, from child protection, from Tower Hamlets, they all indicate a failure of policing.

Let us be honest about this, if MOPAC have not taken the action that we have done, we would almost certainly be referencing the Independent Police Complaints Commission to come in and investigate the police and their actions about Tower Hamlets. In terms of those issues, this one is almost, dare I say it, in terms of that, criminal failures of an organisation that is there to protect young people and children. It has been criminal, to be honest, about what we have been offering up. Somehow, we act like we are in crisis, which you are telling us we are and we are doing those things, but in terms of that last inspection report, the warnings should have been coming on and still should be coming on and something should be done.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I think we are violently agreeing here. Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM], you asked, "Is the pressure felt?" I think if you ask that as a question, you should direct it at the MPS, "Is the pressure felt from MOPAC on child protection?" and I would expect their answer very much to be, "Yes, absolutely". I think Julie can comment on the workings of the group, which she validates as well, but the pulse of pressure, the pulse through oversight, the pulse of discussion across the top of the senior management is intense.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): If I could just say about that oversight group, because we have been doing some work internally in the MPS as well to help them in particular with their self-inspection process, which you would have seen was a particular area of concern that HMIC raised initially, which in some ways was giving assurance. You saw their initial ratings, according to the MPS's self-inspection process, was around 80% and they rated as adequate or good, but when HMIC went in, they concluded the opposite. There was some assurance being given to a degree internally within the MPS that this was not as big an issue as HMIC has now concluded.

We worked really closely with the MPS self-inspection team so that they could understand how to pick samples, how to go out and adapt a really rigorous approach to inspection so that we could have confidence both in terms of the Commissioner having that assurance, which is then passed on to the Deputy Mayor, that the MPS are looking at themselves and coming to the right conclusions around what they are seeing. We have seen an improvement in that process and that is something that my team have worked with the internal inspection team and we have said, "Great, that is a real development, that we are now getting a true picture and we have got really intrusive self-inspection".

The further work that is rigorously being pursued by the Deputy Mayor - and I can assure you, because I witness this when I am in the meeting, and I know the MPS feel it - is that, "OK, we have these results. What are we doing to address it, to make sure that learning is being taken forward on the front line?" I think that is the piece that we are hoping - because the HMIC are coming back and will be reporting in the next quarter - that those improvements that we have seen in terms of governance and self-inspection have found their way to the front line. The training that has been taking place, the feedback from those self-inspections is now really being taken on board and we are starting to see the change in terms of the quality of inspection on the ground and the way that investigations are conducted.

That has taken longer. I can assure you, that what the Deputy Mayor anticipated, and she is constantly asking the MPS to look at how it is doing it, to look at whether the training is being properly evaluated, that we are going out and looking at the right things.

I must say as well the MPS does have a very rigorous internal structure and it has to look at HMIC recommendations and make sure that progress is made. Yes, we were disappointed with the follow-up report. We are hoping in the next report that we will start to see those changes on the front line in response to the issues that are being raised now by the MPS internally itself as well. I can assure you on the rigour. I have witnessed it and it is constant.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I may add, we have other sources for checking back that the nature of our oversight of this is appropriate. As MOPAC, as well as checking back with Julie [Norgrove] we have regular meetings with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services where we ask them in private whether we are applying the right pressure and looking at the right things. Their assurance to us is that absolutely we are doing all we can with this group. They think it is right that we have been applying this pressure. They attend the group themselves. We also have the National Police Chiefs' Council lead [Chief Constable Simon Bailey] for child protection there. We triangulate with them, saying, "Do you think our pressure here is appropriate? What can the MPS be learning from other forces?" We have the College of Policing. We have the Chair of the LSCB. We have independent relationships with all of those members of the group, with whom we check back regularly as to whether this approach is the correct and appropriate pressure. However, ultimately it is for the MPS to bring about these changes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: It would be helpful if you are able to share with us the actions and things you have been calling for, the pressures you are putting on, so we can understand how you are turning this around

because it is such an area of concern.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We have a highly detailed action plan.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Timelines around it as well. As opposed to the years quoted by Paul [Wylie], we want some short and medium-term timelines of actions.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: In terms of vulnerable people, I wanted to flag an area that we, as a Committee, have been concerned about for some time, which is healthcare in custody. When I first met the new Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime [Sophie Linden] after her Confirmation Hearing I said that was one area that, in my view, should be read on the Risk Register and I wanted her to look at it. I have never heard anything from her since on it. I do not know whether it is an area she has pursued.

Where is that in terms of risk with you, Julie? What is MOPAC doing to try to address that issue? Some of it is around the commissioning of healthcare services.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): We conducted a review of that early in the year, Caroline. You will find the output of that in our Audit Panel papers. We did raise the point that there still was an issue around clarity of service provision going forward. That was something we asked the MPS to be clear on, exactly what we are going to do and what the intention is going forward. I know there was a business case that also came across or was planned to come across to MOPAC on future health provision.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Yes, which we have been waiting for, for some time.

Julie Norgrove (Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance, MOPAC): That really was the vehicle for taking that forward.

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): The healthcare issue is coming in a business case that has not yet come to us. I think the MPS is telling us it will be coming in the spring [2018].

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: It has been due for a very, very long time. That is an example of something that I think is a huge risk to the MPS. Perhaps afterwards we could have something in detail in writing about what you are doing around that risk. Obviously, Audit has looked it but I would appreciate wider than that.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): An example of giving the Committee some comfort around issues that are concerning us, which is perhaps also by extension an example of a lack of communication sometimes. We, through Caroline, have flagged up a major issue. You know what it is. If something has been done on it, we need to understand that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Also, what confidence do you have, as the MPS has revised down and revised down its figures of how many nurses it needs, how many Forensic Medical Examiners it needs? How do you get behind that to really understand what the MPS is doing? Is it just to plug the gap or is it that this is the service level we should be supporting?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): That is right. That is a good example of how the earlier process we talked about could better meet your information needs. I am very, very happy to do that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): It was right and proper we spent time on that.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely yes, thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): This is an example of our statutory duty to hold yourselves and the Mayor to account. Although I am conscious of time now, we have a couple more sections to talk about. We are moving now to your role around commissioning, I believe.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, it is around adding value through your commissioning. I will start with Siobhan, if I may. Can you tell us more about the income MOPAC receives to offset some of its commissioning costs and whether you expect this level of income to continue into the future?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): We have formal income in the budget line that reflects DARA cost recovery because it provides an internal audit service to others, so not relevant to commissioning. We have a further source of income shown as income in terms of police property recovery. There is an amount of income that comes in to support our recovery.

Separately to that, when we take on new grant streams we try to make sure that MOPAC's costs of administering a project are reflected in an individual grant. Where that allows us to appoint an additional staff member, to take somebody on secondment or to add some resource to oversee a particular project then we will use funds sometimes to do that.

Susan Hall AM: Do you think this level of income is going to continue?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): Yes, I have confidence on our core commissioning budgets. We have a 'flex amount', I suppose, where we have specific projects from the Home Office Police Innovation and Police Transformation Funds that fluctuates year to year. At the moment we are showing around £10 million of that in this year and £6 million in next year. In practice we know that the profiling is more likely to come out as £8 million and £8 million because some of those projects go over the two years. The resource we have that is dependent on that income is matched to those projects.

Susan Hall AM: Dan, how does MOPAC assure itself that the services it commissions are working effectively?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): In several ways. There is quite intensive contract management with all of the organisations that we commission. We always start off with a very in-depth needs assessment as well. Sometimes that is commissioned externally. Quite often that is through our own Evidence and Oversight Department because obviously it has really exceptional analysis. The assessment can be qualitative and quantitative to establish exactly what that need is and to link it back to the PCP. Our terms and conditions in grant agreements are very robust with key deliverables and payment schedules. There are in-depth quarterly contract management meetings. There are annual contract management meetings with the Director as well. There is a level of seniority on oversight of those contracts, depending on the size and importance of the contract as well.

We do tend to do a lot of work with Evidence and Oversight on evaluation as well. The contract monitoring is varied around performance management - some will come from the providers, some will be external and some will be qualitative - but a lot of it is from Evidence and Oversight so it has more independence.

Susan Hall AM: There is very little detail of any of these particular projects. Where would the public know to find out what is going on and how it is monitored etc? How do we have oversight of those particular projects?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): We are going to put a lot of information in the annual report that is scheduled for this year around the outcomes that are achieved from those projects. Within elements like the LCPF, that is quite a transparent process as well, of what has been allocated to different boroughs and how we work with different boroughs. That is quite a major part of that. Yes, it is really about the outcomes that are achieved by those projects that we want to be publishing within the annual report.

Susan Hall AM: You have not published anything specific so far with the amount of money you have had?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): I am sure we published certain elements for specific contracts and where those outcomes have been achieved. For [the] London Gang Exit [programme], I believe there has been information sharing and there has been information on tackling violence, particularly at some of the conferences and in communications as well.

Susan Hall AM: One of the reasons some of us are concerned is we have seen in our local boroughs all sorts of money going into different places and not always the oversight that is required or holding to account the people that are spending it. Does the money mainly go to individuals, groups or people, or is it varied?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): It is varied. For the LCPF the majority of that goes to local authorities that then re-commission locally. Other contracts are to specific providers. There are different providers across London providing different contracts for us. It is quite varied, whether it is victims, offenders or the LCPF.

Susan Hall AM: There is an awful lot of money that goes into this. There is very little that we can look into to see what you are doing with it.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): If I may add that this is one of the drivers we have looked at in our restructuring. We looked at our capacity and capability. When we looked at this Directorate we made to the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime the business case for increasing our capacity and capability there. In the restructure of this Directorate you will see the creation of a Senior Contract Management post and Individual Contract Managers. We also increased the resource we gave to our internal finance function headed by Siobhan [Peters]. We have also introduced a post on partnerships and innovation for having capacity to bring in more funds for co-commissioning.

This is back to one of your opening questions, Chairman, of what is different in MOPAC in the last six years. It is a recognition that effective commissioning needs professional and skilled resource. We have some in MOPAC and we have determined there was a need to enhance our contract management. We are supported in our conclusions by Audit recommendations on that. As I say, I am not dissatisfied with our contract management now but I have absolutely taken the case and therefore found the resources to prioritise that further. You will, in the future, have a senior contract manager to be able to look at that. Most recently in the June [2017] Audit Panel we had a rich and substantive discussion with the Audit Panel Chair about MOPAC's commissioning contract management arrangements and our future plans. It is very much an area of focus.

Susan Hall AM: What sort of detail will you go into so that the public can see where all this money is being spent? It is millions, is it not? While we are on the funding - I am new so do forgive me - how much does

MOPAC cost?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Our 2018 budget is just shy of £60 million, of which £46.5 million is our commissioning budget. I am very happy to supply this information to the Committee. To get the relative size, the vast majority of our budget is on commissioned services. Of those the biggest is the LCPF. It is one of the sources of funding we were very keen to ensure stability of over the two mayoralities and where we have innovated in how we allocate that in the future more in line with the priorities of the PCP.

The next large bucket - which, again, we expect to go into the future - is victims funding from the Ministry of Justice for victim support. That is around £10 million. We then have been very successful in our bid to the Home Office Police Innovation Fund and Transformation Fund. That is approximately £6 million in 2018/19. We have then created the capacity for a whole basket of other commission budgets, which are £11 million, that really drive our pan-London innovation; our pan-London domestic violence service, our rape crisis funding and independent domestic violence advisors that members of this Committee will be familiar with, and also our innovative gang exit service. We are able in some of those to leverage in money from other agencies to really be quite innovative in our approach.

Susan Hall AM: The problem is it is a huge amount of money. If the public do not know what is happening to it there is not wider scrutiny, because nobody knows what is going on. If you have had that sort of money going in, why has it taken so long to establish that you need more people checking where the money is going, what is happening to it and whether you are hitting targets? Are there proper targets put in? I have only been here six months but all the new things that are coming from the Mayor have less and less targets in there. Are you putting in targets when you give people this money?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): Yes, there are outcomes and deliverables. They all have agreements, yes.

Susan Hall AM: How many members of staff do you have monitoring the £46 million?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): That Directorate currently has 28 people in post. It has a higher establishment because we are recruiting and will be able to recruit further. We have posts that come with grant funding. For example, from the Police Innovation Fund we were given money to set up a Hate Crime Hub. We used the money to recruit expert posts to build London's Hate Crime Hub and reporting app. However, we have recognised we need strengthening, both on the finance and contract management sides, hence the new recruitment in those areas. Do I think the level of staffing was appropriate to the past level of commissioning? Yes, but this is appropriate for the type and nature of commissioning we are doing now that is much more risk-based, much more along the lines of the PCP and a much more intensive partnership process with boroughs, particularly on the LCPF, on the thematic areas where they are directing their resources.

Susan Hall AM: Given it is such a large sum of money do you not think there should be more available detail of the specific projects and what we should expect from them?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): The decisions upfront are published when the decision is made to give the grant. Some of the work has been published in terms of formal evaluations, for example, the pan-London domestic abuse process and impact evaluation and the Harmful Practices full evaluation. For projects this year we will scoop up the evaluation work and the interim outcomes into the annual report that is due.

Susan Hall AM: When you say some of the work, what percentage of the work is published out there?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): Any decision to give the grant has been published. Evaluations that have been conducted and commissioned within the Directorate are published, to my knowledge.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): The point that has been made there well is that it is a significant amount of public money that you are commissioning out. Some of it is directly. Some of it is also at arms' length, which is the boroughs. In other words, you are funding the boroughs to then fund on. We need to be satisfied through that public funding that those organisations who are receiving it in the end are delivering and being held accountable as such. That is something we are trying to hear and we have heard some of, but we might want to write to you for a little bit further around that, if we may.

There may be a target culture from your end of commissioning but sometimes it is not necessarily reflected in the PCP. Without opening that debate too broadly because I can talk about that elsewhere, there may not be the targets shouting out from the PCP but you are telling us here that you are holding your commissioning partners to specific targets.

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): To key performance indicators and deliverables within the contract which is different.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is different, is it? OK. That is fine.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): I do, yes. We have been talking about evaluation. The concern in our questions is whether the people who are being commissioned are doing what they say they will do. I want to ask about the more strategic side of evaluation, i.e. are we achieving the wider social benefits we are aiming for? Clearly that falls under MOPAC. I know it is difficult and I have experience with small grants of how you do effective evaluations of the outcomes. However, the thing about the LCPF is that it is not that much money and a case maybe ought to be made that we spend more on prevention. That depends on the circle of showing that the money you are spending is having an effect. What work is being done on that more strategic side of looking at the wider costs and benefits of the work you are doing, maybe social return on investment and all that sort of thing?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely. You raise really good and powerful questions. That balance of spend through MOPAC or other organisations on prevention versus spend on the MPS in terms of enforcement and investigation intelligence is a key strategic question. Of course, your answer to that question of where do you invest the marginal pound is perhaps different in times where you have budgetary growth and where you have a matching of supply and demand on the enforcement and investigation intelligence side. You may have the luxury of choice in that area. When you are at a time, such as the evidence suggests we are now, where core policing demand is at risk of outstripping core policing supply on investigation intelligence that decision on putting a marginal pound, or rather taking out an additional pound, from core frontline policing versus prevention and investment work from other sectors becomes a lot more challenging.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): That does not prevent you from building up the evidence base. At a time when things are on a knife edge, effectiveness could be more apparent.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely. You are right to say it is not a large amount of money and you are right in aggregate terms. Where we have sought to focus is prioritising towards the areas of maximum impact. The evidence base in the PCP was very much around where the highest social harm is. Through the evidence and analysis, we published in the PCP and elsewhere through our impact assessment,

the highest social harm was on that repeat victimisation, on certain types of crime - violent youth crime, VAWG and hate crime - hence those were the priorities in the PCP. It is also repeat and persistent offending which is why the entire measurement and evaluation framework of the PCP is about reducing that repeat offending and repeat victimisation on those higher social harm crimes.

If you take the LCPF, the process used to support this PCP has not been used in London before. In London before it was more of a direct allocation to boroughs who could then assess how they allocated that. This time we released 70% direct to boroughs for allocation against those PCP priorities, which in themselves we consulted on in a round of 32 borough visits. All boroughs and our Community Safety Partnerships signed up to those being the areas of higher social harm or maximum social benefit and they are investing their LCPF accordingly. We then kept back a 30% top-slice that was quite controversial with local authorities at the time. Through an expressions of interest process, a series of workshops and framework documents they have been able to come together in borough clusters to invest against those areas of highest social harm. What we are seeking to do with the funds we have available is to ensure they have maximum social impact because I completely agree with you that that is correct.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): That was not my question. I was not making the case. I was saying: how are you collecting the evidence for the effectiveness of your current spending? For the LCPF the distribution between boroughs is done according to a formula for some of the things you said, repeat offending, deprivation, knife crime and things like that. You are distributing the money to the areas that have the highest levels of that stuff. Are you monitoring the effect of that spending?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely. For all the grant agreements we make, there is an evaluation methodology embedded in there with a scale of evaluation appropriate to the degree of innovation, challenge or the size of the funding. That is built into future grants we allocate. For grants we have already allocated, each has an inbuilt evaluation methodology.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Does that get as far as a cost-benefit analysis or something where you are making the case of savings in other areas, or are we not at that point?

Siobhan Peters (Chief Financial Officer, MOPAC): As you know, it is often very difficult to do that. With every small project we will go as far as we can towards that. However, in terms of proving the wider point about the overall cost benefit this is hard stuff.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is absolutely right. We can all think of some end providers that are funded probably through the borough, through your money, that are out there. For example, sporting clubs teaching boxing to young people that have some funding. It is designed to help those young people. Measuring those outcomes is very difficult. That is not to say they should not be funded but it is challenging.

Sian Berry AM (Deputy Chair): Exactly. For example, for violence against women, efforts have been made to evaluate the social return on investment of those things. That was my question.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Evaluating social return, as we have rehearsed, is a worthy cause but sometimes difficult.

You will be pleased to know we are moving to our final set of questions.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): I am just getting into the swing of this!

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes, we have heard that, Rebecca.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I can be here all day. It would be quite useful at the moment.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Yes, we could spend all day here. I am sure we would love to.

Anyway, the last set of questions is future challenges. We touched upon aspirations around devolution. The former Mayors and Deputy Mayors for Policing and Crime have taken it so far. We are interested to hear how much further.

Unmesh Desai AM: Three questions really which I will roll into one. Where exactly are you, Ms Lawrence, with negotiations for greater devolution of elements of the criminal justice system to the Mayor? I know a memorandum of understanding is going to be launched sometime this year. Secondly, if we do achieve devolution, how will your relationship with the partners in the criminal justice system change and what would that mean for your organisation?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Very good questions, thank you. Where we are in terms of devolution is we have had an active process of articulation of candidate areas for devolution, which is mapped out and described in the PCP. We have been actively working with Ministry of Justice officials on a shared understanding of what that could look like. There have been many exchanges, written and meetings, with the relevant Ministers in the Ministry of Justice (MOJ). I have to say progress has been somewhat hampered by ministerial changes in the MOJ. With the election in June we have seen a number of changes. There have been a number of different junior Ministers here and a number of Secretaries of State. Every time there is a new Minister there is a need to re-engage. However, the evidence base with the MOJ is very rich and shared.

In terms of how the relationship will change, you could say for some it is an evolving of business as usual and for some the relationship could be very different and there could be very big implications for MOPAC as an organisation. In some areas of devolution what we are talking about is a co-commissioning and co-investment approach. The areas flagged up there are areas already in the PCP, such as youth justice, female offending and adult offender management issues. They are issues selected, as Sian [Berry AM] suggested, where we think there are areas of higher social return from co-commissioning and co-investment. Others are candidates where there is what I call full devolution in terms of devolution of budget and responsibilities, where our conversations with the Ministry of Justice are about testing how such an approach would work, whether it would be possible and what would be the benefits of MOPAC being involved in contract management of the London CRC, probation, or MOPAC holding the victims and witnesses' budget. As I say, the discussion is about how you would test that and build the case.

If we were to have devolution of those responsibilities and budgets, clearly, we would need to look at resourcing staffing skills. I have to say those discussions are very rich, evidence-based and interesting. However, one of the challenging issues has been getting transparency of how much funding is going into these areas, such as probation in London, whether there is sufficient funding in that and sufficient in victims and witnesses' services. We are re-engaging with the new ministerial team.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): Very new ministerial team.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We are quite used to engaging with new ministerial teams at this point.

Joanne McCartney AM: Something may be signed this year moving towards further devolution. From

memory, in the first PCP there was this 2020 target set for the Crown Prosecution Service, the Probation Service and the Courts service, for example. Can you give me a little bit of an idea about how you engage with those three and what influence you have had on them and if you could give an example about where you might have changed practice?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Absolutely, that is a good and fair challenge. The structures we have are through our LCRB, the delivery management group, and the sectoral groups or supporting structures around that. We have a Youth Justice Board, a VAWG Board and a Victims Panel on which we have the statutory partners present. They were consulted on the PCP and have been brought into the PCP. Those delivery structures are maturing. As Paul [Wylie] said in his original opening, it is a key aim of the first half of this year and our commitment to the Audit Panel to get even more granular on the commitment from other agencies in this space. Of course, this is a convening and influencing piece. We have willing and able partners, but when you hold the budget for an organisation you have stronger levers, as it were.

Joanne McCartney AM: Obviously the CRCs have come in for quite a lot of stick. There was an inspection of North London CRCs 18 months ago that was quite damning. What role did you have in challenging that or the solutions to that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): We and London Councils have raised and openly discussed with the CRC the problems with CRC performance. We raised these very actively with the Ministry of Justice who, of course, hold the contract. We raised them very actively in terms of our current PCP responsibilities and used this as making the case for further devolution.

With regards to the Inspectorate, it is a sign of the maturity of our relationships with partnerships that the HMIC wanted our views on that inspection. I personally met with the inspectors there.

I have to say as well as a challenging relationship - the head of the CRC attends the LCRB and the performance challenge is very strongly put to them - we also want to enable them to succeed and to use what we have within our powers and our commissioning budgets the ability to create the conditions for success of probation. An example would be, again, female offending where we know there is a high degree of social harm caused from this group. Women offenders tend to be low-risk offenders but there is a knock-on effect of them not receiving appropriate support services given the high degree of correlation to those women having suffered domestic abuse. There is a high return on investment to giving good support services to women offenders and looking for alternatives to custody, not least for the benefit of their children. We have then - again, the decisions there are published - have a co-commissioned fund for female offender support service, co-commissioned with MOPAC money, National Health Service England money and London CRC/MTCnovo money. Despite the business as usual problems in CRC performance, which we are absolutely bringing to the attention of the MOJ, we are creating conditions for success by continuing to work with them as a partner.

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): That is a fairly comprehensive answer. The only additional thing we have done is to try to work with the CRC to embed it with London partners as much as possible when it first started and we continue to do that.

We are talking to it about the MOJ understanding the contract, understanding the investment, how that works and the implications for London. The LCRB is quite a healthy place, as Rebecca said, for that challenge, especially when an inspection is there and trying to get other partners to work towards that solution side as

well. There is quite a healthy balance between challenge and support. However, as we said earlier on, there is only so far we can go with national regional commissioning or a London convening role, which is why the devolution question arises again.

Joanne McCartney AM: One thing that concerns me is that different CRCs seem to be offering different levels of service and different information to local authorities which makes it very difficult in that regard. It is whether you can influence that.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Yes, absolutely. It would also be a useful role for this Committee. We are probably as one wanting a properly funded and properly effective probation service in London. We, and yourselves, have more limited levers. I think we are doing the maximum we can with the levers and investment we have.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You said at the beginning, Rebecca, that part of your role is a significant national influencing function. You have the CONTEST Board and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime chairs that. However, the issue of Prevent, and all the programmes that are funded through that, is all still done behind closed doors in the Home Office with no say or influence. Have you made any progress, as we had recommended as a Committee, in trying to get some devolution around that?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): Your report was, as I say, very helpful and has continued to give us a springboard. We have now made significant progress which Paul will describe.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Our CONTEST Board met this week. One of the issues we have been discussing is the delivery of the Countering Violent Extremism Programme that the Mayor announced just before Christmas [2017]. This year we will see very comprehensive community engagement, trying to find that adding-value space between what will be a national commission for extremism, that the national Government and the Home Office is working on, through the London Prevent Board which Martin Esom chairs, who is the Chief Executive of Waltham Forest and sub-borough level work. This is a theme that we will be returning to throughout the year. Certainly, the Committee will be a major part of our consultation.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: In terms of devolving of money - that is what we called for, devolving of money - have you had any success with that?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): One of the things we are hoping to use the Countering Violent Extremism Programme to do is to determine what services are best done at a pan-London level so we can therefore enter into further discussions with the Home Office about how that money is channelled and where it goes to. Yes, we have been talking to the Home Office about funding. We need to make sure it is the right type of services that are delivered at the right level. That is what this programme will answer.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Putting it another way, you have not got anywhere directly with them so you are doing a programme in order to give you the evidence base.

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): No, to be fair to the Home Office it is a partnership.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: They are interested in --

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): They are absolutely interested in how to deliver this best in London. They do see what we are doing in London, at the CONTEST Board, the Prevent Board and with the Mayor's new programme, as an opportunity to deliver things differently.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Your programme will be London-wide and not with this ridiculous issue of some boroughs being in and some out that we found in our evidence?

Paul Wylie (Director of Strategy, MOPAC): Yes, there are roles for each of those levels. Certainly, what we are looking at is London-wide.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: We ought to pick up looking at that at some point.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): That is reassuring. Susan, the last question?

Susan Hall AM: A very quick one to Dan. Given your position, are you consulted by the Parole Board on the release of prisoners?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): No.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): No, we were not.

Susan Hall AM: Given they are looking at different ways of running it with different transparency, do you think you should be?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): It is something we are discussing with the Victims Commissioner at the moment.

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): As part of the role of the Victims Commissioner, speaking up for victims.

Susan Hall AM: Do you think you should have been consulted?

Dan Hales (Acting Director of Integrated Offender Management, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, MOPAC): On individual cases?

Rebecca Lawrence (Chief Executive, MOPAC): It is not appropriate on individual cases for a strategic oversight body. However, as you will see, the Mayor has raised questions about the funding of this entire system and whether there is appropriate oversight there.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): You see where this is coming from.

Susan Hall AM: That is why I am asking the questions.

Steve O'Connell AM (Chairman): All right, thank you. We got that one out. Good. Thank you for that. We are where we are. Let us just go back to my agenda. Basically, thank you for your contributions.

Subject: Summary List of Actions

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 7 February 2018

This report will be considered in public

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, as listed in the report.**

Meeting of 11 January 2018

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
6	<p>The Impact and Functions of Impact</p> <p>During the course of the discussion the Chief Executive, MOPAC, agreed to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on the sign-off process for MOPAC's response to the College of Policing's public consultation on Indicative Sanctions, including who the responsible officer was for signing off such responses; • Details on the engagement structures that were in place to work with borough Heads of Community Safety on the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan; and • Details of when the issue of the MPS's response to child protection was first recorded on MOPAC's risk register. 	<p>In progress. The action was requested on 24 January 2018.</p>	<p>Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Continued ...</i></p>

Meeting of 5 October 2017

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
7	<p>Police and Crime Committee Work Programme</p> <p>The Committee delegated authority to the Chairman, in consultation with party Group Lead members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree the date and arrangements for a site visit to New Scotland Yard.</p>	In progress – a site visit is planned for 1 February 2018.	Scrutiny Manager

Meeting of 29 March 2017

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
8	<p>Police and Crime Committee Work Programme</p> <p>The Committee delegated authority to the Chairman, in consultation with the party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree arrangements for a site visit to the MPS training centre in Hendon to observe the facilities for the training and development of officers.</p>	The visit will take place later in the Assembly year.	<p>Scrutiny Manager</p> <p><i>Continued ...</i></p>

Meeting of 19 July 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
6	<p>Question and Answer Session with MOPAC and the MPS</p> <p>Provide a summary of the types of claims against the MPS and whether they had increased, and confirm the MPS budget for claims.</p>	In progress – a follow up request was sent on 17 January 2018.	MPS

Meeting of 3 March 2016

Minute item	Subject and action required	Status	Action by
5	<p>Victims and Vulnerability</p> <p>During the course of the discussion, the representatives from the MPS undertook to provide information about how long the Rapid Assessment Interface and Discharge (RAID) pilot would continue.</p>	A follow up request was sent on 17 January 2018 to ask whether it would be possible to provide the results of the pilot.	<p>MPS</p> <p><i>Continued ...</i></p>

Complaints about the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC)

Subject and action required	Status	Action by	Deadline, if applicable
<p>Complaints about the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No disclosures to report for the period from 19 January 2018 to 26 January 2018.</p>	<p>Monitoring Officer</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Transparency Procedure</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No disclosures to report for the period from 19 January 2018 to 26 January 2018.</p>	<p>Executive Director of Secretariat</p>	<p>n/a</p>

List of appendices to this report: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officer
Telephone: 020 7983 6559
Email: teresa.young@london.gov.uk

Subject: Response to London Assembly Brexit Directive III – Security after Brexit

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 7 February 2018

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Committee is asked to note the response from the Mayor to the letter from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee in respect of London Assembly Brexit Directive III.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the response from the Mayor to the letter from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee in respect of London Assembly Brexit Directive III, attached at Appendix 1 to the report.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Following the meeting of the Police and Crime Committee on 30 November 2017, the Chairman wrote to the Mayor on 7 December 2017, pushing for certainty for the law enforcement and criminal justice services in the run up to Brexit.
- 3.2 The Chairman's letter was reported to the meeting of this Committee on 11 January 2018 and is available on the GLA's website [here](#)¹:

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The response from the Mayor is attached at **Appendix 1** for the Committee to note.

¹ <https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s67576/05b%20-%20Action%20Taken%20Under%20Delegated%20Authority%20-%20Appendix%201.pdf>

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 arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 - Response from the Mayor to the letter from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee in respect of London Assembly Brexit Directive III.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer:	Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers
------------------	---

Telephone:	020 7983 6559
------------	---------------

Email:	teresa.young@london.gov.uk
--------	--

MAYOR OF LONDON

Steve O'Connell AM
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Our ref: MGLA081217-7016

Date: 23 JAN 2018

Dear Steve,

Thank you for your letter of 7 December 2017 where you again push for some certainty for our law enforcement and criminal justice services in the run up to Brexit.

I remain determined to ensure that no compromises will be made over public safety throughout the Brexit process. That is why I set out six 'red lines' to the Government which are crucial for continued cooperation on security and counter-terrorism with European partners.

All these have been identified by UK law enforcement as tools that must be retained or adequately replaced. There are case studies of where Europol and Eurojust have been instrumental in sentencing a person for the human trafficking of a 14-year-old girl and eight other women into prostitution, and then there is the example of when the police extradited one of the suspects of the London 2005 bomb attack within weeks via the European Arrest Warrant.

But it seems that I must say again, we need more than 'good will' from our Government on this. We need to get some clear agreement on the complex issues at hand to establish how we are actually going to continue cooperation with the EU on matters of security. This is why I have pressed the Home Secretary on this.

The Metropolitan Police Service, National Police Chiefs' Council and the National Crime Agency are undertaking work to ascertain the operational requirements post Brexit and are doing the relevant research for contingency planning. My Office for Policing And Crime are engaging with these relevant partners on their progress, concerns and considerations.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your letter and for the continued support of the Police and Crime Committee on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Sadiq Khan
Mayor of London

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Policing the Tower Hamlets Mayoral and Local Elections

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 7 February 2018

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides background information to the Police and Crime Committee for its meeting with invited guests to discuss policing the 2018 Tower Hamlets Mayoral and local elections.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the report as background to putting questions to invited guests on policing the 2018 Tower Hamlets Mayoral and local elections and notes the subsequent discussion.**
- 2.2 **That authority be delegated to the Chairman, in consultation with party Group Lead Members and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, to agree any output from the Committee's discussion.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Following the election of Lutfur Rahman as Mayor of Tower Hamlets in 2014, a number of allegations of election malpractice and fraud were made against him and others. Four petitioners (Andy Erlam, Debbie Simon, Azmal Hussein, Angela Moffat) presented an election petition to have the election set aside on several grounds: principally the alleged commission by Lutfur Rahman or his agents of corrupt and illegal practices contrary to the Representation of the People Act 1983. The petitioners also made allegations against the Returning Officer, though these were later dropped.
- 3.2 Following the hearing of the Petition, which began on 2 February 2015, Richard Mawrey QC handed down his judgement, finding against Lutfur Rahman on a variety of corrupt and illegal practices including false registration; false voting; personation; unlawful completion and use of voting documents by third parties; issuing of knowingly false statements; the payment of canvassers; bribery through the distribution of grant; and the use of undue spiritual influence.

- 3.3 The Court did not find in favour of the Petitioners on three counts: the charge of unlawful alteration of the ballot papers; of treating; and (largely because the law demands demonstration of quite a serious level of “force, violence or restraint” before it will permit an election to be avoided) of there being undue influence at polling stations.
- 3.4 Mr Rahman was banned from public office for five years and costs were awarded against him. However, neither Mawrey nor the Director of Public Prosecutions referred any matter to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to investigate.
- 3.5 At its meeting on 9 February 2017, the Committee investigated why despite the Election Court judgement no criminal prosecutions were forthcoming. The Committee wrote to the Deputy Mayor for Police and Crime recommending that she write to Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) to request a review of the Met’s activities as they pertain to investigating matters relating to the 2014 Mayoral Election in Tower Hamlets and the findings of the Election Court judgement 2015.
- 3.6 Following these events and the continuing concerns about the failure of the MPS to bring in any criminal charges, the then Acting Commissioner agreed that the MPS would undertake a new investigation, Operation Lynemouth, to review and reassess the allegations. HMIC agreed to provide quarterly assurance reports; the Committee has met with the HMIC lead officer to discuss the progress of these investigations.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 This meeting will be used to review the arrangements being taken to ensure a free and fair election. Members will be seeking reassurance on the level of policing resources being deployed to pre-empt and disrupt any attempts at electoral fraud. Members will assess levels of risk and consider whether any further action or recommendations are required.
- 4.2 Invited guests include:
- Will Tuckley, Chief Executive of Tower Hamlets;
 - Claire Bassett, Chief Executive of the Electoral Commission;
 - Chief Superintendent Sue Williams QPM, Borough Commander, Tower Hamlets, MPS; and
 - Detective Superintendent Stuart Ryan, MPS.

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: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer:	Richard Derecki, Scrutiny Team Manager
------------------	--

Telephone:	020 7983 4899
------------	---------------

E-mail:	Richard.Derecki@london.gov.uk
---------	-------------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Police and Crime Committee Work Programme

Report to: Police and Crime Committee

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 7 February 2018

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 updated work programme as set out in the report.**

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 involves a range of activities, including formal meetings with MOPAC, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and other stakeholders, site visits, written consultations and round table meetings.

3.2 The Committee will usually meet twice a month. One of the monthly meetings is usually 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 primarily use Q&A meetings to investigate topical issues and review MPS performance, including consideration of MOPAC's approach to holding the MPS to account.

3.3 The Committee's other monthly meeting is used to consider a particular topic or aspect of policing and crime in greater detail. These investigations will be conducted either by the full Committee or working groups. Working groups will have delegated authority to prepare reports on the Committee's behalf in consultation with party Group Lead Members. Full reports will be approved and published by the full Committee.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The work programme has been designed to proactively examine issues of interest but also allows for flexibility to respond to topical issues and for the Committee to react to MOPAC's work programme. Topics will be added to the timetable for Q&A meetings as they arise. The Committee's work programme from May onwards will be agreed in due course.

Month	Thematic Topic	Q&A Session
February	Wednesday 7 February 2018 Policing the 2018 Tower Hamlets Mayoral and Local Elections	Wednesday 21 February 2018 Q&A meeting
March	Wednesday 7 March 2018 Healthcare in Custody	Wednesday 21 March 2018 Q&A meeting
April	No meetings	

Healthcare in Custody

- 4.2 There are widespread concerns over the quality of care being provided to people who pass through London's custody suites. The Committee will assess the steps the MPS and MOPAC are taking to ensure the most effective model of provision and clinical governance is in place. This will involve examining issues such as the recruitment and retention of custody nurses; deaths in custody; the needs of children and young people who enter custody; and support for those with mental health needs. The Committee held a roundtable on 13 December 2017 with various front-line practitioners, to hear about the current opportunities and challenges in improving healthcare in custody.

Site Visits and other meetings

- 4.3 From time to time the Committee undertakes site visits to inform its work. The Committee has agreed previously to undertake site visits to Hendon Police College and the MPS's training centre at Gravesend. It is anticipated that these visits will take place in the next few months.
- 4.4 On 17 January 2018, as part of its investigation into women offenders in London, the Committee visited HMP Downview. Members had the opportunity to hear from the prison staff, the prison Governor and prisoners themselves about the challenges in supporting London's women offenders and what more the Mayor might do to help reduce reoffending among this group of offenders.
- 4.5 On 1 February 2018, a visit to New Scotland Yard is planned to view the new facilities and receive a short briefing on the MPS's counter terrorism efforts. Members of the Budget and Performance Committee have also been invited for a demonstration of the new technology being used by front line officers in the MPS.

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: None

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None
Contact Officer: Becky Short, Scrutiny Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 4760
E-mail: becky.short@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank